

other kinds of settlements. During the 1840's several national associations existed for the purpose of founding communities, and many prominent Americans befriended this life style, including Nathaniel Hawthorne, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Henry David Thoreau, all of whom either lived or spent considerable time at Brook Farm. The communal tradition thus has old and respectable roots in America. (Even the Pilgrims came here to establish a communal society.)

Today I would estimate that at least 100,000 people live in some form of commune with 5 to 10 times that number considering it. (This is an informed guess for purposes of our discussion; don't quote me on it.)

Groups labelled communes vary enormously in size, family style, child-rearing patterns, economic base, and stability. (Some really are total communities.) To make any statements about communes *must take this diversity into account.*

Communes range from 5 people sharing living space to several hundred.

There is a wide variety of family style in communes, including: 1. monogamous couples who share a dwelling unit (either a separate house or rooms in a common house) along with their children. Also single people in their own rooms. 2. Monogamous couples sharing a room, children living together in children's quarters, single people in their own rooms. 3. All adults and children in separate rooms, some couples (married or unmarried) forming though not living together, liberal sexual norms, no clear pattern. 4. Group marriage, couples, and all adults engaging in sexual relations with all others. No exclusive attachments to adults or children. 5. Celibacy (a rare form today, more common in the last century) no sexual contact. Children if present either born before their parents entered the community or adopted.

Structures for child-rearing vary along the following dimensions:

1. From children living with their parents to children living together in children's quarters.

2. From parents having primary responsibility for their own children to the commu-

nity as a whole sharing responsibility for all children and making policy with respect to them, sometimes delegating this to "house parents" for the children's quarters.

3. From the commune forming its own school and teaching children internally to the commune sending children to school on the outside.

Economic base of communes similarly varies. Some form a production unit and support themselves by working together on a community enterprise, whether a farm or a business. Some of these enterprises are very successful. (Where members work internally on community businesses children often work side-by-side with adults part-time.) Other communes send some adults to outside jobs.

Communes also differ in stability. Some have only existed for a few years and have a high turnover of members. Others, however, have existed for long periods (some well over a hundred years) with a stable group of members.

Examples of advantages of communes. (I welcome your comments or additions—this is only a partial list.)

1. Strong sense of caring and belonging.
2. Multiplicity of role models for children—get to know many adults and many adults tastes.
3. If the group has its own enterprise, then work and family life are well integrated. Children can see their own parents and other adults at work and often work side-by-side.
4. Children can be a vital part of the life of the group, rather than a separate category of person to be isolated and ignored. They are often given the opportunity to make a real contribution to commune life, with their own work to do, developing their sense of responsibility easier transition to adult status.
5. Cooperation an important part of day-to-day life and training in cooperation this is a natural result of living.
6. Reduction of dependency on just two adults. If one or more of the parents is absent the child and the remaining adult still

have a number of other strong, caring relationships with adults.

7. If the commune runs its own schools, then all parents and other adults can more easily participate in the life of children and children in the life of adults.

8. Creation of strong peer groups for children. Sexual learning more natural.

9. Where the commune has a strong set of values and beliefs, both children and adults gain a sense of identity, and purpose.

10. Training in interpersonal competence. Given the close set of relationships in a commune children learn more effectively a basic set of skills in human relations.

11. In many communes children have more rights as well as responsibilities. (Some of these are advantages of any strong family form.)

Examples of problems of communes:

1. Difficult problem of establishing a viable way to organize; therefore many communes find it hard to survive.

2. Creation of strong "in-group" feeling sometimes isolates members from the outside. It is sometimes difficult for a commune to incorporate change.

3. Emphasis on strong ties to the group means that individuals often must be willing to give a measure of privacy and autonomy.

4. Dynamic in stable communes as they develop toward concentrating all energy and loyalty within the commune.

(I'm stopping here because of time and space constraints but there is a great deal more to be said. Let's discuss it further.)

Legislation currently existing in the following areas has discriminatory implications for communes: income tax, adoption laws, housing laws. Communes are also subject to much official harassment.

Since communes are organized around principles of mutual support, self-help, and joint responsibility by all members for all others, they may potentially relieve society of some social burdens rather than adding to them. Therefore this potential should be actively encouraged, and programs built with this in mind. (I would be interested in discussing this further.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, December 29, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

So, my brothers, do stand firmly in the Lord.—Philippians 4: 1.

Our Father God, who reveals Thyself in all that is good and true and beautiful, help us to make our hearts receptive to Thee, and our minds responsive to the leading of Thy Spirit, as we face the tasks of the last days of the old year. Now and always may we keep alive our faith in values that live forever and in virtues that never die. No matter what may be our lot in life—joy or sorrow, victory or defeat—may we be strengthened by Thy presence and sustained by Thy power as we labor for the good of our country and as we work for a better world in which men can live together with justice and in peace.

We mourn the passing of our beloved colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS, "who more than self his country loved." For his devotion to our country, particularly our Armed Forces, we thank Thee. For the love in his home, the warmth of his friendship, the greatness of his heart, we are grateful. The passing of this highly trusted and great-spirited public servant reminds us again that in the midst

of life we are in death. Bless his family with the comfort of Thy presence and strengthen them for the days ahead.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 22, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13810. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. Poehlein.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10874. An act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort

Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had tabled the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 19590) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

And that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 14, 26, 31, 49, and 53 to the above-entitled bill.

And that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the above-entitled bill, disagreed to by the House, and requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

And appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSEL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 14984) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of

funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142, 359-363, and for other purposes," together with all accompanying papers.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 19928) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to House amendments numbered 8, 11, 16, 22, 29, 44, 53, 58, 62, 71, and 84 and that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 15, to the foregoing bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN) is recognized.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn of the passing of our colleague, and my good friend, Congressman LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS last Monday morning, December 28, 1970, at 1:40 a.m. The State of South Carolina, the Nation, and the entire world has lost a great leader.

It is not easy for me to speak about the passing of Congressman RIVERS, since we have been just about as close as any two Members could be during the past 30 years. We represented adjoining districts which cover the entire coastal area of South Carolina where we were confronted with similar problems at all times.

Congressman RIVERS was always one of the first people I saw on arrival at the House Office Building between 7 and 8 a.m. Our parking spaces were adjoining in the House garage and I have never heard MENDEL complain concerning his strenuous 12-hour schedule each day or his health.

Mr. RIVERS' record will stand and be well remembered for its forceful brilliance and integrity. He was a true statesman, an American who gave of himself to uphold the ideals upon which this country of ours is founded. He had a strength of character that could not be swayed by vigorous attempts to alter his ideals. And he answered his challengers with oratory, the likes of which few men today can muster.

On December 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, MENDEL RIVERS handled what was to be his last piece of legislation on the floor, the resolution in support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. He took a strong position, urging that the United States be resolute in protecting its military men and its heritage. In his closing remarks that day, he said, among other things:

Mr. Speaker, I want the world to know that I would tell that crowd in Hanoi, you will either treat them with human dignity or some of you will not be here tomorrow . . . So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if I were the President of the United States, I would deliver an ultimatum to this crowd and let them guess where the next blow is coming from.

That was the kind of man he was. He believed in determining what was the right thing, and then standing up firmly for it.

My heartfelt sympathies go out to his lovely wife and children. He was a devoted family man and I know what a void his passing will leave in their lives. I trust that they will be sustained by their fine memories of him as one of our greatest statesmen and patriots.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our dear colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, takes from our midst a valued friend, an outstanding legislator, and one who loved our country with a devotion and intensity which was always evidenced as a Member of this House and particularly as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

MENDEL RIVERS was a man of strong convictions, particularly in the field of national defense, and of a firm foreign policy. MENDEL RIVERS knew that a strong national defense was a powerful instrument and so necessary in adopting and carrying out the foreign policy of our country, particularly a firm foreign policy.

While everyone did not agree with him on a powerful national defense—and a clear majority of the Members of the House, including myself, did—but those who did not respected MENDEL RIVERS because they knew he was intellectually honest and believed in the policies of national defense and foreign policy he so ardently and strongly and courageously advocated.

In the history of our country there are few Members of the Congress who have contributed more to a strong national defense than MENDEL RIVERS. He realized in the troubled world of today, with the challenge that faces free governments everywhere, that if he were going to err in judgment, it was better if he erred on the side of strength than on the side of weakness in connection with our national defense. He also was aware of the meaning and significance of what is an indisputable fact today, which some persons overlook, that the Atlantic Ocean is no longer our first line of defense.

He knew, as all Americans should now know, that we must be prepared before the fact and not after the fact, and that World War II was the last time that our great country, our beloved country, would ever have an opportunity to prepare itself after the fact. In this opinion of our dear friend, I looked "eye to eye" with him.

MENDEL RIVERS represented strength and security, not gambling with weakness and appeasement.

While MENDEL RIVERS was a man of strong convictions, he possessed an understanding mind and a kind heart toward his fellow human beings. There are countless thousands of persons who are the beneficiaries of his good deeds.

A fighter in committee and in debate in the House for what he stood for, he did not harbor any ill feelings toward anyone. A strong character, yes; but a kind gentleman, yes.

So we pause today, my dear colleagues, with deep sorrow to eulogize and pay tribute to MENDEL RIVERS, a great man and a good man, who has left his strong and favorable impressions upon the pages of American history.

For my colleagues in the House and myself and Mrs. McCormack, I extend our deep sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and her daughters and her son in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished dean of the delegation from South Carolina and all my colleagues from the State in which my wife was born in their expression of sorrow over the death of the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

I join the great Speaker of the House in the stirring tribute which he has made.

The passing of our late colleague struck down one of the strongest public figures of the Nation and one of the ablest legislators of our time. Seldom has the House seen in one person a combination of so much resolution, so much devotion to his ideals, and such varied talents as was possessed by our late colleague. He was the No. 1 public official of the Nation in the area of insisting on a strong national defense. He was known throughout the Armed Forces as one of the finest friends our fighting men have ever had. He was a finished student of the subject matter with which his committee dealt. Few Members have ever known their area of operations in the House as he knew his.

He was strong. He was confident. He was able. He was one of the masters of debate of this generation. I am convinced that every Member of the House, whether he agreed with him or was hostile to his point of view on any issue, would concede that on the floor or on the rostrum he was peerless in debate, eloquent, fluent, witty, intelligent, and always in command of every situation.

I have had several occasions to visit Charleston, S.C., with MENDEL RIVERS. No Member of this House was ever held in higher esteem by his constituents. They loved him. They have lost their greatest public servant. The Nation has lost an outstanding legislator, and the House has lost one of its most competent and colorful Members. I have lost a devoted friend.

Mrs. Albert and I extend to Mrs. Rivers and their children our deepest personal sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this House has lost one of its most eminent and distinguished Members in the passing of L. MENDEL RIVERS, late the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

His long career was marked by a ceaseless devotion to a strong defense force

for the United States. His expertise on matters relating to the military was legendary, as was his prodigious capacity for hard work. He was ever the loyal son of his native State of South Carolina and devoted in his allegiance and loyalty to the United States.

A man of great personal charm and strong opinions, he will be sorely missed by all of his colleagues.

I join other Members in extending sincere condolences to the Rivers family on their immeasurable loss.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues, including the distinguished Speaker, the distinguished majority leader, and the distinguished Republican leader, in expressing the sentiment which I know is felt throughout this body at the loss of one of the great Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this loss particularly, because 30 years ago I came to this House of Representatives with MENDEL RIVERS.

I look about me now, and as far as I know, the only Members left in that group are my good friend and distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the successor to the late MENDEL RIVERS as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the able gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), and the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES.)

Throughout the years during which I knew MENDEL RIVERS he not only distinguished himself as a great leader of this country but also as a friend of the Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, MENDEL RIVERS was a man of his word. He was a man of great honor. He was a hard worker. My office happens to be just one or two doors from the office which he occupied. Frankly, I can state that I never arrived earlier at my office than did MENDEL RIVERS.

Mr. Speaker, seldom do we know what is happening to one of our dear ones. It was just a few weeks ago that MENDEL, despite his dedication to the armed services of this country, talked to me about a matter entirely separate from matters involving the armed services but about a matter with reference to the University of South Carolina. Just before he left I had a long talk with him about some of our problems and at no time had I ever heard him complain in any way. But on that day he said to me that he had been having a little trouble with his heart. However, I came to know that he had had a great deal of difficulty with his heart extending back for many years, but little did I realize how sedious it was.

I join with the distinguished Speaker and others in extending my deepest sympathy and condolences to his lovely wife and his three children.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the distinguished majority whip for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the dean of the South Carolina delegation, for yielding to me at this time.

All South Carolinians, all patriotic Americans, and lovers of freedom throughout the world mourn with us today over the passing of one of the great leaders of our time, a South Carolinian who now takes his place in history along with Calhoun, Hampton, Andrew Jackson, and other great leaders of our State.

MENDEL RIVERS was no stranger to poverty or to hard work. His life was in the classic Horatio Alger tradition. His father, a member of a patriotic old family that had been in America since before the Revolution, raised cotton and ran a turpentine mill near the Hell Hole Swamp around Gumville, S.C. The elder Rivers died when MENDEL was quite young, forcing him to take on more of the farm chores. Later, while a high school student, he would arise at 4 a.m., milk cows, deliver newspapers, and then catch the trolley into Charleston. Throughout these early years of adversity he showed the energy and tenacity that were to characterize his public service, while experiencing the hardships that were to give him such a keen insight into the problems of poverty. Not many of my colleagues are aware of the fact, but MENDEL RIVERS' voting record in the House of Representatives was among the most progressive of all his colleagues from the Deep South. He supported much legislation to help the underprivileged, to help them up the ladder of life. And more important was his leadership in bringing well-paying, industrial jobs to all the people of his district and State. Here was a man who did something tangible about economic distress, and we all know of his pride in the positive economic effect of these great installations and industries on some of the previously most deprived and disadvantaged of our citizens.

Of course MENDEL RIVERS advocated military strength. He advocated military strength through necessarily vast expenditures for national defense because he was a lover of peace. He believed that the only way to have peace was to be strong enough to withstand and forestall aggression.

MENDEL RIVERS believed that weakness invites disaster and invites war, and that strength promotes peace—this MENDEL RIVERS believed. As a former GI myself, I can testify to the universal admiration the average GI held for MENDEL RIVERS. He was their champion. They believed in him.

Though, as we now know, he was then seriously ill, MENDEL RIVERS recently spoke out vigorously in the well of the House, citing the essential role the American textile industry plays in our national defense. And we well remember his recent speech at the keel-laying ceremonies for the nuclear frigate *South Carolina* where he pledged to fight for a U.S. Navy that is once again second to

none. We remember too his gallant speech, but a few days before he entered the hospital, in behalf of our POW's.

I would like to tell you something else about MENDEL RIVERS, about the personal problems which he courageously overcame. For many years he vanquished the heart trouble that only some few of us knew about. We are aware of another personal problem over which he had been totally and courageously victorious. He was successful over this personal problem through the same tenacity and perseverance with which he led his great committee. His victorious battle over this problem is an inspiration to all of us.

In spite of his tremendously heavy workload, which often required him to be in his office before dawn, MENDEL RIVERS developed a closely knit family which he dearly loved. He was devoted to his mother, who was a great influence on his life and a great lady in the tradition of the old South. He was devoted to his two sisters. Always a source of strength to MENDEL RIVERS were his children and his lovely wife, Margaret, the former Margaret Simons Middleton, a daughter of one of our State's most distinguished and illustrious families.

On his last visit to my home, a little over 2 months ago, MENDEL RIVERS made a speech from my front porch and he spoke for 45 minutes. When lunch was served many of the rest of us stayed inside and had something brought in to us, but MENDEL RIVERS requested to go out and meet the people out in the pasture where a barbecue was being served. He wanted to mingle with them. He shook hands with at least 2,000 of the many thousands gathered there, and was so surrounded by wellwishers that he scarcely was able to eat.

He asked to walk up the main street of my hometown and go in some little stores, just meeting people on the street and in the stores. This is one indication of the real character of MENDEL RIVERS, and the secret of his fantastic political success. He was a warm and colorful man loved and admired by people from all walks of life. He was loved and admired by the people of South Carolina as perhaps no other individual of our time.

I remember every time—and I did not always go—but every time, Mr. Speaker, that I went to our congressional prayer breakfasts, MENDEL RIVERS was there. He believed fervently and devotedly in an all-powerful, omnipotent Heavenly Father. And I agree with Dr. Billy Graham upon learning of the sad news yesterday when he said that we are—and I believe this—going to meet MENDEL RIVERS in Heaven.

Do you know what my two little boys said yesterday? They said, "Daddy, this is awful news." They loved MENDEL RIVERS, my children did. And you know, I remember asking them one time not so long ago whom they would like to see the next time as President of the United States, and I named several individuals. Without a moment's hesitation they said, "MENDEL RIVERS of Charleston, S.C." Not just my children, but a great many youngsters were attracted to him. They loved his colorful and unique manner, a public style which, of course, can never be duplicated. But perhaps more important, they believed in his genuineness, his

straightforward manner, his utter lack of hypocrisy and duplicity. He always spoke and acted according to his beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Millie, who admired the chairman so much, and each of my children join me in extending to MENDEL RIVERS' family our deepest sympathy, to his lovely wife and daughters and to his son Lucius Mendel Rivers, Jr. In large measure their private loss is also our public loss. May we all derive strength and sustenance from his memory.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the death of MENDEL RIVERS will be mourned by a great many people. They include servicemen and their families who benefited greatly from his work. No man in our time contributed more to give them the same standard of living which they are called upon to defend. They include that great majority of American citizens who still understand the essentiality of a strong defense and who know he was one of the foremost champions of a strong defense for our country. He was firmly convinced, and properly so, that relaxing our defense efforts would represent a clear invitation to the Communist world that America no longer presents a threat to their plans for world domination. Those who mourn him include also the people who appreciate a fearless fighter for the ideals of America. He understood those ideals, and believed in them. They include in particular the State of South Carolina and his constituents who had great faith in him and benefited so richly from his 30 years of devoted stewardship and sound representation in Congress. And they include his colleagues, who can best measure the ability of the men and women with whom they associate and who know that here was a man who stood tall among our Nation's leaders.

MENDEL RIVERS has built a monument of good works, and he leaves friends and loved ones who know he will not be replaced. I knew him well, better than most. He and I came to Congress together in 1941, a long time ago. During these past 30 years we have shared a close and warm association and I counted him one of my dearest friends. I watched him grow in greatness and applauded his work for America. We have lost a champion among Congressmen. America has lost a great son—a man respected, honored, and beloved.

To Margaret, his beloved wife, to his daughters Margaret—Mrs. Robert G.—Eastman and Lois Marion, and to his son, Lucius Mendel, Jr., Mrs. Sikes and I extend our deep and earnest sympathies. We, too, have lost someone we loved and we understand, at least in part, the measure of their bereavement. This is a sad day for all of us and for America—a very sad day.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me, almost impossible to express the great loss I feel with the passing of my good friend and colleague, MENDEL

RIVERS. For many years I sat next to him on our Committee on Armed Services, he as chairman and I as ranking minority member. In all our committee proceedings he was fair and just, giving every member full opportunity to state his views.

Our committee has a reputation of being nonpartisan. There is nothing partisan about our defense posture. And, as chairman, MENDEL RIVERS made certain that partisan considerations did not enter into our deliberations. He was not arbitrary. He never made a major decision without consulting the minority.

He is said to have been controversial, but not insofar as I am concerned. He was controversial because he stood firm on what he believed. He stood firm on making certain that our country had a national defense second to none. He stood firm on the premise that the American people must at all times be secure. He stood firm on the principle that our best assurance for peace is to be prepared.

MENDEL RIVERS is no longer with us, but he will live on in the mind and heart of all of us who knew him. To know him was to love and respect him.

With the passing of MENDEL RIVERS this Congress has suffered a great loss. Our country has suffered a great loss, South Carolina has suffered a great loss, for no one could be more dedicated to his country than he. And I, Mr. Speaker, have suffered a loss, much greater than I can possibly say. God bless his fine family at this time in their bereavement.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful that the dean of the South Carolina delegation has yielded to me on this sad occasion. I can vividly recall my first impression of MENDEL RIVERS on the floor of the House. He was an active, vigorous participant in the business of the House of Representatives on a most important legislative matter. He was a most impressive debater, an individual who had a personality that was different from that of any one of us. Because of his great ability and his personality I was tremendously impressed with this Member that I had never met. On a number of occasions I had the opportunity to be with him on issues, and on a very few occasions to differ with him. MENDEL RIVERS was the best whether he was with you or against you.

I can say without any hesitation or qualification that MENDEL RIVERS was one of the most dedicated Americans that I have ever known to serve in the House of Representatives. He never ducked an issue, and when he felt that the views in which he believed should be expressed, he spoke them strongly, clearly, and was willing to stand on his record in defense of those views which, in almost every case, were on behalf of a strong America in a difficult world.

It was a shock to me, in the first instance, several weeks ago when I learned that he had a medical problem that eventually led to his passing. But I think the fact that he never told many that he had this illness was typical of MENDEL RIVERS. He had such strength of character and such dedication to doing the job that his

own personal ill health was secondary to the job that he had to do.

We in the Congress have lost a dear friend. We in the Congress have lost a man who was a leader for what was good for America. It will be most difficult to replace him. His record has been indelibly written over the long years he served.

I join the others in extending to his wonderful family the very deepest condolences from Mrs. Ford and myself, and extend to them our best wishes in this hour of difficulty.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN).

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like the other Members of the House, I am deeply saddened by the passing of my dear and esteemed friend, Chairman MENDEL RIVERS. I served with MENDEL RIVERS for many years on the House Armed Services Committee and was in a position to know from close, almost daily contacts, his great talents, his irreconcilable commitment to country and the cause of human freedom. He was a great patriot and a great American.

He was supremely dedicated to his work as has been so well observed here by the distinguished majority and minority leaders, and other distinguished colleagues who have spoken.

He was knowledgeable to an amazing extent that is difficult to describe, because his knowledge was so all-embracing and his grasp of the affairs of the armed services was profound and relevant to virtually every facet of our far-flung defense system. His expertise in military and related matters was truly prodigious and covered the entire field.

He was powerful of advocacy, strong of conviction, and vigorous and courageous in his approach to vital defense questions and their appropriate settlement.

He knew what his goals were at all times, and he had the ability, the experience, the determination, and the strength of character combined with high resolve and patriotism, to perform his duties as he saw fit in the best interest, as he honestly conceived it, of building the strength of this Nation and protecting and defending its security and its posture in the world.

It would be impossible for me in these brief remarks to measure either the quality or the extent of the tremendous contributions that MENDEL RIVERS has made to this Nation during the time he has been chairman of our House Armed Services Committee, and during the entire period of his service in this great House which comprised many years.

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that the record he made here is so memorable and outstanding in its import and impact upon the national safety and interest that it will long remain as an inspiration to all who follow him in the Armed Services Committee and in this House.

His sincerity of purpose, the spirit of dedication, the high motivation he reflected, to keep our country safe and secure against its enemies, foreign and domestic—these indeed will be high goals for anyone to follow, let alone to reach, because MENDEL RIVERS has left a legacy here to the Members of the House and to

our committee that will always remain in this body, and will constitute an imperishable memory as well as an example for many generations of Americans, who will be, not only impressed, but also greatly inspired, by the splendid outstanding services and contributions our dear friend, MENDEL RIVERS, made to our country and to its safety, its security and its well-being.

To touch another point which Chairman RIVERS always stressed in his brilliant service, he was greatly concerned about the well-being, health care, and welfare of the officers, men and women who serve in the armed services, and he gave a great deal of his time, effort, and attention unselfishly to make sure they had better compensation, conditions of work, so far as possible under the circumstances under which they serve, as well as entitlements and rights to generous health, hospital, and medical care, which were the best that could be provided by this Congress in the light of their specialized service.

The members of the armed services generally recognize the great, unpayable debt to this great leader, just as this Nation and this Congress does, for his tremendous, truly invaluable contributions to our country in building up military power and strength we need in this country in these dangerous times, to preserve and protect our free institutions against every threat and jeopardy, and to keep our country the great shrine of freedom, liberty, and justice it has always been, and that it must continue to be, in order to grow in strength, in greatness, and in the luster, freedom, and ways of peace because there can be no peace in this country, in this world without the powerful intent and resolution on the part of free men, here in this Nation and elsewhere, to defend their blessed heritage in every way that may be necessary.

It is difficult indeed for me at this time when my heart is so filled with deep sorrow and grief at the passing of my dearly beloved friend, comrade, and leader, to utter the words that I would like most of all to utter at this time regarding the enduring value of the great contributions of our beloved friend MENDEL RIVERS for many years of his busy life.

I extend to his sorely bereaved, loving, and devoted wife Margaret and wonderful family my prayers and deepest sympathy and my expressions of profound sorrow and to join with them in mourning their illustrious husband and father.

May the good Lord bring the dear ones he loved, and loved him, the strength and courage to bear their irreparable loss with true spiritual resignation and bless them with His spirit of reconciliation and peace.

The Nation has lost a great patriot, his district a great public servant, and the House a great leader. May our dear friend MENDEL find eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished dean of the South Carolina delegation taking this time—who made us all. One could always find

and certainly appreciate his yielding to me—so that I may speak as one of the members of the Committee on Armed Services about our late departed colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Not too long ago, a young constituent of mine, stationed at the Patuxent Naval Station, stopped by the office to visit with his Congressman.

While he waited in the reception room prior to our meeting, he chatted with a member of my staff. An unforgettable part of the conversation went something like this: "Congressman Hall is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, isn't he?" asked the young man.

My staff member replied in the affirmative.

"MENDEL RIVERS is the chairman of that committee, isn't he?" said the young sailor.

"He is," replied the staff member.

"You know," said the young seaman, "if he was to ever run for President, I know a heck of a lot of servicemen who would vote for him."

That young man probably spoke more truth than fiction, for one of the outstanding attributes of L. MENDEL RIVERS, was his deep concern for the men in uniform. Their well-being was first and foremost in his mind.

He wanted them to be well paid and constantly sought to increase their remuneration. He insisted on comparability with commercial enterprise.

He wanted them to have the best of health care and gave his personal approval to my proposal, now law, for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Defense of Health Affairs.

He wanted them to have the finest equipment possible and became an aggressive proponent for improved weaponry, and the necessary research and development funds to keep it the finest.

He loved his nation dearly and feared for her well-being; thus he became an eloquent spokesman for a strong defensive posture so as to keep us always prepared for whatever challenge needed to be met. Truly he, more than self, his country loved.

L. MENDEL RIVERS was many things to many people. To me he was more than a colleague in the Congress. We developed a camaraderie that existed outside the confines of the committee room, and had more the connotation of brothers than of friends. Perhaps this relationship plus me being a physician gave me a little better insight into the man, than the many who have written reams about him yet have never been successful in penetrating the surface to find the real character deep inside.

I was with MENDEL for a considerable time the weekend before and for a few cloistered moments on the floor of the House prior to his entering the hospital. I knew what was at stake, as did he. I took comfort in the fact that he faced his most serious challenge as he had all the others, "Head on." He felt his responsibility to the Nation and thought the odds made the gamble a must. He had all the qualities of properly defined leadership.

To some, it may come as a surprise that L. MENDEL RIVERS was a deeply religious man and spoke often of the God

him at the House prayer breakfast each Thursday morning.

He was a proud man. Proud of his country, his State, his home, and of the accomplishments of the committee he chaired.

He was a controversial man, and knew it, yet he was always willing to "let the chips fall where they may."

He was a good Congressman, and represented his constituents as well as any man in the House of Representatives.

He was a prideful and devoted family man with joy in his lady and their children.

It will be a long time before such a man as he will again walk in the Chambers of the House. Maybe never.

It is tribute enough to say that L. MENDEL RIVERS will be missed, however, there is little doubt that his presence will be felt for many years to come.

In the final analysis, the real and lasting eulogies to Congressman RIVERS will not be written in words, but in deeds. In the ships of the fleet, the planes of the Air Force, and the men of the U.S. armed services who have always been the recipients of his untiring efforts.

Bettie and I join all in heartfelt sympathy, prayers, and love to Margaret and the family.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the dean of the South Carolina delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a very delicate position today.

The Nation has lost a great American and I have lost a great friend.

As my colleague from New Orleans indicated, MENDEL came here 30 years ago with us and BOB SIKES, and we stood in this House and took the oath of office. The ranks have been thinned since then, and today, as we read the roster of the House, we find only nine names on that roster of 435 who were on the list at the time we took the oath. Nine remain.

So many things have been said of MENDEL RIVERS, so many things have been said that would have been better not to have been said. But in the saying of those things that should not have been said we must realize that they were said without knowledge, in ignorance, and unknowing.

Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of knowing MENDEL RIVERS. There was a mutual affection between us which I think has been shared by very, very few people. I shared a trust of confidence in him that was continually reflected in the assignments he gave me to carry out on the Committee on Armed Services.

From the day he became the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee there was scarcely a single matter of high priority, of national import, or importance that he did not assign me to chair a special committee and report back to him.

Mr. Speaker, I walked in the shadow of his confidence and never betrayed it. I cherished it. If I could only impart to the Members of this body the man that I knew, I would be so happy.

Before he came to Congress, MENDEL lived in New Orleans for 2 years. That was 2 years before I came here. The de-

velopment of that friendship is one which so few of us have an opportunity to experience. His abilities, his humor, his fairness in debate all were so composite in him that it made him a most outstanding and unusual man. I think this was reflected in the relationship which existed between MENDEL RIVERS and the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK). MENDEL was attracted to and loved by our beloved Speaker. Of course, as all of us know, MENDEL's philosophy and my philosophy were pretty much the same. They were kin to each other. His greatest thoughts were pretty much his own philosophy in that he termed himself a "McCormackocrat." He claimed there was a new party in the House and that was the "McCormackrat Party" of which he was a member. I tried to join, but MENDEL told me it was impossible to do so. He would deliberately tell everyone about his close association with the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, MENDEL and I learned about the handling of legislation at the feet of the great Carl Vinson. He often referred to our attending the "Vinson College," from which college no one ever graduated. In Mr. Vinson's own words, MENDEL and I were "Peck's bad boys," because in our mutual like for each other and sometimes the likeness of our dispositions and expressions he used this reference. But we loved him, and I know he loved us. He trained us in the art of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the hollow phrases that he gave his life to his country, that he was a dedicated man, that he believed in this and that he believed in that. Far too seldom do we get down to specifics. In this particular case of MENDEL RIVERS we are fortunate to be able to come down to specifics. As Dr. HALL has stated, he was one of the few men who knew MENDEL's condition. He never complained. Three weeks ago plus 1 day he stood in the well of this House and held the same mike that I now hold and fought for a resolution in which he believed with the fierce advocacy that he believed in the things he thought were right.

Those who disagreed with him, within their right, were attempting every parliamentary maneuver there was to change that resolution. The Speaker in his wisdom counseled with MENDEL and he held his ground. On that day when he was here exposing himself to this turmoil and to those turbulent arguments, he should have been in the hospital in Birmingham being operated on, and yet he was 6 months late getting there. If MENDEL RIVERS had listened to the advice of his doctors he would have been in the hospital 6 months ago, and his chances of recovery would have been 80 percent. But yet he saw in his work here the call to a duty that he could not reject. Yes, he did stay on the firing line, and yes, he did fight for that which he believed in.

I must tell you and share this with you: that I think I am the only Member who saw him in the hospital 2 weeks ago Wednesday, and I must also tell you that the MENDEL RIVERS I talked to in

that hospital bed was the same MENDEL RIVERS that you knew on the floor of this House, passionately dedicated to that in which he believed, and barking instructions to me on what to do from that hospital bed.

I returned with those instructions, and carried the message to his most devoted friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN) who now becomes the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and told him what MENDEL had told me. I delivered the same message to the Speaker. We were in disagreement with MENDEL's position, but not one of us refused to recognize the fact that MENDEL wanted it that way, and he went to his grave with it being that way.

So the accolades we pay today, and the moments we pause to pay tribute to him are but sands upon the beach that can well be washed away in time, but there are things that can never be washed away. There are things that never can be forgotten, those memorable days of MENDEL RIVERS standing in the well of this House and leading a fight in which he believed; of not silencing the voice to sponsor that to which he was dedicated. Those things will never die, those things will never go away.

It was my privilege on Christmas morning to talk with his wife, Margaret, at Birmingham. Mrs. Hébert and myself had quite a long conversation with her, and we were feeling very optimistic, and I just could not make myself believe that this great heart had ever stopped beating, but it did, yes, MENDEL RIVERS is dead but the memories of MENDEL RIVERS will never die.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON, Mr. Speaker, I feel ill-prepared to express adequately my deep emotions and sentiments in regard to our late colleague MENDEL RIVERS. He was always tolerant in his dealings with his fellow committee chairmen. His utter and complete devotion to the Nation's welfare was always evident in our relations through the years.

The memory of his warm and abiding friendship will linger with me as long as I live.

I should like to join in all the tributes that have been paid, and that will be paid, to this remarkable man from South Carolina. He made a tremendous imprint in the House of Representatives and in the Nation. He was among the foremost in seeking to preserve this country by providing adequate defense, military and otherwise. He never faltered in his efforts to promote the Nation's security.

Mr. Speaker, a great and courageous spirit has left us. But the things for which he fought—a strong defense, the ideals that have helped make this country great—must be carried on by those of us who remain behind.

My sympathy is extended to Mrs. Rivers and all the family.

Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

Mr. FLYNT, Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad and heavy heart that I join today with the dean of the South Carolina delegation (Mr. McMILLAN) and with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and our other colleagues, in paying tribute to the life and memory of L. MENDEL RIVERS, late a Representative of the State of South Carolina.

The State of South Carolina has indeed lost one of its greatest sons. The United States of America has lost one of its most able and articulate patriots. During his service in the House of Representatives, no one of our colleagues ever believed more in a strong United States of America than did MENDEL RIVERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, MENDEL RIVERS believed that a strong United States of America—strong militarily, strong industrially, and strong spiritually was the greatest and most effective bulwark of peace in a free world.

MENDEL RIVERS was subjected to as many and perhaps more groundless and unfair attacks from many sources than any Member of the House of Representatives or of the Congress of the United States. Yet, as these attacks came his way, they were blunted by the armor of his conscience and by the armor of the knowledge that he was right in seeking to make America a stronger America than it was yesterday.

He seemed to take new courage from the very fact that his enemies attacked him in the way they did.

Mr. Speaker, I knew MENDEL RIVERS first—certainly, before I was elected to the Congress, and even before he was elected to the Congress. In the late 1930's MENDEL RIVERS was a special attorney in the Department of Defense and later he was a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. During a part of that same time, I served as an assistant U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia. All of us in the district attorney's office and in Atlanta knew and liked MENDEL RIVERS. We were told, and we believed, that MENDEL RIVERS was known in nearly every other U.S. attorney's office just as he was in ours because on many occasions when he was a lawyer for the Department of Justice, he would be sent out as a special representative of the Attorney General to counsel with various U.S. attorneys' offices.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that more U.S. attorneys in the late 1930's and in 1940 knew MENDEL RIVERS than knew the man who was Attorney General during that same period of time.

In 1940 MENDEL was elected to the Congress of the United States, where he served from January 3, 1941, until his untimely death during the early morning hours of yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, in meeting with a group of servicemen of the armed services of the United States, MENDEL RIVERS, addressing them, said:

I don't owe you anything—anything except having saved me and having saved our country in four different wars during our lifetime.

And he reminded them that they had enemies not only in Hanoi but in the United States, including Washington, as well.

MENDEL RIVERS was the servicemen's champion. He was champion of the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines, the men who daily defend America and things that the United States of America stands for. The military posture of the United States today is stronger because of the influence and effectiveness of MENDEL RIVERS.

All of us know the effective manner in which he presented bills out of the great Committee on Armed Services to this body, not only during his tenure as chairman of that committee, but in the years preceding his accession to the chairmanship as well.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending our condolences, and our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Rivers, their two daughters, and his son and namesake. May God bless them and watch over them in this their hour of sorrow.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, given MENDEL RIVERS' nature and my own, it was almost inevitable that we would tangle in debate not long after I came here. Out of that encounter grew a friendship that got deeper and firmer over the years, and lasted for more than 20 years.

I read in the newspapers that MENDEL RIVERS was considered autocratic. He served on the U.S. delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly, NATO, of which I have been Chairman since its inception, for about 10 years. When he came on the delegation I do not mind saying that having a man with his seniority and his position as chairman of the Armed Services Committee later, I thought I might be a little uneasy. On the contrary, he was never autocratic. He always consulted with me and with the members of the committee before he projected any move in that assembly. He fought hard in this last session when he probably, as I look back upon it, should not have been there, to get the other parliamentarians from the other 14 countries to accept a theory, a thesis, a slogan, if you will, a projection of "5 percent for freedom"—5 percent of the gross national product of those nations for defense.

He tried to get those who were able and wealthy these many years after World War II to contribute to our common defense so that we, who are contributing the most, could reduce our contribution in line with each nation's ability to pay.

And he got it through. It was accepted and it became a resolution which passed unanimously. He made a great contribution.

He was vice chairman of the Military Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly. He was respected because he knew what he was talking about, and he presented the position not only of America but of the free world in a style in which only he could present it.

I remember an incident some years ago which illustrates what I am trying to say. When we were getting ready to leave for one of the meetings overseas, probably Brussels or Paris—I do not remember where the headquarters were then—when I came on board the big jet, the

military aide introduced me to the crew and said, "This is the chairman." And the colonel who was the pilot of the plane said, "The chairman is already on board." Well, obviously to any military man the chairman was MENDEL RIVERS, and I did not disabuse the colonel. MENDEL RIVERS straightened him out. He said, "I am the chairman most of the time, but on this trip and on this mission, Mr. HAYS is the chairman, and I am just one of the soldiers in the ranks." That was the spirit in which he participated.

So when some newspaperman talks about MENDEL RIVERS being autocratic, it does not square with the man I knew. I knew him as a patriot and as a man who had passionate beliefs and who would argue passionately for what he believed. I can understand a man like that, because I, too, have passionate beliefs, and I sometimes argue passionately for them.

Everything that can be said about MENDEL RIVERS probably has been said about him, about his State losing a great man and about the country losing a great man, but I suppose the people that have lost the most in the untimely passing of MENDEL RIVERS are the young men, as they were known in World War II, the GI Joes, because repeatedly when we were overseas, there would come a lull when there would not be any committee meetings or a day when nothing important was scheduled, and MENDEL would say to me, "Do you mind if I go off some place or other where I have heard the things are not going too well at the camp for the boys, and I want to take a look at it for myself."

Then he would go off to some camp in Europe I never heard of to see whether conditions were the way they ought to be. So they are the ones, as well as the people who believe in keeping America a safe place to live—all of us have lost something in the passing of MENDEL RIVERS.

We did not have to agree with him to say that this is a great American who has gone from our midst.

My family and I express to his family, especially to his wife and also to his daughter Marion, whom we knew intimately and personally, our deepest sympathy and our prayers that they will find strength to bear this great loss.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker—

One told me, Heraclitus, of thy fate;

He brought me tears, he brought me memories;

Alas, my Carian friend, how oft, how late,

We twain have talked the sun adown the

skies,

And somewhere thou art dust without a

date!

But of thy deeds death maketh not his

prize,

In death's despite, that stealeth all, they

wait,

The new year's nightingale that never dies!

With MENDEL RIVERS' passing, one of the strongest, unfaltering arms ever to uphold the shield of the American Republic is gone, and will be lifted no more. Although he never wore the uniform of his country, he was second to none in

his love for it, and he was second to none when it came to insuring its safety against all foes.

It was not necessary for MENDEL RIVERS to have worn a uniform for him to have become one of the stoutest defenders and strongest supporters of the men and women who do. MENDEL knew that upon the shoulders of the men who wear this uniform rests the heavy burden of the continuance of our Republic, and the safety of its people.

There will be mourning on every spot on the globe where there are American servicemen. The American in uniform never had a truer friend than MENDEL RIVERS. Today there is a void in the hearts, hopes, and aspirations of our fighting men. We must see that that void does not go unfilled.

As the Republic is poorer for his passing, it is also stronger because he lived. Let not those who would come against us take heart because he is gone, for what he did, and the example he set, will give renewed courage and determination to those who follow him in his footsteps. He had faith in his country, belief in its destiny and greatness, compassion for his fellow man, devotion to the House of Representatives, and a determination to so order his life and his deeds to leave his country stronger and safer than he found it. His epitaph could be taken from Shakespeare's Henry VIII; inasmuch as any man could have a personal code, this was MENDEL RIVERS:

Be just and fear not. Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's, thy god's and truth's.

And also, Mr. Speaker, as my personal tribute to this man I quote:

The record of a generous life runs like a vine around the memory of our dead, and every sweet, unselfish act is now a perfumed flower.

Speech cannot contain our love. There was, there is, no gentler, stronger, manlier man.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distasteful pieces of American news coverage, in my opinion, was the report on the WRC-NBC 11 o'clock news last evening, December 28, in regard to the death of Representative MENDEL RIVERS. I was shocked to see that WRC-NBC chose this occasion to lambast the seniority system in the U.S. Congress, setting it out as perhaps the most repulsive and unsavory system known to man. A lifelike painting of our departed colleague was shown on a screen during a good part of the discussion, very effectively connecting Mr. RIVERS' name with this "undesirable" system.

No doubt, the seniority system in government is not perfect and the results may in some instances leave something to be desired. But I ask you was the 11 p.m. news the proper time and place to discuss its shortcomings?

Suggesting the abandonment of seniority is comparable to suggesting the abandonment of the gold standard—great idea but what shall be its substitute?

Our Government is big and complex—the wisdom, experience, and dedication

of statesmen like MENDEL RIVERS must always be given high priority if we are to remain a great nation. In addition to those three, Mr. RIVERS had one more attribute that far overshadowed the other three. That was his love; his unquenchable love for his country, his God and his fellowmen.

Yes; he loved America. He worshipped God and loved all men of every creed, color, race, and religion. While he admitted that he could not always understand their actions he placed the greatest charity even upon his enemies. Only a few weeks before his death I heard him comment that he just could not understand why so many reporters seemed to delight in condemning him, even though he was giving his all to his country.

Now MENDEL RIVERS is dead. What emphasis the historians will place upon his life remains to be seen. For myself, regardless of comments from WRC-NBC or others, MENDEL RIVERS will be remembered as a friend, a gentleman, a great patriotic American, and a humble servant of God.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in the life of a great leader, such as now has passed from us, there are many spectacular things which come to our minds today as to his achievements. These are great monuments to him, the things he has done to make our country strong and therefore to protect the world against wars that might have occurred. All of these are great and impressive things.

Many times people do not realize, however, the basis upon which these things are founded. One of the things, of course, is the excellent character of the man we talk about today, our departed and beloved Member, MENDEL RIVERS.

Another is something I have not heard much discussed here on the floor. As a member of the committee he chaired, I certainly am impressed by it; that is, his dedication to doing his homework.

MENDEL RIVERS was a real student, a real scholar, a hard worker early in the morning and late at night. He knew what he was talking about. For about two decades, for 20 years, I sat with him there on that committee, and in this period of time I do not remember ever hearing a military man who came before that committee—for instance, in the field of airpower, types of airplanes or things of that kind—who knew anywhere near as much as the chairman of the committee knew about these highly technical matters.

Now, MENDEL did not get this information by just listening to other people who knew less than he. He got it by studying, by working, by burning the midnight oil. He knew what he was talking about. So he brought to his work as a Congressman not only the spectacular things such as being able to speak well on the floor of the House and to be courageous about issues which came before it, but also the ability to do the mundane, the hard workaday things a Member of Congress must do if he is going to be the chairman of an important committee such as the House Armed Services Committee.

There are many great things MENDEL leaves this country, and he leaves them in a living manner, because they will go on after he is dead, and his presence will be felt, as Dr. HALL said, for years and years to come in the strength of our country.

Most of us here on the floor have the privilege of belonging to a group of men who know each other quite intimately. We know each other in the debates on the floor, and in the cloakrooms, and we know each other in the efforts we share together, perhaps fishing or things of that type.

I knew MENDEL RIVERS in all these things, and also in the Thursday morning prayer group, and in the intimate little things in our lives. I do not believe I ever saw MENDEL, when he was in a relaxed mood, when he did not ask me about my children. I was a bachelor for a long time, and have a young family for my years, and he particularly encouraged me to take time off and to share interests with my children, and he said that I should do these things, because "They will go before you know it."

So as I conclude my remarks today I think not only of a great American passing from the scene, but I think also of a beloved friend.

And I must say this, MENDEL has left an impact upon my life. He has taught me a great deal during my association with him: to study and to do my homework, and also to give of my devotion to my family responsibilities. There was above it all his great devotion to God and country which made him the great man he was. Yes, above all of this there is woven the fabric of his being a great gentleman of God and of his fellow man.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one does not have to be a so-called hawk to mourn the death of MENDEL RIVERS. MENDEL RIVERS served his country and his constituents for 30 years with devotion and energy. He was a foremost advocate of the maintenance of the U.S. military superiority as being the surest way under the circumstances of maintaining world peace. How many doves—and I have many "dovish" moments myself—say for sure that they know otherwise.

MENDEL RIVERS made a lasting contribution to the military strength of our Nation and particularly toward keeping America first on the seas and maintaining the morale of our fighting men.

In my first years in Congress, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I knew MENDEL RIVERS as courteous, good humored, fair, and characterized by a total lack of vindictiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I share with the other Members of this body and his family the loss of a great leader and friend.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we Members have all liked MENDEL RIVERS, on both sides of the

House, regardless of party. MENDEL RIVERS was one of the best liked Members who have served in the House in many years. MENDEL RIVERS has shown high competence, leadership, and dedication as chairman of the important House Committee on Armed Services. Handling authorizations for military expenditures of approximately \$80 billion annually to provide for 3 million members of the U.S. armed services around the world, U.S. military installations, ships, and planes is a most heavy responsibility which MENDEL RIVERS, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has assumed and performed with efficiency and the respect of the House.

Mr. Speaker, serving as the ranking member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have known MENDEL RIVERS very well because of our discussions of mutual problems with reference to research and development both in air and in space. MENDEL RIVERS' knowledge and broad experience in these fields have made working with him rewarding and effective.

On a scientific and medical research basis, I would like to make a few points with reference to the cause of the loss of this fine Member through heart complications following a mechanical valve emplacement. We on the Committee on Science and Astronautics have been working to obtain authorization for adequate funds with which to do basic heart research. I have been specially interested in this matter of rejection. There is a serious situation and problem in procedures to prevent body rejection of transplanted human organs, as well as rejection of artificial devices that are placed in the human body for the purpose of assisting the heart or any other organ of the body.

Dr. Barnard, the famous heart specialist from South Africa, has stated that through research the problem of human organ rejection on transplanting of human organs, and the problem of inert mechanical, or artificial appliance rejection in the human body in his studied opinion, can be overcome. Probably nobody can definitely say at this point of time, and state of research, as to the cause of death of MENDEL RIVERS, through heart trouble, whether it was heart fibrillation or heart failure due to rejection of the mechanical valve. The state of the medical art on transplants of human organs, implantation of mechanical devices, and causes of body rejection, is at present deplorable, with the medical patient submitting to unknown risks, with the odds stacked against the patient, and the doctor and surgeon operating and working on the unpredictable edge of the unknown, with a confidence based on slim hope and ignorance. The only justification for action is that there is a chance that the future will be better than the present. Why has no definite procedure been researched and determined to know, in advance, the tolerance of the patient, and the probability or degree of rejection, prior, and I emphasize prior, to the surgery?

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I look at the unfortunate passing of MENDEL RIVERS as an ex-

ample where there is a crying need to go ahead with basic heart and organ transplant research, because in MENDEL'S case his heart, after the operation, had come back, responding three times, and grew stronger with accompanying amelioration of body functions.

In my opinion, as the heart became stronger each time, then likewise the body rejection process came back stronger, and though the rejection process developed, and continued and grew more powerful, until the heart was overpowered, and body processes likewise deteriorated.

To have as fine a person as MENDEL RIVERS pass away because scientific research and surgical procedures have not yet reached the level of competence we need to reach I believe is a caution to the House. The U.S. Congress should emphasize basic research and applied research in these life sciences we have already learned so much about in space.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Health, as well as educational and foundation laboratories must be organized into national teamwork for developing these necessary and attainable techniques that will save many lives in the future.

I firmly believe that acceptance or rejection, and acceptance or incompatibility of the human body with transplanted living organs, from human or animal sources, or with artificial, manufactured or mechanical organs, vessels, valves, or working functional parts, constitute one of the major problems facing us in this generation. I urge that Congress act to provide adequate authority to solve these heart and transplant problems so that we will have people like our good distinguished friend, MENDEL RIVERS, with us for many more years.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of MENDEL RIVERS the Nation has lost a great and dedicated patriot, and his district an energetic and faithful servant. The American GI has lost his alltime favorite and generous champion; his enemies a determined and honorable opponent; his friends, a loyal and powerful ally; his family, a loving, kind, dedicated husband and father. And my wife and I have lost a very close and dear friend.

I extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, Margaret, his son, Lucius, and his two daughters in this hour of their bereavement.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina yielding to me, and I want to join in paying these few small tributes to a great leader, a great colleague of ours, with whom we had the privilege of serving, L. MENDEL RIVERS. I think we who have worked with him have perhaps

realized these past few years that there probably has never been a man in the Congress who was more severely attacked by outsiders, most of whom really did not understand him, or not quite the kind of man they were attacking.

This body of Congress is made up of many different kinds of people, and there were several things that stood out that made MENDEL RIVERS unique. For one thing, you never had any doubt where he stood. There was never any equivocation, never any trying to straddle or duck an issue; he made it clear where he stood.

As has already been said on many occasions, he was not only dedicated to a strong and adequate defense, but he made his views clear at a time when they were not particularly popular, but at a time when that point of view has never needed more to be eloquently expounded.

He was also a true friend of every man and woman in uniform. His most recent contribution was of course the arrangements that he was very largely responsible for, it making it possible for our servicemen to come back home from Vietnam at a greatly reduced fare over this Christmas holiday season.

We hear a lot these days too, about civilian control over the military, and about the responsibility of Congress for making a difference in the operations of the executive department. Well, here was a man who really did make a difference. Admiral Rickover, perhaps more than anyone else, knows that if it had not been for MENDEL RIVERS and for the support of the Committee on Armed Services, our nuclear power program would be a lot weaker than it is today, and our nuclear submarines would be a lot fewer than they are.

There have been many other criticisms that were wide of the mark. For example, when he became the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he not only worked very, very hard, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT), has so well pointed out, but he made a special effort to make sure that all of the other members of the committee knew what was going on, so that information made available to the committee was not put in the hands of just a few members, but was made available to all the members. And although there were members with whom he differed, and whose views he did not agree with—and upon occasion I was included in that number—he still made it possible for committee members with whom he did not agree to assume responsibility in the committee, nevertheless, and he made a special point of recognizing the contributions that they had made.

Although his views were very strong and very strongly stated, he nevertheless recognized that other members of the committee could hold differing views from his, and that perhaps they might have arrived at a clearer interpretation of the facts. Probably the most notable recent example of that attribute is the report published by the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), on the Mylai incident.

Mr. RIVERS' publicly expressed views on Mylai were not the same as those re-

flected in the subcommittee's detailed report. But he had designated an outstanding member of the committee to chair that investigation. The investigation had followed the facts where they led, and so Chairman RIVERS gave his imprimatur to that report, recognizing that the subcommittee had researched the subject more fully than he had done himself.

So, Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay tribute to MENDEL RIVERS, a man who really was a fighter, a gallant soldier for what he believed in, who died certainly with his boots on, and a man who in spite of all the physical difficulties he faced, nevertheless made a tremendous fight to cling to life and to try to continue in his job.

So, as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) has already suggested, we in this House will do well to carry on what MENDEL RIVERS stood for because we are going to have to maintain a strong defense for our country in a world where the enemies of our country give no signs of relaxing their pressures against us. If we can pick up some inspiration for that important task from our association with our friend, MENDEL RIVERS, then his spirit will indeed live on here in this Chamber.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying these tributes to the memory of L. MENDEL RIVERS who stood so tall among us for so long. While we dwell upon the achievements of this great man, there is one additional point that I would like to include here in our deliberations and that is that just a very few weeks ago he stood here in this Chamber and on this floor and delivered a full dress speech on what he considered to be the needs of this country and the dangers that confront us and what this Nation needs to do to protect its future security and to be a free nation.

So I commend again this man's accumulated great knowledge that he gave us in that speech to all my colleagues for our benefit and guidance in our deliberations henceforth.

Mr. Speaker, I had not been here very long before I had occasion to become involved in a matter with MENDEL RIVERS in which we shared a personal interest. That was the beginning of a friendship that grew through the years.

I probably have received more help and more benefit from his warm friendship than almost any Member of this House. He visited my district three times last year. He has many, many friends among my constituents. I doubt if there is any place on earth, except his home district and State, where he is admired and respected more than in my congressional district.

Not long ago the citizens of Altus, Okla., to show their appreciation for him named one of their public schools the L. Mendel Rivers School.

During the time he was in the hospital, the fifth and sixth graders of this school on their own initiative signed a get-well card and sent it to him.

I am happy to know that one of the things that cheered him during the days

that he was fighting for his life in the hospital was to have received this message from those children who thought so much of him.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and my family and my constituents who knew him join with me in extending to Mrs. Rivers and the family our deepest condolence and sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, all of us live our lives at many different levels and in many different rooms. I cannot claim to have had the complete confidence always of MENDEL RIVERS, nor to have been one of his closest friends—and this I regret, because I had the greatest respect for the man for many different reasons, and I think he was aware of this.

I respected him most because he was not born the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and he became the chairman of the Armed Services Committee not because anyone ever handed it to him on a silver platter, but because through his own efforts and determination and stamina he made himself the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He stepped into tremendously large shoes to fill when he replaced Carl Vinson, but he did the job, and he did it through tremendously hard work, and for this I respected him.

The fact that he arrived at his office in the dark and had finished several hours of work by the time the cafeteria opened every morning was known to his colleagues, but not necessarily known to the people at large, who got a very limited view of the man.

He had facets which were not known to the general public which read the general periodicals. He had a love of poetry, and he liked to recite poetry. He knew poetry more than almost any Member in this Chamber.

He had a magnificent sense of humor, and while he could use it devastatingly in debate, and frequently used it against me, he could also laugh at himself. This is a tremendous virtue in anyone in a place of as great responsibility as he was. He loved nature, flowers in particular. He was an avid gardener and did so many things which are so completely out of the context of the caricature which was sometimes made of the man.

His judgments were not always my judgments, and his priorities were not always mine. I frequently questioned his judgments and his priorities. But I have never ever questioned his motives, and I believe with all my heart that MENDEL RIVERS did, from the day he came here until the day he left here, do those things which he believed in his deepest conscience were best for America. His loyalties were absolutely the greatest loyalties—to his Nation and to his responsibilities. His efforts on behalf of the military, from the richest defense corporation to the poorest private, were the strongest and the most effective efforts which anyone made on their behalf.

I found that my own judgments caused me to question him many times, but I never beat him, ever. I have never seen him lose a battle until this week, when he lost the battle which all of us are

going to lose, and I believe that he did it, as always, with gallantry and with as hard a fight as a man could make.

For the military of America I feel most sympathetic, for they have lost their greatest champion.

To his devoted wife, to his daughters, and to his son, I offer my sincerest condolences.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the sudden passing of our colleague, MENDEL RIVERS. This is a great loss to our Nation—a loss that will continue to be felt in the future as well as in these early hours of grief and mourning.

The people of South Carolina have lost a strong and articulate spokesman who for 30 years served them with dedication in the tradition of Calhoun.

The Congress has lost one of its most able and effective leaders.

The Nation has lost a devoted and proud public servant, an unapologetic patriot deeply dedicated to his responsibilities as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. For several years it was my privilege to serve with him on this committee and later under his chairmanship. To know MENDEL RIVERS as I have known him, I regard as one of the great intangible rewards of my service in the Congress. He was kind. He was good. He was warm. He was honorable. He was sincere. He was a real friend. But above all, he always had a deep and abiding concern for our country's security and the individual welfare of all our service men and women wherever they were throughout the world. Although he had no personal military background, MENDEL RIVERS became the special representative and the advocate of all of those wearing the U.S. uniform.

Words or monuments could never express the love, the affection, and the devotion that our service people have so justly felt for this great American leader. This is the greatest tribute any man could have.

I extend to Mrs. Rivers and each of the members of the family my deep and sincere sympathy and want them to know that I, too, share their loss.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER).

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, share with my colleagues the sadness of this occasion. Anyone who has known MENDEL RIVERS as long as I have, and as long as many of you have, could talk at great length about his achievements. We could talk equally as long about MENDEL RIVERS—the man. Indeed, he had few equals in his time.

We often think of MENDEL in terms of military, because he was one of the Nation's leaders on that subject. Aside from that, let us not forget for 1 minute the fact that this great American was, above all, a patriot. He believed in his country, its institutions, its heritage, and its destiny. Every minute of his life was dedicated to the preservation of those concepts.

I have never known a more energetic person. Every minute of the day was put

to useful purposes. So far as I know he eschewed many of the pastimes, the card games, the fishing, and other time-consuming activities, in order to devote those moments to his goals—always overshadowed by his love of country and the maintenance of its security.

MENDEL RIVERS was one of the Nation's top authorities on all things military. He was probably one of the world's leading authorities on aircraft. He knew intimately the make, the history, the configuration, of practically every airplane ever built, whether in this country or abroad.

As a committee chairman he was superb. His knowledge knew no bounds, and his foresight was uncanny. I recall how he argued with much vigor in favor of bombing of Haiphong and the nearby petroleum supplies at a time when the SAM sites were nonexistent. At that time the damage to the targets would have been awesome, and our losses would have been minimal. But to no avail. Then, 2 or 3 years later the decision was made to do what MENDEL had so strongly advocated—to strike out at targets adjacent to Haiphong and to knock out the petroleum drums. But by that time the SAM missiles were there, and much of the gasoline had been concealed or moved away. Our losses were quite heavy.

I mention this as but one example of the soundness of MENDEL's judgment.

Mr. Speaker, our departed friend was one of the most colorful and most effective Members of this body. The hour was never too late, nor the distance too far, for him to do a favor for a friend. His personal friends were numbered in the thousands, throughout the Nation. He was one of the most sought after speakers in Washington, and probably considering all the exertion involved, he accepted too many of those invitations. But that was the life he loved—standing before a multitude and expounding his views about America and how important it was for us to take those steps necessary to defend and preserve it.

In the death of MENDEL RIVERS I have lost a close personal friend. The Nation has lost a great advocate of every good cause. His own district has lost one of the most able and effective representatives who has served here in my time. He was in deed and in truth a great American.

To Margaret and other members of the family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL).

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation mourns. Flags in the Capital city of Washington fly at half-mast. A State stands still in reverence and pays tribute to the memory of a beloved son.

There is a pall of sadness enveloping those whose lives were touched by the late L. MENDEL RIVERS, distinguished U.S. Representative from South Carolina. Surely, this human reaction is understandable, natural and expected, even though it is admittedly selfish. But such

a dynamic personality as this prominent man does not lead a life of illustrious public service without commanding widespread respect, admiration, and attention.

Citizens and public officials are grieved because this loss is a tragedy for our Nation. America has lost a patriot whose every fiber bristled at schemes by enemies of this country and their American sympathizers to overthrow the freest form of government in the world. In the passing of L. MENDEL RIVERS, the United States has lost a champion of a free enterprise system which has provided for its people the highest standard of living in the known world. MENDEL RIVERS loved his country with an old-fashioned kind of pride that is seldom found in our modern world of sophisticated theories and technology. Indeed, he devoted his entire being to insuring the security of this nation and toward alerting the public to the dangers that imperil us both from without and within. He stressed the importance of foresight in preparations for our national defense, and he worked diligently for the modernization of our aging Navy. The importance of control of the seas was a history lesson he knew well, and one which he constantly repeated to those demanding "rock-bottom" defense programs. Even from his hospital room in Alabama during the last few weeks of his life, he turned to his work and expended life-giving energy to direct certain matters which he considered urgent.

The American serviceman has lost his most persuasive and effective proponent. From the enlisted men to the highest ranking officers, servicemen knew that they had no better friend and supporter than Congressman RIVERS. They loved him and knew he was behind them every step of the way as they defended our country. Just prior to Chairman RIVERS' entrance to the Alabama hospital, a large group of soldiers in Vietnam forwarded to him a symbolic token of their love and appreciation for his unflinching efforts on their behalf. It was a standard baseball cap which bore the affectionate inscription, "The Big Boss." What more appropriate recognition could he have had as his life's work unknowingly neared an end?

The forceful Congressman withstood constant attacks of the most vitriolic kind on his personal and professional competence. Yet, he was unscarred by these attackers, for he was bigger than such petty prejudices. He never stooped to accommodate the originators of such biased accusations. Through his ability to ignore and withstand such false and emotionally motivated taunts, the character of this man was evident. He was his own man—*independent and strong within himself*. Such absurdities could not shake him nor weaken a position once taken, for he was firm in his convictions and unwavering in his efforts. He fought doggedly for that which he believed to be in the best interests of our country, regardless of the verbal assaults launched by his opponents.

As a 30-year veteran of the Congress, MENDEL RIVERS witnessed a world of changing priorities. Yet, never did he sway from his opinion that the single

most important issue before our Nation was the defense of this country. In his mind, the preservation of our free system was the key to the existence of freedom throughout the entire world.

I have lost a dear personal friend. While serving as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I was honored to be associated with this great American. His beliefs, stamina, and persuasiveness gained my unqualified respect and his firmly avowed love of country, dedication, and motivation inspired me to work to the best of my ability. His assistance and friendship enriched my service here, as it did all those who knew him.

As the freshman member of the Armed Services Committee, I desire not only to pay tribute to our departed and revered leader, but also to refute another baseless charge which has been made by the press with respect to the chairman's treatment of junior members of his committee. I know all of the Members have read, as have I, the press' characterization of Mr. RIVERS as a dictatorial leader who rode roughshod over the freshmen members of that committee.

It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, to serve under committee chairmen in the General Assembly of Virginia and in other bodies. I have never served with one who was more considerate of freshmen members or who was more fair in his treatment of his junior associates.

The American people owe a great debt to this noble man. Let us mourn his passing in the appropriate way. Then let us rise above the human condition of grief and remember him in a way that would do credit to his outstanding character and career. Let us maintain a strong defense and revitalize those parts of it which have degenerated. This would be a fitting monument to the late Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS.

His family has my sincerest and most heartfelt sympathy. It is my prayer that God will grant him the peace and the rest that He has reserved for those who serve Him well.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS).

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, MENDEL RIVERS was indeed a legend in his time and, although the proud Southern State of South Carolina claimed MENDEL, he did not belong exclusively to that State. The people of my own State of Alabama loved MENDEL RIVERS, and in memory's eye, I go back several years ago when Chairman RIVERS, along with his close friend and our colleague, the Honorable EDWARD HÉBERT, came to Montgomery to attend the funeral of our own Governor, the late and beloved Lurleen Wallace. He came on other occasions as well—once to pay his last respects to our late colleague, the Honorable Frank Boykin; as the commissioner of the National Association of Stock Car Auto Racing, he was a frequent visitor to our Alabama International Motor Speedway in Talladega, Ala. Although South Carolina's love for this great American surpassed that of most States, our esteemed chairman belonged to the Nation and the Nation has sustained a very deep loss.

Those of us privileged to serve on his committee know and appreciate the great service which Chairman RIVERS performed in his untiring efforts in behalf of maintaining a strong America. Certainly, history will record that Congress—through the initiative and leadership of Chairman RIVERS—had the foresight and wisdom and courage to strengthen the defense of this Nation.

Although I did not have the good fortune as many in this chamber to know MENDEL RIVERS for many years, nevertheless, his dedication, duty and leadership have been an inspiration to me and I shall always be indebted to him for the sound advice he gave me as a new member of the Congress.

I shall miss him in so many ways: his friendship; his great sense of humor, both in the cloakroom and in the committee itself when he used to say, "That's off the record." I shall miss his place at the Thursday morning prayer breakfast and the contributions he made to that very intimate group of colleagues. In times like these, it is difficult to understand why leaders like Congressman RIVERS are called and I heard this expression on many occasions both at the Washington level and following the services in Charleston, "The only explanation which I can suggest is that perhaps God needs men like MENDEL even more than we might need him in these dangerous and troublesome times." MENDEL gave so generously and so tirelessly of his time and energy and his passing is an extremely personal loss to me as well as a loss to our country.

I like to think of a poem which I once heard which we could well dedicate to the life and memory of this great American. I believe it fits his own outlook on life.

I have to live with myself, and so
I want to be fit for myself to know
I want to look myself in the eye
I do not want to stand with the setting sun
And hate myself for the things I have done
I want to go with my head erect
I want to deserve every man's respect.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, few men could storm in and out of St. Peter's pearly gates as did MENDEL RIVERS in his waning weeks of life and death. Few men will ever achieve the stature of this Charleston leader. Whatever RIVERS did, he did emphatically and with the strongest of emotion. He was a man who did not care a little—he cared a lot—whether the issue was shipbuilding, servicemen's pay, the C-5A, the intermediate manned interceptor or the anti-ballistics-missile system.

That RIVERS could build the reputation he did as chairman of the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives in but 5 years is testament to his charismatic leadership and power.

The chairman knew the rules of the House and of his committee. He knew his staff, his subcommittee chairmen and the members of his committee. He was a tireless worker in molding the

structure and entities of the House into a strong national defense policy.

If the chairman believed in the efficacy of the SALT talks he revealed this fact to no man. Not to admire the capability of Chairman RIVERS as he molded defense policy or mocked an ill-considered Pentagon policy is to be insensitive to greatness.

In spite of that greatness I participated as strongly as any of his House colleagues in challenging some of his conclusions on missile or war policy. In spite of those differences I cannot recall any favor or request of mine that he ever denied unless it was for more time in cross examination.

RIVERS was a skilled gladiator, a strong exponent of States rights, the southern way and military might—no subtle diplomacy his. He was a man who helped lead the survival of the United States through World War II—his reallocation of national priorities was to reemphasize the power of the nuclear deterrent.

Perhaps the best I can say of Chairman RIVERS is that if my country was ever under attack from a foreign aggressor, it would be most assuring to know that the stern leadership of L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina controlled defense policy.

To his wife, Margaret, and family I extend my most sincere condolences.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate on a day such as this when many of us feel great sadness because of the death of MENDEL RIVERS that some of us who may have from time to time disagreed with him on certain policy issues speak out and say how very fond we were of him.

Many people do not know this, Mr. Speaker, but he helped me before I arrived in this Congress. I knew of MENDEL RIVERS when I was first campaigning for Congress. Many times during the past few years he has helped all of us in many kinds of ways.

I think I would like to remember him best when he would look at me with a twinkle in his eyes and say "I helped you today, did I not?" And he did.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the remarks of the gentleman from California to the effect that MENDEL RIVERS never refused to listen. He never refused to try to help.

I think probably the greatest compliment that I could pay to him is that I believe this was a man who was competent and he always stated his cause very well. He handled his committee well. I know that I as a Member of this body shall miss him very much. I will miss hearing his strong voice on many issues of the day.

My wife Betty and I and the rest of our family extend to his family our deepest condolences. I think the country has lost, as has been well stated, a great patriot.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has lost a great pa-

triot, the House of Representatives has lost a great Member, and the great State of South Carolina has lost a great son in the passing of my very good friend, MENDEL RIVERS.

It was a great shock to all of us who knew him, because his heart certainly epitomized the strength of this man. He had plenty of heart, figuratively speaking, but his physical heart stopped beating. He was called to his Maker. This House will miss him and the country will miss him, because he was a man who had the strength of his convictions and the courage and ability to fight for those convictions.

Mr. Speaker, the country is better because of the fact that MENDEL RIVERS fought for those convictions, because they were not only right for him, but they were also right for the country.

In carrying on the work of the Congress and of the country after the passing of MENDEL RIVERS, I suggest that it may be easier for those of us who remain than it would otherwise be, because his life and his work in this body can serve as a beacon for our future aims and purposes, for our activities and actions.

We could not take a better model, a better beacon for our work, the work which must keep this country the greatest country on earth, than to reflect on and emulate the things which MENDEL RIVERS did, the causes for which he stood, and the great fights which he made on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rhodes joins me in sending our deepest sympathy and condolences to MENDEL RIVERS' family.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I join my colleagues in mourning the death of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, our late colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Here was a man who personified the fabled "southern gentleman" of literature. Here was a man with whom one could have honest differences, as he and I certainly did; and yet maintain mutual respect, something that I believe Chairman RIVERS and I also had. It is important that Members of this body with differing philosophies be able to debate and discuss those differences with their colleagues. And I always found Chairman RIVERS willing to talk with me about those issues on which we differed.

Only recently I was able to work with the chairman on something about which none of us will disagree. This is "Operation Reunion," the program whereby our men in Vietnam are able to secure 14-day home leaves to visit with their families in the midst of tours of duty in the war zone. "Operation Reunion" came about, in large measure, through the work of Chairman RIVERS who cared so very deeply about our servicemen.

Having worked on this program with the chairman, I met the first flight of "Operation Reunion" when it came to New York several weeks ago and then while in Vietnam worked to have the program expanded and made more efficient. I spoke with many GI's who were able to participate in this program and know what an important morale booster it has been to them and their families. The success of "Operation Reunion" is a fitting

tribute to the memory of a patriotic American. We all mourn the passing of Chairman RIVERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at the death of L. MENDEL RIVERS.

The gentleman from the First District of South Carolina served the Nation long, but more importantly, he served his Nation well.

While many were satisfied to take the defense of our Nation as a prime concern during emergencies, the gentleman from South Carolina had the defense of our Nation foremost in his mind at all times.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he was responsive to the inquiries of his colleagues. I know that I had the occasion twice to inquire about military matters, once when a Russian Mig flew into Florida, and another time when Russian trawlers were spotted in our waters. Both times he carried out investigations into the matters in question.

I would also add that he helped to maintain the right of the House of Representatives and the Congress to raise and maintain armies according to the provisions of the Constitution.

I know that we will all miss the leadership and courage of Mr. RIVERS. My wife, Becky, joins with me in extending our condolences to his wife, Margaret, his two daughters, Margaret and Lois, and his son, L. Mendel, Jr.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this House as it meets today is a far different place with the unfortunate departure of MENDEL RIVERS. He was colorful, he was forthright, he was strong in his views and in the love of his country. One could differ with him, as I frequently did, but one could not dislike or disrespect him.

I was privileged to know this remarkable man and to be his friend. He had his strong opinions, but he never shunned inquiry into controversy. MENDEL RIVERS' views on what occurred in the Vietnam village of Mylai were not the same as mine. But there is a strong possibility that the tragedy would not have come to light but for his intercession. When I received a letter from a returned Vietnam war veteran, Ron Ridenhour of Phoenix, claiming some terrible slaughter of civilians may have taken place in Mylai, I naturally asked Defense authorities to look into the allegations. But I also asked the help of MENDEL RIVERS and he, too, contacted the Pentagon and asked for the facts. I am convinced the military responded much more diligently because of his request and without his help the full extent of Mylai might have remained in obscurity. He was never too busy to listen to my requests or my problems.

MENDEL RIVERS was a man of the House. Too frequently some of the brightest and most promising Members leave this body after a short time to seek service in the Senate or at our State capitols. No doubt MENDEL RIVERS could have had any position within the power of the people of his beloved South Carolina to bestow. Yet he chose to begin and end his major political career in the House he loved. He was a student of

the House, he loved the House. He left his mark on the House and the country.

In a position which influenced the spending of hundreds of billions of dollars, MENDEL RIVERS was a tower of personal integrity. No one in this place, where rumors are easy to start, ever heard a whisper against his personal integrity. He lived modestly and sought success in his career, not private wealth.

Now he is gone, but he will not be forgotten. I extend my sympathy to his widow and children, and join with all his colleagues in mourning the passing of a giant.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for our country. It is a sad day for the House of Representatives. And, Mr. Speaker, it is particularly a sad day for me.

Only a few short days ago when several of us were having breakfast in the Longworth Cafeteria, as we often did, with our departed friend, MENDEL RIVERS, one would have never thought he would lie at this hour with his voice hushed, his body still, and his soul taken flight to a heavenly reward.

Mr. Speaker, in my 28 years as a Member of this body I have seen hundreds of Members come and go. Many of them were great. Many were hard workers. Many rendered fine service to this Nation. But none were greater than our departed friend, MENDEL RIVERS. None worked more energetically or harder. And, indeed, none rendered greater service to this Nation.

MENDEL RIVERS opened his office many mornings long before the sun had dispersed the darkness that enshrouded our beautiful Capitol. Day after day he put in long hours in the service of his people. On morning after morning at or before the hour of 8 a.m. Pentagon automobiles could be seen parking at the east entrance of the Rayburn Building. Alighting therefrom were the Nation's highest military leaders who had been called to attend a committee hearing of the powerful Committee on Armed Services which MENDEL RIVERS so ably served as chairman. MENDEL would call them out early and have them stay late. He kept himself and his committee informed through lengthy and meticulous briefings and conferences with the military. His desire was to get the best information, to get it from the right source and to get it as quickly as possible. He never loitered or loafed. He was dedicated to maintaining a strong defense establishment and he saw to it that such was maintained. For his service, a service so important to this Nation existing as it is in a troubled world, we owe him, yes, the Nation owes MENDEL RIVERS, a deep debt of gratitude.

MENDEL RIVERS was a most intelligent person. He had a keen and powerful mind. He was a good student. And with all of this he was also a great speaker and a great debater. He never came to this Chamber half prepared. When he rose to speak he had studied his lessons. He knew what he wanted to say and said it effectively.

Holding a position of tremendous power in this House, he never abused that power. Yes, sometimes he was tough. One has to be and ought to be

tough when dealing with military matters and the defense of this great Nation. But he was always fair.

Also, Mr. Speaker, our late friend was a tender person. He sympathized with the downtrodden. He opened his heart to help them. One of his greatest and most interesting traits was his tremendous sense of humor. He could coin a humorous phrase in a second and draw a quick laugh or a chuckle from his listeners with the greatest of ease.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in MENDEL'S passing I feel a deep personal loss. He was my warm personal friend. On morning after morning over a long period of years he gathered with a group of us for breakfast in the Longworth Cafeteria. There we would cut and jibe at one another, all in fun, for 20 minutes or so before we started the daily routine in our respective offices. We enjoyed this association with MENDEL. This was a real "fun" hour. Now it can never be the same.

I shall miss him, Mr. Speaker. So will this House of Representatives. So will his district, State, and Nation. He served them so well.

I deeply sympathize with his fine family and extend to each member my deepest sympathy. They have lost a fine husband and a loving father. I have lost a close and personal friend. And our country has lost a great and dedicated public servant.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House in their expression of grief and sadness in the passing of one of America's finest political figures, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina.

It was my good fortune to have been closely associated with MENDEL RIVERS for 24 of my 26 years of service in this body. I have worked with him in many of his favorite fields of interest—military airlift, research and development, nuclear propulsion for our naval vessels, and in his fight to make certain the United States was not caught short in the development of the next generation of manned bombers.

There has never been a more staunch and sincere friend of the men in uniform—those who devote their lives to the service of their country—than MENDEL RIVERS. They have lost—as we have lost—a real friend.

He was one of the most vigorous champions of adequate national defense. He wanted to make certain that America's military power was sufficient to serve as a deterrent to aggression from any source. He felt that such a deterrent was the best assurance that world peace would sometime be attainable. He sincerely believed that America's military strength was the only bulwark against another world war.

In fighting for recognition and better compensation for enlisted men from the time he first became head of the Armed Services Committee 6 years ago, he was striving to promote an interest in the military service which would attract career servicemen to devote their lives to their country's national security. He sponsored scores of acts to help the GI and their families. He was ever mindful of their interest.

He worked at his job early and late. Committee business drew his first attention. Like the good Congressman that he was, he never forgot the people back home. And their appreciation was shown in the great admiration and love they frequently expressed for him. I was privileged on several occasions to witness that deep respect in testimonials to him in his beloved Charleston.

I have lost a good friend. While our political philosophy on domestic matters was in conflict, he respected my views and I respected his. I know this is true with all other Members of the House—many of whom have frequently expressed to me their personal fondness for MENDEL RIVERS—despite conflicting views.

He was a great American. In his passing Congress loses one of its most effective advocates of national defense, at a time when the Nation's military arm is in acute danger of being crippled and ignored through the emotional clamor of some who question the need of such strength.

Mrs. Price and I extend deepest sympathy to his wife, Margaret; his son, Lucius Mendel, and his daughters, Lois and Mrs. Robert C. Eastman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our distinguished colleague, MENDEL RIVERS, was a sad blow to me personally, but even more important, I recognize the loss that has been sustained by our country. I believe that all of us recognize that our national defense is of primary importance and that while we may become preoccupied from time to time with other matters and focus our attention on various problems which appear to be acute, we all count on our defense establishment being there when needed and we expect it to be organized and equipped to deal with any emergency.

MENDEL RIVERS dedicated his life to doing the job which I believe it is absolutely essential that the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives must do in order to assure that our defenses will be adequate.

I valued MENDEL RIVERS' services as a leader and a counselor in dealing with important foreign policy issues. He kept himself well informed with background of important world problems and played an active part in promoting an understanding of the issues which confronted us and in seeking the best way to deal with them.

I always regarded MENDEL RIVERS as a sincere patriot who was interested primarily in the security of his country. He worked hard at his job, he knew what was going on and felt that he had an obligation to take the initiative with respect to matters of national defense. Our Armed Forces are better organized, better equipped and better manned today because of his action and his influence.

It is hard for us to realize that he is no longer with us and all of us will find it difficult to adjust to the fact that he is not on hand filling the place we are accustomed to having him fill.

I want to express my sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and to his children in their bereavement, but I am sure their grief will be lightened by the fact that their

husband and father had rendered such distinguished service to his country.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has indeed lost a great Member in the sudden and untimely passing on December 28 of the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina.

Throughout his long and outstanding congressional career, MENDEL RIVERS served his district and his country with a deep sense of patriotism and courage. He was a man who always believed that every Member of the House should be an active committee member and at all times should do his homework. No Member who has served in the House of Representatives during the 20th century has worked more diligently to know and understand the many problems confronting the Armed Services Committee than my friend, MENDEL RIVERS, and in his capacity as chairman he gave tirelessly of his time and efforts in behalf of the individual serviceman as well as our overall Armed Forces.

MENDEL RIVERS will be greatly missed and I extend to Mrs. Rivers and other members of the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late, great MENDEL RIVERS. There was no more respected Member and no better friend to every colleague than the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. He was kind to junior Members, gracious to his adversaries and extraordinarily vigilant for his country. MENDEL RIVERS typified the finest traditions and example of this great body.

I like to think of our dear departed friend as a man of granite, high on a windy hill, standing firm for a strong America against all comers. My native State of New Hampshire is known as "the Granite State." It would have been honored to have been able to claim MENDEL RIVERS as a native son. Since it cannot, it is fitting that I extend to his memory the greatest compliment to come from a sister State to South Carolina, the attribution of that quality of strength of character symbolized by our State motto in an accolade to an outstanding citizen of South Carolina.

Storms might come and go across the land. Storms from the right or the left, from those who sought to lessen our defense capabilities for more money for domestic priorities from any direction, but come hades or high water, our good friend and stalwart protector of defense MENDEL RIVERS stood like granite for America high on that windy hill.

His untimely passing comes at a perilous time and leaves a void in the House that will be well-nigh impossible to fill. Because he was a man who recognized that this Nation cannot make social progress if we do not first retain the basic freedom to pursue it, he became one of the strongest defenders the cause of an adequate national defense has ever had. As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, his was a clear voice insisting America not be lulled into a false sense of security. Running counter to the sweeping tide pressing for the enactment of far-reaching domestic programs at the

cost of dangerously reduced defense outlays, MENDEL RIVERS correctly and passionately pointed out that all the improvements in the world could be wiped away in a few brief moments if America were not strong enough to guarantee the precious freedoms for which this Nation stands.

Those who labored with him to preserve our national security for the perilous times that lay ahead knew well that he had shouldered no easy task. When he accepted the call to a position of great power in the Congress, he did so only after first being prepared to assume great responsibility. MENDEL RIVERS never allowed great odds to deter him from taking unpopular stands dictated by his devotion to his country and her needs.

During his three decades in the Congress, MENDEL RIVERS' efforts in providing our Nation with adequate security have involved major reforms and improvements in the Defense Establishment. It has been through his efforts that this year has seen the beginnings of a long-overdue program to revitalize and modernize our aging naval forces. At the same time he has earned the reputation of being the strongest advocate the American soldier, sailor, and airman had in Government. Not only did he press continuously for improved equipment and support to enable our men in the field to perform the difficult and frequently dangerous task their country asked them to perform, but he led the fight for a series of pay increases and other improvements that have helped make and keep the American fighting man the best in the world.

All Americans, whatever their political beliefs, mourn the loss of this great man. MENDEL RIVERS was an outstanding man whose wisdom and farsighted devotion to his country will not be easily replaced. The voice he raised in his Nation's cause earned him the unwavering support of his constituents, the respect and admiration of his colleagues, and the loyalty and devotion of all Americans. His efforts were an inspiration to all who served with him.

Mr. Speaker, we have suffered a profound loss. A voice is stilled and we mourn the silence. Virginia and I extend our deepest sympathy and heartfelt regret to his lovely wife, Margaret, and his fine family.

May God grant this great American eternal peace.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, our country has lost a great statesman, the American servicemen have lost a close friend, the House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member, and the State of South Carolina has lost a devoted servant with the untimely departure of L. MENDEL RIVERS.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Congressman from South Carolina was a hero to our military forces everywhere. His support of our Armed Forces is well known. He fought for all the military, from private to general—and has been praised by Presidents, generals, privates, Congressmen, and just about every military and patriotic group in the country.

One of his most prized possessions, was a field cap with six stars presented to

him by a group of enlisted GI's he assisted in getting home for Christmas—one of his last official acts.

I am pleased and proud to have served on the House Armed Services Committee under the leadership of this great American. The Halls of Congress will not be the same without L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. The death of MENDEL RIVERS is a serious, far-reaching loss to the United States of America.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, America has lost a courageous leader with the death of Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS. But, his contributions to the defense of the land he loved will long be remembered.

In my 18 years in Congress, I have always been fortunate enough to have an office within a few doors of the gentleman from South Carolina. He always was a good friend and neighbor.

Particularly during the last few years, we shared thoughts on many issues of mutual concern. The two of us fought hard for a strong merchant marine, and he was staunch backer of the supersonic transport program.

His eloquent words from the floor of the House will long ring in my ears. Always his great concern was for a strong nation. He truly was a pillar of strength in the defense of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying respects to L. MENDEL RIVERS. His leadership will be missed.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, America has lost one of its most dedicated citizens and one of its outstanding leaders. MENDEL RIVERS has left a mark upon this Congress that will long remain unequaled. His devotion to patriotism, his performance of his duty, is an inspiration to all who serve in public life. I will miss him as a personal friend and as a loyal colleague who was always most helpful to me when I came here as a freshman Congressman. America will miss the zeal he displayed in protecting the strength and defense of this country. Freedom is more secure because MENDEL RIVERS served in the Congress. I want to take this opportunity to extend my deep sympathy to the members of his family and to say a fond farewell to one of the most devoted Members of this body.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, we mourn today the loss of a beloved and respected colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), who brought to this Chamber a sense of dedication and patriotism that time cannot erase. He will be missed by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I always admired and respected MENDEL for his efforts in behalf of his constituency and his Nation. He believed, as I do, that the safety and security of all Americans must always be our first priority. In this time of turmoil, his counsel will be missed.

Perhaps the loss of L. MENDEL RIVERS will be most deeply felt by the millions of American servicemen at home and abroad, for he was their champion. He knew that our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen are not merely cogs in a war machine. He knew that they richly deserve all the benefits and protection that this Nation can provide. He dedicated his life to the fulfillment of their needs. For this he shall never be forgotten.

As we mourn our loss, it would do us well to remember the words of Ovid: "It is not wealth, nor ancestry, but honorable conduct and a noble disposition that make men great." By this measure, L. MENDEL RIVERS was a great American. His passing leaves a void that can never be filled.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife Margaret and his family.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in their tributes to our late friend, L. MENDEL RIVERS.

For almost half of his allotted span of years in this world—30 years, MENDEL RIVERS walked the Halls of Congress, devoting himself to labor without ceasing on behalf of sound and sensible legislation. Especially did he labor for proper legislative attention to anything affecting the security of the land he loved with a fierce and unwavering devotion.

We will miss his astonishingly wise and sagacious counsel. We will miss his outstanding leadership. We will miss his courageous spirit of honesty and determination.

MENDEL RIVERS will be sorely missed in the Congress of the United States. He will be missed in the First District of South Carolina, which he served so ably and so long.

But, his loss will be keenly felt by a vastly wider constituency, a constituency comprising men and women from all walks of life and from all parts of our country—the members of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Wherever they may be—on battlefield, on training ground, on garrison duty, on board ship, or in the air, countless men and women of our Armed Forces will mourn his passing.

For MENDEL RIVERS was not only the staunch and brilliantly articulate defender of a strong America, he was also the champion of those Americans in the ranks who may be called upon at any time to lay down their lives in defense of our freedom and safety and cherished independence.

He did this at a time when it has become increasingly popular to be critical of the men and women who stand ready to defend our national interests with military strength whenever the absolute need to do so arises.

MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina was a great and patriotic South Carolinian, whose name will never be forgotten so long as the name of South Carolina is remembered in the annals of American history.

But, in addition to that I do not hesitate to say that MENDEL RIVERS was a great American.

And that is, perhaps, the greatest single tribute that can be paid his memory.

May I conclude by extending my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and the entire Rivers family.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, it seems odd that there can be two completely different views of the same person.

But really there was not in fact two MENDEL RIVERS—there was only one.

We, here, knew MENDEL RIVERS. We knew him as a friend; we knew him as a

strong man and yet as a kind and courteous man.

Some, in the press, felt so strongly in opposition to his views on the military that they let their fundamental difference distort the image of the man himself.

Today, we pay respect to MENDEL RIVERS the man.

As a relatively new member of this body, I will always remember his kindness to me; I will always respect his courage.

MENDEL RIVERS fought for his district, his State, and for his country. And through it all, he had time to care about his friends and colleagues.

We shall miss him.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my words of regret, to those of others who have spoken, on the passing of our colleague from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS.

MENDEL RIVERS was a strong man and an able man. He was a master of the parliamentary procedure of the House. He was a skillful debater and an articulate and resourceful speaker above all, he was a master of the material which he handled and his knowledge of his subject was deep and extensive.

Although others have suggested a hardness and insensitivity about him, those who knew him knew also of his warmth and his interest in human beings of all segments of society. They were all alike to him in his interest and affection. Most illustrative of the capacity of his personality to break down preconceptions was the recent Life magazine article on MENDEL RIVERS in which the author began his story with a rather obvious and hostile bias, but gradually as he progressed with its writing succumbed to the charm of MENDEL, and his essential humility. This article ended by being a subtle laudation of our late friend rather than a destructive effort.

We shall certainly miss MENDEL RIVERS in the difficult days ahead and I sincerely hope that the example of his patriotism and his hard work and his devotion to what he considered his duty will long be before us as we meet great problems without his help.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, our friend and colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS, has returned to his beloved home, St. Stephen, S.C. for the last time, and tomorrow he will be buried near his parents.

It is with a great deal of sadness that I join in bidding this distinguished legislator farewell. We will miss MENDEL's flowing white hair, his tart tongue, and his devotion to his constituents, his State, and his country.

Since the 77th Congress he has served his constituents and the Nation in a dedicated way. In addition no one questions the fact that he was indeed the champion of our GI's. He won many awards throughout his career of public service but I think he was most proud of the gift cap which the GI's gave him at Christmas time, inscribed to "the big boss."

It has been a pleasure for me to work with MENDEL since I was elected to serve in the House of Representatives in the

86th Congress. He was never too busy to lend a helping hand to a colleague.

His gaiety and wit brightened many hours of our lives, but his stature as a person will be long remembered. He stood for a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy and his passing is mourned by those who have been privileged to know and work with him.

Mrs. JOHNSON joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, Margaret, his two daughters, and his son.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, not only Congress but the entire Nation has suffered an irreparable loss in the death of our colleague MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina, who served with such ability and distinction as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

MENDEL RIVERS was a great American and a true patriot, who did not shrink from calling attention in the most forceful manner to the deadly peril in which we have placed ourselves by continuing cutbacks in national defense. No accusation or calumny could deter him from performing this great service for his country.

MENDEL RIVERS knew that if we reduce our military strength much more, we can forget all about our other "good causes," because we will no longer exist as a free nation to implement them. His speech on the House floor at the end of September, demonstrating this grim truth unmistakably, was one of the greatest ever delivered in the House of Representatives, and should be a landmark in its history.

Now he is dead, leaving none of comparable stature and experience to continue to sound the warning. I hope every good American will honor the memory of MENDEL RIVERS and speak out, as he did, for the sake of our national survival. That is the best tribute we could pay to his memory—and it is, I am sure, what he would want us to do.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues this morning to pay tribute to our beloved colleague, the late L. MENDEL RIVERS, and to extend to his family my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Congressman RIVERS has been not only a dedicated Member of this House and a tremendously loyal American, but he has been one of the "kind" people in this House. Whenever there was a problem involving any serviceman I found Congressman RIVERS and his staff sympathetic, considerate, and understanding. His committee staff has been extremely able and courteous.

Congressman RIVERS was ever a gentleman, and ever thoughtful of individuals regardless of viewpoint.

This House will miss him. The Nation will miss him. And to his family, again, may I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, during the past 10 years, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and to become acquainted with the late, distinguished chairman of the committee, L. MENDEL RIVERS, both as a senior member of the committee while Carl Vinson was its chairman, and later during the 6 years

MENDEL RIVERS chaired the committee himself.

Although very frankly, in most recent years, there were occasions on which I disagreed with the chairman, they were not many in comparison with all of the issues that have been dealt with by the committee in recent times.

I have always been deeply impressed by Mr. RIVERS' dedication to his responsibilities and the exceptionally long hours and hard work which he devoted to the job of chairman. I have been equally impressed by his sincerity in all that he has done. Even on those occasions when I disagreed with the chairman, I never doubted his complete sincerity in the position he occupied.

His was a long and distinguished career in the service of his country, one in which his family, as well as all who knew him can take great pride. We will all remember his dedication to the principle that this country should remain militarily strong not only for the security of the United States, but also in order to be an effective force for peace throughout the world.

The men and women of the armed services of the United States will remember Chairman RIVERS as their champion for better pay, better living conditions, more adequate transportation during periods of leave, and a great many other things which made life in the military service more pleasant.

MENDEL RIVERS was without doubt a great man. This Nation will miss him, as indeed will I.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep sense of personal loss at news of the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, a loss I know is felt by many other Members of this body as well as by his entire State.

No Member of this august body has been so conversant with matters pertaining to the defense of this country, and while we pay tribute to his many accomplishments, our sadness is tinged with the knowledge that at no time in our history is such knowledge and ability so greatly needed as now, when the very concept of our national defense is under such heavy attack from within our Nation.

Congressman RIVERS was aware of this unfortunate trend in our national thought and gave much of his time and thought in an effort to counterbalance it with positive evidence of support for our essential military structure. His strength cannot be replaced. But his example can serve as inspiration for all of us who love this great Nation as he did to step into the fight and make certain the efforts he has contributed will not have been in vain.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, while Chairman MENDEL RIVERS was fighting for his life in Alabama after his surgery, I sent him a telegram of well wishes, and called him "the unsinkable MENDEL RIVERS" for this is how I regarded him. His demise was a shock and a tragedy to all America.

Prior to securing a seat on the Armed Services Committee, I came to regard Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS as my

friend. For the 4 years I was looking in on the committee, with various critical military matters for the west Texas district I represent, Chairman RIVERS treated me with great civility and understanding of our problem. So it was that I was pleased to have been named in 1969 to this great committee to serve under his leadership.

During these past 2 years of membership on the Armed Service Committee I came to appreciate his firm but fair directorship as chairman. He was a totally patriotic and dedicated American who had amassed an amazing amount of information and balance in knowledge of the defense needs and posture of the country. There is no doubt that our state of readiness can be attributed to him as he fought inch by inch for an adequate defense system.

He helped America, he helped the servant, he helped this Congress, and he certainly helped me innumerable times.

I regard him as one of the outstanding, memorable, and colorful figures that have served in Congress. None has ever been more dedicated in the preservation of this Nation.

I know the people of his district are proud of this tall-standing product of a proud, historic area. I am sure that his family are proud of this now legendary personality, and can take comfort in the undying memory of a great American. Gone but never forgotten.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today it is my sad duty, along with my distinguished colleagues in the House, to bid farewell to one of the great leaders of our time. I bid farewell to L. MENDEL RIVERS as a colleague, as a member of the committee which he chaired and, especially, as a friend. I shall always remember the kindnesses which Chairman RIVERS showed to me and his willingness to go out of his way to provide whatever assistance he could to me in my efforts to represent the people of my district. The news of his death comes with suddenness and leaves a feeling of emptiness.

I remember last October when Chairman RIVERS was kind enough to come and visit my district personally, in order to visit with many of my constituents in southern California. He commented to me that he had not been feeling well and was somewhat concerned about some reports he had had recently about the condition of his heart. I expressed concern and we discussed the situation and his feelings for a short time. Now, looking back, I realize that it seemed inconceivable to me then that a man of such dynamism and strength would so soon be lost to us. His was a friendship that I feel grateful to have experienced.

Perhaps Chairman RIVERS' greatest characteristic was that, as a man who was in a position for which leadership was the primary requisite, he had the courage to lead. For this reason he was often viewed as a controversial figure, for he was never afraid to use his considerable abilities and energies in order to reach the goal which he felt were essential to preserve the strength and security of the United States. In an age where we hear to many calls for leader-

ship, it is reassuring that we can today praise a man who never lost the fortitude to lead effectively and persuasively.

Although the chairman did not serve as an active member of the U.S. military, no military man ever had a better or more loyal friend than L. MENDEL RIVERS. From buck private to five-star general, from the Air Force to the Coast Guard, the chairman saw to it that the American military man never had to take a back seat to any other individual in our society or any other. He understood above all that serving and defending one's country is a task and a profession to be admired and to be rewarded. As long as he was in charge there was never any doubt that this proper attitude would be the basic guideline by which important decisions affecting thousands of our men and women in uniform would be made. In this, he made a significant contribution toward insuring human dignity for a segment of our population which certainly has a priority claim to it.

I know also that Chairman RIVERS was a devoted father and a conscientious family man who cared very deeply about his wife and children. Being the father of four myself, we discussed, from time to time, some of the different situations that arise in a busy and active family. I learned firsthand of the love and respect which he always gave to those closest to him. To Mrs. Rivers and her family, Mrs. Wilson and I extend our deepest sympathy at the loss of our good friend from South Carolina.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the sad news which conveyed the information of MENDEL RIVERS' death was most distressing to me. Although his condition was constantly reported as serious, I was hopeful that he would survive his operation and I am sure that I was not alone in this hope. The fact that he is no longer with us is difficult to believe but it is one of those realities that we must prepare to face.

I learned to know him when I first came to Congress and our mutual friendship over the years has been a source of great pride to me personally. I admired him because there was no equivocation or hiding of his position. Everyone knew how he stood on every issue and he was always prepared to defend it.

MENDEL RIVERS was a dedicated American who believed in his country and gave his energy and talent to see that it was always protected from its enemies. His passing is a real loss not only to the Nation and the district he served for 30 years but also to his family and his many friends.

Much will be said about him and many will praise him now—but the record of his work and devoted service here in the House of Representatives will live on.

Mrs. Betts and I extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and her family at this time.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of my dear friend, our colleague MENDEL RIVERS. It was my privilege to know MENDEL well since I came to Congress in 1943. Since that time I have en-

joyed his friendship and assistance so readily given.

MENDEL was truly a patriot. He worked untiringly to protect and to expand the general welfare of his fellow citizens and our Nation.

He was a good student of history. He knew well that in unity there is strength and that strength will protect and keep our Nation free.

MENDEL was very personable with a keen sense of humor. It was always pleasant being in his company. He was a thorough gentleman, with a strong character and firm determination.

To his lovely wife and family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness and profound respect that I join my colleagues today in tribute to a man who was so unquestionably devoted to our Nation, and to the security of our people.

Throughout my own service in this body I have learned to appreciate the many and varied persuasions and points of view held by my colleagues and I have especially come to appreciate those who represent their standpoint effectively and with dedication. The gentleman from South Carolina epitomizes this dedication and this effectiveness. We have lost a distinguished leader from our midst.

The passing of our colleague grieves me not only out of a sense of loss to our Nation, but also as a loss of a personal friend. Perhaps as a result of my previous service as a naval officer stationed in Charleston, S.C., Chairman RIVERS and I enjoyed a warm sincere friendship. He often found time to discuss with me matters of mutual concern and interest; as representatives of maritime districts, we often discussed the need for maintaining our Nation's seafaring traditions and naval strength. While we did not necessarily agree upon all matters, I found the chairman considerate, gracious, and always a true gentleman in every sense.

I think it was always apparent to all of us that L. MENDEL RIVERS was a devoted and sincere patriot; he was always unflinchingly devoted to the preservation of our national security. He lived by biblical warning "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle?" L. MENDEL RIVERS was never an uncertain trumpet in his country's cause. Our Nation's men in uniform knew the gentleman from South Carolina as a man who shared their own dedication and who understood their views. As long as our Nation is rivaled by those who would use military force to seek their goals, we must have men such as MENDEL RIVERS in our Congress.

I mourn the passing of our colleague and my wife, Alice, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his beloved family at this time of deep grief.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has lost one of its most able and influential leaders—Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina—and it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow and condolences to the family

of my good friend, who passed away yesterday.

As chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, he stood staunchly for superior American military strength as our best means of maintaining a peaceful future. He was an outstanding citizen and a great patriot, and his family and friends are justifiably proud of his distinguished record of public service.

He first ran for Congress in 1940 when he won the South Carolina First District seat he has held ever since. For 30 years he served his constituents and his country with dedication and devotion. He had an unequalled understanding of the operations of the Defense Department and did all that he could to guarantee the security of our Nation through its military strength. Nothing could deter him from the course he deemed right for America, and his critics as well as his ardent supporters had the highest admiration for his steadfastness of purpose.

Chairman RIVERS was born in Greenville, S.C., and moved to North Charleston at an early age. As he grew up, he was determined to become a lawyer, and he worked hard to achieve his purpose. He attended the College of Charleston and law school at the University of South Carolina, passing the bar examination in 1932. After two terms in the State legislature, he came to Washington as a special attorney for the Justice Department.

Shortly thereafter, L. MENDEL RIVERS ran for Congress, and embarked on the active and very successful political career which has been cut short by his untimely death. His skill in the legislative field, and his keen insight and sensitivity to the needs and wants of the American people will be missed not only by his colleagues but also by his constituents whom he served so well from the 77th through the 91st Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to have served in the Congress of the United States with Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS. He earned our respect, our admiration, and a lasting place in the pages of American history.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to his widow, Mrs. Margaret Rivers, and to his two daughters and son, our personal and deepest sympathies on the loss of their beloved husband and father.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Hon. MENDEL RIVERS takes from our midst a man of unforgettable character and enduring influence. Firm and unwavering in his conviction that the surest guarantee of peace is to be found in armed strength, he gave tirelessly of himself to uphold American security at home and abroad. He was friend and advocate for American servicemen everywhere.

His leadership in Congress placed him among the most powerful champions of freedom in the world. He saw the international situation as one not only of grave concern but of dire peril, and in that light he labored to keep his beloved America strong. He won the respect even of those who differed with him.

L. MENDEL RIVERS came to this House as a young man of 35. In this year 1970, he had completed 30 continuous years of

service. Through all his career he cherished the example of South Carolina's great leader, John C. Calhoun. And, indeed, he himself came to embody many of the virtues associated with Calhoun: Eloquence in oratory, vigorous convictions powerfully expressed, and deep, passionate loyalty. A man with cherished roots, loving his home, his State and its people, he was able to extend that concern to the whole Nation.

We shall not soon see another of his stature. We share the sorrow felt in his passing by his dear wife, his daughters, and his son, even as we also share the consoling pride which is theirs in the memory of his life and work. From that memory may we, his colleagues, take continued inspiration in these times.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House—individually and as a whole—feel it when we lose a colleague of great dedication; and, certainly, a great loss was felt yesterday when we sorrowfully learned that we had lost our dear friend and late colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS.

MENDEL RIVERS was certainly senior to me as he had been serving in Congress almost 20 years before I was elected; but from my first days here, I learned from the counsel of this hardworking, conscientious man. Having Fort Campbell, Ky., in my congressional district, and being a relative newcomer to Congress, too, meant that I constantly sought advice and help from Chairman RIVERS. I found him unselfish and always willing to go out of his way to help make the task easier for a fellow Member who needed his assistance in either a small or large way.

MENDEL RIVERS was without fail the "soldier's friend;" and since his passing, I have heard from many active and reserve servicemen in my district who have expressed their deep sorrow over his untimely passing and said many personal things about this dedicated man, such as "I considered MENDEL RIVERS the next closest thing to my Kentucky citizenship." Remarks of this nature spell out the special love that our patriotic, fighting men had for this dear man; they considered him their protector and compatriot. I am sure that the servicemen of all 435 congressional districts, as well as their families, feel the same about MENDEL RIVERS. They shall miss him as we shall in the House, but can greater honor be paid to anyone than to have been regarded by so many as "protector and compatriot"?

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, marked the passing of a legend. As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Congressman RIVERS proved to be a powerful and consistent spokesman for a strong military and an unbending national defense posture.

In addition to his well publicized and sometimes controversial actions as a committee chairman, Congressman RIVERS represented his South Carolina constituency for 30 years. He was a Representative in the true sense of that word, concerned about the problems of his

people and determined to stand up for their beliefs in the Congress.

When a legendary figure is taken from a nation, there is a loss which cannot be filled. We have lost a legendary colleague but history has recorded the details of his career for future generations to remember.

I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to the members of the Rivers family.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the eloquent statements made by my colleagues on behalf of our beloved late chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS. My own words can only echo their reflections on this remarkable man, who served his country so long and faithfully. My acquaintanceship with MENDEL RIVERS was brief, extending just across my first term here in the 91st Congress; but during this period I came to recognize those same virtues which my colleagues saw evidence of over many years—his courage, his fighting spirit, his uncompromising determination to provide for the defense of our republic, and his great love of America.

On a more personal note, I will always remember his courtesy toward me as a freshman member of his committee. Countless times he went out of his way to be helpful to me and to honor my requests, whatever they were. He told me on our first day that the Armed Services Committee had no place for politics. He was as true as his word, never manifesting the slightest degree of partisanship in conducting committee business. His single concern was our national security. Individual members might have taken issue with him on specific points, but at no time did this influence his personal relationship with them. This is a mark of manliness, and I have never seen it displayed by anyone else in such a grand manner.

That he was a friend of the serviceman was made clear to me wherever I traveled among military personnel. From admiral to seaman, from private to general, I heard nothing but praise for the chairman's efforts to improve the condition of our career military personnel. His tireless efforts on their behalf will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I regard his passing with the very keenest regret. A part of America has died, and it shall not be soon replaced. I join with my distinguished colleagues of this body and with millions of Americans in mourning his passing.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the holiday season and the closing days of the 91st Congress were tragically saddened by the untimely passing of our great friend and colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS of Charleston, S.C.

All of us in the House of Representatives who were fortunate enough over the years to enjoy the example of our dear friend MENDEL's great work, wit, and gentlemanly southern charm, have suffered a great personal loss.

Of greater significance, however, is the loss to the Nation of Mr. RIVERS as chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House. L. MENDEL RIVERS from this all-important post that he occupied with such great competence and diligence, will be sorely missed. The Nation's valiant

armed services throughout the world have truly lost one of their greatest champions.

MENDEL RIVERS' great city of Charleston and the State of South Carolina have now been deprived of their strongest advocate. His dedication and devotion to his constituency are legend and I am sure that this outstanding accomplishments will long be remembered by his beloved city and State who benefited from his faithful service.

Mrs. Friedel and I extend to his family our deepest sympathy at this sad time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late gentleman from South Carolina.

Chairman RIVERS was a powerful man—not only in the power inherent in his committee position, but in the power of his beliefs, of his dedication, of his devotion to his country. He had this power and he used it. In doing so, he frequently met disagreements with many of his colleagues—and when he did, he was a formidable adversary. Even though there was disagreement at times, no one ever questioned that he was fighting for principles in which he believed and principles which he sincerely believed were in the best interest of our Nation.

With the passing of L. MENDEL RIVERS, an era ends, but he has left his work and the future generations of Americans will profit from the work and determination of this man from South Carolina.

I extend my condolences to his lovely wife, Margaret, and their two daughters and son in this time of bereavement. I know they will be comforted in their loss by the knowledge of his many great accomplishments over the years.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Members of the South Carolina delegation, the Speaker of the House and others in expressing my sorrow and paying my respects and tribute to the late Honorable LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina.

It seems as if it were only yesterday when I first came to know Mr. RIVERS. In 1953 when I entered this body MENDEL was already a veteran of 12 years, service. He was extremely cordial and helpful to me as a new Member. From the very first we developed an affectionate friendship which continued until his untimely death on yesterday. His death is a deep personal loss to me and creates a void which will be difficult to fill. Our offices were always located close to each other, both in the Old Cannon Building and since 1965 in the new Rayburn House Office Building. He was a source of good advice, of wise counsel, and of help and assistance when either was needed.

Mr. Speaker, a large measure of the close association with MENDEL RIVERS derived from the close association between him and Carl Vinson who was dean of our Georgia delegation during the entire time of my service in Congress until Mr. Vinson retired at the end of the 88th Congress. Mr. Vinson reposed great trust and confidence in MENDEL RIVERS, and when he retired from Congress and from the chairmanship of the Committee on Armed Services, he did so knowing that he relinquished the chairmanship into the hands of a capable successor. If

he had felt otherwise, I dare say he would never have voluntarily left the Congress.

Congressman RIVERS was knowledgeable and effectively knowledgeable on all matters within the jurisdiction of the committee which he chaired. Originally a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he was originally known and referred to as the champion of the Navy, but I have never known him to show any partiality among any of the armed services of the United States. He did much to subdue interservice rivalries and to create a balanced force with each service complementing the other two. He encouraged teamwork and played a major role in the development of that teamwork.

When the House considered and passed H.R. 18970, the Trade Act of 1970, MENDEL RIVERS made an impassioned speech in behalf of this legislation. He addressed his remarks largely to the textile import quota title of that bill and spoke as knowledgeably for the need for that legislation as if lived in a heavy textile producing district. He spoke eloquently of the great importance of a strong textile industry to an adequate national defense and documented his assertions with carefully researched and factual data. I believe that his speech was one of the more effective speeches during debate on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, I have lost a warm and devoted personal friend. His family has lost a devoted husband and father. His district has lost a masterful Representative, his State a great and noble son, and the United States of America has lost one of its greatest patriots. We shall all miss him, but at the same time, we are all grateful to have known him and we in the Congress to have served with him as a friend and colleague.

Mrs. Landrum joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and their three children.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of grief that I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of a giant among us. The late gentleman from the First Congressional District of South Carolina represented the people of his district for more than 30 years in the House of Representatives.

MENDEL RIVERS was widely known as "the serviceman's best friend" and the "serviceman's Congressman" because of his kindnesses and consideration for our men in uniform.

His appraisal of the world situation closely paralleled my own. He knew that the best road to peace is a strong defense. For many years he criticized those who would make "cost effectiveness" the sole criterion for our military expenditures. Recent reports would indicate that he was much closer in his analysis than were his adversaries.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will be missed by us all, and to Mrs. Rivers, his children, and all of those who knew him, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, patriotism and Americanism may, among some elements of our population, be words of waning importance.

However, when applied to our late colleague whose death has saddened us all, they glow with the full and enduring character, since he lived them in their fullest meaning throughout his life.

We can thank him, my friends, for his singleness of purpose and determination that time and again saved this Nation from dismantling its defenses.

We can thank him for his understanding, his grasp of our military needs, and for his unstinting service—service that wore out a strong heart and eventually took him from us.

He was a man for his times. He was an American to the fullest sense of the word, for his people and his country. He was a patriot—a patriot whose depth of character and loyalty paralleled the lives of those men who first dreamed and then made America work from the beginning.

He was my friend and I shall miss him. He was our colleague and we needed him. He goes from among us with my full prayers, into a peace he so well earned while among us.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the passing of the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS. As a great American he loved his country and demonstrated his loyalty throughout his life.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he stood firmly for the rights of every man who served in the military. He held an unyielding position in his belief in the defense of this Nation. He was a courageous and dynamic leader whose voice will be missed in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the death of Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

As a member of the committee, I came to know Chairman RIVERS well. Although he and I frequently disagreed it was always on a philosophical, not on a personal basis. In fact, he took pains at times to provide those of us who differed with him with additional opportunities to be heard.

MENDEL RIVERS was a dedicated public servant. Many of the improvements in the military services that have come about in the last several years are directly attributable to his leadership. He was a staunch patriot whose intense love of country was the driving force in meeting his responsibilities as a Member of Congress. There is no accolade that he would have preferred more than that of patriot. I have no doubt that he always will be remembered in this vein.

My wife and I extend to the Rivers family our deepest sympathy over their great loss. May God comfort them in their grief.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in this eulogy to MENDEL RIVERS and to express my deep sorrow at his death.

The 30 years that MENDEL RIVERS spent in Congress were dedicated to his belief that America's freedom was solidly tied to its military might, and he never swerved from his commitment to this belief. He knew criticism and opposition,

but he remained firm in his conviction that America must above all else remain militarily strong. His efforts to benefit the enlisted soldier were undeniable. Their gratitude, which many of them publicly avowed, must have been a great source of satisfaction to him.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, MENDEL RIVERS had assumed a high place in the House hierarchy, and in this post he served his country with the same sense of devotion with which he served the people of his own State and of his congressional district.

Chairman RIVERS was a familiar figure in the halls of Congress. Probably one of the busiest Members, he always took time to stop—in the corridors—in the dining room—on the floor—to chat for a few moments. A friendly and cheerful man, with a fine sense of humor, and with a particular life-style of his own that openly reflected his boundless patriotism to his country, his death is a loss to us all.

Mrs. Corman and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and the family.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, our country lost a great patriot and we in Congress a great friend.

L. MENDEL RIVERS was the personification of the high ideals for which this body stands. A stalwart supporter of our country's security, his far-sighted and untiring efforts in behalf of our Nation's defenses knew no bounds.

As a chairman he conducted the affairs of the Armed Services Committee in a most efficient and responsible manner. Always on the alert, his constant attention to the strategic needs of our defensive systems is a contribution for which he will long be remembered.

It is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to this great American. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and his many friends.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing sorrow at the loss of our colleague Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS. He could truly be described as one of the key Members of the House; as a Member who very effectively fulfilled the role of leadership which he had attained.

He was dedicated to the strength of this Nation, to its national security and defense preparedness. He properly respected the role of the military in defending the freedoms which we too often take for granted. He also properly respected the role of our military in defense of the free world. He recognized the continued danger to the United States and its allies, of the ever-continuing Communist aggression.

MENDEL RIVERS was also dedicated to the House of Representatives, to its Members and the constituents that they represented. He was a patriot in the finest sense of the word, and also a keen student of government and a master tactician in the legislative branch.

We will certainly miss him in his role of chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. We will also miss him as a respected colleague and a warm, and always friendly associate. He served his country with rare devotion, and this service will long be remembered by those

of us who were privileged to serve with him.

Mrs. Derwinski joins me in extending sympathy to his family.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the country has lost a great patriot and an outstanding statesman and I have lost a friend. My personal grief and sorrow at the death of MENDEL RIVERS is great but it is overwhelmed at the sense of loss that I feel for our Nation. Those of us who knew him on a personal basis, especially the members of the congressional prayer breakfast group, will mourn his death and pray for renewed strength to continue in his absence.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, MENDEL RIVERS was a religious, God-fearing man. He was devoted to his church and a believer in the American principle of free religion, which has played a major part in the development of this Nation.

He was a man of deep, spiritual faith and when I traveled with him on various occasions, I noted that on Sundays, he always attended church without fail, even in instances when he might have to go far out of his way to do so.

He was also broad and tolerant in his views toward all religions, and I have known him to attend religious ceremonies in churches other than his own.

He had respect for other beliefs, and the religious views of other people and devoutly believed in the Lord.

At times he was maligned and many lies were circulated about him that were without foundation. In public life, he was often the victim of gross misrepresentations, but it never shook his faith in his public calling, and it never caused him to lose his faith in the people whom he loved with all his heart. He was a great and good man.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for Congress as we all join together to pay our respects to MENDEL RIVERS. For 15 terms he has served his country with distinction and honor as a Representative from South Carolina.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he carried forward progressively a balanced defense program for America. His committee was recognized for the efficient way it evaluated and expedited all of its business.

But I will always remember MENDEL best as the friendly southern gentleman that he was. Two weeks ago I was sitting in the gallery with some folks from home. MENDEL walked across the floor and they all immediately wanted to know who he was. When I said RIVERS, they all knew him by reputation. They knew of all his active commitments. The impressive thing to them was that he looked like the man they visualized him to be.

MENDEL RIVERS looked like a southern colonel. He had a strong carriage. His white solid hair gave him depth. His glasses reflected his intellectual capacity. His friendly smiling face with his twinkling eyes was his great strength. You could see in MENDEL a warm man who loved his friends and respected his adversaries.

MENDEL RIVERS was a great man. He was a wonderful friend and a great national leader. To his family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy. Your loss is shared by the South and the entire Nation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal sorrow that I join my colleagues in this tribute to the late L. MENDEL RIVERS.

To have had MENDEL RIVERS as a personal friend was a gainful experience for me, indeed. Although I disagreed with him on many of his statements and positions, I am convinced that he was a deeply sincere man with an unshakable dedication to serve the people of South Carolina and this Nation in his own way, to the best of his ability. A loyal patriot, devoted to the preservation of America's greatness, he believed that without military superiority, real greatness could not be achieved in the light of competing ideologies. History may someday construe his position as one which helped to preserve what we Americans hold so dear—a free and independent nation among free peoples everywhere. Only time will tell.

During his rise from a boyhood spent in relative poverty to a position of power in Congress, MENDEL RIVERS showed himself to be a man of considerable personal integrity and courage who was always true to himself. There was truly only one of his kind and we shall sorely miss his strong leadership.

To Mrs. Rivers and her family, I extend deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences. May the blessings of the Almighty be upon them in this hour of bereavement.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we live in a time when many profess that they know the absolute truth. But this is also a time when it is hard to find many who will stand by their statements, people who really have faith in their convictions, people who are unashamed to take a stand. MENDEL RIVERS was a man who had faith. He had beliefs, he said what he believed, and felt no necessity to apologize for it.

Of him it can be said, as Paul said of himself:

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.

There are many who did not agree with MENDEL RIVERS, but no one ever accused him of avarice. No one ever accused him of making empty gestures. No one ever had any doubt about where he stood. He believed passionately in the things he defended, and his faith was not doubted by any man, even his most ardent enemies.

Now MENDEL RIVERS is gone. We will miss him, as any ship's captain would miss a familiar landmark. Some would say he was a rock, a shoal endangering the Nation; but others would say that if he was a rock he was one the Nation could stand on.

Now he is gone, dead as all men must be one day.

I hope that this House will see more men of such faith, for we need them. The business of the Nation is too pressing for us to be surrounded by men of shallow gestures and shallow deeds. We need men who have the courage of their convictions, as this man did.

If we would remember MENDEL RIVERS, let it be as keepers of the faith.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our most distinguished col-

leagues, L. MENDEL RIVERS. He was a patriot, he was courageous, he was outspoken for his country.

There were times in which I disagreed with Chairman RIVERS and his appeal for what I thought was an excessive military might which burdened the Nation and which crushed other human needs. We had differences—but seldom did we have different goals. He fought for the Military Establishment better than any admiral or general—they fought for power and inner rivalries. He fought for all branches of the service. He fought for strength beyond any challenge—the greatest strength of all.

It was my privilege to know MENDEL RIVERS and his family. Mrs. Vanik and I were guests at his home. He and Margaret were gracious, kind, and warm. They provided an almost forgotten kind of hospitality and gentility.

Mrs. Vanik and I express deep regret to Margaret Rivers on the untimely passing of this distinguished American.

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent the following telegram to the widow of MENDEL RIVERS:

DECEMBER 28, 1970.

Mrs. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Charleston, S.C.:

My profoundest regrets with the passing of your husband, a patriot in the most exalted tradition. He stood up strong and brave against inexorable enemies for what was best for America. Make no mistake, his enemies though they be alive will not triumph. It is not in the economy of the Lord. As time goes on the place in history of Mendel Rivers will stand supreme, the equivalent of America's greatest contributors. The hound dogs of malice in the press can have their mean and evil and salivating satisfaction. No American, repeat American, with any appreciation of America's responsibilities, its essential nature, and the direction of history, can fail to revile his enemies in the same measure that they mourn his loss. My deepest sympathy and affection.

MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of our distinguished colleague from South Carolina has left those of us who were privileged to serve with him in the House of Representatives with a deep sense of sorrow and loss.

I shall always count my association with Chairman RIVERS as one of the richest treasures afforded me by my service in the Congress. His friendship was greatly valued, as was the example of leadership which he provided all of us in the House of Representatives.

The parting of this outstanding American is not merely a personal loss to those of us fortunate enough to have served with him in the Congress, however. His death represents a great loss to the U.S. Government, and most especially the legislative branch in which he served for 30 years; to the House Armed Services Committee, which he has so ably led as its chairman; to the citizens of South Carolina's First Congressional District, whom he has served so well for so long; and to our beloved Nation, whose security has been maintained to a very great extent through Chairman RIVERS' untiring efforts toward an adequate defense posture.

MENDEL RIVERS shall be missed greatly. This great American shall long be re-

membered, as will his distinguished record of service to his country.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, December 27, 1970, was a day marked by sadness and reflection on the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS. The Nation, his home State of South Carolina, and free men everywhere have lost a courageous leader.

I feel somewhat presumptuous in extolling this great man since my only close contact with him was through the House prayer group and so many persons, who had known him longer and more intimately than I, have expressed themselves.

In 4 years, I came to know Mr. RIVERS as a very religious man. He came every Thursday morning to the meeting of the House prayer group. On Thursday before his operation, he told the prayer group about it, about the fact that he had a leaky heart valve—as he put it—and about the fact that if it had not been repaired, he would have been an invalid. He said the one thing he would never be was an invalid. But, he assured us that he had a great surgeon; that he would be back soon. And then he added: "Boys, pray for me."

MENDEL RIVERS was a classic example of an Horatio Alger in our time—a man who rose from a humble beginning to become a Congressman and a national figure as the powerful chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. In that position, he used his great power with courage and wisdom. He knew that we live in a dangerous world, and the special responsibilities imposed on the United States for maintaining world peace required a posture of military strength. The political fads that from time to time called for a downgrading of military preparedness never caused Chairman RIVERS to deviate from his view that American security was dependent on military strength.

The Republic has lost a great legislator, respected by all, because he dared to take a stand, stick to his guns, and proceed on a course which he felt was proper. This is why L. MENDEL RIVERS will go down in history as one of the great men of the House of Representatives.

Marjorie and I extend our deepest sympathy and heartfelt regret to his wife, Margaret, and his fine family.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in mourning the passing of a great American, the late L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. He was one of our Nation's top leaders in the fields of national defense and security. He was an ardent patriot who worked tirelessly to assure the military superiority of this country.

His strong support of the military and its programs earned him the loyalty and respect of servicemen everywhere, especially the men in the ranks whose lot in life he worked to improve, especially in the area of adequate salary and compensatory benefits. He believed in rewarding these persons who were fighting for all Americans.

South Carolina and the Nation will miss him also for his skill in all facets of the legislative endeavor. In addition he was the very model of a southern gen-

tleman, courtly, courteous, and generous to a fault.

Mrs. Sisk and I join in expressing our sympathy and sorrow to Mrs. Rivers and their children.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, this is the day that those of us who have concerned ourselves with the national defense of the United States of America have feared, the day when our beloved L. MENDEL RIVERS would no longer be among us. I could not let this day pass without providing for the benefit of our colleagues the remarks he made on his last appearance in my district. The occasion was the keel-laying of the U.S.S. *South Carolina*, a nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate at our great shipyard in Newport News.

Chairman RIVERS was indeed at his best. He was driving yet another nail in the great bastion of our defense which he championed during his entire career of service with us. As a tribute to him and to the things for which he stood, I include his remarks in the RECORD for today, the day on which he is being laid to rest:

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS BY HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS, U.S.S. "SOUTH CAROLINA" KEEL LAYING, DECEMBER 1, 1970

Secretary Chafee, Admiral Zumwalt, distinguished platform guests, my own colleagues from the Congress, my fellow South Carolinians, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I don't know what I can say. I think the best thing to say is "Let's eat!"

To date, my wife has already made the best speech.

Admiral Rickover started off on my side and when he finished, I don't know whose side he was on! He fixed the politicians forever.

And my dear friend, Senator Thurmond, whom I love, and all of South Carolina knows this, with that wonderful speech he gave to all of you, and the history contained therein, there's very little for me to say.

But I want to pay my respects to this great shipyard. No shipyard in America or anywhere has done more for its country than has this one. Its ships in all the wars in which we have been engaged have been first class. The only shipyard in America that can build a carrier—the only one. And now it's taking on the line of the nuclear frigates—the largest surface ships we are building outside of the carrier.

Then to come to the District of my dear friend, Tom Downing. When Tom Downing wants something, he gets it. He hangs around us like Grant around Richmond, but he gets what he wants. He thinks all ship construction should begin and end in Newport News and that the rest of the shipyards should be nothing more than satellites. And it's a real pleasure to be in your District, Tom, and see your wonderful people, and these great workers, and this great corporation which has done so much for America.

Then to have so many of my own South Carolinians here, and members of my staff, and of my office. This is a great day for South Carolina . . . the year in which we celebrate our 300th anniversary.

Then we have the greatest coach on earth, Paul Dietzel, of our great football team. Paul Dietzel is here. Paul, are you still here? Stand up. Where are you? There you are! He even came for the occasion. A great ambassador is Paul Dietzel.

Then there's another man here whom every sailor man knows. The greatest civilian back of our United States Navy, Frank Jameson, president of the Ryan Aeronautical Company in San Diego, California. Where are you,

Frank? Frank is Mr. Navy League. He runs the Navy League; he owns the Navy League; he makes the Navy League do everything for the United States Navy, and he came all the way from California to be here and, Frank, we appreciate it.

And then, my very dear friend, Chet Hollifield—Mr. Atomic Energy—the one man in the Congress, the one man in the Congress, who has done more than all of us combined to see that your Navy had nuclear power. And his lovely wife, Chet, you all are so good to come.

I don't need to tell you about Admiral Rickover, because he's already told you. But this man represents his country always. He never, ever, ever shirks from responsibility and, if there is a person on earth who comes before a Congressional committee and tells it like it is, that's one Hyman Rickover, and this is kind of refreshing in Washington—and we need more like him. I just told him that I was going to introduce a bill next week making him Admiral in Perpetuity. I think that would be a good title.

And I want to say something I've written here. If I read it, it will be the first speech I've read in 65 years, but I want to say one or two things that are in my heart about this nuclear frigate.

This thing was born in controversy. Born in controversy, because this ship (and its sister ship) was a real confrontation between your Congress and your President. We had to live with a man by the name of Robert Strange McNamara, and he was determined to give America obsolescent ships from the very beginning, and the John F. Kennedy is one of those. The John F. Kennedy was born in obsolescence. That should have been a nuclear powered carrier (and, Bill Martin, you know this). And he was determined not to build this ship. He was determined not to build the California. And your Congress, which started the nuclear program against the Executive Branch of the government, gave you the nuclear submarines, and your Congress alone did it. And we were equally determined that you'd get nuclear frigates. We put in a provision—I happen to be the author of it—that the President of the United States should order these ships built unless he wrote the Congress that it was not in the national interest. McNamara went to one Lyndon Johnson and asked him to write a letter saying it was not in the national interest, and Lyndon Johnson had sense enough not to do it. And that's why we have the DLGN-36 and the DLGN-37, and we'll get others. Out of that confrontation came a new Secretary of Defense by the name of Clark Clifford, and he ordered these ships to go forward and his successors have carried on—to their great credit.

And so, all I want to say, and I have finished, is that this ship began in a stormy sea, and, if you can find any stormier sea than the Congress of the United States, I'd like to know what the name of it is. But, as Chairman of your Committee on Armed Services, I plan to give your Congress the opportunity to try to catch the Russians in the days that I have, because today I'm not sure we're ahead of the Russians; I'm not sure we could beat them if we met them on the high seas, and my authority for that is one Hyman Rickover. A lot of our battle wagons would take off for the battle, but they wouldn't get there, because 80 percent of your Navy is old and 80 percent of their Navy is new. And come January, your Congress is going to have the opportunity to try to begin the catch-up, and already we've started . . . I have my Acting Chief Counsel here with me today . . . and our bill is well on its way to being prepared for introduction.

I am determined, as is your great Committee on Armed Services, that in your lifetime your Navy will not melt away, or as Kipling said in his famous lines:

"Far-called our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks afire:
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre."

And Lord God—Lord God, be with us—lest we forget this commitment with our destiny which I plan to keep, so help me God.

I'm glad to be here today. Mrs. Rivers and I are honored beyond expression that we could participate in the program for this ship which bears the name of our great state. It's a humbling experience—one I shan't forget. And to receive the hospitality of these warm Virginians, these great Americans, together with the presence of my own people, this is something I shall remember as long as I live.

Thank you very much.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sorrow that we note the passing of our beloved colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS. As a member of the Armed Services Committee which he has led with such vigor and objectivity, I am aware of his great contributions to the security of this country and the welfare of those who wear its uniform. He was dedicated to this task and gave to it all his strength and courage. He was widely respected by those with whom he served and in the ranks of the services he had a warm spot in every heart. They knew MENDEL cared and was their friend. He strengthened their morale.

During the past year there have been occasions of recognition and appreciation at which our chairman heard and knew the gratitude we all have felt. These are precious memories for it would haunt us if these sentiments had not been expressed. Now that his work is ended, we will bless these memories and trust they will ease the sorrow of his beloved family to whom we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

With majestic courage and sincerity of purpose he served his country well. With affectionate pride we recall his achievements and his kindly acts. He was a great chairman, a fine Congressman, and a loyal friend. We will long remember him.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of L. MENDEL RIVERS, the Nation has lost one of its most outspoken patriots, the State of South Carolina has lost its most distinguished statesman, and I have lost one of my closest friends.

The death of our great chairman last Monday leaves this body with a vacuum that will be very hard to fill. Many tributes have already been paid to this great man, as I am sure, many more will be in the weeks ahead. But, the greatest memorial to this man is the record that he compiled during his many years in the Congress. It is a memorial that will stand long and proud in honor of a man who was dedicated to the security and defense of his country. As a Member of Congress for the last 12 years, I have had the honor and privilege of sitting with him during many memorable sessions. I am especially thankful for having had the opportunity to Chair the debate of many of Mr. RIVERS' bills. His knowledge of military matters, his parliamentary expertise, coupled with his extraordinary wit, made these sessions most rewarding.

I could go on to list almost endless awards and citations Chairman RIVERS

has received, but these, I am sure, are already known to all of us. I would, instead, like to insert the tribute paid to Mr. RIVERS in the Chicago Tribune, a paper which has been one of his strongest supporters and has always admired him for his courage, determination, and fierce belief in the causes which he championed.

An article follows:

L. MENDEL RIVERS

Leading the nation in mourning for L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, President Nixon called the South Carolina Democrat a patriot who held "unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States." He was a friend, said Mr. Nixon, upon whom he could always rely "in times of great difficulty."

These were no routine words of acknowledgment for a departed member of Congress. The Republican President had no more fervent supporter of his policies in Viet Nam than the powerful committee chairman who died Monday of a heart attack. Nor did the military establishment have any greater admirer in the House.

From the moment he entered Congress, in 1941, Rivers fought for American supremacy in arms. He fought as hard for nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers for the Navy—his favorite service—as he did for modern weapons systems for the Army and Air Force. His was the voice heard most clearly in support of America's Safeguard antiballistic missile system.

If the United States has fallen behind the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race, as many military experts argue, it is not thru any lack of effort by Rep. Rivers. In fact, he more than any other single member of Congress is generally credited with giving the United States as much defense as it now has.

As President Nixon phrased it, Rivers was important to the security of this nation because he believed freedom was inextricably tied to American military strength. Fortunately for the interests of national defense, Rivers' committee mantle is expected to fall on the next senior Democratic member, F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana, an equally strong supporter of the military and American servicemen.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply saddened to learn of the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

My friendship with MENDEL began on the first or second day of my congressional service. He was a man with a deep sense of honor, and was always a man of his word. He had a great personal charm, and was the personification of the legendary southern gentleman.

MENDEL was a most effective and impressive debater. He pursued his arguments with force and vigor, and frequently disarmed his adversaries with sparkling humor and lines of poetry.

Chairman RIVERS was an outstanding patriot, and was passionately devoted to assuring that America's military posture was second to none. He was also deeply concerned for the welfare of our men and women in the armed services, and fought continually to improve their pay and living conditions.

MENDEL gave unstintingly to his constituency and to his Nation. He regularly went to work near dawn and stayed late at night to give his people and his country the fullest measure of his devotion,

and the broadest range of his uncommon talents.

In the words of Edwin Markham:

Here was a man to hold against the world;
a man to match the mountains and the seas.

To his wife and his children, Mrs. Delaney and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our beloved colleague leaves us all with a full measure of grief and sadness. Yet, on reflection, we can take solace in the fact that America is stronger because he lived, and we are all richer because of his service in the House.

MENDEL RIVERS loved his country beyond description, and he held dear the glorious traditions of his native State—South Carolina and her people. He was fierce in debate but delighted in helping a fellow Member of Congress. As few men do, MENDEL RIVERS became a legend in his own lifetime.

The death of this great man is a severe loss to his district and the Nation. He will be long remembered in this body and his contributions to our national security will always be appreciated by those who love liberty and who are willing to make sacrifices for freedom.

There is a lonesome place against the sky—for a giant has fallen.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, with the untimely passing of L. MENDEL RIVERS, we have lost one of the grandest men who ever graced the Halls of Congress.

With his stately manner, judgment, and ability, he has earned a place in history that only a few can enjoy. He not only was a student of government and military affairs, but was a deeply religious man. He was as handsome inside as he was handsome in his personal appearance.

His passing is a great loss to the Congress of the United States and the people of the Nation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in my State of South Carolina, the name of Mendel Rivers has a very special meaning. To me, as well as to a host of Americans, the name of MENDEL RIVERS has a very special meaning. Although my home district is in the Piedmont region of the State of South Carolina, my constituency has always held the gentleman from the low country in high regard. He has always had our respect and admiration. Thus it was that in my initial campaign for Congress in 1968, the endorsement, assistance, and personal appearance of MENDEL RIVERS were significant in my election. It has been a high privilege to serve with him in this House and to observe the efforts that he has exerted on behalf of our beloved Nation. His passing is a particularly sad occasion for the people in South Carolina, not simply because he will no longer be there to pursue the interests of the State, but because all South Carolinians identified with him in his national role, and were proud to identify him as a South Carolinian.

It is well, when thinking of LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS in retrospect, to recall him through the lines of that immortal poem which he so eloquently used last year to eulogize the late Congressman

Bill Bates. Not only do these lines attest to the great oratorical ability of MENDEL RIVERS, but they apply as well, albeit all too soon, to his life and leaving:

He went down

As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

Recent newspaper and magazine articles have attempted to catch the essence of MENDEL RIVERS, the man who so enormously influenced this House and the armed services of this country. None of them are adequate. With his frost-white hair and tall bearing, Mendel Rivers was, indeed, a walking recollection of that earlier Carolina statesman, John C. Calhoun. But here the identification ended, for MENDEL RIVERS was no latter-day embodiment of a dead plantation aristocracy. Although he did portray some of the best qualities of that bygone society, his sense of aristocracy was more in the vein of the Jeffersonian concept of a natural aristocracy. It sprang from an inner excellence, not from a social label. His rise out of poverty onto the plateau of great national power was the result of enormous determination, native intelligence, hard work and cool tenaciousness.

But the great success which he achieved never alienated him from his people. There is a sign outside a small town in his district which reads "We appreciate MENDEL RIVERS." There are no military installations in that town. The sign with its simple message tells more about this man of the people than anything else which has ever been written. It tells about a man who genuinely cared for the individuals whom he served. It tells about farmers and mechanics and grocery clerks who always found the busy man willing to listen and to help whenever he could. It tells about a Congressman who would go to bat for a constituent when everyone else had turned a deaf ear. He has been heard to say, "In life, it's the small things that count." Believing this, RIVERS' heart was never very far from the plain, ordinary people whom he served.

Yes, MENDEL RIVERS was loved in his district. The lack of political opposition in his district has become a part of the Rivers legend. Part of that can be attributed to the truth in his boast:

If we don't have opportunity in Charleston,
there ain't no cows in Texas. We got opportunity for about anybody who's got a pulse.

He was a man of his word, and the people knew it. His scrupulous honesty and integrity went unquestioned even by his severest critics. His hands remained as clean as his district became prosperous. In 1968, when he ran against a black opponent in the Democratic primary, MENDEL RIVERS picked up approximately half of the black vote, an astounding achievement for one who was supposed by so many to be a reactionary on matters of race. He was not reactionary in the least, of course, and the distinction of race was, for him, no distinction at all.

His faith and belief in the American soldier was another part of the RIVERS legend. The American fighting man has never had a better friend than Lucius

MENDEL RIVERS. He insisted that they have the best in the way of facilities and protection. There was no surer way to get his dander up than to disparage the honor of those men and women who wear our Nation's military uniforms. And they returned his admiration and respect. Recently, when he managed to obtain a substantial fare reduction for service personnel flying home for Christmas, they responded by sending him a cap with six general's stars. One can say with some validity that MENDEL RIVERS had two constituencies, one, his congressional district, and the other, the entire military, which revered him as—one might as well say it—a Caesar, born to conquer the true enemies of the Republic.

Over the years there have been many tributes made to MENDEL RIVERS. I cannot exceed their eloquence or praise. I can only say that I deeply admired and respected him. He never wavered in his duty to his country. History will have to judge the rightness of his decisions, but, for my part, I feel that time will deal with him kindly. I am sure that his memory will live in the minds and hearts of a grateful posterity, and this, most assuredly, is the greatest tribute that can be afforded any man. I sincerely hope that his wife and family will find some measure of comfort in the admiration that so many of us feel for this truly great American. His memory will stand as a monument, symbolizing an incredible steadfastness toward achieving for America not only those things which are best, but those things which are necessary for the preservation of her freedom. If those of us who remain can emulate that same steadfastness, then that monument will help to fill the "lonesome place against the sky."

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great personal sadness that I learned of the death of our distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS. His loss will not only be felt in his congressional district or home State, but throughout the entire country.

The late chairman of the Armed Services Committee was truly an American, a patriot dedicated to his country, and an outstanding statesman. For the past 30 years, MENDEL RIVERS has guided this country's national security with a determination and loyalty unsurpassed by few men in the history of America. In Chairman RIVERS, every soldier, sailor, and airman found a friend and champion. He has consistently led the fight in support of our men in the armed services and has never let them down.

Mr. Speaker, these past few years have been troublesome times. We have heard our military force and national defense goals challenged and criticized mercilessly and continuously. Throughout all of the turmoil MENDEL RIVERS stood strong and unswerving in his principles and would not be swayed by the attacks against his beliefs. To paraphrase the words of the great Winston Churchill, MENDEL RIVERS would not give in, except to convictions of honor and good sense.

I will miss the wit and unique personality of Chairman RIVERS, as will all of us in the House of Representatives. We

have lost an extremely remarkable and capable man.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing grief at the passing of my friend, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, a committee chairman respected by his fellow Members of this House, esteemed by his constituents, and beloved by those on active duty in our military services, who called him "the big boss" as a title of affection.

His constituents' esteem for him was based partly on his solid achievements in their behalf. He saw to it that his First Congressional District of South Carolina had defense production payrolls for its people and defense installations within its boundaries. Some of these were the Charleston Army Depot, the Charleston Naval Station, the Charleston Shipyard, the Charleston Naval Hospital, the Beaufort Naval Hospital, the Charleston Naval Supply Center, the Charleston Naval Weapons Station, the Charleston Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarine Training Center, the Charleston Polaris Missile Facility—Atlantic—the Marine Air Station at Beaufort, the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, the Charleston Air Force Base, and the Headquarters of the 6th Naval District.

The men and women of our Armed Forces, who regarded him as their special protector, did not base their loyalty on mere hearsay. They knew directly that it was he who had sought pay raises for them at the times they were left out while sizeable increases were being voted for bureaucrats busily keeping the home fires burning. Chairman RIVERS once added a billion-dollar authorization to the budget for a military pay raise. He believed that it was not possible to do enough for those who serve in the Armed Forces. Those who serve in the Armed Forces thus had good grounds for the friendship that they felt for him.

He was on a first-name basis with most of the people in his congressional district. They were his pals long before he could do anything about getting defense payrolls into his district. They will remember him fondly and so will we. Mrs. Kluczynski joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, and her family at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of December 30, 1970, entitled L. MENDEL RIVERS:

L. MENDEL RIVERS

Leading the nation in mourning for L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, President Nixon called the South Carolina Democrat a patriot who held "unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States." He was a friend, said Mr. Nixon, upon whom he could always rely in "times of great difficulty."

These were no routine words of acknowledgment for a departed member of Congress. The Republican President had no more fervent supporter of his policies in Viet Nam than the powerful committee chairman who died Monday of a heart attack. Nor did the military establishment have any greater admirer in the House.

From the moment he entered Congress, in 1941, Rivers fought for American su-

premacy in arms. He fought as hard for nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers for the Navy—his favorite service—as he did for modern weapons systems for the Army and Air Force. His was the voice heard most clearly in support of America's Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system.

If the United States has fallen behind the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race, as many military experts argue, it is not thru any lack of effort by Rep. Rivers. In fact, he more than any other single member of Congress is generally credited with giving the United States as much defense as it now has.

As President Nixon phrased it, Rivers was important to the security of this nation because he believed freedom was inextricably tied to American military strength. Fortunately for the interests of national defense, Rivers' committee mantle is expected to fall on the next senior Democratic member, F. Edward Hebert, of Louisiana, an equally strong supporter of the military and American servicemen.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute today to a departed friend who can never be replaced.

While I mourn the passing of a dear and admired friend, MENDEL RIVERS' death is more than a personal loss. His leadership touched the hearts of hundreds of thousands of individuals in and out of the military service. This is truly a national loss of the foremost champion of a vigorous armed services and a strong America. MENDEL RIVERS was one of the most devoted advocates of the philosophy expressed by George Washington.

If we are to have peace, it must be known that we are always prepared for war.

MENDEL RIVERS has been called a superhawk—but I would rather see him classified as an eagle, perhaps a supereagle. His vision was better than ours; his vantage point as chairman gave him the ability to see through the smoke screens and false maneuvers of those who would tear down our military strength.

He was truly a great patriot and a warm and understanding individual. My life is better for having been close to MENDEL. My deepest affection and condolences are offered today to MENDEL's beloved wife Margaret and their family.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, MENDEL RIVERS was my friend. I always believed he liked me and I have been deeply appreciative of this because it is a source of confidence to have some one you admire and respect to show they like you.

MENDEL was a Southerner with all the pride and love of that heritage. Even so, his first concern was the United States of America. He was a staunch patriot and advocate of a powerful America. The carping and criticism of lesser people left him unshaken in his advocacy of peace through the power of a strong Christian nation. But even with all his responsibilities for the defense of America, he was ever a willing servant of his colleagues in the House who, like me, went to him for help.

For 10 years I watched him and I listened to him. I observed him on the floor in debate, in the cloak room in conversation, at social engagements, at the weekly House prayer breakfasts, on veterans programs, at political gatherings, at the Navy Supply Corps School in my district, at Fort Gordon in my district, at

the Georgia Veterans Nursing Home in my district, at the dedication of his Veterans' Administration hospital in Charleston, at the Masters Tournament in my district, at the home of his predecessor and preceptor, Congressman Carl Vinson, and at a dinner in my behalf where he was the featured speaker.

At no time under any of these many circumstances did MENDEL ever fail to show his great intellectual abilities, his knowledge, wisdom, courage, humor, and genuine kindness for his fellowman.

Some one will take his place but no one will replace him. I mourn for my friend MENDEL RIVERS.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of my long-time colleague and dear friend, LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS.

He battled a failing heart as he had battled in this very Chamber time and time again for a strong national defense. While he lost this final battle with heart disease, he seldom lost in Congress.

MENDEL was one of the first people I met when I came to Washington in 1944. It was the beginning of a long friendship, filled with mutual admiration and respect.

The people of South Carolina's First Congressional District had the wisdom to send MENDEL RIVERS to Washington for 15 consecutive terms. For that we who were his colleagues and all Americans can be truly thankful.

For here was a giant of a man, if ever one sat in the House of Representatives. He was a skillful legislator, a powerful chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a tireless worker who put in long workdays, and an orator with few equals.

MENDEL RIVERS was dedicated to keeping the United States strong militarily so that we would always act from a position of strength in time of war or during periods of negotiation. Every sailor, soldier, and airman knew they would be heard, and most eloquently, in the House of Representatives through the distinguished South Carolinian and great American we mourn today.

MENDEL RIVERS talked tough to Hanoi, and he was right. He believed that our very survival depends on maintaining a strong national defense posture—and he was right. He was a man of fearless conviction and unquestioned integrity. He fought for what he believed in and retreated from nothing and no one.

Yes, surely this body and this Nation has lost a great man. We cannot replace a MENDEL RIVERS. We can only carry on the spirit of dedicated patriotism that he exhibited throughout his long and very distinguished career.

While MENDEL was sometimes tough, he was also a kind and gentle person. His compassion was well known to those who knew him, and particularly to those South Carolinians whom he represented for 30 years.

I shall miss MENDEL RIVERS, and greatly so. It is hard for me to imagine beginning the 92d Congress without him. It is hard to imagine the House of Representatives without him. His loss will be sorely felt by all.

Mrs. Andrews and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathies to his

sweet wife, Margaret, and his three fine children.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 28, 1970, death claimed one of the great American patriots of all time. L. MENDEL RIVERS fervently believed that no price was too great to pay for the protection of the United States.

Military preparedness was his watchword, the Armed Forces his life. He was often considered the best friend of the Armed Forces on Capitol Hill and he did nothing to refute this charge.

L. MENDEL RIVERS was a controversial man. The feelings of his colleagues in the House of Representatives ran the gamut of emotions; but no one ever questioned the sincerity of his beliefs, nor his dedication to his country.

L. MENDEL RIVERS will be sorely missed in the House of Representatives in his role as leading advocate for military preparedness for the United States. His greatest legacy to his country was his dedication to the principle that America must remain a free and democratic nation.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and the family.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my tribute to those of others who have taken this week to mourn the death of our esteemed colleague, Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina.

The House of Representatives is diminished as an institution by the death of Chairman RIVERS. I am sure that it will never be the same again. Chairman RIVERS brought with him a fire, a sense of authority to debate which few others are capable of achieving.

Whether or not you agreed with the chairman on a particular question, it was always a lesson and a pleasure to hear him in this Chamber. For me, some of the most instructive hours of the past 4 years were spent in listening to Chairman RIVERS on the House floor.

There can be no doubt about the spirit and the confidence of MENDEL RIVERS. It began when he was young. I remember an occasion last fall, shortly before Thanksgiving, when he told me about a decision he once made to change jobs. It happened several years before his election to Congress.

Young MENDEL asked his employer—the one he had decided to leave—whether he would write a letter of recommendation for him. And to his surprise, as the chairman described the scene to me, his boss told him to draft the letter himself and that he would sign whatever young MENDEL thought was appropriate.

Well, the chairman said he labored over that letter for nearly a day. He polished it. And he included every conceivable detail about his work for the company—apparently all of it favorable.

When the employer read the letter before signing it, he told the chairman, "I can't let you leave. I never realized before how valuable you are to this company." And as an inducement to stay, he offered the chairman a large raise.

That was the spirit of MENDEL RIVERS. He had the confidence which comes from total dedication to a job. It could never be said that the chairman was unprepared for debate. Nor could anyone say that he gave less than a full effort on

the House floor in fighting for defense legislation.

MENDEL RIVERS was as ready to take up the cause of a buck private as of an admiral. If a serviceman had a grievance, no matter what his rank, he had an audience in the Committee on Armed Services.

There was another side to the chairman, a side which tends to be overlooked because of his stature in the area of national defense. Chairman RIVERS had interests and concerns which ranged far beyond the military. In this session alone, he had introduced a compassionate bill to increase disability benefits for the blind. He had sponsored a bill to establish a national student congress as a forum for the young in America. He had lent weight to the bill to reform the postal service. And he introduced a bill to protect animals from inhumane treatment in interstate commerce.

I hope these bills will be regarded as his successes along with his enduring work in national defense.

The dedication and the fervor of MENDEL RIVERS should be a model for the House of Representatives. His patriotism, his desire to keep America preeminent in world affairs, and his concern for the members of the Armed Services are worthy of study by us all.

I deeply regret the death of Chairman RIVERS. To his wife and children, I extend all sympathy. It was an honor to have known him.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of L. MENDEL RIVERS, America loses one of its foremost patriots, civil government loses one of its most distinguished public servants, this House loses one of its most beloved Members, and the millions of anonymous young men who make up the armed services of our Nation lose one of the best and most devoted friends a serviceman ever had.

For 16 years of my service here in Congress, MENDEL RIVERS has been a truly towering figure. His courtly manner, his natural and unselfconscious flamboyance, his impelling oratory and his genuine gifts for friendship seemed almost as much a part of these Halls as the mace, the microphones, and the Speaker's dais.

For all of his often brilliant and sometimes impassioned advocacy, MENDEL RIVERS was at heart a man of reason. His keen and incisive mind often burned through the dross of peripheral argumentation to lay bare the essential heart of the matter. Frequently in our debates he lighted the torch which showed the way to a reasoned solution.

Yet he had the capacity to believe, and this is a precious ingredient in an age of cynicism. He will be missed sorely. But as long as Congress is served by men who served with MENDEL RIVERS, his spirit still will live among us. Like many in this Chamber, I have lost a friend. But enduring are the lessons that I learned from him. And all those who knew him and loved him can take comfort in the knowledge that his memory will endure.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my friend from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN) in lamenting the sad loss of our colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS. The love for him was never so evident

as at the pre-Christmas prayer meeting held for him in the Chapel here at the Capitol. The respect for him and for his ability was never more evident than has been shown here today in these stirring addresses in this hallowed House Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my mother, a native South Carolinian, and in behalf of all of my family, I express sincere and genuine sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and the children. May they know that our thoughts and prayers are with them and may they know that all of us deeply share their sense of loss for truly this is a national mourning.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened by news of the death of Chairman RIVERS.

Surely no Member of this body can but pause today and join with the many who are paying tribute to a distinguished and able colleague. MENDEL RIVERS served this Nation and defended the Armed Forces. He led when it was needed. He fought his battles with wit and vigor and he worked tirelessly on behalf of his constituents.

Congress has lost a man of stature and grace. Mrs. Steiger joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and her family.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the loss of my dear, personal friend L. MENDEL RIVERS, I recall the words spoken by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover at the keel laying of the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate *South Carolina* at Newport News on December 1 of this year.

I want to insert these words in the RECORD at one point to demonstrate the feeling and admiration one great American had for another. MENDEL RIVERS will never be forgotten by those of us who knew him and loved him and by the countless thousands he helped through the years.

Admiral Rickover's remarks follow:

It is an ungrateful task to try to sum up a man's character in a few words, but in the case of Mendel Rivers much will have been said when I have stated that he is an American and a patriot, because he is one as much as the other, and he is both intensely.

I find it hard to put into words all that I have learned to admire in him. Many men have entered our Congress. The conventional descriptions—ambition, public service, chance, social ardor, eagerness for power—none of these seem satisfactorily applicable to Mendel Rivers.

There is no use trying to explain him by reducing a versatile man to one or two main talents. He cannot be judged in the way some people judge an eagle by noting how he walks on the ground. An eagle must be judged by its majestic flight into the sky.

He has been obliged to make his own way by his own abilities and enterprise, but the advantages in intelligence and ambition were given him by his parents. He has used these well and has augmented them by his own ability and ambition. No smooth path of wealth or patronage was offered to him. Whatever power he has acquired has been grudgingly given. He has had to fight every mile of his road through life; nothing came easily to him, not even oratory in which he excels.

He is one of the great men of our Congress. He is dedicated to peace, but aware of the awesome responsibility our Nation bears in defense of our freedom. Where our

national security is involved he is brave, resolute, stubborn. His legislative acts are heroic; they speak of struggle and triumph; they reflect his pragmatic ability.

No man possesses in so high a degree as he the peculiar awareness of military realities. His efforts in behalf of American security are tireless. He has a marvelous gift for stepping beyond the appearance of things, going beyond it, and penetrating to the very essence of the matter.

He speaks as a man of the people—a man for whom the deepest spiritual truth is approachable only through the heart and can be grasped only when embodied in the realities of this world. He does not believe that being serious means going about with a long face. He has always held calmness to be a form of virtue; it is in many cases an extremely difficult form of courage.

He is one of the most unimpeachable men in the United States. He knows that a good leader is doing his job when half the people are following him and half are chasing him.

He has an old-fashioned and unqualified love for the United States. This has given him a sense of dedication, responsibility, and purpose. He has the fortitude to stand up to the illegitimate and illegal activity of a tiny minority bent on tearing down every institution we have built and which we cherish.

He believes in fulfilling what you are able to fulfill, rather than running after what you will never achieve; in striving to be as complete human beings as possible. That will give us trouble enough.

He believes in the God-given genius of certain individuals, and he values a society that makes their existence possible. He understands the chasm between men with knowledge who lack power and men with power who lack knowledge; men who are instructed but not educated; assimilative, but incapable of real thought; men who do not want to confuse the ideal with the real; and intelligent idlers who always set their sights high in order to alibi their idleness and demonstrate their intelligence.

He does not agree with many of the pseudo-intellectuals who are drowning in their own words and suffocating in their own documents. Many of them are as ignorant as swans. He knows that we must abandon the prevalent belief in the superior wisdom of the ignorant.

He knows that some students of society and politics among our intellectuals have little contact with life as it is actually lived by most men; that they are more lucid as critics of existing society than as visionaries of a better one; that some of them seem to experience a vicarious pleasure in discrediting everything American; that in their seclusion they are constantly tempted to devise political constructions rooted firmly in mid-air—in which governments and political authority are replaced by communes of free and equal individuals; in which society exists without repression, and domestic policies require no sanctions; a society in which diplomats always tell the truth and a foreign policy is pursued in which the wolf lies down with the lamb, and the leopard with the kid.

Mendel Rivers is aware that without a knowledge of history, we are left with nothing but baseless abstractions with which to compare ourselves; that we then judge the present by the standards of a mythical trouble-free dream world where all mankind is at peace. He believes that in spite of the recent triumphs of science, men haven't changed much, and in consequence we must still try to learn from history.

He knows that a person who is often praised must set stricter standards on himself. He holds a number of beliefs that have been repudiated by the liveliest intellects of our time. He believes that order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction. He prefers gentleness to violence, forgiveness to

vengeance. He believes in courtesy, the ritual by which we avoid hurting other people's feelings. He thinks that knowledge is preferable to ignorance; human sympathy more valuable than ideology.

His effort is sincere and profoundly human, it shatters old servitudes, overthrows prejudices and idols, and rises little by little toward the light. He lacks any capacity for intrigue; he is innocent and straightforward.

He knows that no country has departed from its basic principles so much, in so short a time and without realizing it, as has the United States; that what we need is simplicity and what we can do without is romanticism.

He understands that if what is needful is to be done, we cannot depend on illusions, especially of an impossible good. A calamity can be brought about by persons of great good will. Too many such persons have set themselves up in the "grievance business." Their job is to find things that are wrong; then attempt to right them. If their efforts only make matters worse, they find something else wrong.

Mr. Rivers knows that the last war has been forgotten, erased from the collective American memory—the most devastating commentary history can render is to be forgotten because no one wants to remember.

He has named, numbered, and made perceptible, even to those who disagree with him, all the national verities that animate and sustain us, and that breathe in our blood.

He does his duty as if he were going to live forever, and casts his plans way ahead. He feels responsible without time limitation; the consideration whether he may or may not be around to see the results never enters his thoughts.

The day will come when this man, one of our great legislators and a prophetic thinker, will be recognized at his true value.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS, creates a great vacuum in this Chamber, for he was that type of legislator who gave himself vitally and totally to the legislative proceedings of the House of Representatives.

As he was a competent legislator, so was he a remarkable personality, gaining the respect of all with whom he associated.

I shall feel his absence in a dual capacity, not only in this Chamber but at our Thursday morning prayer breakfasts. He was a regular attendant at these meetings.

MENDEL had a deep love for his country, and everyone would quickly agree that the term "patriot" had accurate application to him.

He also had deep convictions, and while an individual might not always have agreed with his view on things, he never had any doubts as to where he stood.

His congressional district has lost an able Representative, this House of Representatives has lost a diligent legislator, and this country has lost a real patriot. But while he is gone from our midst, he leaves us with the memory of his ardent sincerity, his deep devotion to duty, and his great love of America.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. Speaker, during 30 years in Congress, the last 5 as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, my friend and colleague L. MENDEL RIVERS rightly earned the title of patriot on whom the Nation could always depend. His death was greeted with sorrow by the powerful and

the poor, by friend and foe alike. He ran the powerful Armed Services Committee the way a general runs his command—as a fearless advocate of a strong America. Despite what some called his shot-from-the-hip rhetoric, he was, in fact, a gentleman, loquacious, and quick to smile. He was a friend to me and a helpful colleague whose kindnesses I shall never forget. William Greider, in the Washington Post, captures the flavor of this colorful and controversial man who became the champion of our GI's. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I, therefore, include Mr. Greider's tribute to our departed colleague:

L. MENDEL RIVERS DIES; CHAMPION OF MILITARY

(By William Greider)

Lucius Mendel Rivers, congressional godfather to the military, died early yesterday, the flamboyant champion of the lowliest GIs and of the mightiest defense contractors.

His body was flown in an Air Force jet from Birmingham, Ala., to Charleston, S.C., where his funeral will be held at 1 p.m., Wednesday at Grace Episcopal Church. He will be buried at St. Stephen, S.C., near the graves of his parents.

Rep. Rivers was 65 years old and at the pinnacle of his authority as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, where he stood for superior military strength as America's best security for a peaceful future.

Yet, in the midst of a troubling war and deep domestic strife, the South Carolina congressman also came to be a living symbol of "the military-industrial complex"—that mixture of patriotism and pork-barrel politics which seems ever in quest of larger defense budgets.

He will be best remembered, probably, as a congressional figure with his own flavorful style, the flowing white hair, the tart tongue, the occasional demands for a warrior's vengeance, the single-mindedness which seemed courageous to his friends, dictatorial and dangerous to his opponents.

"You are the only crowd who must die," Rivers told an audience of soldiers once. "You haven't done a thing for me but save me in four world wars . . . Of course, you have enemies—not just in Hanoi, you got enemies in Washington."

President Nixon led the national tributes to the congressman, who died 17 days after undergoing open-heart surgery at the University of Alabama hospital.

"I have lost a friend upon whom I could rely in times of great difficulty," the President said. "South Carolina has lost one of the most distinguished men in her history and America has lost a patriot."

Three months ago, when he was shepherding the massive military-procurement bill through the House, Rivers gravely warned his colleagues again of the Soviet threat and his fear that the U.S. "seems hell-bent on national suicide" with its failure to develop new armaments.

Yet the powerful Congressman pleaded also with his critics not to dismiss his warning "as the shrill cries of a hawk who is suffering the agonies of reduced expenditures".

USED TO BEING HEEDED

In Congress, despite the wave of anti-Pentagon sentiment in the last three years, Rivers was used to being heeded during his career, whether he was pushing pay raises for the troops for a new cargo transport for the Air Force or a vast shipbuilding program for the Navy or a government subsidy to help a private company sell jet planes to other nations.

In the military, he was continuously applauded and honored. Just a few weeks be-

fore his death, grateful GIs in Vietnam sent him a hat with six stars on it, inscribed in gold to "the big boss." They were thanking Rivers for his success in engineering special reduced air fares so many of them could fly home for Christmas.

The armed services thanked him, also, by delivering to his congressional district and his hometown of Charleston, S.C., a remarkable array of defense installations—air bases, supply depots, hospitals, shipyards, missile facilities and others, not to mention the defense contractors who opened plants there.

HONORS IN CHARLESTON

In Charleston, they dedicated a bust of the congressman on Rivers Avenue and named a suburban subdivision "MenRiv Park." In Vietnam, the main thoroughfare at the Army base outside Pleiku is Mendel Rivers Parkway.

To Rivers' critics, his nine-county First District was one of the grossest examples of how politicians and Pentagon planners scratch one another's backs—more ships, more planes, more contracts and, in return, more goodies for the folks back home.

To friends and admirers, Rivers' fortification of Charleston was a subject for public banter. When the D.C. chapter of the Air Force Association honored the congressman at an award luncheon this year, Vice President Spiro Agnew offered this tongue-in-cheek appraisal:

"I would like to lay to rest the ugly, vicious, dastardly rumor that he is trying to move the Pentagon piecemeal to South Carolina . . . I have had it clearly explained to me that the military facilities so evident in that area are a testament of Mendel Rivers' unselfish willingness to allow his own First District of South Carolina to accept, in the national interest, military installations which just had to be put someplace . . .

"Even when it looked like Charleston might sink into the sea from the burden, Mendel Rivers' patriotic response was, 'I regret that I have but one congressional district to give my country to—I mean to give to my country.'"

WIT UNMATCHABLE

But no one could match the congressman's own pungent wit, when he twitted opponents in public oratory. During the 1960s, when Rivers held running skirmishes with the civilian managers at the Pentagon, he broke up military audiences with this description of McNamara's "whiz kids":

"The only powder those people have ever smelled is talcum powder. The only war they have been in is the BOOD-war."

But sometimes the humor was replaced by a martial note of vengeance. Rivers proposed a nuclear ultimatum to North Korea two years ago unless the adversary promptly returned the USS Pueblo and her crew. "I'd make positive that at least one of her cities would disappear from the face of the earth," he said.

ONLY ONE ANSWER

His strategy for Vietnam was equally blunt. "Words are fruitless, diplomatic notes are useless," he thundered on one occasion. "There can be only one answer for America—retaliation, retaliation, retaliation. They say 'Quit the bombing.' I say: 'Bomb.'"

Rivers never served in uniform himself, but he looked the part of the elder warrior. On the House floor or presiding on the dais of his committee chamber, he was ramrod erect with a flowing crown of snow-white hair. When a Senate critic referred to him as "Julius Caesar," Rivers seemed flattered by the comparison.

In his manner of speaking, Rivers displayed that special blend peculiar to the best politicians of the South—a graceful command of the language, but punctuated with crude thunder, like the warm flavor of good

bourbon going down, followed by the husky kick.

He was chairman of the House committee for six years and he drew his power from serving the vast array of people and interests who depend upon its legislative products—the soldiers, the contractors, the Pentagon strategists.

But Rivers reached his position of power simply by staying in Congress—surviving faithfully for 25 years until his chairman, former Rep. Carl Vinson, of Georgia, decided to retire in 1964 at the age of 81.

Rivers was born in Gumville, S.C., near a place called Hell Hole Swamp, in the low country of the Palmetto State's coastal plain. His father farmed and ran a turpentine-still and died when Mendel was eight years old. His mother lost the family place and moved her six children to North Charleston where she took in boarders.

Rivers grew up, determined by the experience, to be a lawyer. He worked in a grocery store, delivered newspapers by pony-back, played outfield for a semi-pro team.

TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

He attended the College of Charleston and law school at the University of South Carolina just long enough to pass the bar exam in 1932. After two terms in the South Carolina legislature, he came to Washington for four years as a special attorney in the Justice Department.

When he married Charleston debutante Margaret Middleton, she noted immediately that he was destined for a political future.

At the wedding, she recalled years later, Rivers turned from the altar and worked his way up the church aisle, shaking hands and greeting folks.

FEW OPPONENTS

In 1940, against the advice of older, more influential politicians, Rivers ran for Congress. His campaign was styled against the "the Charleston crowd" and won with the heavy support from the rural counties in the district. He never had serious opposition after that. In all but two or three elections, he didn't even have opponents.

When Rivers entered the 77th Congress as a freshman, he was appointed to the Naval Affairs Committee. Vinson of Georgia was chairman. At war's end, the defense realignment made it the Armed Services Committee and through the years, Rivers moved gradually up the seniority ladder without any spectacular events along the way.

WON A NICKNAME

Indeed, in his early congressional days, Rivers won the nickname of "Oleo" Rivers for his colorful and successful campaign to repeal the federal tax on oleomargarine (a product manufactured from cottonseed and soybean oils native to his district).

"Butter will kill you deader than Job's turkey," Rivers once warned his fellow congressmen, "but eat a little margarine and you will look like a million dollars."

When Vinson retired and Rivers became chairman in 1965, he introduced a more combative style to the committee's disputes with the Pentagon—particularly the management of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. Rivers used to remind audiences that McNamara's middle name is "Strange."

The congressman listened to the generals and admirals who found their counsel unheeded by their Pentagon boss and he fought many of their battles for them, legislating new weaponry which McNamara didn't want or refused to employ.

On his committee dais, surrounded by flags and battle ribbons, Rivers had the constitutional language inscribed on a walnut plaque:

"The Congress shall have power . . . To raise and support Armies . . . provide and maintain a Navy . . . and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

CARBINE OVER DOOR

The chairman frequently reminded the executive branch of that congressional mandate. Indeed, he was accorded the trappings of a military leader, the award plaques and pictures of admirals and generals on his office walls, his frequent inspection junkets to overseas bases, the AK-47 carbine over his door, captured from the Communists in Vietnam.

Each year, his Capitol Hill luncheon, featuring Carolina quail and Charleston she-crab soup, brought together the diverse elements of the "military-industrial complex" from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to contractors to fellow defense-minded congressmen.

Over the years, he pushed very hard to double presidential proposals for military pay raises, usually successfully. He also tried to enact a congressional veto over military base-closings—and failed.

SOUGHT FLEET OVERHAUL

He was in the forefront of the congressional pressure to get the Navy into nuclear-powered vessels, particularly submarines. At his death, his current crusade was a campaign to overhaul the entire fleet—most of which, he insisted, was dangerously obsolete or in disrepair.

In the air, he fought through the 1960s for the air transport capability of the C-141s and, more recently, the controversial C-5-A.

His most remarkable personal victory, in recent years, was his lobbying to sell Congress—and the Air Force—on a government subsidy to help produce an international fighter plane made by American industry which could be given or sold to U.S. allies. This session, he won, and the first contracts have been awarded on the \$1.1 billion program.

LITTLE DISSENT

In all of this, the chairman found little dissent among his committee members, partly because he dealt swiftly with those junior members who strayed from his line of priorities. One New York congressman found himself passed over a subcommittee chairmanship because he was a member of the "fearless five" which often opposed Rivers in committee sessions.

Rivers himself once summed up the congenial atmosphere over which he presided: "We get along just fine. There aren't more than five or six troublesome fellows on a committee of 40. I call that a pretty good average. If I can't meet that, God help Mendel Rivers."

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

He was a man of deep conviction and unwavering loyalty to country. His zealous commitment to cause endeared him to his constituents whom he served devotedly for three decades.

Even those who may have disagreed with him admired MENDEL for his courage and strength of convictions and he undoubtedly has left a distinguished mark in the annals of our Nation's history.

While there is little that one can say to ease his family's sorrow, I know that they can take consolation in his unstinting dedication as a public servant.

I knew MENDEL as a warm friend and I extend to his widow and family my deepest sympathy, and I hope that my prayers will in some way help them bear the heavy burden of their loss.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the untimely demise of the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina has left this body in a state of shock. It should likewise be noted that perhaps the greatest impact of all was upon his family, to

whom I now offer my sincere condolences and sympathy. MENDEL RIVERS was truly the epitome of a good husband, excellent statesman, and an overall man of good will. His courage in defense of this great Nation shall long be remembered for in my humble estimation it has no parallel.

As chairman of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee MENDEL RIVERS gave an outstanding performance of his love for the serviceman. Today it is quite fashionable in many quarters to defile the character and lives of men and women in our armed services because they forget that without a good defense every nation will fall. MENDEL RIVERS made sure during his occupancy of the chairman's seat that this could never happen. His defense of the serviceman was consistent and without equivocation. He shall be missed by all the men and women who wear a uniform in defense of this country.

He was my friend and I shall truly miss him. I know that God will be merciful and he will look down upon us from his new home.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I share the sorrow occasioned by the death of our colleague, MENDEL RIVERS. Our Nation has lost a great citizen. American servicemen lost their No. 1 supporter, and I have lost a valuable friend.

The word most frequently used in referring to MENDEL RIVERS has been the word "patriot." He was patriotic and held a deep concern for our country's security and for the welfare of each individual wearing this country's uniform. He was firm in his determination that the military posture of the United States should never be compromised. So often we heard MENDEL RIVERS join Speaker JOHN McCORMACK in expressing love for this country and its institutions and faith in its future. He was proud to be an American citizen and to use his great influence and committee chairmanship to keep America strong.

MENDEL RIVERS said what he thought, and he believed what he said. He was as intellectually honest as any person that I have ever known. He held strong convictions and had the courage to tell all people where he stood on issues.

MENDEL RIVERS was colorful and controversial, but those who knew him personally and worked with him on day-by-day tasks know that he was sincere and dedicated and kind and warm and considerate.

He took problems seriously and was always willing to go out of his way to do a favor for a congressional colleague, for a friend, for a constituent, for a fellow citizen.

The people of South Carolina and the Nation have suffered a great loss. I share their grief.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those who have spoken so eloquently and so well on our colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, whose recent, unfortunate passing has been such a sorrow to us all.

Although I did not always agree with Chairman RIVERS, I never ceased to respect his courage, his determination, and his dedicated services to principles he believed were right.

No better gage of this outstanding Member of the House of Representatives could be found than his deep and sincere concern over the plight of our American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

Last April, Chairman RIVERS testified before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, of which I am chairman, during hearings on the POW issue.

At that time he expressed the belief that no problem facing the United States was greater than that of obtaining humane treatment and ultimate release of U.S. prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

In his testimony he said:

These men have earned the full sympathy, understanding and support of every man, woman and child in this country and, for that matter, in every free country in the world. Their plight and the plight of their families will be resolved only if we in the Congress continue to call the attention of the world to the outrageous and inhumane treatment these men are receiving.

This testimony by Chairman RIVERS and his subsequent statements on the subject did much to keep the problems of our prisoners squarely before the Congress, the people of our Nation and the world.

Moreover, as one of the last official acts he performed in this body, Chairman RIVERS sponsored and guided through the House a resolution calling for renewed attention to the POW problem.

With the death of Chairman RIVERS, the American prisoners of war and their loved ones here at home have lost a powerful champion. I am confident, however, that he has left a spiritual legacy of that deep concern for the POW's which will cause us, his colleagues, to rededicate ourselves to that cause—a cause to which he gave so much.

Although MENDEL RIVERS will not be among us on that joyful day when the last of our American prisoners is released from captivity and reunited with their families, we will know that his efforts, his dedication, helped bring that day closer.

To his beloved wife, Margaret, and his family Mrs. Zablocki and I send our deep and sincere sympathy. May he rest in peace in the bountiful mercy and love of God.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the death of Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS is a great loss to the United States of America. Our many colleagues have expressed their sympathy far more eloquently than I can. However, I would like to bring to their attention just one personal memory of the graciousness of this great patriot.

Exactly 1 year ago today, my wife and I drove to Charleston, S.C., for a couple of days of vacation. We did not know anyone in the city. The following morning, I was pleasantly surprised to receive a phone call from Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, who had seen a congressional license plate in the parking lot of the hotel and inquired who was staying there. He not only joined me for breakfast a few minutes later, but he insisted that my wife and I spend the rest of the day as guests of the Rivers family at their home. This outstanding

display of southern hospitality and charm left an indelible impression upon us.

During that day with the Rivers family, we had an opportunity to observe this fine American as a family man. His lovely wife along with his daughter and son just could not have been more gracious. It was with great reluctance that evening that we finally departed.

There was never any doubt in any of our minds that Chairman MENDEL RIVERS was a living legend. He was probably the hardest working Congressman on Capitol Hill. His knowledge of the armed services exceeded that of any of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Peggy joins me in extending to Mrs. Rivers and their children our deepest sympathy and prayers. Chairman RIVERS will long live on in our memory because we can never forget his deep dedication to his country and the need to keep America militarily strong.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, my father, a Methodist minister from the State of Virginia, early implanted in me a sense of respect and gratitude for those American patriots who steadfastly fought for those principles that enabled all of our citizens to live in freedom.

As a youth I thought that the fight had been won and that the need for patriotic men was past and that we could just sit back and enjoy the fruits of their efforts and sacrifices. I soon learned however through World War II, Korea, and the cold war that the battle for freedom and justice is never completely won but is an ever continuing process of maintaining those safeguards that would insure that the United States of America would remain in the hands of its own people.

When I came to the U.S. Congress 20 years ago, I was very concerned about the future of our country.

My fears were soon allayed as I came to know my colleagues. I found many of them possessed that same dedication and love of country that marked the American patriots of yesteryear.

MENDEL RIVERS was among the greatest of these modern patriots. He possessed the same degree of devotion to country, courage and farsightedness that distinguished our Founding Fathers. I feel that same sense of gratitude to him that I feel toward our other great patriots. I feel honored that I was privileged to serve with him and deeply mourn his passing.

I first learned to respect MENDEL RIVERS on an athletic field.

In my freshman year in the Congress I was selected to play on the Republican baseball team in our annual game with the Democratic Members. I had played both in college and with several semi-professional teams. I felt pretty cocky when I first came to bat.

As I looked over the field before me, I noticed a player in centerfield who had long white hair. Thinking that I only had to drive the ball over his head to secure a homerun, I lengthened my grip on the bat and hit the first pitch right on the nose to deep centerfield.

I did notice the white-haired centerfielder drifting back looking over his shoulder. Never anticipating that he

could catch up with the ball, I put my head down and took off for what I thought would be an in-the-park homerun.

Can you imagine my embarrassment as I crossed second base to find that instead of a homerun, I had just made the third out of the inning—for the white-haired centerfielder had timed my drive perfectly and with deceptive speed had gathered it into his glove.

As I disappointedly turned toward the bench, I met MENDEL RIVERS coming in from his post in centerfield. As we jogged off the field together, I told him that I would never underestimate him again. I never did. I am glad that I learned my lesson on the athletic field rather than on the floor of the House.

I know that others will pick up the torch that he has passed on and will continue the policies that he so eloquently declared.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot find it in my heart to believe that MENDEL RIVERS has passed away. For 30 years I have watched him move through the Halls of Congress, strong and sure and committed. It was more than the service to his constituency that brought MENDEL back to Congress term after term; it was also, in no small measure, the warmth of his personality, the friendliness of his greeting, and the sincerity of his beliefs. This was a side of MENDEL that was absent in the national portrait placed before the people of this land. To those who knew him personally, he conveyed a zest for life, a zest which flowed over into the causes to which he had dedicated himself. It was not necessary to agree with MENDEL to stand in the warmth of his vitality.

There are few who suspected that he lived in the shadow of his ailment, because he, himself, cast no shadow of apprehension nor gloom. This was his private matter and he sought no pity therefor.

To his wife and family, I extend my very deepest sympathy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS has deeply affected all of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him. We have lost one of the most dedicated and capable citizens that I have ever known.

A Member of this body for over 30 years, and since 1964, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, MENDEL RIVERS worked with sincere conviction and deep devotion for the welfare of our Nation. There has rarely been a Member of this body who has worked with such diligence for his country and for his district.

He was a skillful student of government and an able legislator. In a time when patriotism may be looked upon by some as old fashioned, MENDEL RIVERS was a genuine patriot and a true leader in the House of Representatives.

Although we often differed in our views, I have always had the most profound respect for his abilities and his fairness. His sudden death will leave a void in this Chamber that will be difficult to fill.

We have lost a colleague of unique distinction and outstanding attainment.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to our late colleague, MENDEL RIVERS, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the special association he had with my congressional district and why his loss has a special meaning for myself and a number of constituents in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia.

Although it was not generally known, Congressman RIVERS, at one time, owned farm property in Augusta County near Staunton. He was a frequent visitor to the Shenandoah Valley and had a great interest and knowledge of that area.

He made many friends in my congressional district and often when I would be in the Staunton area I would have constituents who knew him inquire about him and send their best.

The lasting friendships which he made in my area of the State is typical of the man and his character. During my service here, he extended to me many kindnesses and I join with others in expressing deepest sympathy to his family.

The Congress and the country have lost an outstanding leader.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in giving tribute to our late colleague from South Carolina. He gave 30 years' service to his district and to the House of Representatives. His leadership was of great importance when the crucial issues of those three decades were being debated, and, as we all know, his interest in and concern for our military strength can be credited for the existence of a strong military establishment.

But there is a less dramatic aspect of MENDEL RIVERS' service, which, I feel, should be recognized. I refer to his efforts on behalf of the American serviceman.

Many times, Mr. Speaker, servicemen in my district have contacted my office for assistance of one sort or another. Frequently I was able to help; in some cases I was not. When these more difficult situations developed, I often contacted MENDEL RIVERS. His interest and involvement were the crucial factors in getting many cases reconsidered and unjust decisions reversed or amended.

Federal bureaucracy can be a frustrating experience for a young man with specific problems. This is especially true at the Pentagon, where the very size of its personnel system leads to errors and occasional hardship. The requests for compassionate leave or discharge or for reassignment so a soldier can live near his family—in short, the calls for help from the helpless GI—can be very compelling.

MENDEL RIVERS never showed the slightest hesitation in coming to their aid. His long record of leadership is detailed, in one instance after another, by various examples of assistance to the American fighting man. He sought not only to alleviate unnecessary hardship but also to improve the pay, the leave, and other benefits our servicemen deserve. They have lost a real friend.

It is this high tradition of service for which I have always respected MENDEL RIVERS and for which I will remember him.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, all loyal Americans mourn the death of our colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS. He was a great patriot, an untiring voice calling out for a strong America. I believe that this House will heed the echo of his words in the days and years ahead.

I know that the people of Alabama felt a close and special affection for this great man. And in their behalf and for myself and my family, I want to extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and other members of the Rivers family.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I learned of the death of the gentleman from South Carolina, LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS. I join with all of my colleagues in mourning the passing of the colorful and dedicated chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Armed Services for my first 6 years in the House. It was in the course of this experience that I got to meet and to form indelible impressions of this dynamic son of the Old South. On field trips with him to aircraft production plants, I was able to observe his copious knowledge of military aircraft. He was to live through several generations of aircraft development and technology and he was passionately absorbed in the subject. I will always feel that he resented the intrusion of missile technology with its ICBM's, IRBM's, into the strategic force. He loved airplanes which were flown by brave and heroic men. He was in many ways a romantic when it came to airplanes and the armed services.

MENDEL RIVERS and I disagreed on most matters relating to the great social and economic questions of our day. We would frequently chide each other over our differences but it was always done with genuine understanding and puckish good humor. MENDEL was a vestigial southern romantic and I was a northern liberal with a totally different agenda for our society. But we were able to argue and to laugh. He held strong views and was filled with a special kind of regional pride, but he also was known for his graciousness both to friends and adversaries alike.

L. MENDEL RIVERS is now a part of U.S. history. He was among the last of a very special breed of Americans. He will be remembered for his unbridled devotion to the cause of the armed services and his beloved South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of eulogies and editorials have been written in praise of our late beloved chairman and friend, L. MENDEL RIVERS. Typical of these expressions of respect and sorrow are the following editorials from two South Carolina papers outside the chairman's own congressional district, the Aiken (S.C.), Standard and the Greenville (S.C.), News:

[From the Aiken Standard, Dec. 31, 1970]

REPRESENTATIVE L. MENDEL RIVERS

The American in uniform has lost his best friend.

The death of United States Rep. Lucius Mendel Rivers of Charleston is being felt already in faraway places around the globe, wherever an American serviceman is stationed. In the last few years, a warm affinity had developed between Mr. Rivers, the chair-

man of the House Armed Services Committee, and the man in uniform.

It was not an uncommon thing for any South Carolinian far from home to get a special greeting from our men in uniform—"because that's Mendel Rivers' home state." Mr. Rivers just about acquired patron saint-hood in their eyes.

"He speaks our language," they would tell you.

"He's the man who has our interest in mind, is able to do something and does it," was an oft-heard consensus.

Mr. Rivers was obsessed with a determination to keep this country's military forces strong, in the belief that this was the best way to keep the peace and keep our freedom. He was an outspoken hawk. He believed in the capacity of our military establishment, and he believed it should be used to preserve our position. He believed we should have gone all-out to achieve victory in Korea. He felt we should have mass-bombed Hanoi to destroy North Vietnam's main artery for supplies.

"Military might!" he was wont to say. "It's the only thing those people understand." He openly scorned whatever effect such positions might have had on world opinion.

Mr. Rivers rarely exposed tepid opinions. He felt control of the military establishment belonged in the hands of Congress and made his case forcefully and often. It quickly produced a highly publicized series of confrontations with the then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. There were a number of occasions when Mr. Rivers and his committee authorized appropriations in excess of that sought by the military chiefs. Mr. Rivers would tell them plainly that they needed more, whether it was for more destroyers or more hospitals.

He was a champion of advanced military hardware. He took a keen interest in the development of the beleaguered C5 airplane. When the first one was being delivered to Charleston for duty, there was the predictable ceremony. Mr. Rivers was the principal speaker.

To the embarrassment of most persons present—but not Mr. Rivers—the giant droopy-winged airplane dropped a wheel just before it landed safely.

"That's why those planes have 28 wheels," Congressman Rivers said. "It landed safely. It didn't have to use all those wheels."

He then took the opportunity of dismissing critics:

"There are some," he acknowledged, "who would rather have seen a wing drop off. All I can say is to hell with them."

The military people, from generals to privates, admired his unflinching aggressiveness and his courage in the face of criticism that often became intense and personal. His forthrightness if not always his position, was admired by his colleagues of both political parties in the House.

A few months ago, after a bitter attack by a Washington columnist, his fellow congressmen one after another took the floor to lavish praise on him.

Mr. Rivers began his political career as an underdog. Few in Lowcountry South Carolina had given him much chance to be elected in Congress. He came through, and was returned to office 16 times in the ensuing years.

His early years in Congress were spent in the more usual chores of a young congressman: doing what he could for the people of his First Congressional District. It was often said that when it came to looking after the personal interests of his constituents there was not a better representative. He was similarly indefatigable in his efforts to bring new prosperity to a region which, at the time of his election, was still trying to extricate itself from the ravages of the Civil War. He is credited with bringing the big Air Force base to Charleston; a number of defense-related industries; bringing the Marine Air Station to Beaufort; the Veterans' Administration

Hospital to Charleston, and keeping and strengthening existing posts such as the Charleston Naval Base and the Parris Island Marine Depot.

Comics and critics said that if Mr. Rivers put another military installation at Charleston the whole area would sink into the Atlantic Ocean. On one occasion Mr. Rivers quickly took up the challenge and said he would seek to have the Federal government drive pilings in order to reinforce the entire area so that more military installations could safely be placed there.

Usually he answered such quips straightforwardly.

"Where else," he would ask, "can you find a more deserving people, a more patriotic people, a more efficient people, a more conscientious people, a better climate and a better location?"

When the Charleston area's economy became so heavily supported with the Federal payrolls, it was whispered about that the city's economic structure was but a heartbeat away from collapse. Mr. Rivers' heartbeat.

Mr. Rivers' heart has now stopped beating after 65 years. The Lowcountry area's economy, while still heavily enriched with Federal money, is today quite healthy apart from it. And this pleasant condition to some degree, at least, is attributable to Mr. Rivers' energetic stimulation of the whole economy. The South Carolina Lowcountry's economy is strong enough now to withstand changes in the military presence that likely will come in the months and years ahead. Mr. Rivers' beloved First Congressional District—the Lowcountry of South Carolina—is much healthier now, thanks in large measure to his tireless efforts.

More than 10,000 persons had filed past his casket Tuesday at Grace Protestant Episcopal Church in Charleston. Men in work clothes, bearded youths, political luminaries, shuffling elderly people walking with assistance, white people and black people.

For the most part, they were those residents of the First Congressional District he called "my people".

They had come to say goodbye to an old and trusted friend.

He was a colorful man, an energetic representative. He was a friend to thousands of soldiers, sailors and airmen from every state of the Union who knew him only by name and reputation. He was a personal friend to thousands of South Carolinians. All are saddened by his death.

All will miss the man from Hell Hole Swamp who became one of this country's most powerful men.

[From the Greenville News, Dec. 29, 1970]

CONGRESSMAN MENDEL RIVERS

Congressman L. Mendel Rivers always did his homework well. As a result he was one of the most powerful men in Washington and was unbeatable in the First South Carolina Congressional District.

As Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Congressman Rivers was almost the absolute master of the House of Representatives on military matters. He had the respect and confidence of an overwhelming majority of his fellow legislators.

A believer in strong military forces and strong action to protect American interests, the South Carolinian was intensely disliked by the latter-day liberal establishment. But he proved more than a match for all opponents in battle after battle in the House.

A representative for more than 30 years and chairman of Armed Services for the past five, Congressman Rivers was an acknowledged expert on military affairs. He made it his business to keep in close touch with the far-flung military establishment, traveling all over the world and talking with service personnel of all ranks.

Detractors criticized what they called Representative Rivers' frequent "junkets" to

military installations everywhere. But those trips kept the chairman well informed about what was going on in what he regarded as his global military constituency. No matter what happened or where militarily, Mendel Rivers knew what it was—and more important why it was.

He was respected, even revered by career enlisted personnel, because he fought constantly for better pay and better conditions for servicemen and women. He had the confidence of military leaders. He also had that all-important confidence of the House of Representatives and of all Presidents with whom he worked.

He was able to build and keep a coalition of House votes, composed of both Democrats and Republicans, which guaranteed passage of important military legislation. Critics could carp at Congressman Rivers, but they could not prevail against him.

The same situation obtained in his home district, which covers a wide area of lower South Carolina. No matter where he went or how often he went, Mendel Rivers kept in close touch with the people back home. He moved among them constantly, never losing the flavor of his Berkeley County Farm origin.

Because he was powerful in the military world, Congressman Rivers was able to get many military installations for South Carolina, especially in his home district. He was acknowledged as the Charleston area's chief economic asset.

In recent years nobody could touch Mendel Rivers politically. He was the choice of Democrats and Republicans, whites and blacks, throughout his district. He also was his own boss in national political affairs. Some Democrats complained because he spoke favorably of George Wallace in the 1968 presidential campaign, but suggestions that he be "disciplined" by the party in Congress were laughed off.

Congressman Rivers was a strong-willed man with an excellent intellect. He knew what he was doing, why he was doing it, and how to get it done. He had much to do with keeping this country's military guard up in the face of increasing disarmament pressure.

Because dangerous world conditions make military strength mandatory, Congressman Rivers' death Monday was a severe loss to the nation and the free world. Already doubts are being expressed about whether the "military coalition" he built will survive his passing.

For South Carolina the loss is immense. A strong voice in national affairs has fallen silent. A powerful developer of military installations in the state has gone. The entire state, especially the Charleston area, can suffer economically and otherwise.

More important, however, the nation and the free world have lost a stalwart patriot, a giant who cannot be replaced easily or quickly.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, like all of our colleagues in the House, was saddened to learn of the death of Chairman MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina.

In an age in which all too many persons downgrade patriotism, MENDEL RIVERS stood tall in the service of his country. No one of us will forget his tireless efforts as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, his concern for the security of the Nation, and his dedication to the American servicemen who defend us.

Mrs. Brotzman joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Chairman RIVERS' family.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House has lost one of its most distinguished Members and the Nation has lost a great

patriot in the passing of the devoted chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS. I was privileged to serve with Chairman RIVERS throughout his three decades in the House and came to know the true greatness of this outstanding statesman and gentleman from South Carolina.

Perhaps more than any other man in our century, he realized the truth of Thomas Jefferson's warning that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and Chairman RIVERS dedicated his life to maintaining a strong national defense. He was an authority on weapons systems, and his remarkable knowledge of military matters was recognized and respected throughout the world. The House will sorely miss the wise advice and sage counsel which he was always so willing to share with his colleagues. One of his last major addresses in the House was a penetrating analysis of our defense capabilities and represents one of the finest discussions of the subject in recent years. His speeches on the floor were always immensely informative and meaningful, and they gave us the background necessary for proper consideration of vital defense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, MENDEL RIVERS will be remembered as one of that select group of patriots who did more than revere their country. He is now among those who gave a lifetime of meaningful and effective leadership to keep our Nation free and the emblems of America high in the sight of all people as a continuing beacon of hope and democracy. He had a great and abiding faith in the future of America, and in these troubled times, we would all do well to share his unshakable confidence in our Nation which is the world's strongest bastion of freedom and justice.

On this occasion, I want to join with my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to his wonderful family at this difficult and trying time.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am most grieved by the passing of our colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS. He was one of the greatest American patriots to ever serve his nation in the U.S. Congress.

Congressman RIVERS placed his country first before any other duty he undertook as an American and as a Congressman. He was a strong constitutionalist of the first order and believed in America's safety first and foremost. He fought for the preservation of the American way of life and did his utmost to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Congressman RIVERS had a steadfast and accurate stand in his positive attitude that the security of America depended on the strength of America's military system. He certainly assisted in insuring this system as the protective force under which this Nation continued to survive and thrive.

The loss of our colleague is not only a loss to the U.S. Congress and the Nation, but his passing also is a loss to the servicemen and women of America.

It is my hope that the tradition of a strong military posture for American defense, which Congressman RIVERS was

largely responsible for establishing and battling for, will be maintained.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of loss that this country mourns the passing of one of its elder statesmen, Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS. Throughout his entire life he has been the embodiment of the American ethic, sometimes praised, sometimes condemned, but always the touchstone of quality and performance. Although I did not always agree with him, I respected his ability and leadership.

MENDEL RIVERS was a successful man. His roots reached back into the farmlands of his native Gumville, S.C., just as this Nation was founded in the agrarian life of the early settlers. His was a difficult beginning in the midst of the poverty of the great depression; but, just as the fledgling United States had its difficulties, the rigors of early life molded the man into a courageous individual who would never consider compromising what he considered to be right.

MENDEL RIVERS was a compassionate man. His life was not built with people he stepped on, but rather with those whose everlasting friendship he gained as a result of his willingness to help everyone in need. The millions of servicemen who have known him will readily attest to that. The thousands of residents of the First District of South Carolina will acclaim his constancy over the years. And many people the world over will remember him as a friend.

MENDEL RIVERS was a patriot. His devotion to the country his life so closely paralleled was unmatched by any man in this body or in this Nation. He was unswerving in carrying out his personal commitment to keep America strong and free. He was relentless in his drive to build a better country.

No one can question MENDEL RIVERS' integrity and sense of duty. His passing will mark an end of an era.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the waning days of the 91st Congress have seen the passing of a citizen-patriot who stood tall among us in support of his convictions—Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina.

There is no need for me to reaffirm how much we will miss his presence among us. This has already been done by several score of the House Membership with phrases more impressive than those at my command.

There is some sort of cosmic significance, however, in the timing of his departure. Throughout the 91st Congress the Defense Establishment of this country has been under continuous and unrelenting attack. From all sides and all directions we have witnessed a continuous orgy of howling and screaming against not only the professional military, but also the civilians of higher echelon who must shoulder the grave burden of keeping our country strong.

In the center of a hurricane of fury whipped up from coast to coast almost daily during the past 2 years, one man has stood immovably, MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Never before in this century has there been such a concentrated effort to seriously weaken this Nation's

defenses, and never has it been so successfully resisted.

Because this one man stood as a rallying point for those who will not turn the lives and fortunes of Americans over to foreign or internationalist influences. He thought in terms of duty first, duty last, duty always. He was determined that on the passing of his stewardship, he would not leave his country an ounce less strong than it was when he assumed his responsibility. And in this he prevailed to the advantage of this and coming generations.

It must be said therefore that if the time had arrived for him to be called away, then his passing came on a note of triumph. For all who believe that a militarily powerful America is a first prerequisite to world peace, he set the code of conduct to be followed in the future. It will be our obligation to measure up to his level of high conviction and determination.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was deeply saddened to learn of the death of the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS who represented South Carolina's First Congressional District here in the House of Representatives for 30 years. I know and admired the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for most of those years and will miss him greatly. MENDEL RIVERS was a giant of a man. A man of strong convictions and a man not afraid to fight for those convictions, popular or not. He was a firm believer in a strong America and a fierce fighter of those who would weaken or destroy our country. MENDEL RIVERS was a true patriot. He was a hard-working, unique, and colorful man, always genuine, always honest. He was a man who hated hypocrisy and deceit and so always spoke and acted in a manner that left no doubt as to his beliefs. And he was always a fine gentleman. To his wife, daughters, and son I extend my deepest sympathy in their loss.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I take this opportunity to say an official farewell to an old and dear friend and a leader of this distinguished body—L. MENDEL RIVERS.

There is no question that MENDEL RIVERS was a controversial person. I freely note that there were many times during the 18 years we served together on the Armed Services Committee that we disagreed. Other times we were in agreement. But I can state without equivocation that in all the years I knew MENDEL RIVERS, I never met a single Member of this House who did not admire him for his zeal and directness of action.

One could certainly say about MENDEL RIVERS that there was never a time in his long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives that his position on any matter was not clear and forthright.

It was natural that MENDEL RIVERS in his first term in the House should seek and achieve a seat on the then Naval Affairs Committee. His constituency of Charleston, S.C., has historically been a naval base for this Nation. But MENDEL RIVERS did not stop there. With the

formation of the Armed Services Committee, MENDEL RIVERS enlarged his sphere to embrace all the Armed Forces as his official constituency.

He loved and admired the men and women who guard our Nation, and fight for it, with a zeal unknown in the annals of this body. Never in our history had one single man devoted his life and career so wholeheartedly to our fighting forces—and he a man who had never worn a uniform.

If MENDEL RIVERS had been born earlier or later, who knows that he might have made the military his career. Nevertheless I doubt whether history will record any man in uniform or out who served his Nation's fighting forces with more love and sincerity.

And let no one suggest that MENDEL RIVERS' interest centered about the stars of generals and admirals. MENDEL's interest and love transcended all rank and position. It was the serviceman and servicewoman he loved—regardless of rank. His heart and office were open at all times for "gripes" of the lowest ranking enlisted man, and he acted expeditiously on their complaints. He was truly their friend.

There has been much talk—some good humored and some bitter—concerning the growth of military installations in the Charleston area. There is no question of this growth and MENDEL was the first to declare—and declare proudly—that he was responsible for this growth.

But let it not be forgotten or overlooked that there are many other areas of our Nation which owe MENDEL a debt of gratitude for his cooperation and interest. My own constituency of Philadelphia has been a beneficiary of MENDEL's interest and understanding. I say without equivocation that MENDEL extended me every possible cooperation when the military attempted to remove such viable and efficient operations as the Philadelphia Naval Base, the Frankford Arsenal, and the Army Electronics Command. These are still functioning efficiently because MENDEL listened with an open mind when I asked him to assist me.

Many, many other Members could make similar statements.

When the 92d Congress convenes in just a matter of days, MENDEL RIVERS will no longer be among us. His death leaves us a challenge. I hope we can fulfill it.

I know I join with the entire membership of the House in extending to his wife, Margaret, and their three children our heartfelt condolences for their great loss—and ours.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are all diminished—as a legislative body and as a nation—by the death of our dear friend, MENDEL RIVERS, the gentleman from South Carolina, and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

It had become popular in some quarters to refer to MENDEL RIVERS as a controversial Congressman and a controversial chairman.

All I can say is that I served with MENDEL RIVERS, and worked closely with him during the entire 24 years I have served in this body—our areas of legislative interest were often joined to-

gether—and I never found him controversial in the least. He was always considerate, kindly, helpful, knowledgeable, and a Christian gentleman.

Above all, he was a patriot, and it is a sad commentary on our decadent times that it was this patriotism which caused lesser persons to call him controversial. He loved this country as few men have the heart and the power to do, and he bitterly resented those who tried to downgrade it.

He was firmly committed to the philosophy that military strength is the ultimate key to peace, and that weakness is the most certain means of creating national disaster. He supported the military to the limit whenever he felt their requests were reasonable. He was not—as some of his carping critics used to claim—blindly permissive in his attitudes toward the Pentagon, but he was not going to risk the safety and security of the Nation and its citizens through false and rashly imposed economies.

And, let no one forget that it was not only the "top brass" to whom he offered his protection and support. If anything, he was even more passionate in his defense and support of the GI. The life of the American fighting man is far more humanized and endurable today than it was during World War II, for instance, and most of those improvements came about on the insistence of MENDEL RIVERS, and some of them were achieved despite Pentagon disapproval.

MENDEL RIVERS was my friend, and I regret his passing very deeply.

But—more than that, far more than that—MENDEL RIVERS was, every inch of him, a Congressman. In an age of grey conformity, MENDEL RIVERS was a figure of color and enlightenment. He adorned this chamber. He looked like a Congressman; he acted like a Congressman; he thought like a Congressman.

He had the complete loyalty and devotion of his committee because he did his homework faithfully and knew more about the legislative problems facing him than any man alive. To him, leadership was something that had to be deserved every day of one's life and he devoted the working hours of every day to this task.

We are all better persons and better Congressmen because MENDEL RIVERS sat in our midst and worked with us. We are all much poorer—the Nation is poorer, every member of the Armed Forces is poorer, every Member of this body is poorer—because he has left us.

May God rest his soul. And may God give strength to his widow and his children to sustain this bitter loss.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has lost a valiant soldier with the passing from our midst of L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Here was a man who fought fiercely for those principles in which he believed. History will regard him among the truly great men in this Nation's life. He was a man of courage and determination; he was forthright as he fought for his beloved country.

He was among the first men I met when I came to the Congress and I came to respect him because of the man that he was. He was rightly concerned about

the defense of this Nation as we have entered into an era where a strong national defense is the only means to preserve the peace for all men.

In truth, MENDEL RIVERS was fighting for all of the people of the world, for he understood that the United States is the bulwark of freedom and only by remaining strong can we hope to deter aggression from the despot and those who seek to enslave the minds of men.

Fifteen times the people of the Charleston area named him as the Representative. Few men have ever represented their district so ably; but in a larger sense he was truly a Representative for the Nation.

I well remember the pride he felt back in 1965 as he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I remember that my own feelings were that a strong advocate of national defense, Carl Vinson, had been succeeded by another and that this Nation would be well served. Today I can say that he was a good and faithful servant in his mission.

MENDEL RIVERS is gone from our midst but I would hope that what he stood for will never be forgotten.

Let us heed his warnings that our Navy is becoming obsolete and in disrepair. Let us remember his concern at the state of our Air Force and Army and that they must continually be modernized and upgraded.

To me, MENDEL RIVERS stood for something great. His hero was the dynamic John C. Calhoun, and now he has joined that statesman as South Carolina's two most magnificent contributions to this Nation.

When he received a cap from GI's on Christmas leave from Vietnam—with six stars and inscribed to "the Big Boss," it was a testimonial from our men and women in our armed services who knew that he was their friend and one who would not hesitate to battle any odds for them.

Now that he is gone, it is up to us to carry on the battle which he fought so boldly, nobly, and devotedly.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy. To them I say that we have all suffered a great loss, but we can take heart in the knowledge that this man lived a life of service and that as long as men revere courage, patriotism and devotion, he can never be forgotten.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our colleague from South Carolina, Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, this body has lost the services of one of its most vigorous and colorful Members.

Mr. Speaker, in faithful dedication to this Nation and to its national security, Chairman RIVERS served his committee, the Congress and the Nation with fidelity and with marked effectiveness during a period of trial and unrest unmatched in recent history.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman RIVERS was a true southern gentleman in the finest sense of the term. He was always gentlemanly while at the same time straightforward and firm in the positions which he advanced.

Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged to have known Congressman RIVERS and to have had him as a friend and colleague.

In this hour following his passing, Mrs. McClory and I extend to Mrs. Rivers and to the members of his family our deep sympathy.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a dear friend and colleague, a great American patriot and Christian gentleman, the Congressman from South Carolina, the late Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

The United States has been well and faithfully served by many prestigious statesmen, and leaders from the State of South Carolina but none have been more dedicated to our constitutional Republic, the perpetuation of individual liberty under God and America's destined role in world leadership than Congressman RIVERS.

Congressman RIVERS' fearless devotion to his people and his country is without equal. His defense and praise for our system of government are well preserved through his some 30 years of continuous service as a Member of this body. His untiring and unselfish efforts always seemed more effective during times of crisis, when others seemed to be faltering.

Congressman RIVERS' speech, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, before this body on September 28, shortly before his tragic death, will long be remembered by his fellow countrymen when MENDEL, at his finest hour said:

Never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this House with greater concern for the future of this Nation.

The fears that I have are those that must be shared by every American regardless of his political or social philosophy or his economic status.

All Americans have been given the blessed and priceless heritage of freedom—a freedom which I am convinced is in terrible jeopardy.

His passing leaves the footprints of a giant to be filled, and the burdens of an Atlas to be borne by those who inherit his legacy.

To his beloved widow and surviving relatives, the people of the Sixth District of Louisiana join me in extending our deepest sympathy in this their hour of bereavement, reminding them that their loss is also borne by every free man throughout the world who labors for liberty, honor, and justice.

His voice is silent,
His place vacant,
His column is broken,
His work is done.

His death is untimely
But his memory and work
Shall be perpetuated and live on in the
Hearts of all free men who knew
Him and all who understand his tocsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks in the RECORD on the passing of our late colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of seventy-one Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following members on the part of the House: Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. DORN, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAHON, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HAYS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. JONAS, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. SISK, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. CLANCY, and Mr. HAGAN.

Mr. HALL, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KING, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. PIKE, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HICKS, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. CORDOVA.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, December 22, 1970, the Speaker did, on December 23, 1970, sign sundry enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House, and enrolled bills of the Senate as follows:

H.R. 7311. An act to amend item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes;

H.R. 14645. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain uses of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, and of the seals of the President and Vice President, and to authorize Secret Service protection of visiting heads of foreign states or governments, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17473. An act to extend the period for filing certain manufacturers claims for floor stocks refunds under section 209(b) of the

Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17901. An act to improve judicial machinery by providing for the appointment of a circuit executive for each judicial circuit;

H.R. 18306. An act to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19333. An act to provide greater protection for customers of registered brokers and dealers and members of national securities exchanges;

H.R. 19857. An act to name certain Federal buildings;

H.R. 19885. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 19911. An act to provide additional foreign assistance authorizations, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res 1420. Joint resolution authorizing the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the Cavaliere di Gran Croce, of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica, an award conferred by the Government of the Republic of Italy;

S. 11. An act to reinforce the federal system by strengthening the personnel resources of State and local governments, to improve intergovernmental cooperation in the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to provide grants for improvement of State and local administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to provide grants to State and local governments for training of their employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities, to facilitate the temporary assignment of personnel between the Federal Government, and State and local governments, and for other purposes; and

S. 2984. An act to permit certain Federal employment to be counted toward retirement.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 19590, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 19590) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, together with the amendments thereto; insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments and insist on the House amendments to Senate amendments 14, 26, 31, 49, and 53, and agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SIKES, WHITTEN, ANDREWS of Alabama, FLOOD, SLACK, ADDABBO, RHODES, DAVIS of Wisconsin, WYMAN, CEDERBERG, and BOW.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF SENATE HEARINGS ON U.S. SECURITY AGREEMENTS AND COMMITMENTS ABROAD

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1797) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85) authorizing the printing of additional copies of

Senate hearings on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations four thousand additional copies each of parts 1 through 11 of its hearings of the Ninety-first Congress on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10874) to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "NS-GI-7100H, and dated July 1970:" and insert "NS-GI-7100J, and dated December 1970:".

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from North Carolina explain the Senate amendment and the purport of the amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, if enacted, will authorize the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore in the States of Mississippi and Florida.

Only one minor change was made by the other body with respect to this House-passed measure. It is my understanding that the State of Mississippi requested that the water area of the seashore be limited to 1 mile from the low tide line of the offshore islands. Originally, the boundary on the north side of these offshore islands coincided with the Intracoastal Waterway. This boundary was chosen primarily because of the convenience of utilizing the existing visual markers; however, there is no compelling reason for selecting this line as the boundary of the seashore.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informally advised that the National Park Service has no objection to this boundary revision, and I know of no opposition to this amendment; consequently, I urge my colleagues to join me in concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 10874.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the Federal Government is giving away 2 miles of potential offshore oil rights to the State of Mississippi and perhaps to some other State?

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

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

Mr. KYL. The gentleman asks a good question because I think we should establish some legislative history of this character. There is really no mischief involved in the change suggested by the Senate. There is, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, a longstanding controversy as to who owns about 36,000 acres of Continental Shelf land. The State of Mississippi claims it owns the land, the U.S. Government claims it owns the land, and this legislation does change the boundary, but it does not settle any dispute. I think it should be clearly understood by this body that the action of the Senate in no way—absolutely no way—gives any credence to any claims made by the State of Mississippi.

There is this factor which my colleagues should understand. The boundaries established for this park are not the usual kinds of boundaries in this respect: the boundary establishment only gives the Secretary the authority to purchase lands within that boundary. It does not in and of itself transfer any title whatsoever. Therefore I am, myself, satisfied that there is nothing wrong with agreeing to the Senate amendment in this instance, but I want to repeat for my colleague, who is, as usual, acting very diligently in this matter, that there is a question of who owns lands. This bill does not deal with that question whatsoever. It does not deal specifically with the transfer of any land. It provides that the boundaries are such, and that within those boundaries the Secretary can acquire land.

Mr. GROSS. In this case the seashore will become Federal property, would it not?

Mr. KYL. The seashore would be Federal property.

Mr. GROSS. The Senate amendment then would give the Federal Government the right to the oil potential only 1 mile offshore, is that correct, and would turn over to the State of Mississippi or the State of Florida, as the case may be, title to the potential offshore oil 2 miles beyond. Is there any other Federal property to which the Federal Government surrenders its right to offshore oil or any other mineral under less than 3 miles?

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

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

Mr. KYL. The only exact thing I can tell the gentleman in response to his question is this, that with the exception of the areas within Horn and Petit Bois Islands, which are to be treated in essence as a wilderness area, the bill authorizes the Secretary to permit the removal of leasable minerals from the Federal lands under his jurisdiction within the seashore under the Mineral Leasing Act or the Acquired Lands Mineral Leasing Act, if he finds that such removal would not have a significant adverse ef-

fect on the administration, development, or public use of the seashore.

If the gentleman will permit me, this does not mean, in other words, that the Federal Government is giving away anything. It merely means that the same regulations would be followed in harvesting whatever mineral values would be taken under the same conditions as applied to all other public lands with appropriate return to the Federal Treasury under existing law.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any other seashore which is similarly located as to which the Federal Government makes a similar concession to a State?

Mr. KYL. If I may respond to the gentleman, there are various provisions for different areas. In one case, for instance, an area with which my colleague is very familiar in the Texas Gulf area, a provision there permits the extraction of oil if it is done by a slant drilling process in such fashion that it does not diminish the surface areas, does not disrupt the beauty or utility of the park itself.

In other instances where the removal of a mineral would obviously affect the beauty and the esthetic nature, it is forbidden entirely. In still other instances the language is exactly the same as it is in this particular bill.

Mr. GROSS. Evidently the States of Mississippi and Florida have reason to believe there is oil in the offshore, area being dealt with in this bill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is eminently correct. They do believe there is oil there. There is every reason to believe there is oil there. But the Congress is not going into that controversy as to who owns the oil. This is a matter which has been the subject of a great dispute for a long time and is presently under litigation as a matter of fact.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not now predicated on a 3-mile limit—that is oil in this and other areas?

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield, I am not certain the limitation is 3 miles in all instances.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do understand the State does claim oil rights out to 3 miles and that most of the area between these islands and the mainland is within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. GROSS. But we are dealing here with what will become Federal property?

Mr. TAYLOR. The bill provides there will be no mining for oil in the park and the amendment does change the boundaries of the park somewhat.

Mr. GROSS. What I do not understand is what we are doing to the law governing offshore ownership elsewhere in other coastal areas. That to me is important in this legislation.

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

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

Mr. KYL. This is a matter which is subject to controversy. This bill, however, does not alter any basic fact. It does not

deal with the issue because it cannot deal with the issue of oil. The settlement of that issue must be outside this bill and outside the Congress, as a matter of fact.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the Government of the United States, which will become the owner of this land, not take the oil within the entire 3-mile limit, if there is oil?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, when the appropriate decision is rendered by the court, then that question will be answered, but we cannot answer it today.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that this is going to be helpful to the prospective court decisions for the Congress here today by law to establish this kind of offshore control or ownership.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this is exactly why I said in the beginning that I am glad the gentleman mentioned this. In fact, if he had not brought it up, I was going to, because personally I do not want anyone to think this bill in any way deals with an attempted settlement of offshore claims or any other claims of that nature. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what effect it would have on the court or whether the court would even take note of what has been said here today on this floor. The court might take cognizance of it or overlook it altogether. I do not think that is the meaningful part of this discussion. I do think we are setting some kind of precedent here, although I am not sure. I did not know this bill was coming up with this amendment until a few minutes ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman understands we are considering legislation to create a new park. If the legislation is not passed, and the park is not created, the oil can be drilled in the channel between the islands and the mainland right up to the privately owned land. In creating the park we are saying no oil can be drilled on the parklands, and the parklands include not only the islands but also 1 mile from the low water line.

Mr. GROSS. The State of Mississippi can drill anywhere it wants, of course it can, on land and seashore belonging to the State, but when the Federal Government takes over the oil rights ought to go, in my opinion, to the 3-mile limit and not merely 1 mile out.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the legislation we passed the park boundary did not go to the full 3-mile limit. It only went to the Intercoastal Waterway. We just selected that boundary because it was convenient and already marked. Now this changes the boundary to 1 mile from the low water line. In some areas it does not restrict the boundary, but in other areas it does restrict the boundary.

In that area where the park is created there could be no mining of oil.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. The State of Mississippi has always claimed the right to the oil which lies 1 mile, 1½ miles, 3 miles offshore. The bill does not change that.

As a matter of fact, I repeat once more, so far as the relation to setting boundaries is concerned, the boundaries which are set in this bill simply permit the Secretary of the Interior or the Government of the United States to acquire lands within those boundaries. We are not buying everything within the boundaries. It is not proposed to do so, and we never will, in all likelihood. I do not know how we could. What we have to do is set some area within which the Government can acquire lands.

This bill does not affect the controversy between the United States and Mississippi one bit so far as determination of oil rights is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. KYL. It must not. That is why again I say I am glad the gentleman brought up this subject, because I want it clarified, too. The bill in no way attempts to settle the controversy.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman one more question.

What was the amount of money contained in the bill as it passed the House, and has it been increased by the other body?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. The amount of money for acquisition was \$3 million. A large part of the land, practically all of the land in the Florida section of the park, is being donated by the State or other units of government. The amount of money involved for development is \$15 million.

Mr. GROSS. It has been increased from \$3 million to somewhere near \$15 million?

Mr. TAYLOR. The \$3 million is for acquisition of land. That is a low figure, relatively, compared to other parks, because much of the land is being donated.

Mr. GROSS. What about the other \$12 million?

Mr. TAYLOR. The \$15 million is for development, to be spent over a period of 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. For development?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right. This amendment does not in any way affect the cost.

Mr. GROSS. The Senate amendment does not affect the cost?

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. It seems to me that we ought to get every possible dime out of the potential oil, rather than to give away 2 miles of the potentiality to the U.S. Government. Perhaps I do not understand this situation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Please let me clarify some points which I think are highly important. This bill is not in any way associated with the tidelands controversy or the question of ownership of mineral rights on offshore bottoms. It has to do with the establishment of a new park

area. The Senate amendment is intended only to clarify the boundaries of the park. Some questions were raised in the Senate which were resolved by the adoption of the amendment which the House now is asked to approve. The House language on boundaries failed to satisfy some of the officials of the State of Mississippi and they have asked for this clarification.

The important thing is that we are seeking to establish a great new national park area for the benefit of all of America's citizens. It is a proposal which will preserve magnificent beaches, beautiful woodlands, and very important historical sites. Some of these date from Spanish Colonial days. There is no other area which offers such a combination of attractive and interesting features in close proximity today. In this period of shrinking natural assets, we feel that it is essential that we protect and preserve properties such as those which will be included in the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

It should be understood that in Florida there is no controversy about oil nor any question about the value of the mineral rights which are being transferred. No successful oil explorations have been conducted within less than 50 miles of the Florida property. On the other hand, the people of my State and other political subdivisions are proposing to give to the Federal Government more than 30 miles of waterfront, including some of the very finest beaches to be found in all the land. This valuable property comes to the Federal Government without cost. The value is many times that of any possible value which could be attributed to the oil rights associated with this property. I feel that posterity will make great gains from the passage of this bill and I strongly urge the approval of the Senate amendment so that the bill can go to the President for his signature. I would hope the gentleman would look at what we are trying to do for all the people.

Mr. GROSS. I have not said as yet that I would object to the consideration of this bill at this time. What I am trying to get at is that in the establishment of these boundaries the Senate apparently has given away 2 miles of prospective offshore oil rights.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, as pointed out on both sides of the aisle, the boundaries of the park never were established as 3 miles at sea. They were delineated in a way somewhat difficult to follow. The Senate felt that the boundaries should be specifically stated at 1 mile. The original boundaries did not extend 3 miles at sea.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this discussion. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF VOYAGEURS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10482) to authorize the establishment of the Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "park." and insert "park: Provided further, That the Secretary shall not acquire other lands by purchase for the park prior to such donation unless he finds that acquisition is necessary to prevent irreparable changes in their uses or character of such a nature as to make them unsuitable for park purposes and notifies the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of such findings at least thirty days prior to such acquisition."

Page 7, after line 10, insert: "(c) All mining and mineral activities and commercial water power development within the boundaries of the park shall be prohibited, and further, any conveyance from the State of Minnesota shall contain a covenant that the State of Minnesota, its licensees, permittees, lessees, assigns, or successors in interest shall not engage in or permit any mining activity nor water power development."

Page 8, line 4, after "(3)" insert "recreational."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the amendments added by the Senate are germane to the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman is correct; they are germane.

Mr. GROSS. There are no oil rights involved in this legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. No oil rights are involved in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. None at all?

Mr. TAYLOR. None.

Mr. GROSS. What about the expenditure? Has that item been increased?

Mr. TAYLOR. The amendments do not in any way increase the expenditures for the project.

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

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina to explain the amendments made by the Senate to the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, last October we approved H.R. 10482, a bill authorizing the establishment of the Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota. That legislation has now been considered by the other body and returned to us with three noncontroversial amendments. None of the amendments alter the substantive provisions of the House-passed measure.

One amendment deals with land acquisition within the park boundaries. Like the House bill, the Senate measure

requires the donation of the lands owned by the State and its political subdivisions, but the Senate amendment permits the Secretary to acquire privately owned lands if he finds that their acquisition is necessary to prevent irreparable changes which will render such lands unsuitable for park purposes. Before acting, the Senate amendment requires the Secretary to notify the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of his findings at least 30 days prior to acquisition.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will assure the integrity of the park area until the State and its localities can complete the formalities required to donate the lands for the park. At the same time, it provides the Secretary with authority to act in the event that an emergency situation arises with respect to privately held lands. While the Members of the House Committee felt strongly that the Secretary should not engage in the acquisition of privately owned lands until the State lands are donated, we recognize that circumstances might arise which might necessitate Federal acquisition of a particular property in order to avoid irreparable harm. In those few instances, after due notification to the appropriate committees of the Congress, this amendatory language will allow the Secretary to act.

The second amendment is designed to preclude any possibility of mineral or water development within the park boundaries. Normally, such activities are not permitted in national parks. The Senate amendment will merely reassert this well-established principle.

The intent of the third amendment is to provide the Secretary with adequate authority to regulate the use of watercraft within the park boundaries. This alteration clarifies the language of the legislation so that it conforms with the intent of the original language approved by the House.

Mr. Speaker, these three modest changes in H.R. 10482 are consistent with the objectives of the bill as approved by the House. I know of no objection to the Senate amendments. In light of these facts, it is appropriate for the House to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 10482 so that this measure can be forwarded to the President.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to serve notice on the delegation from Minnesota and also the State of Minnesota that as one member of this committee I will do everything I can to stop any land acquisition on the part of the Federal Government until the State of Minnesota donates its land. I say this because I do not want to be a party to any proposal authorizing funds for this project on the allegation that irreparable damage will result unless the Federal Government purchases land prior to the donation by the State of Minnesota.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me state to the gentleman from Kansas that he was very helpful in drafting this legislation, and it was the intention of our committee to provide that the Secretary of the Interior could not go out and acquire land until the State of Minnesota had made the necessary donation. But the Park Service felt then that some emergencies

might develop, such as somebody might decide to subdivide certain sections and build roads and streets, or build an expensive motel which we might later have to purchase, so that if such situations were to develop this would give them a little freedom to step in and stop it before irreparable damage had occurred.

Mr. SKUBITZ. May I say that the State of Minnesota can stop any emergency from that arising by donating the land she now owns and has promised to give to the Federal Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to state to the gentleman that we have a safeguard in the amendment. It does require that the proposal be submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the House and the Senate for 30 days' study before any action is taken.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express on behalf of the entire Minnesota delegation our deepest appreciation for the fullness of cooperation which we have received on this bill sponsored by Members from both sides of the aisle. Particularly are we indebted to the chairman for his special outstanding efforts and especially for the close scrutiny that has been needed and will continue to be needed. We are confident that this park will turn out to be really a jewel of a park. It is not a large park; it is about average in size, but we believe it will truly become a jewel. So I wish to express our deepest appreciation, to the House committee and its distinguished chairman, Mr. ASPINALL and Mr. TAYLOR, as well as to the select committee and its chairman, Mr. BIBLE.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) for pointing out the matter which he did call to the attention of the House. With the gentleman from Minnesota who was the author of this bill, and with other members of the committee, I also, through this process, want to make sure that the department knows we are watching as they try to administer this area, because it presents the kind of conflict which is going to become much more common in the days ahead as we consider park and conservation legislation, where in attempting to preserve an area for one purpose we place in great jeopardy specific animals and predators that prey on those animals, predators which are now becoming an endangered species. It will take the closest kind of technical management and even imagination upon the part of the administrators of this area to preserve an area which meets the purpose stated in the bill and at the same time preserves wild-life and botanical values.

As I say, this is the kind of conflict which is going to become more and more common, and all of us must be watchful to see that the balance is maintained, because it is going to be an extremely difficult problem.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 19590, THE DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 19590) the defense appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS AT ANY TIME TODAY OR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time today or tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think there ought to be some explanation as to what kind of a legislative situation we are faced with today and tomorrow before consent is given to recess.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we had first thought of trying to get such permission to extend through the remainder of the session, because the gentleman from Iowa knows the conditions existing between the two Houses.

Mr. GROSS. No, I am afraid I do not know all the conditions between the two Houses. I am sure it is a sad and sorry condition.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman knows we have to wait for action on the part of conferees, and sometimes for action on the part of the other body, and that we are trying to finish as quickly as possible this session of the Congress.

Second, our late distinguished colleague is being buried tomorrow, and there are a large number of House Members who have been appointed as members of the official delegation to attend the funeral. That is why I am making the request for 2 days instead of for 1 day.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be helpful to the distinguished majority leader, who, I am sure, knows the frame of mind that this gentleman is in, to give the authority to the Speaker to recess the House at any time up to midnight tonight. Then perhaps have a pro forma session tomorrow noon, and recess from noon tomorrow until, say, 7 o'clock in the evening, then go back in session tomorrow night, and wind up this session?

Mr. ALBERT. In view of the special circumstances tomorrow, I ask that the

gentleman not object to this request, which does not apply beyond tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. I am well aware of what the situation will be tomorrow in the absence of authority to declare a recess. But I am unwilling, as I was a few days ago, to give the Speaker the authority to call a recess at any time over a period of 2 weeks. That was unconscionable, and we now come down to this day and time, it is unconscionable so far as I am concerned to ask for 2 days. If the gentleman insists, I will have to object.

Mr. ALBERT. The only reason we are including tomorrow is the fact that there will be the funeral in Charleston, S.C., of the late friend and colleague.

Mr. GROSS. I am well aware of the funeral services that will be held. But cannot the gentleman give us some indication of what period the recess would take tomorrow and today?

Mr. ALBERT. It would be hoped, and I cannot speak for all of the leadership on this particular point—but it would be hoped that we would be able, if it appeared feasible, to recess sometime today and to bring back some matters from conference or from the Senate and to act on them. It would be hoped that if there were noncontroversial matters, prior to recessing tomorrow until the funeral party returned that we might dispose of them tomorrow. This is just a matter of expediting the business of the House and that is all.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the distinguished majority leader, I think it would be absolutely unfair to the 100 and more Members who will be going to the funeral tomorrow to attempt to transact business at this stage in this session of the Congress until they returned. That is why I make the suggestion of suspending business until the funeral delegation returns.

Mr. ALBERT. It would be the purpose, and it could only be the purpose of the House, to transact such business as can be transacted by unanimous consent, and then recess until the funeral party returned.

Mr. GROSS. But the 100-and-some Members might wish to participate in the business being transacted under unanimous consent.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion and subsequently I would like to make a comment.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very helpful, I believe, if I might say to the distinguished majority leader, if we could have the assurance that when the funeral party came back that we reconvene to undertake whatever business we could transact from that point until we adjourned tomorrow night.

Mr. ALBERT. That would be our intention so far as I am concerned—and I am not at liberty to do so now but I would be willing to ask for a recess from the time we would normally convene tomorrow, or right after convening, until they come back. I am not at liberty to do that, but I assure the gentleman that nothing fast will be pulled on the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I personally would be willing to go along, with the assurance that the distinguished majority leader has made, that when the funeral party returns that we would reconvene and conduct whatever business we could do at that time. I know at this point the distinguished gentleman cannot make that categorical commitment. But I do know how he feels and he has from my point of view sufficiently expressed himself here on that point.

Let me make one other observation, if I might. The House of Representatives has done its job and done it well even though I have not agreed with every decision on every issue.

Let me repeat. The House of Representatives has done its job. On the Democratic side and the Republican side, we have worked hard and done a job.

But there is another part of this legislative branch that, in my opinion, has not done its job, and I, for one, am fed up with the procrastination, the indecision, the inability to get the job done on the other side of the Capitol. I do not know what can be done to break the legislative logjam over there so that they can do their job that they are required to do. I just hope and trust that the American people know where the fault lies. It lies at the other end of the Capitol. We can do only so much on this side of the Capitol, and we have done it. The House Democratic leadership and the House Republican leadership have done everything they can, but somehow the American people have to wake up to the fact that a small group at the other end of the Capitol are at fault for a breakdown in the legislative process, and the sooner the better.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think those are fine, soul-stirring words here after Christmas and before New Year's Eve from our minority leader, and I subscribe to them in detail, in toto, and I wish they had been initiated just before this post-election lameduck session reconvened, and the Members will recall that I had a few equally well chosen words to say at that time, and since.

Mr. Speaker, once again this body needs to look to the northernmost part of this hallowed Capitol Building and ask of our "unresponsive" colleagues of the other body, obviously enraptured by the sounds of filibuster, "Quo vadis?"

It is becoming more apparent with each passing day that the American people have been set upon, as was Caesar of ancient Rome, by supposedly friendly Senators, and a handful of them who under the guise of "reordering" the Nation's priorities, have determined that we shall have no priorities at all.

There is little doubt that when the history of the 91st Congress is written, it will stand out as a tribute to the arrogance of a group of powerhungry "little men" who have set themselves and their selfish desires, above and beyond the needs of the American people. Thus, they wittingly obviate the public trust.

While calling for that body to reassert its power, they have succeeded only in

dragging it down the road of opportunism.

While crying for more attention to human needs, they have succeeded only in scuttling the hopes of 26 million Americans who are trying to survive on inflation-ravaged social security payments.

The Members of that body have responded to the predictions of a regrettable lameduck session by making it worse than could ever have been imagined. We fail also, who stand idly by and wait—and wait—and wait.

It is time that these aspirants stop thinking of themselves and started to restore the stature of their once respected body and Congress by responsible, well considered acts they were sent there to accomplish in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard any comment about this House adjourning, as it has in the past, sine die, and when we are going to do it on the completion of business if we do grant this unanimous-consent request for recess today, or whether they are going to try to adjourn sine die tomorrow. I think any practical-thinking man, whether it is so-called leadership or not, knows that we are not going to have a quorum here on New Year's Eve, and we are not going to reconvene on the first day of 1971—a Federal legal holiday—nor Saturday nor Sunday, and the Constitution states that we will adjourn sine die at noon on Sunday.

I think it is time that we got on with the job and let these men dangle, and I would be constrained to object unless we so do.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Missouri has used two Latin phrases—"quo vadis" and "sine die." It is in an effort to accomplish the latter that I make this request.

Mr. HALL. Yes, but if the gentleman will yield further, what we want to know is when.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not have control of the time. The majority leader does not have control of the entire legislative process on both sides of the Capitol.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could advise those of us who are not going to the funeral tomorrow whether or not, if the House reconvenes at 7 o'clock, there is any intention of trying to adjourn at that time sine die, or are we going to be brought back here next Saturday?

I would think many Members would want to get away tomorrow if there is not going to be any subsequent business to conduct after 7 o'clock tomorrow evening.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the House is always in control of the question of adjournment. As for me, if we made it 7 o'clock tomorrow night, and there is business that we can do that will speed the sine die ad-

jourment, I would be willing to stay here and do it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again, please?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I say this with some reluctance. I have personal plans, as everybody else does, but to me it is far, far more important that the House maintain its position of an equal or coequal body with that of the U.S. Senate. I, for one, regardless of any personal plans that I might have, will stay here until January 3, at 12 o'clock noon, rather than capitulate to a small handful of individuals at the other end of the Capitol. I think this ought to be on the record and I suspect many people in this body today feel equally as strong as I do. We are not going to let a handful of individuals dictate to the House of Representatives when the House has expressed itself on a number of issues, in the traditional legislative way, and has done its job. We should not let some individuals at the other end of the Capitol, because they think they have us over the barrel timewise, overthrow judgments and decisions that the House of Representatives has made in the proper course of action. I happen to believe it may be necessary for us to be here until 12 noon January 3, unless they understand what the cold hard facts of life are.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield once more?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, we have obtained no assurance of any plan for a sine die adjournment. What we have heard is a lot of fancy talk on the one hand about the other body that are keeping Congress on tenterhooks, and at the same time talk about the need of public trust if we are needed to individually stay here. This is not necessarily true.

There is a technique for adjourning the Congress, and when the distinguished majority leader says we are only one party to it, this may be true, but it has been done before, and it can be done again, and I cite the closing of this House in the session of the 86th Congress in 1959, as an example, where we simply say that we have done our work, and we are closing up shop and the other side can do it or not, and "so long." This can be done, and it should have been done a long time ago. It is just as effective a way of showing these dilators over there, that they cannot keep the entire Congress on tenterhooks, while tearing down the good name of the Congress in the minds of the people, as is the method of letting us be constitutionally adjourned on Sunday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that was not done when a Defense appropriation bill was in conference, and it was not done at a time when a social security matter had not been disposed of. This matter of adjourning at this particular time is entirely different from the case the gentleman cites, in which there was left open only one matter of any consequence, and it had been for all intents and purposes resolved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, now getting back to the business at hand—and putting first things first—may I ask the schedule for the remainder of this afternoon and tonight if a recess is authorized?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. We have a few unanimous-consent requests. We have not had the 1-minute rule yet. We have a conference report on a bill that is ready to be taken up this afternoon, the so-called potato research bill.

Mr. GROSS. One conference report?

Mr. ALBERT. One conference report is now ready.

Mr. GROSS. Would the distinguished majority leader amend his request to provide that the recess end no later than midnight tonight, so we might have some idea of where we stand?

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to give the Speaker the power to protect the Members who go to the funeral tomorrow. That is all I want for tomorrow. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. All right. Then why not come in at noon, hold a pro forma session and recess until 7 o'clock tomorrow evening?

Mr. ALBERT. That, I think, is more or less what will be done.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot quite absorb that qualification of more or less. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

RETURN TO SENATE OF H.R. 14984,
PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY
JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE
MISSISSIPPI SIOUX INDIANS, TO-
GETHER WITH ALL ACCOMPANY-
ING PAPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) laid before the House the following request from the Senate of the United States:

DECEMBER 28, 1970.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 14984) entitled "An Act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142, 359-363, and for other purposes", together with all accompanying papers.

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senate.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 20, not voting 177, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—235

Abbott	Frey	Perkins
Abernethy	Fulton, Pa.	Pettis
Adams	Fuqua	Philbin
Addabbo	Galifianakis	Pike
Albert	Garmatz	Podell
Alexander	Gaydos	Poff
Anderson, Ill.	Gonzalez	Preyer, N.C.
Anderson, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	Price, Ill.
Annunzio	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Arends	Gude	Pucinski
Ashley	Hamilton	Quie
Ayres	Hammer-	Quillen
Barrett	schmidt	Rees
Beall, Md.	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Bell, Calif.	Harrington	Rhodes
Bennett	Harsha	Roberts
Betts	Hastings	Robison
Bevill	Hathaway	Rodino
Blester	Hawkins	Roe
Blackburn	Hays	Rogers, Colo.
Blanton	Hechler, W. Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Blatnik	Helstoski	Roth
Boggs	Hogan	Roybal
Boland	Horton	Ruth
Bolling	Hunt	Ryan
Brademas	Hutchinson	St Germain
Brinkley	Ichord	Satterfield
Brooks	Jacobs	Schadeberg
Broomfield	Johnson, Calif.	Scheuer
Brotzman	Jonas	Schneebeli
Brown, Mich.	Jones, N.C.	Schwengel
Broyhill, Va.	Kastenmeier	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Kazen	Shriver
Burke, Mass.	Kee	Sikes
Burleson, Tex.	Keith	Sisk
Bush	King	Skubitz
Byrne, Pa.	Kluczynski	Slack
Byrnes, Wis.	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Cabell	Kuykendall	Smith, N.Y.
Carey	Kyros	Springer
Carney	Latta	Stafford
Carter	Leggett	Stanton
Cederberg	Lennon	Steed
Chamberlain	Long, Md.	Steele
Chappell	Lukens	Stephens
Clark	McCloskey	Stratton
Clay	McDade	Stubblefield
Conable	McFall	Stuckey
Conte	McMillan	Symington
Corman	Macdonald,	Taylor
Coughlin	Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Crane	MacGregor	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Cunningham	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Daniel, Va.	Mailliard	Tunney
Daniels, N.J.	Marsh	Udall
Davis, Wis.	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Dent	Mayne	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	Meeds	Vanik
Dickinson	Melcher	Vigorito
Dingell	Mikva	Waldie
Donohue	Miller, Ohio	Wampler
Dorn	Mills	Ware
Duiski	Minish	White
Duncan	Mink	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Mizell	Whitten
Feighan	Mollohan	Widnall
Findley	Monagan	Wiggins
Fisher	Morgan	Williams
Flood	Morse	Wilson, Bob
Flowers	Natcher	Wilson,
Flynt	Nedzi	Charles H.
Foley	Nelsen	Wolff
Foreman	Nichols	Wyllie
Forsythe	Nix	Wyman
Fountain	Obey	Yates
Fraser	O'Hara	Young
Frelinghuysen	Olsen	Zablocki
	Patten	Zwach
	Pelly	

NAYS—20

Ashbrook	Dennis	Landgrebe
Bow	Goodling	McClure
Bray	Gross	Passman
Brown, Ohio	Hall	Rarick
Camp	Hansen, Idaho	Schmitz
Collins, Tex.	Harvey	Steiger, Wis.
Dellenback	Kyl	

NOT VOTING—177

Adair	Blaggi	Button
Anderson, Calif.	Bingham	Caffery
Andrews, Ala.	Brasco	Casey
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brock	Celler
Aspinall	Brown, Calif.	Chisholm
Baring	Broyhill, N.C.	Clancy
Belcher	Buchanan	Clausen,
Berry	Burlison, Mo.	Don H.
	Burton, Calif.	Clawson, Del
	Burton, Utah	Cleveland

Cohelan	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Collier	Hébert	Pickle
Collins, Ill.	Heckler, Mass.	Pirnie
Colmer	Henderson	Poage
Conyers	Hicks	Pollock
Corbett	Holifield	Powell
Cowger	Hosmer	Price, Tex.
Cramer	Howard	Purcell
Daddario	Hull	Railsback
Davis, Ga.	Hungate	Randall
de la Garza	Jarman	Reid, Ill.
Delaney	Johnson, Pa.	Reifel
Denney	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Devine	Jones, Tenn.	Riegle
Diggs	Karath	Rooney, N.Y.
Dowdy	Kleppe	Rooney, Pa.
Downing	Landrum	Rosenthal
Dwyer	Langen	Rostenkowski
Eckhardt	Lloyd	Roudebush
Edmondson	Long, La.	Russelot
Edwards, Ala.	Lowenstein	Ruppe
Edwards, Calif.	Lujan	Sandman
Edwards, La.	McCarthy	Saylor
Eilberg	McClory	Scherle
Erlenborn	McCulloch	Sebelius
Esch	McDonald,	Shipley
Evans, Colo.	Mich.	Smith, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	McEwen	Snyder
Fallon	McKneally	Staggers
Farbstein	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Fascell	Martin	Stokes
Fish	Mathias	Sullivan
Ford,	May	Taft
William D.	Meskill	Talcott
Friedel	Michel	Thompson, Ga.
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	Tiernan
Gallagher	Minshall	Ullman
Gettys	Mize	Waggonner
Glaimo	Montgomery	Watson
Gibbons	Moorhead	Watts
Gilbert	Morton	Weicker
Goldwater	Mosher	Whalen
Gray	Moss	Whalley
Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.	Winn
Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.	Wold
Grover	Myers	Wright
Gubser	O'Konski	Wyatt
Hagan	O'Neal, Ga.	Wydler
Haley	O'Neill, Mass.	Yatron
Halpern	Ottinger	Zion
Hanna	Patman	

So the request of the Senate was agreed to.

Messrs. GOODLING and McCLURE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER S. 4268,
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK, EXPAN-
SION OF EXPORT TRADE

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 4268) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman be good enough to explain why you wish to remove the Export-Import Bank from the provisions of the Expenditures Control Act?

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this has been a proposal advanced by the Bank and the administration.

Mr. GROSS. What administration, if I may ask?

Mr. ASHLEY. The current administration.

Mr. GROSS. The current administration of what?

Mr. ASHLEY. By President Nixon's administration, which currently holds office.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Now I understand what he means by administration.

Mr. ASHLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, what was the remainder of the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. Why do you wish at this time to remove the Export-Import Bank from the provisions of the Expenditures Control Act?

Mr. ASHLEY. If this is not done, let me say to the gentleman, if this measure is not adopted the lending activities of the Export-Import Bank will be very substantially curtailed, and this will have a very adverse effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position, and indeed on our entire export trade effort.

Mr. GROSS. Where are the reports to substantiate the gentleman's contention that the administration supports this provision?

Mr. ASHLEY. The reason, let me say to the gentleman from Iowa, that the bill is being considered under this procedure, is that the measure has been adopted by the other body, but has not been considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and therefore there are no reports that have been received by the House committee from the various agencies and departments. There have been reports, of course, received by the other body which I can describe to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the contrary, the Comptroller General says, reading from a communication from Mr. Staats:

We expressed our strong reservation with respect to legislation which would establish a precedent for removing lending operations from the budget totals and from further expenditure limitations which may be established by the Congress.

The obvious alternative to S. 4268 would be the submission by the executive branch of an amendment to the Expenditure Limitation Act to increase the lending operations of the Bank for fiscal year 1971.

In other words, the Comptroller General of the United States says that in effect the proposition before us now is a backdoor operation and if the Export-Import Bank wants to be removed from the provisions of the Expenditures Control Act, the proper thing to do is to come through the front door to the Congress with an amendment to that act. I thoroughly agree with the Comptroller General and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

INCREASING AMOUNT ALLOWED FOR PURCHASE OF SPECIALLY EQUIPPED AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 370)

to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, and to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—AUTOMOBILE ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Disabled Veterans' and Servicemen's Automobile Assistance Act of 1970".

SEC. 102. Chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

Chapter 39.—AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Sec.

"1901. Definitions.

"1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment.

"1903. Limitations on assistance.

"§ 1901. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible person' means—

"(A) any veteran entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title for any of the disabilities described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) below, if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by any other active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty:

"(i) The loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

"(ii) The loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

"(iii) The permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye; or

"(B) any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who is suffering from any disability described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) of clause (A) of this paragraph if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by any other active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty.

"(2) The term 'World War II' includes, in the case of any eligible person, any period of continuous service performed by him after December 31, 1946, and before July 26, 1947, if such period began before January 1, 1947.

"§ 1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment

"(a) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to each eligible person by paying the total purchase price of the automobile or other conveyance or \$3,000, whichever is the lesser, to the seller from whom the eligible person is purchasing under a sales agreement between the seller and the eligible person.

"(b) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide each eligible person the adaptive equipment deemed necessary to insure that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and so as to satisfy the applicable standards of licensure established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

"(c) In accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, the Administrator shall (1) repair, replace, or reinstall adaptive equipment deemed necessary for the operation of an automobile or other conveyance acquired in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and (2) provide, repair, replace, or reinstall such adaptive equipment for any automobile or other conveyance which an eligible person may subsequently have acquired.

"(d) If an eligible person cannot qualify to operate an automobile or other conveyance, the Administrator shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to such person, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, if the automobile or other conveyance is to be operated for the eligible person by another person.

"§ 1903. Limitations on assistance

"(a) No eligible person shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this chapter, and no payment shall be made under this chapter for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of an automobile or other conveyance.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 1902 of this title, no eligible person shall be provided an automobile or other conveyance under this chapter until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator, in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe, that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will satisfy the applicable standards of licensure to operate the automobile or other conveyance established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

"(c) An eligible person shall not be entitled to adaptive equipment under this chapter for more than one automobile or other conveyance at any one time.

"(d) Adaptive equipment shall not be provided under this chapter unless it conforms to minimum standards of safety and quality prescribed by the Administrator."

TITLE II—FLIGHT TRAINING AND FARM COOPERATIVE TRAINING

SEC. 201. Section 1677 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) (1) In any case in which a veteran wishes to pursue a course in flight training under this section but does not possess a valid private pilot's license and has not satisfactorily completed the number of hours of flight instruction required for a private pilot's license, the Administrator is authorized to make a direct loan to such veteran to pursue the flight training required for a private pilot's license.

"(2) Loans made under this subsection may be made in any amount not exceeding \$1,000 or 90 per centum of the established charges for tuition and fees which similarly circumstanced non-veterans enrolled in the same flight training course are required to pay, whichever amount is less; and such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Administrator, but not to exceed 6 per centum per annum.

"(3) Loans made under this section shall be repayable in equal monthly installments over a period of time not to exceed three years commencing—

"(A) upon the failure of the eligible veteran to obtain a private pilot's license within one year after the loan is made,

"(B) upon the failure of the eligible veteran to enter upon a course of training under subsection (a) of this section within one year after obtaining a private pilot's license,

"(C) upon failure to complete satisfactorily such a course of training within eighteen months after enrollment in a course of training under subsection (a) of this section, or

"(D) one year after the veteran has completed his course of training under subsection (a) of this section.

"(4) Loans made under this section shall be made upon such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

Sec. 202. (a) Section 1682(d) of title 38, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) An eligible veteran who is enrolled in a 'farm cooperative' training program which provides for institutional and on-farm training and which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be eligible to receive an educational assistance allowance as follows: \$141 per month if he has no dependents; \$167 per month if he has one dependent; \$192 per month if he has two dependents; and \$10 per month for each dependent in excess of two.

"(2) The State approving agency may approve a farm cooperative training course when it satisfies the following requirements

"(A) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment; and the course provides for not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, at least fifty hours of which shall be on a farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm or establishment each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veterans' institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(B) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of

the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(C) The farm or other agricultural establishment on which the veteran is to receive his supervised work experience shall be of a size and character which will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group instruction part of the course.

"(D) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(E) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted; but any veteran enrolled in a farm cooperative course under section 1682 (d) of title 38, United States Code, prior to such effective date may continue in such course to the end of the current academic year under the same terms and conditions that were in effect prior to the effective date of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I do request the gentleman to give us a brief explanation of what is proposed to be done.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this particular bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 370, as passed by the House on June 15, 1970 authorized an increase in the amount allowed by the Veterans' Administration for the purchase of an automobile from \$1,600 to \$2,500 for those veterans who have lost, or lost the use of one or both hands; one or both feet; or who are blind to a prescribed degree and provided that the injury or the disease causing the disability was in

line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty. It also extended the same assistance to those who have remained on active duty in the Armed Forces.

The Senate, in passing its version of the bill on September 25, increased the amount to \$3,000; provided for the issuance, as they are needed, of adaptive equipment on automobiles which are now purchased from private funds for veterans in this category; liberalized the eligibility requirements; and added a section authorizing a liberalization of the flight training program and resumption of on-the-farm training under the Vietnam GI bill of rights on the basis which was in effect during the Korean war.

The proposed compromise which I am offering today, as an amendment to the action of the Senate:

Sets the amount of money available at a compromise amount of \$2,800 for the purchase of a car;

Keeps the eligibility requirements of the Senate bill;

Accepts the furnishings of adaptive equipment for veterans in this category;

Disagrees to the inclusion of any language on on-the-farm training and flight training. These latter two subjects were rejected by the conferees when Public Law 91-219 was enacted.

The cost of the bill as it passed the House was approximately \$3.3 million; as passed by the Senate the cost was \$20 million; the substitute proposed today is approximately \$7.2 million—\$5.6 for the car cost and \$1.6 for adaptive equipment.

In accordance with an agreement which I had with the senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Senate conferees, on the bill which became Public Law 91-219, hearings have been held before the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on on-the-farm training. No other action has as of this date been taken.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the suggested House compromise is reasonable and equitable and I hope that the other body will speedily agree to this action.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks in the RECORD a comparative print of H.R. 370 showing the text of the bill as passed by the House on June 15, as passed by the Senate on September 25 and the proposed compromise.

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

There was no objection.

The comparative print follows:

COMPARATIVE PRINT H.R. 370

AS PASSED HOUSE (JUNE 25, 1970)

AS PASSED SENATE (SEPTEMBER 25, 1970)

SUGGESTED HOUSE COMPROMISE

TITLE I—AUTOMOBILE ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Disabled Veterans' and Servicemen's Automobile Assistance Act of 1970".

That this Act may be cited as the "Disabled Veterans' and Servicemen's Automobile Assistance Act of 1970".

That sections 1901, 1902, and 1903 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "\$1,600" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof, "\$2,500".

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

Sec. 102. Chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

COMPARATIVE PRINT H.R. 370—Continued

AS PASSED HOUSE (JUNE 25, 1970)—continued

"§ 1906. Assistance for certain persons on active duty

"The Administrator, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall make the benefits provided for under this chapter available to any person who, on or after the effective date of this section, is (1) on full-time active duty in the Armed Forces (not including active duty for training), and (2) suffering from any disability described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1901(a) of this title if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during any period of war or service specified in section 1901 of this title."

(b) Section 1904 of such title is amended by striking out "No veteran" and inserting in lieu thereof "No veteran or person eligible under section 1906 of this title".

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 39 of such title is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"1906. Assistance for certain persons on active duty."

AS PASSED SENATE (SEPTEMBER 25, 1970)—CON.

"Chapter 39.—AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Sec.

"1901. Definitions.

"1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment.

"1903. Limitations on assistance.

SUGGESTED HOUSE COMPROMISE—continued

"Chapter 39.—AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Sec.

"1901. Definitions.

"1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment.

"1903. Limitations on assistance.

"§ 1901. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible person' means—

"(A) any veteran entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title for any of the disabilities described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) below, if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by any other active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty:

"(i) The loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

"(ii) the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

"(iii) The permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye; or

"(B) any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who is suffering from any disability described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) of clause (A) of this paragraph if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by any other active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty.

"(2) The term 'World War II' includes, in the case of any eligible person, any period of continuous service performed by him after December 31, 1946, and before July 26, 1947, if such period began before January 1, 1947.

"§ 1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment

"(a) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to each eligible person by paying the total purchase price of the automobile or

"§ 1901. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible person' means—

"(A) any veteran entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title for any of the disabilities described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) below, if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II or the Korean conflict; or if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty:

"(i) The loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

"(ii) the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

"(iii) The permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye; or

"(B) any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who is suffering from any disability described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) of clause (A) of this paragraph if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by any other active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty.

"(2) The term 'World War II' includes, in the case of any eligible person, any period of continuous service performed by him after December 31, 1946, and before July 26, 1947, if such period began before January 1, 1947.

"§ 1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment

"(a) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to each eligible person by paying the total purchase price of the automobile or

COMPARATIVE PRINT H.R. 370—Continued

AS PASSED HOUSE (JUNE 25, 1970)—continued

AS PASSED SENATE (SEPTEMBER 25, 1970)—CON.

SUGGESTED HOUSE COMPROMISE—continued

other conveyance or \$3,000, whichever is the lesser, to the seller from whom the eligible person is purchasing under a sales agreement between the seller and the eligible person.

other conveyance or \$2,800, whichever is the lesser, to the seller from whom the eligible person is purchasing under a sales agreement between the seller and the eligible person.

"(b) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide each eligible person the adaptive equipment deemed necessary to insure that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and so as to satisfy the applicable standards of licensure established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

"(b) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide each eligible person the adaptive equipment deemed necessary to insure that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and so as to satisfy the applicable standards of licensure established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

"(c) In accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, the Administrator shall (1) repair, replace, or reinstall adaptive equipment deemed necessary for the operation of an automobile or other conveyance acquired in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and (2) provide, repair, replace, or reinstall such adaptive equipment for any automobile or other conveyance which an eligible person may subsequently have acquired.

"(c) In accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, the Administrator shall (1) repair, replace, or reinstall adaptive equipment deemed necessary for the operation of an automobile or other conveyance acquired in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and (2) provide, repair, replace, or reinstall such adaptive equipment for any automobile or other conveyance which an eligible person may subsequently have acquired.

"(d) If an eligible person cannot qualify to operate an automobile or other conveyance, the Administrator shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to such person, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, if the automobile or other conveyance is to be operated for the eligible person by another person.

"(d) If an eligible person cannot qualify to operate an automobile or other conveyance, the Administrator shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to such person, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, if the automobile or other conveyance is to be operated for the eligible person by another person.

"§ 1903. Limitations on assistance

"§ 1903. Limitations on assistance

"(a) No eligible person shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this chapter, and no payment shall be made under this chapter for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of an automobile or other conveyance.

"(a) No eligible person shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this chapter, and no payment shall be made under this chapter for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of an automobile or other conveyance.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 1902 of this title, no eligible person shall be provided an automobile or other conveyance under this chapter until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator, in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe, that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will satisfy the applicable standards of licensure to operate the automobile or other conveyance established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 1902 of this title, no eligible person shall be provided an automobile or other conveyance under this chapter until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator, in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe, that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will satisfy the applicable standards of licensure to operate the automobile or other conveyance established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

"(c) An eligible person shall not be entitled to adaptive equipment under this chapter for more than one automobile or other conveyance at any one time.

"(c) An eligible person shall not be entitled to adaptive equipment under this chapter for more than one automobile or other conveyance at any one time.

"(d) Adaptive equipment shall not be provided under this chapter unless it conforms to minimum standards of safety and quality prescribed by the Administrator."

"(d) Adaptive equipment shall not be provided under this chapter unless it conforms to minimum standards of safety and quality prescribed by the Administrator."

TITLE II—FLIGHT TRAINING AND FARM COOPERATIVE TRAINING

SEC. 201. Section 1677 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

(b) The analysis of title 38, United States Code, and the analysis of part III thereof, are each amended by striking out

"(c) (1) In any case in which a veteran wishes to pursue a course in flight training under this section but does not possess a valid private pilot's license and has not satisfactorily completed the number of hours of flight instruction required for a private pilot's license, the Administrator is authorized to make a direct loan to such veteran to pursue the flight training required for a private pilot's license.

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans ----- 1901"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(2) Loans made under this subsection may be made in any amount not exceeding \$1,000 or 90 per centum of the established charges for tuition and fees which similarly circumstanced non-veterans enrolled in the same flight training course are required to pay, whichever amount is less; and such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the

"39. Automobiles and Adaptive Equipment for Certain Disabled Veterans and Members of the Armed Forces ----- 1901".

AS PASSED HOUSE (JUNE 25, 1970)—continued

AS PASSED SENATE (SEPTEMBER 25, 1970)—CON.

SUGGESTED HOUSE COMPROMISE—continued

Administrator, but not to exceed 6 per centum per annum.

"(3) Loans made under this section shall be repayable in equal monthly installments over a period of time not to exceed three years commencing—

"(A) upon the failure of the eligible veteran to obtain a private pilot's license within one year after the loan is made,

"(B) upon the failure of the eligible veteran to enter upon a course of training under subsection (a) of this section within one year after obtaining a private pilot's license,

"(C) upon failure to complete satisfactorily such a course of training within eighteen months after enrollment in a course of training under subsection (a) of this section, or

"(D) one year after the veteran has completed his course of training under subsection (a) of this section.

"(4) Loans made under this section shall be made upon such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

SEC. 202. (a) Section 1682(d) of title 38, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) An eligible veteran who is enrolled in a 'farm cooperative' training program which provides for institutional and on-farm training and which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be eligible to receive an educational assistance allowance as follows: \$141 per month if he has no dependents; \$167 per month if he has one dependent; \$192 per month if he has two dependents; and \$10 per month for each dependent in excess of two.

"(2) The State approving agency may approve a farm cooperative training course when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(A) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment; and the course provides for not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, at least fifty hours of which shall be on a farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm or establishment each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veterans' institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(B) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(C) The farm or other agricultural establishment on which the veteran is to receive his supervised work experience shall be of a size and character which will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply the major

Faint, illegible text bleed-through from the reverse side of the page, appearing as mirrored bleed-through.

Faint, illegible text bleed-through from the reverse side of the page, appearing as mirrored bleed-through.

portion of the farm practices taught in the group instruction part of the course.

"(D) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(E) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted; but any veteran enrolled in a farm cooperative course under section 1682(d) of title 38, United States Code, prior to such effective date may continue in such course to the end of the current academic year under the same terms and conditions that were in effect prior to the effective date of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty and to Vietnam era veterans, and to provide for provision and replacement of adaptive equipment and continuing repair, maintenance, and installation thereof, and to amend chapter 34 of such title to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make loans to veterans to help meet the expenses of obtaining a private pilot's license where such veterans intend to pursue a flight training program under such chapter and to improve the farm cooperative training program authorized under such chapter, and for other purposes."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty, and to provide for provision and replacement of adaptive equipment and continuing repair, maintenance and installation thereof."

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would point out that the suggested compromise would save about \$12 billion. It does have my approval. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Disabled Veterans' and Servicemen's Automobile Assistance Act of 1970".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Chapter 39.—AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Sec.

"1901. Definitions.

"1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment.

"1903. Limitations on assistance.

"§ 1901. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible person' means—

"(A) any veteran entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title for any of the

disabilities described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) below, if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II or the Korean conflict; or if the disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty:

"(i) The loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

"(ii) The loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

"(iii) The permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye; or

"(B) any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who is suffering from any disability described in subclause (i), (ii), or (iii) of clause (A) of this paragraph if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by any other active military, naval, or air service performed after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty.

"(2) The term 'World War II' includes, in the case of any eligible person, any period of continuous service performed by him after December 31, 1946, and before July 26, 1947, if such period began before January 1, 1947.

"§ 1902. Assistance for providing automobile and adaptive equipment.

(a) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance to each eligible person by paying the total purchase price of the automobile or other conveyance or \$2,800, whichever is the lesser, to the seller from whom the eligible person is purchasing under a sales agreement between the seller and the eligible person.

(b) The Administrator, under regulations which he shall prescribe, shall provide each eligible person the adaptive equipment deemed necessary to insure that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and so as to satisfy the applicable standards of licensure established by the State of his residency or other proper licensing authority.

(c) In accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, the Administrator shall (1) repair, replace, or reinstall adaptive equipment deemed necessary for the operation of an automobile or other conveyance acquired in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and (2) provide, repair, replace, or reinstall such adaptive equipment for any automobile or other conveyance which an eligible person may subsequently have acquired.

(d) If an eligible person cannot qualify to operate an automobile or other conveyance, the Administrator shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other con-

veyance to such person, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, if the automobile or other conveyance is to be operated for the eligible person by another person.

"§ 1903. Limitations on assistance

"(a) No eligible person shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this chapter, and no payment shall be made under this chapter for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of an automobile or other conveyance.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 1902 of this title, no eligible person shall be provided an automobile or other conveyance under this chapter until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator, in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe, that the eligible person will be able to operate the automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will satisfy the applicable standards of licensure to operate the automobile or other conveyance established by the State of his residing or other proper licensing authority.

"(c) An eligible person shall not be entitled to adaptive equipment under this chapter for more than one automobile or other conveyance at any one time.

"(d) Adaptive equipment shall not be provided under this chapter unless it conforms to minimum standards of safety and quality prescribed by the Administrator."

(b) The analysis of title 38, United States Code, and the analysis of part III thereof, are each amended by striking out

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans ----- 1901"

and inserting in lieu thereof:
 "39. Automobiles and Adaptive Equipment for Certain Disabled Veterans and Members of the Armed Forces ----- 1901".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the title of the bill, with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the title of the bill, insert the following: "An Act to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty, and to provide for provision and replacement of adaptive equipment and continuing repair, maintenance, and installation thereof."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendments, as amended, were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1181,
 POTATO AND OTHER COMMODITY
 PROMOTION PROGRAMS**

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1181) to provide authority for promotion programs for milk, tomatoes, and potatoes, and to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended, to provide for the extension of restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported raisins, olives, and prunes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the gentleman proposes to take time to inform the House as to what transpired in the conference with respect to this bill?

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I intend to take time to explain the result of the conference.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 21, 1970.)

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference between the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate on House bill 18884 and the Senate bill currently before the House, S. 1181, resulted in unanimous agreement on the part of the managers. The House-passed bill contained four titles, Title I authorized certain advertising and promotion amendments to existing marketing orders for milk. The title authorized such amendments only after the usual hearings and vote by producers.

Title II of the House-passed bill was designed to give general authority for other marketing orders to be amended to include provisions for advertising and promotion under circumstances to those applying to milk in title I.

I might say the reason the Committee on Agriculture asked for general authority for amendments to all marketing orders for advertising and promotion was the belief on the part of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and the majority of the committee that the House had been perhaps occupied unnecessarily with individual bills calling for the amendment of one particular marketing order or another. The principle of allowing marketing orders to be amended for advertising and promotion seemed to be valid for all commodities if valid for any. So it was our desire

to save the time of the Congress and of this body by authorizing general legislation.

A third title of the House-passed bill was a section dealing with the potato research and promotion program. This was different from the other titles in that it did not deal with existing marketing orders, but with authority for a special national program. Such a program would set up a national referendum and approval by commercial potato growers to assess themselves 1 cent a hundred-weight for the purpose of developing research and promotion programs, including advertising, to advance the use of potatoes as a food.

This title is similar in content and character to the cotton research program which was passed in the 90th Congress. Title III provided an opportunity for any potato grower who was a commercial potato grower to obtain a full and prompt refund if he desired not to participate in the program.

The final title of the House-passed bill, title IV, dealt with certain restrictions on the imports of prunes, olives, and raisins where existing marketing orders in the United States set standards of grade and quality. It would prohibit the import of a foreign product of this kind unless it met the same standards of grade and quality which is required under U.S. marketing orders.

When the House and Senate managers met, the Senate bill included a potato research section which also included an amendment for marketing orders pertaining to tomatoes, providing programs for research and promotion. The result of the conference was that the House receded on title II, general authority, and accepted the addition of a tomato program rather than the general legislation which dealt with all commodities. The decision of the managers on the part of both bodies was unanimous. The conference was concluded promptly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of these programs is to allow producers to aid themselves by utilizing machinery to provide self-imposed assessments for the purpose of advancing the product they grow and sell. It is in my judgment very difficult to understand how anyone could seriously oppose this kind of interest on the part of American producers of commodities that are not price supported and do not have other extensive Department of Agriculture programs available to them.

We had testimony before the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations of the Committee on Agriculture, which indicated very strong support for these programs on the part of producers. I hope the House will express equally strong support for the conference report this afternoon.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me the customary half of the time?

Mr. FOLEY. I regret that I neglected to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California 30 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I shall not use the full 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct one misstatement. For some reason which is not entirely clear to me one of the Republican conferees did not sign the conference report. It was not I. I approve of this program. This is a self-help type of operation applicable to commodities which do not participate in the subsidy and control big farm agricultural programs which are so very costly.

I, however, thoroughly approve of the settlement made, the agreement in the conference, and I strongly recommend to my colleagues that they do approve the recommended conference report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe the record should be further corrected and we should mention that the gentleman who did not sign the conference report is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture (Mr. BELCHER).

This potato salad bill has been around here too long. I want to point out to the House, as I pointed out before, that originally the potato section of the bill was defeated on November 12, 1969. An attempt has been made to improve it by adding a lot of other commodities, a lot of other ingredients.

As I stated before, this bill could have been sweetened by adding honey. Why we did not add honey I do not know at this time. The honey people want the same privileges these other commodity groups want, but for some unknown reason honey was eliminated.

I would point out again, as I have pointed out to the House before, in this bill we are definitely opening a Pandora's box.

This thing has got to grow. There can be no other way. If we do this for one commodity group we have to do it for every farm commodity group.

I am not at all certain that the Department of Agriculture is not overstuffed at the present time. I recall someone facetiously introduced an amendment on the floor of the House several years ago saying that the Department of Agriculture could not have more employees than there were farmers in the United States, and I am not at all certain we are not approaching that stage right now.

If we are going to continue to give the Department of Agriculture more and more to do, we are going to overburden the Department.

There are a lot of things I could say on this bill, but time is not going to permit me to do that. I do wish to read a few things from the report, which Members of the House probably do not know or have not read.

I realize the olive section has been sweetened to a certain extent. I do not know whether they did it with olive oil or whether they did it with honey, but it has been sweetened to a certain extent.

Let me read from the report:

There is thus no need for new restrictions on imported olives.

In addition, the proposed amendment would cause difficulties in our relations with Spain. Spain is the principal source of

United States imports of olives and potentially would be the country most affected by the proposed legislation. In recent years Spain has consistently supplied more than 90 percent of total United States imports and has been very sensitive to efforts to interfere with this trade. The Spanish Embassy has made repeated and strong representations to officials of the Department of State not only against the proposed amendment but also against other pending legislation which would substantially increase the duty applying to imports packed in small airtight containers. The Embassy has noted that domestically produced olives are not directly comparable with olives imported from Spain, that during the Kennedy Round negotiations the United States agreed to bind the existing duties on imports of olives from Spain in return for concessions granted by the Spanish Government, and that any decision on the part of the United States Government to limit, by whatever means, imports of olives from Spain would be regarded by that country as an unfair measure against established trade and as a violation of an international agreement.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for raising these questions about the conference report and to state my own reservations about it and my intention to vote against it; also to state that it is very clear that this conference report does not have the enthusiastic endorsement of all farm organizations. In fact, I think the gentleman can verify that the largest farm organization in the United States, the American Farm Bureau Federation, does, indeed, very strongly oppose this conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I have been around here a long time, and I fail to remember any piece of farm legislation that had the enthusiastic support of all farm organizations.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from California for just a brief time.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman has raised the question about the olives. I simply want to make it clear, as I am sure others do, that we did adopt an amendment that would exempt the Spanish-style green olives, and that did remove the objections of the Spanish Government to this bill. The writing of this amendment was participated in by representatives of the Spanish Olive Association, and, therefore, they actually said to us that they no longer had any objection whatsoever to the bill as written in regard to olives.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman will remember that I stated that the olive section was improved slightly, but, as I understand it, there are still objections from the Spanish Government.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is not the information that their representatives gave to us, that upon the adoption of that particular amendment it removed

their objection. If they have any such objection, I have not heard of it. I want to make it clear that that is the case.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois, although my time is very limited.

Mr. FINDLEY. Well, perhaps we have cleared up the attitude as to Spanish green olives, but what about the interest of the non-Spanish nongreen olives? Should we not give some thought to their interests in this field?

Mr. GOODLING. I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is using a lot of my time, but I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. I shall undertake to get the gentleman additional time.

But let me say here, of course, it is my understanding that as Members of Congress we are concerned with American agriculture, American producers, and American commodities and American consumers. If we are more concerned about Spanish growers and farmers, then, OK, let us lay it on the table. We grow a lot of olives in this country, and certainly this bill does tend to give additional protection to the American olive industry. I do not think there is any question about that.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on raisins, also, if I have the time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I shall yield additional time to the gentleman. How much time does the gentleman feel he will require?

Mr. GOODLING. Three additional minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman an additional 3½ minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman from California.

As I said, I was going to say a few words about the raisin industry, but I shall not do that because I know I will not have time.

I want to say that in my opinion this conference report should be defeated, and I hope it will be defeated.

We also have the potato checkoff provision, and this bill imposes a dairy checkoff plan which is even worse than the potato section. At least, the potato provision does provide for a lot of refunding. However, the dairy section does not.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in order to correct the record, I think the gentleman might like to recognize the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), who is also seeking recognition, offered an amendment adopted by the House which would provide for a refund to any dairy producer who desires it, and his amendment provides for a speedy and prompt refund—I am not quoting the language ex-

actly, but the amendment provides for an easy and uncomplicated refunding procedure.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) may have reference to the original bill which did not have the refund provision, but as the conference report comes back to the House it does include the language of the amendment I offered in the House. It was included in the bill passed by the other body.

I believe, may I say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, that the milk section of this conference report is in good shape, and I hope it will be supported.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. I now recall that the amendment was adopted.

The gentleman will not say that all milk-producing sections are in favor of this bill, will he?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, I cannot speak for all milk-producing sections. I know that in the State of Wisconsin there is widespread support for this, and on the part of the National Milk Producers Federation, which does support the conference report.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the milk provision is truly a voluntary system where producers who do not want to go along can very easily avoid contributing, then it might also be said that this very same type of voluntary system could be set up yesterday, today or tomorrow without the benefit of this legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. That is correct, and let me say that as to the dairy section it provides for block voting. The individual dairyman does not have a voice in this, his co-op will do the voting. That, to my way of thinking, would not be a very desirable procedure.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct in that block voting, as is the pattern and the practice under the present law, will be applicable in this section.

As the gentleman knows, I tried to get this changed by an amendment to prevent block voting that was defeated here in the House. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I know of his strong feelings on this subject, that even with the block voting concept, with the refund we can protect the dairy farmer so that if he does not wish to participate he can get his money back in a prompt and reasonable manner.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, most of the States have a voluntary program of checkoff for the advertising of dairy

products. Many years ago in our State, the State of Minnesota, we started out with a plan using a State appropriation which was later paid back, and we have the voluntary program going now, and I believe most of the States have copied this plan. Now I am a little fearful of the fact that this type of legislation would destroy the voluntary programs that are already in operation and if it can be provided that a producer can get out if he wishes, then why get in, if we do have a voluntary program going? So I am just a little fearful of what this might do to what we already have. I want to be assured that plans such as Minnesota developed can continue.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If this is going to cost the taxpayers any money, and if you people representing the farm areas cannot agree, what are we city folks going to do?

Mr. GOODLING. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. I was thinking of that, and was going to mention it.

It will definitely cost the taxpayers a considerable amount of money, and that is one of my serious objections to this bill. The potato people themselves expect to collect about \$2 million, probably more, and I think that the potato growers of the United States should be willing to pick up the tab for administering the program, yet they refuse to do that.

We had a referendum in our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and it was defeated because they simply are looking for a handout. I want the farmers themselves to have some interest in this. As I say, it will cost a considerable amount of money. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that, for the potato section alone, the administrative costs per year would probably be in the neighborhood of \$90,000 to \$100,000, and that is a sizable sum of money. You multiply that by the other commodity groups, and you are going to run into a large-size figure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) that the division among farm groups may not be as widespread and as serious as it may appear to them.

This bill came out of our committee with a vote of approximately 25 to 5.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report and hope it is adopted.

I specifically want to address myself to two points that were raised during the discussion on this as it relates to the milk section. Quite frankly, I have no deep abiding interest in tomatoes or potatoes and I assume that those provisions are acceptable to Members who have these products in their area. But I do have an interest in the milk section.

No. 1—I want to respond to some of the things that have been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and that which was addressed by the gentleman from Minnesota.

There is a provision in the conference report which is on page 1 which does provide:

Provision may be made in the order to exempt, or allow suitable adjustments or credits in connection with, milk on which a mandatory checkoff for advertising or marketing research is required under the authority of any State law.

This, it seems to me, is proper protection for the Minnesota plan or for that matter the plan that may be voted on in Wisconsin in the very near future.

What we are saying, as I understand it, and the gentleman from Washington can correct me if I am wrong, is in an order provided by the Secretary, provision can be made to credit the mandatory State checkoff plan funds toward the requirement of the order, if it is the Chicago order, for example, for research so that there is a method of insuring the Wisconsin or the Minnesota dairy farmer is not checked off twice in the order area. Am I correct?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Washington for that response.

I might also say that with the provision for the refund, I believe the dairy farmers across the country can be served and not have this work against what they view as their best interest. I do think there is need for additional promotion of dairy products and I think this is a method which insures that there is a means of collecting the funds that are necessary and yet provides protection for the dairy farmer—if he does not want to participate—so he can get a refund.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House adopt the conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out about the true cost to the taxpayers of this bill which, as we heard a few moments ago, would be zero.

It is my understanding that a couple of years ago the Department of Agriculture stated that it would cost approximately \$325,000 for the potato referendum. It would also cost some \$80,000 to \$160,000 per year to maintain the program.

Can the gentleman explain how many producers would benefit from the program on the basis that we do have 2.1 percent of the farms reporting potato production, producing 81 percent of the potatoes.

Mr. FOLEY. I cannot give the gentleman a precise figure as to how many potato growers there are in the United States that produce more than 5 acres of potatoes. I will seek that information for the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me for a comment while we are looking up that information?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I have a question as to the cost to the taxpayers. Is it still anticipated that the cost would be \$325,000 for the referendum?

Mr. FOLEY. No. The testimony of the Department of Agriculture was that it would be approximately \$325,000 for the referendum if it were necessary to set up actual polling places in a local county office and so on, and an additional cost of \$180,000 if a suitable mail ballot could be taken and they have every reason to believe that such is feasible.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. As to the \$180,000—on that particular figure, does the Department of Agriculture have a mailing list that they could use? As I recall that was a stumbling block.

Mr. FOLEY. The Department of Agriculture stated that if a mailing list was available from the National Potato Council or some other agricultural organization, it would cost approximately \$180,000, for a mail referendum.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. But we have no guarantee on that at the present time, is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. I cannot speak for the Department, but I have had no information that indicates that the Department doubts that a mail ballot is feasible.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Will the cost of this bill, the 1 cent per hundredweight, be passed on to the consumer?

Mr. FOLEY. The market for potatoes is not tightly controlled, as the gentleman may know. I see no reason to believe that the assessment will be passed on to the consumer. I believe it would not be passed on, but would be borne by the cooperating producers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I appreciate the time for the purpose of attempting to find out how many producers would be affected by the legislation.

Mr. FOLEY. I cannot advise the gentleman precisely how many farmers would be involved in a referendum but I am sure the numbers would be in the tens of thousands.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 40, noes 28.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 159, noes 93, not voting 180, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—159

Abbutt	Gonzalez	Pike
Abernethy	Green, Oreg.	Podell
Adams	Griffin	Preyer, N.C.
Albert	Hamilton	Price, Ill.
Alexander	Hammer-	Pryor, Ark.
Anderson,	schmidt	Pucinski
Tenn.	Hanley	Quie
Annunzio	Hansen, Idaho	Rees
Ashley	Hansen, Wash.	Rhodes
Barrett	Harrington	Roberts
Bell, Calif.	Hathaway	Rodino
Bennett	Hawkins	Roe
Bevill	Hays	Rogers, Colo.
Blanton	Helstoski	Rogers, Fla.
Blatnik	Horton	Roybal
Boggs	Ichord	Ruth
Boland	Jacobs	St Germain
Bolling	Johnson, Calif.	Shriver
Brademas	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Brinkley	Jones, N.C.	Sisk
Brooks	Kastanmeter	Skubitz
Brotzman	Kazen	Slack
Broyhill, Va.	Kee	Smith, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Kluczynski	Stafford
Burleson, Tex.	Kyros	Stanton
Bush	Leggett	Steed
Byrne, Pa.	Lennon	Steiger, Wis.
Cabell	Lukens	Stephens
Carney	McCloskey	Stubblefield
Chappell	McClure	Stuckey
Conte	McFall	Symington
Corman	McMillan	Taylor
Culver	Macdonald,	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Daniels, N.J.	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Dingell	Matsunaga	Tiernan
Donohue	Meeds	Tunney
Dorn	Melcher	Udall
Downing	Mikva	Van Deerlin
Dulski	Mills	Vigorito
Feighan	Mink	Waidle
Fisher	Mollohan	Wampler
Flood	Monagan	White
Flowers	Morgan	Whitehurst
Flynt	Natcher	Whitten
Foley	Nelsen	Wiggins
Fountain	Nix	Williams
Fraser	Obey	Wilson,
Frey	Olsen	Charles H.
Fuqua	Passman	Young
Gallianakis	Patten	Zablocki
Gallagher	Perkins	Zwack
Garmatz	Pettis	
Gaydos	Philbin	

NAYS—93

Addabbo	Ford, Gerald R.	Mizell
Anderson, Ill.	Forsythe	Morse
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Nedzi
Ashbrook	Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara
Ayres	Goodling	Pelly
Betts	Gross	Poff
Blester	Gude	Quillen
Bow	Hall	Rarick
Bray	Halpern	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Harsha	Robison
Brown, Ohio	Harvey	Roth
Burke, Fla.	Hastings	Ryan
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler, W. Va.	Satterfield
Camp	Hogan	Scheuer
Carey	Hunt	Schmitz
Carter	Hutchinson	Schneebell
Cederberg	Jonas	Schwengel
Chamberlain	Keith	Scott
Collins, Tex.	King	Smith, Iowa
Conable	Koch	Springer
Conyers	Kyl	Steele
Coughlin	Landgrebe	Stratton
Crane	Latta	Taft
Davis, Wis.	Long, Md.	Vander Jagt
Dellenback	McDade	Vanik
Dennis	MacGregor	Widnall
Derwinski	Mailliard	Wilson, Bob
Dickinson	Marsh	Wolf
Duncan	Mayne	Wylie
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Wyman
Findley	Minish	Yates

NOT VOTING—180

Adair	Beall, Md.	Broomfield
Anderson,	Belcher	Brown, Calif.
Calif.	Berry	Broyhill, N.C.
Andrews, Ala.	Blaggi	Buchanan
Andrews,	Bingham	Burlison, Mo.
N. Dak.	Blackburn	Burton, Calif.
Aspinall	Brasco	Burton, Utah
Baring	Brock	Button

Caffery	Griffiths	O'Neill, Mass.
Casey	Grover	Ottinger
Celler	Gubser	Patman
Chisholm	Hagan	Pepper
Clancy	Haley	Pickle
Clark	Hanna	Pirnie
Clausen,	Hébert	Poage
Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Pollock
Clawson, Del	Henderson	Powell
Clay	Hicks	Price, Tex.
Cleveland	Hollifield	Price,
Cohelan	Hosmer	Purcell
Collier	Howard	Rallsback
Collins, Ill.	Hull	Randall
Colmer	Hungate	Reid, Ill.
Corbett	Jarman	Reifel
Cowger	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
Cramer	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cunningham	Karath	Rooney, Pa.
Daddario	Kleppe	Rosenthal
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Landrum	Roudebush
Delaney	Langen	Russelot
Denney	Lloyd	Ruppe
Devine	Long, La.	Sandman
Diggs	Lowenstein	Saylor
Dowdy	Lujan	Schadeberg
Dwyer	McCarthy	Scherle
Eckhardt	McClary	Sebelius
Edmondson	McCulloch	Shibley
Edwards, Ala.	McDonald,	Smith, Calif.
Edwards, Calif.	Mich.	Snyder
Edwards, La.	McEwen	Staggers
Elberg	McKneally	Steiger, Ariz.
Erlenborn	Mann	Stokes
Esch	Martin	Sullivan
Evans, Colo.	Mathias	Talcott
Evins, Tenn.	May	Thompson, Ga.
Fallon	Meskill	Ullman
Farbstein	Michel	Waggonner
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Ware
Fish	Minshall	Watson
Ford,	Mize	Watts
William D.	Montgomery	Weicker
Foreman	Moorhead	Whalen
Friedel	Morton	Whalley
Fulton, Tenn.	Mosher	Winn
Gettys	Moss	Wold
Gialmo	Murphy, Ill.	Wright
Gibbons	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
Gilbert	Myers	Wyder
Goldwater	Nichols	Yatron
Gray	O'Konski	Zion
Green, Pa.	O'Neal, Ga.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Blaggi against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ottinger against. Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Bingham against. Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Clay against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Diggs against. Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Gilbert against.

Mr. Edwards of California for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Lowenstein against.

Mr. Ellberg for, with Mr. McCarthy against. Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Stokes against. Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Sandman against.

Mr. Snyder for, with Mrs. Dwyer against. Mr. Blackburn for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Wydler for, with Mr. Goldwater against.

Mr. Thompson of Georgia for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Clawson of Delaware against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Cowger against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Grover against.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Ware against.

Mr. Casey for, with Mr. Scherle against.

Mr. Fascell for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Ruppe against.

Mr. Randall for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Rousselot for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Myers for, with Mr. Winn against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Sebelius against.

Mr. Burlison of Missouri for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Pirnie against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Montgomery for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Gialmo against.

Mr. Hogan for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Mosher against.

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Wold against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Zion against.

Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Whalley against.

Mr. de la Garza for, with Mr. Whalen against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Steiger of Arizona against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Riegle against.

Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mrs. Reid of Illinois against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Rallsback against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Pollock against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Mize against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Minshall against.

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Yatron for, with Mr. McDonald of Michigan against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Lujan against.

Mr. Mann for, with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Erlenborn against.

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Fish against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mr. Denney against.

Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Wyatt for, with Mr. Beall of Maryland against.

Mr. Evans of Colorado for, with Mr. Adair against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Button.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Langen.
Mr. Collins of Illinois with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Purcell with Mrs. May.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Welcker with Mr. Roudsbush.

CXVI—2758—Part 33

Messrs. SCHWENGEL, BURKE of Florida, and VANDER JAGT changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by Mrs. Rivers to advise the House that memorial services will be held at the Washington Cathedral at 1 p.m., Wednesday, December 30, 1970, for the late Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS. Services will be conducted by the Reverend Dr. C. Leslie Glenn, canon of the Washington Cathedral.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1626, REGULATING PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FUQUA filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1626) to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1798)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1626), to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House No. 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
DON FUQUA,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 1626), to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first House amendment, not included in the Senate bill, struck the entire section 17 of the Senate bill (S. 1626) and inserted

new language which incorporates by reference the provisions of the District of Columbia Code (Title 14, Sec. 307) relating to the confidential relationship of doctor and patient and making the protections as to testimony applicable to the practice of psychology. The Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment, and agreed to the same.

House amendments No. 2 and No. 3 added a new section (Section 20), which amended Section 5 of the Act of May 28, 1924 (D.C. Code, title 2, Sec. 505), enlarging the authority of the Board of Optometry of the District of Columbia, and renumbered the appropriate sections of S. 1626. The House receded from its amendments No. 2 and No. 3, and the Senate agreed to the same.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
DON FUQUA,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 1626) to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same conference report that was just filed for printing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. It has to do with the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia?

Mr. FUQUA. If the gentleman is addressing his question to me; yes, sir. It has already passed the House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Florida who asked this unanimous consent, what are the changes in the bill as it passed the House, made in the other body?

Mr. FUQUA. In response to the gentleman, if he will yield, there have been two amendments. One amendment was added to the bill in the House which related to the practice of optometry. That has been deleted. The House changed the provision relating to the patient-client relationship similar to that which doctors and lawyers have. These are the only two changes made in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I request of the distinguished gentleman, that he elaborate a bit more on that last change. Is the gentleman speaking of the doctor-patient confidential relationship as applied to psychologists and patients and, if so, is it still in the bill, or is it out?

Mr. FUQUA. It is still in the bill. It is just modified to conform to the present District of Columbia Code as it relates to patient-doctor relationships.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation.

I have no objection to considering the conference report, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I think I have just explained the bill in response to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, are there any other amendments to this bill?

It is not being used as a rider for other nongermane amendments?

Mr. FUQUA. There are no other amendments to the bill, and certainly there are no nongermane amendments to the subject we are discussing.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 19172) to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities to develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning and local programs to detect and treat incidents of such poisoning, to establish a Federal demonstration and research program to study the extent of the lead-based paint poisoning problem and the methods available for lead-based paint removal, and to prohibit future use of lead-based paint in Federal or federally-assisted construction or rehabilitation, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act".

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR THE DETECTION AND TREATMENT OF LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

GRANTS FOR LOCAL DETECTION AND TREATMENT OF LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter referred to in this title as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to units of general local government in any State for the purpose of assisting such units in developing and carrying out local programs to detect and treat incidents of lead-based paint poisoning.

(b) The amounts of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of developing and carrying out a local program, as approved by the Secretary, during a period of three years.

(c) A local program should include—

(1) educational programs intended to communicate the health danger and prevalence of lead-based paint poisoning among children of inner city areas, to parents, educators, and local health officials;

(2) development and carrying out of intensive community testing programs designed to detect incidents of lead-based paint poisoning among community residents, and to insure prompt medical treatment for such afflicted individuals;

(3) development and carrying out of intensive followup programs to insure that identified cases of leadbased paint poisoning are protected against further exposure to lead-based paints in their living environment; and

(4) any other actions which will reduce or eliminate lead-based paint poisoning.

(d) Each local program shall afford opportunities for employing the residents of communities or neighborhoods affected by lead-based paint poisoning, and for providing appropriate training, education, and any information which may be necessary to inform such residents of opportunities for employment in lead-based paint poisoning elimination programs.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

SEC. 201. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to units of general local government in any State for the purpose of assisting such units in developing and carrying out programs that identify those areas that present a high risk to the health of residents because of the presence of lead-based paints on interior surfaces, and then to develop and carry out programs to eliminate the hazards of lead-based paint poisoning.

(a) A local program should include:

(1) development and carrying out of comprehensive testing programs to detect the presence of lead-based paints on surfaces of residential housing;

(2) the development and carrying out of a comprehensive program requiring the prompt elimination of lead-based paints from all interior surfaces, porches, and exterior surfaces to which children may be commonly exposed, of residential housing on which lead-based paints have been used as a surface covering, including those surfaces on which non-lead-based paints have been used to cover surfaces to which lead-based paints were previously applied; and

(3) any other actions which will reduce or eliminate lead-based paint poisoning.

(b) Each such program shall—

(1) be consistent with workable programs for community improvement referred to in section 101, and

(2) afford, to the maximum extent feasible, opportunities for employing the residents of communities or neighborhoods affected by lead-based paint poisoning, and for providing appropriate training, education, and any information which may be necessary to inform such residents of opportunities for employment in lead-based paint elimination programs.

TITLE III—FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 301. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop and carry out a demonstration and research program to determine the nature and extent of the problem of lead-based paint poisoning in the United States, particularly in urban areas, and the methods by which lead-based paint can most effectively be removed from interior surfaces, porches, and exterior surfaces to which children may be commonly exposed, of residential housing. Within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a full and complete report of his findings and recommendations as developed pursuant to such

program, together with a statement of any legislation which should be enacted, and any changes in existing law which should be made, in order to carry out such recommendations.

TITLE IV—PROHIBITION AGAINST FUTURE USE OF LEAD-BASED PAINT

PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF LEAD-BASED PAINT IN FUTURE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take such steps and impose such conditions as may be necessary or appropriate to prohibit the use of lead-based paint in all Federal construction and rehabilitation, after the date of the enactment of this Act, of any residential building or dwelling, with Federal assistance in any form.

TITLE V—GENERAL

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 501. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "units of general local government" means (A) any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State, (B) and combination of units of general local government in one or more States, (C) an Indian tribe, or (D) with respect to lead-based paint poisoning elimination activities in their urban areas, the territories and possessions of the United States; and

(3) the term "lead-based paint" means any paint containing more than 1 per centum lead by weight (calculated as lead metal) in the total non-volatile content of liquid paints or in the dried film of paint already applied.

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SEC. 502. In carrying out the authority under this Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate with and seek the advice of the heads of any other departments or agencies regarding any programs under their respective responsibilities which are related to, or would be affected by, such authority.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 503. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of title I of this Act not to exceed \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of title II of this Act not to exceed \$13,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of title III of this Act not to exceed \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(d) Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation Acts; and any amounts authorized for the fiscal year 1971 but not appropriated may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1972. Any amounts authorized for the fiscal years 1971 and 1972 but not appropriated may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1973.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I believe it requires unanimous consent for consideration of this, because there are no copies available and so forth—I wonder if, under my reservation, the gentleman would undertake to explain whether or not the Sen-

ate amendments are germane and whether or not there are any other Senate additions to the House-passed bill than those read by the Clerk?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would inform the gentleman that there are no nongermane amendments in this bill. There is a difference in the amount of money from that in the House bill.

Mr. HALL. What is the difference?

Mr. BARRETT. There are no nongermane items in it at all.

Mr. HALL. If I understand the gentleman's statement, Mr. Speaker, all additions by the other body are germane to the original House-passed document.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Second, I will ask the gentleman, what is the addition to the cost to the taxpayers in the bill we have before us by unanimous consent, against that which left the House?

Mr. BARRETT. I would be glad to inform the gentleman that the House passed the bill for \$15 million a year for 2 years, and the Senate bill is \$25 million for 3 years.

Mr. HALL. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if I understand this correctly, the other body has more than doubled this so far as the import of the bill is concerned. They have added on a 1-year extension to the time. The gentleman asks us to accept this by unanimous consent; is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, when would this bill, if enacted into law, expire?

Mr. BARRETT. This is a 3-year bill.

Mr. HALL. Actually what happened was that the other body took the House-passed bill and struck out all after the enacting clause and substituted its own verbiage.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. And this involves an increase from \$30 million for 2 years to \$75 million for 3 years?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct. Or at the rate of \$25 million a year instead of \$15 million a year?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a real question involved here. This is the question of Federal priority or not. Everyone knows and agrees that anything that can be done in the way of demonstration projects, in the way of educating the public, and in the way of making doctors available for children who eat lead paint off the windowsill or peel off and devour little impregnations of the wallpaper or toys, that something should be done. But there is the real question as to whether such federally sponsored legislation can ever take the place of proper parental control and training in the home or the responsibilities of the communities and municipalities and, yes, even the counties and the States.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure that this is a Federal problem. If it is, then the stamina of parental care and training has certainly deteriorated. I would decry us letting it deteriorate more by taking on the burden at the Federal level. It has been proved time and time again

that when we take these burdens on federally there is a lack of responsibility locally.

For that reason I certainly do not feel that we should take this up by unanimous consent, but I would point out that it should be debated. We should have time to see the printed measure, the substitution of the other body for this bill, and, therefore, I am constrained to object.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me inform the gentleman that we had this bill before the Housing Subcommittee. We had hearings on it. The Surgeon General has stated that this is a very, very serious situation all over the country and he has informed us that action to attack this problem should be escalated because of increased number of lead poisoning in children and the brain damage to those who manage to survive. In our hearings we learned that 200 children die each year from lead poisoning. Thousands and thousands of them were affected by brain damage and retardation from ingesting lead paint. We passed this bill in the House here after much debate on October 13. It was passed unanimously. The bill went to the Senate and they had stricken all after the enacting clause and inserted their language, which is almost verbatim. Let me point out here, that most of the provisions in the Senate bill are the same as the House passed earlier this year. The only difference in the bill as it comes back here is the difference between \$60 million and their \$75 million, which involves so many people in so many areas very badly.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman mentioned the difference as being between \$60 million and \$75 million. The difference is between the figure of \$30 million and \$75 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is correct. The difference between \$30 million and \$75 million.

Mr. HALL. That is quite a difference.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says is undoubtedly true. I am sure that the Surgeon General, whose job is to protect the health of all the people of the United States, if he can, would of necessity point this out. But the gentleman knows we have had over 50,000 car accidents on interstate highways alone last year. This is much more of a Federal problem, in my opinion, because these are interstate and defense highways, than the question of children nibbling paint from the windowsill in their home. Certainly anything that can be done in the way of a pilot program I would be for, but I do not see how it is a Federal problem and why we should, without debate and by unanimous consent, accept the bill of the other body which is dawdling on eulogies over there today, rather than passing the necessary appropriation legislation leading toward a sine die adjournment—problems which are truly Federal problems and problems of our Government insofar as its operations are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I think this comes at a very poor time and, indeed, there is a question as to

whether or not it is a Federal responsibility. There are funds which are provided to the National Institutes of Health and should be if nibbling on paint constitutes a Federal problem. I believe the problem could be handled "inhouse." However, it seems to me that every State could preclude the use of soluble lead or absorptive lead from the use of toys. This is probably their bailiwick and prerogative.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I certainly would not want to debate the medical aspects of this. I know the doctor's experience along this line. I was convinced the other day after hearing him debate that he is qualified in surgery, and I want to point out, as he certainly knows, where a child contracts brain damage or retardation by ingesting lead paint and that child is sent into an institution it costs that local governments and the Federal Government \$250,000 for the care of that child over its lifetime and the child is never restored to normalcy.

This is one of the most humanitarian bills that ever came to this floor. The gentleman states that this is a local problem. It is and many local governments have ongoing programs, but they need Federal assistance to meet the great increase in lead paint poisoning in little children. I am certainly sure, and I think the gentleman knows it, if the local governments were financially able to carry out this program without any financial aid from the Federal Government, I would not be arguing for this bill on the floor.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have never known the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania to bring other than the most humanitarian bills out onto the floor of this Congress for passage. And I will say he is very adept in slipping the expenditure of the taxpayers' money through the Congress, whether it be for buses or whether it be for the sucklings of lead or whatnot. I happen to believe we should be smart enough to leave adequate tax funds in the local communities, primarily, instead of draining it all off to the overly indebted Federal Treasury. Be that as it may, the responsibility is not with the Federal Government, and with the drain on the taxpayers' money without the process of debate and due process, so that all sides of the problem can be learned in the House, I therefore do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS AT ANY TIME TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time today for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what may we look forward to? Is there any indication from across the Capitol that the other body is

doing anything but eulogizing departing and retiring Members? What is taking place? What is the latest report?

Mr. ALBERT. The only information that I have, the only valid information I can give the gentleman, if he will yield further, is that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has indicated that it would not be long before they would be ready to bring before the House the Department of Defense appropriation bill conference report.

Also the conferees are reportedly going to conference within the next few moments on the foreign aid appropriation bill. I do not know whether they will get that back in time for tonight or not, but we do expect the Department of Defense appropriation bill back. That is the largest of all the bills, and I think it would be worth taking a recess if we would thus be able to adopt that conference report tonight.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's request was until what hour tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. At any time today, but I will give the gentleman assurance that the House will not be called back after 10 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. After 10 o'clock tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. After 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. GROSS. That would be a nice, round hour to be called back.

Mr. ALBERT. It will not be after that.

Mr. GROSS. It will not be after that?

Mr. ALBERT. No; we would not call back the House after that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is some slight consolation. But what do we do in the meantime if we do not get any business from the other body?

Mr. ALBERT. Some of us might sign our mail.

Mr. GROSS. I have already done that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is always ahead of everybody else.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman think of anything else I might be able to do?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman might take a nap.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend that most of the time the benches in the lounges are full and overflowing with Members taking naps.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this means, then, perhaps any time up until midnight tonight, if that is considered today; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. I will give the gentleman assurances, and I am sure the Speaker will back me up in this, that the House will not be called back into session after 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. GROSS. And the distinguished majority leader thinks that we should wait?

Mr. ALBERT. I think we must wait.

Mr. GROSS. We should sit and wait for the other body to perform?

Mr. ALBERT. We are waiting on our own conferees to get their report prepared now.

Mr. GROSS. I see. And this is for today only, and until midnight tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. But hopefully not after 10 o'clock?

Mr. ALBERT. Certainly we will not be called back after 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. GROSS. But we might be in session until 12 if we became tied up on something here?

Mr. ALBERT. If all the other Members of the House, including the gentleman from Iowa, will keep as quiet as the majority leader will be, we will be out before midnight tonight.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, I do not particularly want the distinguished majority leader to be quiet because I do enjoy hearing him from time to time.

Mr. ALBERT. I like to hear the gentleman from Iowa, too. All I am trying to say that is if we move expeditiously, we should be out of here much before 12 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that note of assurance I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I just wonder if the distinguished majority leader, who is again asking us to stand idly by clicking our heels while we wait for a few Members in the other body to dawdle us like straw puppets and do their bidding—I wonder if the gentleman would have any conjecture as to whether or not, if this permission is granted, we might adjourn sine die tomorrow evening? Because anyone with the least perception and logic would know and predict that we cannot expect Members to be here on New Year's Eve or New Year's Day or Saturday and Sunday following. I repeat my prior statement that the Constitution, as amended, requires that we go out of session at noon on Sunday.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, I cannot promise that we will be out of here by tomorrow night. But we will be taking a good portion of the day to attend the funeral. Our only purpose in making this request is to expedite our business on the House side as much as possible.

Mr. HALL. It certainly seems to me that the distinguished majority leader and the leadership of this majority-controlled House should have long since served notice on the other body that we have completed our business and are waiting only for their joint conferences and reports back to this body and that we are going to serve notice that we will adjourn over from time to time until such time as they complete their business and they had "better get with it," because this is unconscionable to continue calling Members back and to plan work on a federally recognized holiday—as long as we have waited, and especially in view of that fact that we have had our necessary appropriation bills in this body so long passed.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is certainly correct in observing that the House had passed all of the appropriation bills, initially at least, much earlier this year.

Mr. HALL. I think we would give great respite to the taxpayers of this country if we were to adjourn and go off leaving the other body dangling, instead of us dawdling.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT)?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 19172, LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 19172) to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities to develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning and local programs to detect and treat incidents of such poisoning, to establish a Federal demonstration and research program to study the extent of the lead-based paint poisoning problem and the methods available for lead-based paint removal, and to prohibit future use of lead-based paint in Federal or federally assisted construction or rehabilitation, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. BARRETT, REUSS, ASHLEY, WIDNALL, HALPERN, and STANTON.

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EMERGENCY ECONOMIC PROGRAM TO COMBAT INFLATION AND RECESSION

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today setting forth through the medium of a proposed House concurrent resolution a basic emergency economic program designed to combat the twin evils of inflation and recession.

It is clear that the administration's planned reduction in employment and production has not brought inflation under control. The cost of living has continued to rise, particularly in concentrated industries such as automobiles, machinery, and steel. At the same time the economic slowdown has far exceeded Presidential plans. Some 12 months ago the economy operated at 84 percent of capacity and unemployment stood at 3.5 percent. Today, the economy operates at only 76 percent of capacity and unemployment has reached a startling 5.8 percent.

My own State of Connecticut has been particularly hard hit; 91,900 workers or 6.6 percent of the Connecticut labor force were without jobs in November. In Waterbury, unemployment reached 9.9 percent. Rather than deflation, the administration's planned slowdown has brought only serious unemployment.

Our task now is twofold—to bring the economy back to its full potential with a minimum of new inflation, and once at this point, to maintain stable and steady

growth without inflation. The latter is a long-term problem and must be dealt with through long-term solutions. However, the former is clearly a short-term problem and must be tackled immediately. The 4 million persons now looking for jobs, the businesses approaching bankruptcy, the hard-pressed consumers struggling to make ends meet, cannot wait for a long-range, permanent solution. They need immediate and emergency relief.

The time has come to recognize that the present economic situation requires emergency measures. My resolution provides the basic framework for a program of immediate inflation-unemployment relief. It expresses the sense of Congress that an economic emergency does indeed exist and, therefore, requires special temporary solution to achieve full economic potential without increased inflation. Such recovery demands both a rapid expansion of aggregate demand and positive measures to limit wage and price hikes during the emergency expansion period.

While increased demand can be achieved through existing institutions and available economic tools, the wage-price spiral requires a unique and novel solution. Accordingly, this resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that price and wage rates can be kept to an acceptable minimum during the emergency growth period by means of an Emergency Guidance Board, which would establish a voluntary price-wage guidance program. Such a board could, after consultation with leaders of business, labor, and consumers, establish emergency guidelines. While these guidelines would not be mandatory, nevertheless any substantial businesses planning a major price increase or any unions seeking major wage increases would be required to file an economic justification with the Board. The Guidance Board would publicize those wage and price increases which exceeded its published guidelines.

The Emergency Guidance Board, which would be a temporary creation, could thus bring substantial pressure to bear on both business and labor to achieve desirable economic results. Used properly and fairly, the Board would be an effective tool in cutting the wage-price spiral.

In the next Congress I will introduce legislation to establish the Emergency Guidance Board by law. It is my hope that the Congress will accept this board and that the President will in accordance with this legislation, ask the leaders of both business and labor to abide by the Board's guidelines during the period of emergency expansion.

This emergency guidance and growth program would, of course, not satisfy the Nation's long-term economic needs. However, it would provide desperately needed short-term relief. Our most immediate economic necessity is to increase aggregate demand and employment as quickly as possible but with minimum inflation. The Emergency Guidance Board can provide the essential wage-price stability while the economy as a whole is returned to full potential through more conventional means.

ADDITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, presumably, sometime within the next few days, if and when we ever get an opportunity to settle down to some serious business, we will vote for the third time in this session to increase social security benefits and, of course, social security taxes. I expect that I will join with most of you here in supporting that third increase.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of benefit that is very hard to oppose at any time and particularly today when our own actions here have done so much to lead to excessive spending and to thereby eroding the dollar of the pensioners.

Nevertheless, I think it may be worthwhile pointing out for future reference that in this connection, as in some others, the day of reckoning may at one time come. In 1970, the top tax paid by everybody on \$7,800 was 4.8 percent a year, which was \$374.40 a year. In 1971, it will be 5.2 percent on \$9,000 per year, which is \$468. Those who are self-employed will pay \$660.

Next year, the tax rate for both employer and employee will total 10.4 percent on incomes up to \$9,000 per year—a tax take of almost \$1,000 on a \$9,000 income. A serious question arises how long will the working people of America, of all ages, stand for this tax drain on their earnings? The whole social security system requires some careful and fundamental study.

I include with my remarks a thoughtful article from the Indianapolis Star of December 27, 1970, written by Jameson G. Campaigne and entitled "Social Security: Little for Much":

SOCIAL SECURITY: LITTLE FOR MUCH

(By James G. Campaigne)

This is the season when we are counting our blessings.

Next week will bring in a new year in which we will start counting the costs.

The Social Security tax is due to go up again. There will be increased benefits for Social Security recipients ranging from 5 per cent to 56 per cent. To them that will be a blessing. But the cost will be almost \$100 a year more for everybody else who pays Social Security taxes, and even more for the self-employed.

In 1970 the top tax paid by everybody who earned \$7,800 or more was 4.8 per cent of earnings. That comes to \$374.40 a year. In 1971 the taxes paid by working earning up to \$9,000 a year will be set at 5.2 per cent or \$468 a year. The self-employed will pay about \$660 a year as against \$538 in 1970.

In addition the House last year passed a bill that would guarantee automatic benefit increases for those getting Social Security whenever the cost of living rises by 3 per cent. With this new provision, as long as inflation continues, benefits will keep on increasing—and so will taxes.

In 1937 when the Social Security program went into effect the tax was 1 per cent of all salaries up to \$3,000 a year for both employer and employee. That was only \$30 a year each. It didn't hurt much, particularly since income taxes were also quite low at that time. Next year the tax rate will have increased five fold for both employer and employee to more than 5 per cent each, making a total of 10.4 per cent of payroll on all

incomes up to \$9,000 a year. The tax take will be almost \$1,000 on a \$9,000 income!

Of course plans are being made for further Social Security tax increases and larger benefits in the years to come. The average worker, and his employer, can expect to pay into the Social Security system far more money than he can ever get back in benefits—if he should live long enough to collect any benefits.

Coupled with automatic pay raises being proposed for all Federal government workers (the expected rate of rise is 6 per cent), with automatic increases in welfare payments to a rising number of "clients," the regular increases in the Social Security taxes will help push the total tax burden on the average citizen toward 50 per cent in the 1980s.

Social Security has become, by now, virtually indistinguishable from a welfare program. It is not an insurance program. There is more money backing up private pension programs in the U.S. than there is in the Social Security "trust fund". The truth is that income and outgo in Social Security just about balance each other. Taxes—not insurance premiums—pay the current Social Security bills.

I don't know how long the young, and middle-aged and middle-income Americans will stand for this constant drain on their earnings by the Federal government. But what does worry me is that when they find out how much they are paying for so little security, they will revolt at the polls and demand that the Social Security system be cut back drastically.

This is already happening in Great Britain where the Conservative government has the support of more than 70 per cent of the people, including union members, in its efforts to cut down the welfare state costs, and provide funds only for those in real need.

I suspect it will not be long before the same thing happens here.

NEW OUTDOOR LIGHTING SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS WITHIN THE FEDERAL TRIANGLE

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, Robert L. Kunzig, inaugurated the new outdoor lighting system for the Government buildings within the Federal Triangle.

The project, coordinated with the Fine Arts Commission and the District of Columbia government, is a pleasing and beautiful addition to the effort to enhance the appearance of the Federal City.

The General Services Administration turned to the Crouse-Hinds Co. of Syracuse, N.Y., for the variety of lighting fixtures used to illuminate the buildings. I am pleased to represent this old and progressive manufacturing firm, and I want to share with my colleagues the following press release from Crouse-Hinds which sets out in detail the lighting project.

I am also bringing to the attention of the Members a news story on the event which appeared in the Syracuse Herald Journal on December 22.

LIGHT COMES TO WASHINGTON AT NIGHT

A new outdoor lighting system that dramatically illuminates buildings within the Federal Triangle was officially inaugurated December 15th by the General Services Administration. This project is related to a

major plan to roll back the darkness in Washington and, in a sense, turn it into a city of light. Many of the important monuments and memorials have been illuminated, others are planned for the future, and a new high-intensity street lighting system is being installed.

The famous 8-block Triangle, bounded by Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues and 15th Street, is the site for the buildings which house The Federal Trade Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, The Post Office, and the departments of Labor and Commerce.

The permanent lighting system is much more than a spectacular addition to this year's holiday scene in Washington. It has transformed this section of the city into an after dark landmark for the enjoyment of visitors, residents, and Capitol workers who previously detoured the shadows in favor of better lighted areas of the city where they felt more comfortable.

The General Services Administration and the consulting engineering firm of Sanders and Thomas, Inc., Pottstown, Pa., selected a variety of six different lighting fixtures manufactured by Crouse-Hinds Company, Syracuse, N. Y., to meet the demanding requirements of hard-to-light Gothic columns, crownshaped domes, and ornate horizontal and vertical surfaces. The project was coordinated with the Fine Arts Commission and the District of Columbia government.

The objectives of the lighting program are to beautify the architectural features for night enjoyment and to reduce the crime rate in the area. Crouse-Hinds illuminating engineers benefited from their previous experience in designing and manufacturing lighting fixtures for many of the country's notable monuments and landmarks—Mount Rushmore, National Archives, Treasury Department, and the Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln Memorials.

The permanent lighting system will be virtually unnoticeable so the lighting fixtures are not obtrusive in the daytime and are also less vulnerable to vandals. Similar lighting techniques are used for each building to allow presentation of the Triangle as a totally integrated architectural design. A light level for all buildings was established to blend with the Capitol Building without detracting from it. The light reflected off the buildings onto adjacent sidewalks provides basic protective lighting around the building, and fills in shadow areas out of reach of the street lights.

To capture the texture and variety of planes in the building facades, an up-lighting technique is used in which the light tapers off near the top of the building. The darkness at the extreme top portion of the building is cut by a bank, or crown of light of higher intensity. The resulting contrast is pleasing and realistically portrays the depth and dimension given to the building by the architectural design. Free-standing columns are illuminated softly; they stand in semi-silhouette, adding strength and permanence to the appearance of the buildings.

Of the more than 1100 Crouse-Hinds lighting fixtures used in the Triangle project, approximately 900 are equipped with 400-watt metal halide lamps, the remaining with 175-watt mercury vapor lamps. The weatherproof fixtures are made of high-impact-resistant cast aluminum, and provide for quick, simple relamping.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, Dec. 22, 1970]

CROUSE-HINDS LIGHTS UP WASHINGTON (By Joseph C. Ganley)

Downtown Washington is lit up like a Christmas tree these days, and a Syracuse manufacturing firm had much to do with it. The thousands of visitors jamming the

capital this week appear to approve the new lighting of federal triangle buildings located between the White House and Capitol Hill.

The lights, more than 900 luminaries manufactured by Crouse-Hinds Co. of Syracuse, were installed on buildings in the federal triangle prior to Dec. 16 when President Nixon switched them on at the same time he lighted the national Christmas tree.

The idea of the triangle project was to beautify the architectural features of the buildings at night, transforming the area into a 24-hour landmark for visitors and residents, and at the same time provide basic protective lighting around the buildings and in shadow areas out of reach of street lights.

Buildings illuminated include the Federal Trade Commission, Internal Revenue Service, Post Office, the Departments of Labor and Commerce, the National Archives and the Justice Department. The triangle is bounded by Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues on the sides, and 15th Street at the base.

The system design, which was guided by the Fine Arts Commission, provided for hiding luminaries (an enclosed fixture which incorporates lamp, reflector, lens) so they are not noticeable in daylight, and less subject to vandalism, and use of "up-lighting" techniques to emphasize texture, an upper crown of light to convey dimension, and similar treatment of all buildings to present the Triangle as a totally integrated architectural design.

A visit to the area indicates the design is successful, bathing the buildings in a blue-gray light which sets them off and produces a pleasing visual impact—tying the structures into an overall blend with the White House, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and the Capitol.

Of the 900 luminaires used in the system, 660 are provided with 400-watt metal halide lamps, the balance with 175-watt mercury vapor lamps. Illuminating engineers from Crouse-Hinds Syracuse plant worked with the General Services Administration and other firms on the project, which cost \$355,000.

When the lights of the national Christmas tree are turned off early next year, the triangle buildings will remain lighted. They are already being hailed for their beauty, and also as a crime deterrent. The idea may spread to Syracuse.

Arthur Urlandt, Crouse-Hinds vice president in charge of Washington affairs, reported his firm is becoming the "lighting specialists of Washington." He noted the company supervised lighting recently of the Jefferson Memorial, and re-did the lighting scheme for the Lincoln Memorial.

He predicted the Washington experience would mark the beginning of a nation-wide trend to brighten downtown areas both for beauty and security. "It will keep business in downtown," he said.

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union demands the condemnation of all Americans—of the entire world community, in fact. Eleven persons—nine of them Jewish—have been convicted in a Leningrad court of the attempted hijacking of an airplane. Two have been sentenced to death, and the others to prison labor camps for 4 to 15 years. Another trial, involving some 20 more Jewish citizens accused of alleged anti-Soviet activity, is imminent.

To impose such severe sentences for an alleged crime never even committed violates common standards of justice. Hopefully, the voices of concerned men and women throughout the world have been heard, and the appeal hearing which has been scheduled for tomorrow by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation will overturn, or at least decrease the severity of, the sentences.

But the real issue—one which the just completed trial and the forthcoming trial signal—is the cultural and political oppression being visited upon Soviet Jews. For many of them, their chief desire is to emigrate—that is what is really the moving force behind these trials. In large part, this desire stems from the repression which the Soviet Government exerts against them. The trials dramatize the plight of some 3 million Soviet Jews, whose cultural heritage is being destroyed and whose desire to live as Jews is being stifled.

Soviet Jews must be freed; the Soviet Government must let those who wish to emigrate do so, and let those who wish to live as Jews, in Russia, do so.

I urge that the House of Representatives make its voice heard by passage of the resolution which I have today introduced—House Resolution 1320. This resolution is a successor to House Concurrent Resolution 30, which I introduced on the first day of the 91st Congress "to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion."

The resolution which I have introduced today condemns the religious persecution holding sway in the Soviet Union, urges the Soviet Union to permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by all within its borders, and urges that the Soviet Union allow those citizens who wish to emigrate to do so.

The repression being visited upon the Jews of Russia evokes the most terrible memories of the recent past. This time, the world must immediately make eminently clear that anti-Semitism is the foul disease of depraved minds, and that any government which cultivates or abets that disease is itself depraved.

The full text of the resolution which I have today introduced follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1320

Whereas the House of Representatives deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens and imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives condemns the persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union, urges that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by all Jews and all others within its borders, and urges that the Soviet Union allow those citizens who wish to emigrate to do so.

**A NEW POLITICAL HERITAGE—
DANIEL MOYNIHAN'S DISSERTATIONS**

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom in our time that we have the opportunity to listen and to learn and be inspired by and moved by political rhetoric. Too often the political rhetoric in recent years has been an appeal to selfish interests, sectional problems, and too often what we say will not live or be good to look back upon.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the past will reveal that statements by political leaders in critical tones have measured highly and what they have said has turned out to be good not only for their time but for all time. They had their influence for good in what they said and what they did. Our response to what they said has added to our heritage, enhanced our stature, and strengthened our character and greatness because many benefits have come from this.

Mr. Speaker, once again in our time we are privileged to learn from our own political assets, and our present political leadership and from this to get our bearings, to find our base from which we operate and serve. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the magnificent summary of 2 years with an administration, by Dr. Daniel Moynihan. He is going to be listened to as he should because of the respect he has earned among his close associates and especially the intellectual community, and most of all because of his experience as a Democrat with a Republican administration.

He will be listened to also because of the circumstances that prevailed and the place he gave us his summary. The circumstances of his retiring from the Cabinet to go back to a place where he can help explore, probe and influence the minds of preparing citizens to a great university, and the place was, of course, at the White House at a Cabinet meeting before men of great experience and stature and deep conviction. As he points out how because of the assets we have and because of who we are, America is still the hope of the world. Mr. Speaker, this speech should be read and pondered on by every American citizen of whatever political complexion, faith or belief, for it comes from a committed man, an honest man, a man of great mental ability and greater intellectual honesty.

This type of political rhetoric coming from this kind of people can help to bring a much needed stability to our time. It can reestablish our faith in the system. All this rhetoric, however, is for naught if we do not respond to it. And so respond we must in the areas where the real problems are. We must recognize that in today's world he who refuses to change, wastes his resources. Mr. Speaker, this statement, this dissertation, this eloquent reminder by Dr. Moynihan is calling us, is challenging us to change, to do better so that we can take advantage of the resources we have and not continually waste them.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to comment and to elaborate on the statement, but it speaks better for itself than anyone can speak for it. It is as Sandburg said of Lincoln:

His own words speak better than any we could say about them.

And so I join with my many colleagues and especially the gentleman from Massachusetts in a request to have the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may become a part of the RECORD and be available for reading to an estimated 60,000 people who read the RECORD, and with the hope that this may inspire and encourage others and especially those in the public service media to comment further and extensively on this magnificent political literature that now too has become part of our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked and been given permission to put the entire statement in the extensions of remarks of the RECORD where all can read this magnificent literature. A literature that will be a fine new addition to our American political heritage.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. MURPHY OF ILLINOIS ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE U.S. CONGRESS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take this special order to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Illinois, who is retiring after 12 years of service.

As BILL's close personal friend and colleague of many years, I know I speak for all of us when I say that his presence will be greatly missed in the Congress.

BILL got into politics 36 years ago, and few men have made a more substantial and outstanding contribution to government at every level, local, State, and national. His successful career reflects the highest standards of energy, integrity, ability, and concerned citizenship.

While working as an engineer draftsman for the Chicago Highway department, BILL put himself through law school. At that time the highway department was across the street from Loyola University, and BILL, besides attending school there at night, ducked out on his lunch hour to attend classes. By 1926 he had his law degree and, after being admitted to the Illinois bar the next year, he took a job as an assistant right-of-way attorney for the highway department.

When an alderman's seat on the city council opened up in 1935, BILL ran for it and was elected. I think it is a very significant sign of his outstanding character that he won in a ward where his party was in the minority by about 4 to 1.

Serving on the council until his successful race for Congress in 1958, BILL in his 24 years as alderman of the 17th ward amassed a record of leadership and progressive action that is almost unmatched. With a wide range of interests and expertise, he served at various times

as chairman of the committee on labor-management, the committee on planning, and the committee on planning and housing. He also served a term on the Chicago plan commission.

Those 24 years of dedicated service in the Chicago city government earned BILL the admiration, affection, respect, and loyalty of his constituents, who returned him to office with generous majorities in each election since his first congressional contest in 1958. This is particularly noteworthy, since when BILL started his congressional service, no Congressman had succeeded himself in his district for 18 years. In BILL, the people of the third district found a representative who had earned their absolute trust and confidence through his legislative leadership, dedicated service, and tremendous ability.

BILL is not the kind of person to seek the limelight of publicity for his accomplishments, but those of us who have worked with him over the years, his friends and colleagues in Congress, are very proud of his contribution to our Nation's foreign affairs as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs and as a member of the African Affairs Subcommittee. Very few men in Congress or in the Nation have his knowledge and understanding of the problems of the developing countries.

Virtually no one in our Government has made more friends through his intense sympathy and interest among the diplomatic representatives from Asian and African nations. The respect and admiration that BILL has earned among the foreign diplomatic community is so great that in 1 month 127 leaders of developing African nations met with him to discuss their particular problems and what the United States could do to help them. Much of his time on weekends is spent studying information on Asian or African nations, and he has become a self-taught expert on the problems, geography, and politics of Communist China.

BILL's place here can never be filled. His friends, his fellow members of the Illinois delegation, everyone who has known and worked with him, his constituents, and his many friends and admirers among the leaders and representatives of Asian and African nations are saddened greatly by his departure. But he will not be forgotten, and the record of his legislative leadership in foreign affairs will stand as a lasting tribute to his brilliant and dedicated service.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to BILL and to his devoted wife, Rose, our best wishes for abundant good health and many rich and happy years to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while I am very sorry to see my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) leave the House, I congratulate him for the dedicated service he has rendered to his district, to his State, and to our country.

During his service in the House since 1958, BILL MURPHY has served with outstanding ability and courage. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which committee considers legislation of vital concern to the foreign affairs of our country, he has shown a

keen vision of history in the making; of the ability to look into the future, which is most difficult for human beings, and to make his contribution as to the correct course for our ship of state to take. His intuition in his ability to look into the future in performing this important and sensitive duty has been remarkable.

For some years, BILL MURPHY recognized as a real statesman in thought, word, and deed.

A profound student of foreign policy and world conditions, he has been of invaluable assistance to his colleagues and to the House in giving to us the benefit of his experience, his knowledge, and his sound wisdom. Among the Members of the House, BILL MURPHY is highly respected for those rich human qualities that he possesses, and, more, because at all times he is a gentleman. He has exercised tremendous influence in conversation with Members who so frequently came to him for advice and guidance. And on many occasions, I called upon BILL MURPHY for his advice and guidance not only in matters concerning foreign affairs, but on legislation relating to our internal affairs.

For BILL MURPHY was recognized as a student across the whole pathway of government, and, in fact, life, and one who was a real supporter of progressive legislation.

One of the friendships I shall always cherish is the one that developed between BILL MURPHY and myself during our service together in the House of Representatives.

As a gentleman of high ideals and noble character, and as a legislator, he has added to the high traditions of the House of Representatives. He has contributed in a noble manner to the strength of our country internally, as well as in the fields of national defense and a firm foreign policy.

To my dear friends Congressman and Mrs. William T. Murphy, I extend my very best wishes that God will continue to bless them for many more years to come, and, in this respect, I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished Speaker in paying tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, BILL MURPHY, who is retiring from Congress this year. He is a member of the Eighty-Six Club, that rather substantial and stalwart group of Members who first came to Congress as a result of the 1958 elections, and he is now stepping down voluntarily from this Chamber. I had the privilege of coming to this Congress with BILL MURPHY in 1959, and I have enjoyed my service with him during all of these 12 years.

He came to this House as one who had spent a great deal of time in municipal government in the city of Chicago. He had been a member of the board of aldermen, so he understood city problems. Here in this body Mr. MURPHY became, as the distinguished Speaker has just reminded us, one of the most valuable and competent members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, being a very serious student of foreign affairs especially of Asia and China, and he contributed greatly to the work of that committee.

Congressman MURPHY was one of those whose experience and knowledge in world affairs had been such that he realized that this country continues to face a serious threat from communism both in Europe and in Asia, and that some of the easy clichés which have been prevalent in recent years in some circles did not really meet the needs of the preservation of our own form of government.

We are going to miss BILL MURPHY in this body, and I want to salute him for what he has done and to wish him and his lovely wife, Rose, Godspeed.

Mr. WOLFF. I should like to join the gentleman in the well in his remarks about our colleague from Illinois, BILL MURPHY.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our most distinguished Members, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY. Here is a gentleman who will be sorely missed when the 92d Congress convenes.

During the past 2 years I have been privileged to serve on the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, of which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is the chairman. I have witnessed first-hand his depth of understanding, his thoroughness, his commitment to seeking the truth and his devotion to the development of the most responsible foreign policy for this country.

I have traveled to the Far East and heard from our diplomats and the leaders of other countries of the great respect they hold for Chairman MURPHY. I have seen that respect here on the floor of the House. When Chairman MURPHY speaks we all listen, for he speaks with great wisdom and compassion.

Not only has the chairman been an excellent leader of the subcommittee, but he has been an able, responsible Congressman in all aspects of his work. His single-minded devotion to public service has given him a career spanning three decades. I consider myself fortunate to have been able to know and learn from Chairman MURPHY during the congressional phase of his multiphased career. I trust that in his retirement he will keep active and not lose his zeal for public service.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join our distinguished Speaker and the other Members of the House in paying tribute to BILL MURPHY, who is leaving the Congress. The Congress will be the poorer body because of his absence. He was a member of the 86 Club, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) said, and no man has served with greater dignity, honesty or integrity than has BILL MURPHY.

Having had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with Mr. MURPHY for some 12 years, I can say that in the various committee meetings and hearings we have had I have observed no one with a greater fund of historical knowledge or a greater fund of geographical knowledge than Mr. MURPHY. He has been able to place in context our relations with other nations and their people, to arrive at a proper perspective that was in the best interest of the United States.

BILL MURPHY has an expertise far beyond that of people professional in the field of foreign relations, and he has never failed to distinguish himself in his exchanges with professional people and the distinguished visitors and personages from other lands during the various hearings we have conducted. His knowledge impressed kings and presidents and ministers.

So, as one who has been personally very friendly with him, I have had the pleasure of his counsel, of his wise and guiding hand, since we first came to the Congress, and I can say we will deeply regret his absence. And I will miss a good friend.

BILL is a man who is a friend in all seasons and for all reasons, and I know that this House will be saddened by his absence.

I, too, wish him good health and health for his family, and hope that God will give him a lifetime to enjoy the fruits of his labors and the happiness of his family, who are so close to him and who revere him, as do his friends.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in paying tribute to our friend and colleague, Representative WILLIAM T. MURPHY. The people of the great State of Illinois have honored this House with a distinguished congressional delegation none of whom are more distinguished or more deserving of praise than our friend, BILL MURPHY.

BILL MURPHY is a valuable and respected Member of this House. He has been an able legislator and as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and more recently, the chairman of its Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, he has played an important and vital role in the legislative process as it applies to foreign policy.

I join my colleagues in saluting him and his service to his district, his State, and his Nation. I salute the citizens of Illinois's Third Congressional District for sending Representative MURPHY to Congress and I thank them for giving us the privilege and pleasure of serving with and knowing this fine gentleman. We will greatly miss him in the next Congress.

Mrs. Albert joins me in extending to Congressman MURPHY every good wish for the future.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) for his thoughtfulness in taking a special order today and affording the House an opportunity to pay tribute for his many years of public service to our colleague, WILLIAM MURPHY, who has chosen to retire at the conclusion of the 91st Congress.

WILLIAM MURPHY exemplifies the very highest tradition of public service.

As U.S. Representative from the Third Congressional District on Chicago's farthest southwest side, Mr. MURPHY has brought to his constituency a new dimension of understanding in world affairs, but at the same time, has never permitted himself to ignore the needs of his own constituency.

BILL MURPHY's career in Congress topped off an illustrious contribution to public service in which BILL MURPHY

has been associated for more than 40 years.

Before coming to Congress, BILL MURPHY gained recognition and respect as one of the most capable members of the Chicago City Council.

As a former Chicago alderman, BILL MURPHY played a key role in developing the modern face of Chicago. As chairman of the important city council zoning committee, BILL MURPHY protected the residential areas of our city, while at the same time, methodically and systematically, put together an industrial grid that has helped make Chicago the biggest industrial complex in the world.

It was his skill and knowledge that brought about a balance between the needs of industrial growth in Chicago and the retention of the city's residential communities.

Here in Congress, BILL MURPHY has distinguished himself as one of the most knowledgeable members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There is not a Member on either side of the aisle who has not had occasion to marvel at BILL MURPHY's profound knowledge of the world's geography and history.

He is a quiet individual, and his unusual calm belies the intense knowledge that he has brought to the Foreign Affairs Committee and to the House on the complexities of the world's geography.

BILL MURPHY is a scholar. He is an industrious student of history. There is not a country in the world that BILL MURPHY does not know from the very beginning of its history. It has been a rare pleasure for me to be able to listen to BILL MURPHY expound on the history, the culture, the growth, and the development of the various nations of the world.

I believe it is safe to state that BILL MURPHY has proven himself one of the most profound students of the world's makeup in Congress.

BILL MURPHY will be missed. I am consoled by the fact that his immediate plans do not call for leaving Washington. I find comfort in knowing that he will be with us in Washington and that we will be able to continue enjoying his warm friendship and wise counsel.

I join my colleagues in wishing BILL, and his lovely wife, Rose, a most pleasant retirement and may they find a never-ending source of comfort and inspiration in the knowledge that all of us here in Congress are so much wiser because we have had the great opportunity of including BILL MURPHY as our friend, our colleague, and our counselor on foreign affairs.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we salute a member of the Illinois delegation in the House who is retiring after 12 years of distinguished public service. Congressman WILLIAM MURPHY of Chicago has been an outstanding member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and in his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs he has demonstrated a concern for underdeveloped nations and for a proper balance in America's role as a world power that does credit not just to his constituents in Chicago, but to that whole group of Americans

who have a vital concern in the conduct of this country's foreign affairs. His legislative skill will be missed both in committee and here on the floor of the House. But more than that, his retirement represents a personal loss to those members of the Illinois delegation who have worked with him over the years and to his other colleagues in this House who join us now in saluting a distinguished American legislator. We wish him well and thank him for the service he has rendered.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing my regret that BILL MURPHY decided to retire and will not be with us when the new Congress convenes.

I want also to thank him for his distinguished service as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to wish him continued health and happiness during his retirement.

BILL MURPHY has served six terms on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and during the last 2 years was chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

BILL MURPHY took his responsibilities as a member of the Committee seriously. He attended meetings regularly and took an active part in questioning witnesses and in our deliberations.

In addition, he was a student of history, geography and of the migration of peoples in Asia as well as in other parts of the world. All of us benefited from his expert knowledge of these matters.

All of us who know BILL MURPHY are impressed with the breadth of his background and experience. In addition to being a member of the bar, he was a licensed professional engineer. Before coming to Congress, he served for 14 years as a member of the Chicago City Council and was a member of the Chicago Plan Commission.

Needless to say, this experience, together with his knowledge of the countries of Asia which he visited and about which he studied continually, was invaluable to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

All of us on the committee will miss him next year.

I want to pay a special tribute to BILL MURPHY and to his wife, Rose Mary, as being fine people. They embody the characteristics which all of us think of when we refer to good citizens. They have character. They stand up for their beliefs. They know the difference between right and wrong, and they are good company.

They deserve an opportunity to relax and enjoy life, and I join with all of their friends in wishing them well but I am sorry that they are leaving.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives who will retire at the end of this 91st Congress—the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Illinois.

I have known BILL MURPHY as friend and fellow member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee since he entered this body in 1958. His knowledge, his industry, his untiring work on behalf of the

people of his district and our Nation have never failed to impress me.

BILL MURPHY has been of particular assistance to me during the period when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian Affairs and he was perhaps its most active member. Indeed his interest and contributions to the efforts of the subcommittee preceded his membership on the subcommittee.

During the period from 1965 to 1969 that subcommittee conducted hearings on the Sino-Soviet conflict, U.S. policy toward China, rural development in Southeast Asia, and the future U.S. role in Asia and the Pacific. The record of those hearings has been called one of the most comprehensive treatments of Asian policy and issues of the 1960's.

Much of the credit for the success of those hearings must be given to BILL MURPHY. He has been a student of Asia, particularly of China, for several decades and he brought an interest and an expertise to the subcommittee proceedings which was invaluable to its work.

During this 91st Congress, BILL MURPHY succeeded me to the chairmanship of the Asian Affairs Subcommittee and has demonstrated in that role his continued leadership and foresight.

Only recently the subcommittee, under his direction, conducted a series of hearings on United States-China relations. Top experts from the Government and academic circles testified on relevant issues.

The printed proceedings were issued just before Christmas holidays as United States-China Relations: A Strategy for the Future, and commanded considerable attention from the press because of their importance.

It is a tribute to BILL MURPHY that, although he knew that he would be ending his career in Congress at the end of the 91st Congress, he undertook so important and so difficult an endeavor as this major series of hearings.

The document which has been produced will, I am certain, stand as a lasting tribute to his outstanding efforts in the area of foreign affairs, and particularly Asian policy.

My wife, Blanche, joins me in expressing sincere heartfelt sentiment to BILL and to his lovely wife, Rose, that their retirement will bring them many days rich with joy and fulfillment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the close of this Congress, we are again faced with the inevitable departures of dear friends and colleagues. Although over the years one comes to expect this, it does not lessen the regret that we feel.

For the last 12 years, I have enjoyed my association with BILL MURPHY. He is a dedicated American who has served his district and his Nation with distinction. Although one can recognize the many reasons that led him to retire, it does not diminish the sorrow at the departure of such an able public servant.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois retires with the knowledge of great accomplishments, a record of achievement, and the admiration of all his colleagues here in Congress. I join with them in wishing him many happy years of retirement, although I know he will

continue his active service to our Nation for many years to come.

To BILL and his lovely wife, Rose, I wish the very best for the years to come.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, BILL MURPHY is somebody that everybody will miss as a Member of Congress. His dedication to public service is a longtime thing. Anyone who knows him also knows that one way or another that lifetime of public service will continue.

But it is not just his constituents who will miss him. BILL MURPHY has touched many people in his travels through the political world. Almost without exception, the people he has reached have remembered the courtesy, the humility and the friendliness of this man.

BILL MURPHY will be missed by his colleagues here in Congress for those traits and for many more. As a freshman member of the delegation, I can personally give witness to the many acts of kindness of MURPHY of Illinois. There was never any acrimony from BILL MURPHY. There was always the gentleness of spirit which makes the term of appellation for our colleague one of real meaning. We shall all miss the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to my good friend and colleague, BILL MURPHY. At this time, I would also like to thank my fellow Chicagoan, Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO, for preparing this tribute.

I have known BILL MURPHY ever since I first became involved in politics in the early 1950's. We have worked long and hard together and shared many interesting and rewarding experiences.

BILL's years of public service to the city of Chicago span four decades. He was a member of the Chicago City Council for 24 years and during that time was the very able chairman of the city committee on planning; a position well-suited for his dual talents as both a lawyer and an engineer.

BILL and I were fortunate enough to be two of the five freshmen Congressmen that the people of Illinois chose to send to Washington in January of 1959. Since our arrival, we have all devoted our time to different interests. For example, while ROMAN PUCINSKI has spent his time working hard on the Education and Labor Committee, and I on the Committee on Ways and Means, BILL has dedicated himself to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and has risen to the chairmanship of the increasingly important Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

It has been said by several people at the Department of State, that his precise understanding of the individual problems of the countries under the domain of his subcommittee never failed to amaze the various experts that appeared before his committee. BILL was appreciated by these people for the thorough and well-briefed manner in which he approached the issues.

While our commitments here in Washington have differed in many respects, our prime concern has always been for our great city of Chicago. It has been our togetherness in the support of our city that has made our delegation so strong, and in this cohesive group, BILL MURPHY has been one of our strongest spokesmen.

The Chicago delegation, as well as, I am sure, the entire Congress, will miss BILL's presence in Washington.

On behalf of my wife, LaVerne, and myself, I would like to wish BILL and his family the very best in the years ahead.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM T. MURPHY is a political foe of mine, but I like to count him a personal friend. He served on the Chicago City Council before he came to this House, and he did so with vigor and distinction. His work in city planning—and like all cities Chicago requires great wisdom in planning—marked him as a man of considerable talent.

As a colleague in the House of Representatives, I have found him progressive in his outlook and straightforward in his associations with his fellows.

He has been a good man for Illinois and for the United States. We will miss him.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of the opportunity provided us by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) to express our appreciation for the conscientious work during the past 12 years by Congressman WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Chicago, whose voluntary retirement from Congress will deprive us of one of our outstanding experts on Asia, Africa, and the Near East as exemplified by his valuable work on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

All of us who have joined in the House in support of liberal domestic legislation and in support of the many programs instituted over the years to achieve a peaceful world have always counted on Congressman MURPHY's strong assistance and on his leadership, too.

While he will no longer be joining us in answering the bells summoning us to the House floor when the 92d Congress convenes, I am sure I reflect the views of many of my colleagues in the forthcoming Congress when I say we will always welcome his advice and counsel on legislation and hope he will let us know from time to time how he feels about those bills which carry on the work he so ably handled during his career in the House, particularly in the foreign policy fields, where his views always carried great weight with the Members of this body. My best wishes and warm regards go with Mr. MURPHY as he prepares to leave this Chamber in which he has served so well.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join in the tribute being paid to my good friend, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, upon his retirement from the Congress. In fact, BILL was my neighbor since his office was across the hall from mine.

The House is not only losing a good friend, but a capable and experienced legislator who always did what he thought was in the best interest of his constituents and the country.

We need men of BILL MURPHY's caliber at this time in our history, but I for one am sad to see him retire. But there is no doubt that BILL has served well for the 12 years he has been here and has earned the privilege to what he thinks best.

I could go on ad infinitum about BILL's accomplishments, but his record speaks for itself. I do want to wish him and his

family many years of happiness and success in any endeavors that he may pursue in the future.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, there is always regret and some sadness when one realizes that a good friend and stout-hearted colleague is retiring. I came to membership in the House with the opening of the 86th Congress in 1959, and not long after I first took the oath of office I met Congressman BILL MURPHY, a new Member from Illinois.

We shared together the beginnings of learning what a full weight of responsibilities we had undertaken. I recall very well his determination to master the workings of Congress and be in a position to serve both his country and his constituents.

I found him ever aware that in the House of Representatives we do not govern. We give voice to what we have learned from the people and transform that voice into law so that the people, in effect, govern themselves.

I thought of BILL MURPHY not long ago when Speaker McCORMACK remarked that President John F. Kennedy had the capacity to "disagree without being disagreeable." This capacity along with a belief in the essential dignity of the law-making process and a firm dedication to principle have earned him the high esteem of all who have worked with him during the past 12 years.

He has shown never a doubt of his country's aims, never a fear for his country's future, and never a question but that his role in Congress contributed to the "last best hope of mankind."

I join with many others who will miss both his rewarding personal friendship and his good counsel, but he has earned the right to enjoy the years of contentment. I wish both BILL and his gracious wife a long life in happy knowledge of a job well done and a host of friends made during their congressional years.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mixture of sadness and joy that I say farewell today to my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY), who leaves us this week after 12 years of distinguished service to the Congress, the Nation and the world.

I am sad, Mr. Speaker, for I shall miss BILL MURPHY. He came to Congress with me in 1958. I have worked next door to him in the Rayburn Building for the past 2 years. Above all, however, BILL MURPHY has been my friend.

At the same time, I am happy for him. After such a long and outstanding career, no one is more deserving of the opportunity to lay down the burdens of public life and leave them for others to assume. In our struggle to solve the problems of America and the world, he has done more than his share.

BILL MURPHY has achieved success as both a lawyer and an engineer; how many of us have had to struggle to achieve success in but one of these fields? He fought in World War I and has lived to help shape the course of world events; how many of us can say the same? Once a city councilman, he achieved the singular distinction of representing the Speaker of the House at the dedication of the Israeli Parliament in 1966; how many of us have traveled so far in life?

Perhaps BILL MURPHY's highest honor, however, comes from those of us who have been privileged to serve with him in this House over the past 12 years. We all recognize him as an able legislator, a dedicated public servant, and a gentleman in every sense of the word. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reputation BILL MURPHY has earned in Washington. He has every reason to be proud of it.

I want to wish BILL and his lovely family every possible success and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in wishing the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY, many, many years of happiness and ease as he voluntarily retires from this body. I have known BILL MURPHY for all of the 12 years that he has been in the House of Representatives and regret that he has chosen to retire. But after a lifelong career of public service BILL has well earned some leisure time. We shall miss his warmth and urbanity and even more so the integrity and capability brought to the House and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A hard-working and dedicated man, BILL MURPHY has earned the respect of all of us. We wish him, as well as his lovely wife, Rose, and fine family, Godspeed, health, and happiness over many years to come.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished Representative of the Third District of Illinois, BILL MURPHY. His departure from the Congress saddens all of us who have had the pleasure of working with him in the House and on the Foreign Affairs Committee. More important, however, his retirement will be a severe loss to the district, the State, and the country he has served so honorably since 1959.

BILL MURPHY has had a brilliant career in private and public life. A successful lawyer, he was willing to sacrifice his practice in order to devote his time and energy to public service. Whether acting as a member of the Democratic Party, as a Chicago city planner, or as chairman of the House Committee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, BILL MURPHY has proven to be a creative and devoted leader. Few men have a better claim on the respect of their peers.

The career of an elected official must ultimately be judged by his resolution of the basic conflicts of political life: the good of the party versus the good of the State, personal gain, or national security. In an area of profound confusion throughout the Republic, there was never a doubt where BILL MURPHY would stand on a troublesome issue. Time and again he came down on the side of the national good. He put his country first, and we are all the better for it.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I wish BILL and his family continued happiness in the years to come. No man deserves that happiness more than my colleague, BILL MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, BILL MURPHY and I were not only members of the 86th Congressional Club, but also for the past several years we had our Washington residence in the same apart-

ment house. Consequently, I feel that I have become much aware of his outstanding character, and qualified to share this respect with my colleagues.

My friend BILL MURPHY is a quietly effective individual. He is well read and knowledgeable on many subjects, and exhibits particular expertise in the field of foreign relations. Of particular value to those of us who have had the privilege of working with BILL here in the House of Representatives is his kind and thoughtful attitude toward his congressional friends.

To BILL and his fine wife, Rose, go our best wishes and our sincere appreciation for their many kindnesses. They shall be deeply missed.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that this time has been reserved to celebrate the distinguished service of the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY, with whom I have shared these 12 years of service in this body.

Mr. MURPHY and I came to Congress in the same year and I at once learned of his faithful and vigorous work for so many years in Chicago. They gave him a steady and sturdy grounding in the growing problems and opportunities of our great urban complexes, particularly in the fields of planning and housing.

But it was a surprise to me, as I know it must have been to many others, to become aware of his widespread interests, and particularly his understanding and familiarity with the geography and political problems of Africa, which made him a most happy choice when he became a member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa and the Near East, and showed up in his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Asia and Pacific affairs.

We have also been aware of his interest and useful service through many years on the Canada-Paris Interparliamentary Group, strengthening the ties between these two great countries.

One of the pains at leaving this House is to experience a temporary, at least, disruption in the comradeship of so many fine Members. One can hope only that it will be temporary and we extend our best wishes to Congressman MURPHY, Mrs. Murphy, and his family for many happy years in the throbbing heartland of the Midwest.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague in the Illinois delegation, BILL MURPHY, announced over a year ago that he planned to retire at the end of the 91st Congress, bringing to a voluntary conclusion a distinguished record of solid public service. That time is now upon us; I wish to commend his achievements in this body and wish him a happy and productive retirement.

Integrity, resoluteness of purpose, attention to detail, breadth of outlook, a humane spirit, and a friendly manner, these have been some of the attributes of BILL MURPHY as a Member of Congress, just as they were his characteristics during the 24 years he served as Alderman of Chicago's 17th ward.

That ward has been part of BILL's congressional district, to which he has returned at least once a month during his six terms to serve his constituents by firsthand familiarity with their needs

and opinions. He has accomplished many things as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee concerned with the complexities of Far Eastern problems. An expert on Communist China, his insight has often helped his colleagues in understanding the difficulties caused us by this Communist totalitarianism.

The members of his family, his wife Rose, his daughter, Rosemary, and his sons, William, Jr., and John, may take great and justifiable pride in BILL MURPHY's lifetime career of dedicated public service. We wish them to know that he will be greatly missed by those of us who know best his high qualities of mind and character.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, we are all happy that this session is rapidly approaching its end, but our pleasure is tempered somewhat by the realization that many of our colleagues will not be here for the 92d Congress. Among those who will not respond when the roll is called is my neighbor from Chicago, WILLIAM T. MURPHY.

Our distinguished and able colleague became a member of this body on January 3, 1959, after a successful career as a lawyer and a civil engineer. As I began my service just 2 years earlier, I have been associated with the gentleman from Illinois throughout his six terms in the House of Representatives.

During those 12 years of domestic turmoil and foreign crises, as the people's representatives labored to find solutions to the many problems that confronted our Nation, I had many opportunities to work with Congressman MURPHY. I soon became impressed with his experience, his ability, and his devotion to duty.

The gentleman from Illinois answered the call to the colors during World War I, when he was yet in his teens. Later, as he completed his interrupted education and grew into manhood, he continued to be of service, first as a member of the Chicago City Council and then as a member of this great body. He served on the council of his native city for almost a quarter of a century before assuming the even greater responsibilities of a Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, as Congressman MURPHY retires following a lifetime of dedicated service to his city, his State, and his country, my best wishes go with him. May the Good Lord continue to shower His blessings on him, his gracious wife, and his wonderful family.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in this salute to Congressman BILL MURPHY. Over the last decade, during good times and bad, BILL MURPHY has rendered outstanding service to his constituents and to this House, and he has made warm and lasting friendships which will endure his absence from this floor. I want to wish the gentleman from Illinois many happy and productive years in whatever pursuits he undertakes in his retirement.

You know there's another rising figure in the Murphy clan. Bill, Jr., a Ph. D. candidate at Princeton, headed this year a nationwide effort to elect new Democrats to the House. In the family tradition, he did a tremendous job.

As our colleague ends his fine service in this House, I wish for him and all his family all the things they would wish for themselves.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of our colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM MURPHY, after more than a decade of distinguished service in this House, represents a loss not only to this body but to the whole Nation. It is my privilege publicly to recognize his character and leadership during this period and to share in the heartfelt tribute which is his due.

Born in Chicago in 1899, he entered upon a career in law, studying nights at Loyola University, where he received his law degree in 1926. Admitted to the Illinois bar in 1927, he served as attorney in the Chicago Highway Department. In 1935 he ran for the office of alderman in the city's 17th ward, won, and was regularly reelected for 24 years. As a member of the city council, he served at different times as chairman of the committee on labor management, the committee on planning, and the committee on planning and housing; he also served a term on the Chicago Plan Commission. In 1958 he ran successfully for Congress, winning reelection consistently for 10 years.

BILL MURPHY was the first Congressman to succeed himself in his district for 18 years. His public career was a tribute to his enduring popularity among his constituents. Deeply concerned for foreign affairs, he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and Pacific Affairs and as a member of the African Subcommittee.

Here was the field in which he was able to accomplish incalculable good for America, building bridges of human association and trust across the seas, welcoming the new nations of Africa and Asia into fuller participation in the life of the world community. An expert on the problems, geography, and politics of Communist China, he has devoted time and energy to making foreign affairs relevant, informed, and vital.

I wish him; his dear wife, Rose; their two sons; their daughter; and two grandchildren all happiness. I am confident that BILL's retirement will mark a new phase in that life of service to God and country which has earned him our lasting respect, affection, and esteem.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM T. "BILL" MURPHY has served as a valued Member of this House since 1959. Prior to his election to the House, BILL served long and productively in the Chicago City Council. I know that other Members will testify to the value of that earlier segment of BILL's public career. My observations necessarily concern the several years since 1963 when I first became a House Member, was assigned to the Foreign Affairs Committee and met our esteemed colleague from Illinois. However, I recently read in the *New Republic* an essay about the Chicago political system in which BILL MURPHY has played an effective role. This analysis is a worthy addition, I believe, to this special order. I include it at the conclusion of my statement.

BILL MURPHY's constancy, his hard work, his extensive reading about and study of the world—in short, the fine ex-

ample he set for us, testify to his value as a House Member. I admire his diligence and his willingness to keep his mind open to new ideas and his willingness to consider new departures in our Nation's affairs. And while we have occasionally differed in our views on foreign policy he always exemplified a strong devotion to the Nation's security interests. For the past decade his contribution to our committee work has been an informed one and a solid one. He will be missed.

The essay follows:

[From the *New Republic*, Dec. 12, 1970]

TAKE HEART FROM THE HEARTLAND

(By Andrew M. Greeley)

"I don't like ethnic campaigning; I think it's kind of cheap."—Arthur Goldberg, candidate for governor of New York, to an audience of Italian-Americans.

"If you are humble in victory and courageous in defeat, you'll always get along in politics. Tonight is a night for great humility."—Richard J. Daley, November 4, 1970.

Both Kevin Phillips and the team of Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg are agreed that the Middle West is crucial in American politics. Whether it be called the "Heartland" or the "Quadracail," it is the "swing region" in Presidential elections; and as the elections of 1970 quickly become an unpleasant memory, one is forced to say that the heartland has moved to the left. In the massive block of America between the Ohio River and the Rocky Mountains, Democrats managed to hold almost all of their supposedly tenuous Senate seats, score most of their House gains, send a bright new liberal face to the United States Senate, and grab just about every governorship in sight.

How can this be? What happened to the silent majority? Where is the backlash? What became of the crime issue? Apparently, they've all migrated east of the Hudson River.

And, if the heartland has become liberal once again, its capital is the despised Second City on the shores of Lake Michigan. For the hated Daley Organization won what may be its greatest victory. Adlai Stevenson III now holds the Senate seat his father always wanted, having obtained 2,065,154 against his opponent's 1,519,718 votes. Two other attractive Democratic candidates—Alan Dixon, the new state treasurer, and Professor Michael Bakalis, the superintendent of public instruction—joined with Stevenson in leading the first major success for the Organization in previously solid Republican suburbs of Chicago; the Republicans find themselves with almost nothing left in Cook County, and the Democrats dominate the state legislature in Springfield for the first time in the twentieth century. Not bad at all for the last hurrah.

While Democrats and liberals in New York and Connecticut were busily engaged in committing suicide, Richard J. Daley was picking up every marble on the playground. While progressive New York was helping Mr. Agnew put James Buckley in the United States Senate, benighted, hard-hat Illinois was giving an overwhelming victory to a man whose family name symbolizes all that was supposedly dear in American liberalism. Is it possible that those who do most of the thinking and writing about American politics, who shape the issues and campaigns, who author the columns and the articles in the liberal journals have missed something critical about American politics?

One of my colleagues remarked the day after election that "of course you can elect a liberal in Illinois if his name happens to be Adlai Stevenson." Leaving aside the fact that there was a liberal called Paul Douglas and another called Charles Percy, the question remains why a name which symbolizes the "liberal permissiveness" that Mr. Agnew so

cheerfully denounced is political magic in a state supposedly dominated by the silent majority and, to use a term bandied about at a meeting of the American Sociological Association in 1968, "shanty Irish bigots"?

I am contending that the Chicago system deserves a fair investigation in the wake of November 3 to see what it may tell us about the operation of the political process. Martin Meyerson, Edward Banfield and James O. Wilson have made such investigations on the scholarly level but their investigations are systematically ignored, even by their sometime colleagues at the University of Chicago. And the journalists from the East—to say nothing of their alienated imitators from Chicago—are interested only in telling it like they knew it was before they bothered to investigate it in any depth. Let me illustrate.

An Eastern paper the day after the election wrote of a "deal" by which Stevenson agreed to support Daley candidates in return for Daley's support of his senatorial candidacy. The article added that while Stevenson had won easily, the Daley machine had not done well. The facts are that such "deals" do not exist in Chicago politics (they are not necessary), that Stevenson was a Daley candidate, and that the Daley organization had won the greatest victory in its history.

The normally fair Howard K. Smith lumped Stevenson (though not by name) with Agnew on the night before the election as an example of campaign demagoguery because Adlai wore an American flag on his lapel, emphasized the crime issue, and put a famous prosecutor on his campaign staff. The facts are that Stevenson had authored crime legislation before it was fashionable to do so and that the prosecutor in question, Thomas Aquinas Foran, receives more hate mail for prosecuting a school integration case in a Chicago suburb, indicting police for the convention disturbances, and pushing faculty integration in the public schools.

Roy Newquist, writing obviously for non-Chicagoans in *Fielding's Guide to Chicago*, observes, "the political complexion of Chicago seems to be undergoing a change. The 1968 Democratic Convention riots upset the natives more than anything else that has happened in decades and citizens of all colors are taking harsh second and third looks at the regular Democratic (or Daley) machinery." Newquist is right, of course, that the natives were upset by the convention demonstrations, but the slightest glance at the public opinion polls ought to have indicated that it was not the organization at which they were angry.

A prize-winning Chicago journalist has quoted several times a sentence from a speech of Foran's after the conspiracy trial in which the prosecutor said, "Our children are shocked when they hear us saying 'wop' and 'nigger.'" He never bothers to add that the next sentence was, "And they are right to be shocked." Nor does he point out that on racial and economic matters Foran has always been a liberal. Indeed, one of the most fascinating interludes of the campaign was Foran—an impressive TV personality—upstaging Jesse Jackson on a TV talk show with ploys like, "I agree with you completely, Reverend Jackson, but I'd want to go further and take an even more radical stand."

A New Yorker once observed to me, "Everyone knows that Julius Hoffman is the most corrupt judge who ever bought a seat on the bench from Dick Daley." Hoffman is a Republican appointed by Dwight Eisenhower before Daley was mayor of Chicago, and judgeships are not "bought" in Chicago. They are frequently a reward for loyalty, but Chicago has no monopoly on this method of judicial selection.

The ordinary explanation for the "Machine's" triumphs implies that in part the votes are bought or stolen, and that in part

they are cast by a patronage army. One gets the picture of vast, unthinking Slavic hordes marching in tight discipline to the polls. The facts are that you cannot steal or buy a half-million votes, and that the patronage army is tiny compared to the size of the city. Furthermore, the black and Slavic voters of Chicago are no less intelligent than voters elsewhere. The blacks have had alternative candidates to the Daley candidates and have, with one or two exceptions, soundly rejected them. Nor are the Polish voters who overwhelmingly endorsed Adlai Stevenson unaware of his racial stand. To explain the Organization's ability to get more than three-fourths of the Polish vote and three-fourths of the black vote in terms of fraud, fear, and theft is to turn the voters of Chicago into dull, stereotypical automatons. Such a strategy is useful for those who don't want to face the possibility that there may be some extremely important political truth that the Organization has discovered. But it is also prejudice in the strict sense of that word.

One moderately militant black summarized the position of many of his colleagues when he told me, "We're loyal to the organization because it works, because we know of no better way of improving our position in Chicago, and because, while it can't give everything he wants, it can give most Chicago groups enough to keep them happy." Such a comment may sound cynical and, from a black, even treasonable. But, from the point of view of Chicago Democrats, it represents the essence of the political process.

The masters of ethnic politics are not intellectuals; they are not given to articulating abstract ideas; only Foran and one or two others look good on TV; their insight into the city and what makes it tick is not phrased in slick social science terminology, but is concrete and instinctual. Any attempt to state their model of the political process in formal terms—such as I will shortly engage in—is bound to lose something of the vigor and flavor of the original. On the other hand, while intellectual types may find the poor diction and malapropisms of some of the ethnic politicians vastly amusing, their amusement should not blind them to the fact that the best of politicians have an intuitive grasp of the city that would make the most skillful social scientist look naive.

The first assumption of ethnic politics is that the city is composed of various groups, national, racial, economic, religious. It is the politician's role to act as a broker among these groups, arranging and rearranging power and resources in such a way as to prevent one group from becoming so unhappy with the balance that they will leave the system. He arranges, usually indirectly and informally, and almost always gradually, compromises among the various power elements within the city, that these elements could not achieve by direct negotiation among themselves. Thus, Irish aldermen or congressmen are slowly phased out to be replaced by Poles and then blacks (there are three Polish Democratic congressmen, two blacks, two Jews, one Irishman, and one Italian from Chicago, and in the next aldermanic elections about 30 percent of the city council seats will be held by blacks); but there is no great fanfare accompanying such changes. Does the organization slate a black congressman to represent Cicero and Berwyn? It surely does; but it doesn't issue press release claiming that it is engaged in a revolution.

The "balanced ticket" is a symbol of this power brokerage game. To exclude a group its "place" on the ticket is to insult and offend them. If you should tell an ethnic politician that in one state (New York) the Democratic slate was made up of three Jews and a black and that the party still expected to get the Irish and Italian vote, he will simply not believe you. And if you tell him that in another state (Connecticut) a Unitarian minister with an Irish name and a liberal background led a slate on which, for the first time in many years, there were no

Irish Catholics he would assume that the Irish vote would go Republican and wonder who was responsible for such an inept decision.

Nor would he be able to understand why some would consider piece-of-the-pie demands to be immoral. The model of the new politics—enthusiastic college students from "out of the neighborhood," vigorous ideological liberalism, passionate moral self-righteousness—would baffle him. The ethnic politician knows that in most of the districts of his city this model will not win elections.

In his frame of reference you can't afford to lose one economic or racial or ethnic group. If you win an election at the price of turning off one such segment of the city and setting the others against this scapegoat group you're simply asking for trouble. No political leader can afford to lose a major group from his consensus, for he will find it difficult to govern without this group and even more difficult to be reelected.

The ethnic politician also realizes that most people are not ideologues. He knew long before Amital Etzzone's brilliant article in *Transaction* that most people are quite "inconsistent" in their political attitudes; they are "liberal" on some issues, "conservative" on others. Furthermore, the ethnic politician realizes that for all the attention they get on the media, self-appointed "spokesmen" usually represent only themselves and a tiny band of friends. Most citizens are not interested in ideology but are moved by more concrete and pressing matters—jobs, sidewalks, garbage removal, streets, transportation, housing, access to the government to get assistance when needed. The vast network of precinct captains is not merely, or even principally a downward channel of communication designed to convey voting instructions. It is also a technique—frequently more effective than public opinion polling—for determining what is on people's minds and providing them with a feeling of access to the system.

Why do you slate an obvious liberal like Adlai Stevenson at a time when the pundits are all persuaded that there is a "shift to the right"? Partly you may do it because you don't read the pundits, but partly because your instincts and your organization say that Adlai is a winner. Why are you undismayed when a smooth advertising firm, relying on poll data and White House advice, turns out clever ads suggesting your candidate is "soft" on student radicals? Mostly because your instincts and your organization tell you that the student issue is not all that important and that Adlai is still a winner. And why do you rejoice when the Vice President arrives on the scene as part of the "realignment" strategy and accuses Adlai of disgracing his father's name? Because you know your voters well enough to know that they are not going to be "realigned" by such foolishness and will certainly resent such an attack on someone about whom they have already made up their minds.

The ethnic politician is also free from the pundit's uncertainty about the nature of the electorate. Before the election, there was much fear that the voter was a narrow, frightened, easily swayed member of the silent majority, and maybe a hard-hat to boot. After the election, he looked more like a responsible, discriminating, and sophisticated person. But from the ethnic politician's viewpoint, both images are incomplete. He is well aware of the unpredictability, the strain towards bigotry, the extreme sensitivity to slights, the fear, the impatience with all politicians. But he also realizes that there is a strain towards rationality, openness and trust, and a sympathy for social reform, and that, in his better moments, John Q. Voter is capable of civility, intelligence and generosity. Thus, the ethnic politician is not too surprised when he rises to heights. In other words, you appeal to both the voter's fears and his idealism, his selfishness and his integrity; and, after awhile, you hope

that you have become skillful in the art of blending the two kinds of appeals.

The ethnic politician's slogan that social progress is good politics is neither phony nor cynical but simply a statement of political reality as he sees it. He knows that if he is too "conservative" the balance he has established will not shift rapidly enough to keep up with the changing state of his city; and if he is too "liberal" he may attempt to force change on the city before there is a broad enough consensus to support it. In the thirties he supports the trade unions and in the sixties the black demand for power, but he supports both such demands in ways that will not drive other groups out of his coalition. There may be a tendency in such an approach to move too slowly, especially if the organization has poor communication links with a minority group. But the political leader is much less sanguine than his academic critic about the ability of any leadership to correct most social problems in a brief period of time.

The two Stevensons, Paul Douglas, Otto Kerner (who presided over the extremely liberal report on Civil Disturbances), and the present Lt. Governor, Paul Simon, represent a liberal tradition of which any state might be proud. Michael Bakalis, a thirty-two year old university professor (of Greek origin, conveniently enough), and US Congressman Abner Mikva are liberal enough to please Professor Galbraith. The ethnic politician knows that there is a strong liberal strain in his electorate and that an articulate and intelligent liberal can have strong voter appeal. The liberal must of course be able to win, he must want to win (frequently a difficulty for many American liberals) and he must not forget who helped him to win—or run the risk of not winning again. Furthermore, he must realize that he and his fellows cannot claim a monopoly on all offices. From the point of view of the ethnic politician, liberalism is good politics, especially when he can find a liberal who is willing to admit that politics can be good liberalism.

While his critics contend that it is patronage which holds the organization together, he knows himself that "loyalty" is more important than jobs. As one young Irish lawyer put it, "a man who is not loyal to his friends will never be loyal to an idea." The mockery to which Arthur Goldberg was subjected by those who thrust him into the political limelight would be unthinkable to an ethnic politician. You stand by your own, even if they have made mistakes, or if they have perhaps grown a bit too old. You wait patiently in line until it's "your turn" to be slated. You accept the decisions of the organization with good grace and work for the success of the ticket even though you are personally disappointed. You do so because you're convinced that there is no other way to engage in politics and that the alternative is what New York Democrats are currently calling Balkanization.

In his book, *The Irish and Irish Politicians*, Edward Levine tells the story of Nineteenth Ward Committeeman John Duffy who supported Martin Kennedy against Daley in 1955 because of the loyalty that Duffy's mentor, Thomas Nash, felt for Kennedy. According to Levine, Daley is reputed to have said, "If I were Duffy I would bolt." Later Duffy became the organization's president of the county board and worked closely with the mayor. There is a nice etiquette required of those who must balance loyalties, but the phrase "do what you have to do" is fully understood by the ethnic politicians. When he hears that this is "clanishness" the ethnic politician is puzzled. What are the alternatives? To quote one of Levine's informants, "The only thing you have in politics is your word. Break your word and you're dead. The most successful politician is the politician who kept his word." But if he is puzzled by the failure of the "liberal" to understand this truism, the ethnic politician

would probably be astonished that such new left political theorists as John Schaar are demanding the same kind of personal fealty from their political leaders. The ethnic leader and the hippy guru may have more in common than they know.

There are obvious faults in such a political model in addition to those which are inevitable in any political model. Its very flexibility and amorphousness may make dishonesty and corruption somewhat easier than the so-called Reform models of politics, but ethnic systems are much less corrupt in most American cities than they have been in the past and ethnic politicians have no monopoly on corruption. Nor is the charge that the ethnic system is not open to the major forces of social change a valid one; quite the contrary, if the system is working properly social change is precisely what it is open to, though it distinguishes between actual social change and that announced by academic theorists.

There are three critical weaknesses however. First, the responsiveness of the system to groups depends to some extent on how well organized and articulate a given group is. The ethnic politician does not readily spot a situation where a given group may need his help in organizing itself and articulating its demands.

Second, small but potentially explosive groups can be missed. The basic problem at root of the 1968 turmoil was that the organization had little experience with the Youth Culture and was unprepared to deal with it. It learned quickly and there has been no repetition of the scene in front of the Conrad Hilton, but the mistake of playing into the hands of the radicals was a function of the fact that until the convention Youth Culture was not seen as a serious problem to cope with.

Finally, while the ethnic politician is not likely to be swayed by the moralism, the dogmatism and the perfectionism of the academic, his own proclivity to a concrete and instinctual style makes it hard for him to communicate with the intellectual and make use of the intellectual's important contribution to the political process—and, in particular, the intellectual's ability to spot long-range trends and problems.

It is difficult to write such an article for non-Chicago readership. The mere mention of "Chicago politics" or "Richard Daley" or "Irish politicians" erects a barrier in certain segments of American society which is hard to pierce. The system is immoral and corrupt or, to use Mr. Goldberg's word, cheap.

But the "liberal" may want to ponder the thought that the alternative is Nelson Rockefeller and James Buckley till the year 2000. And the "radical" may feel that ethnic politics are part of the "establishment" which must be overthrown in "the revolution"—whether it be the peaceful revolution of Consciousness III or something more bloody. But the "radical" may want to ponder the fact that even after the revolution he will have to contend with the same social groups in the large city with which the ethnic politician must cope, and that if he does not come up with a better method, he will either have to fall back on the ethnic strategy or maintain a very efficient secret police and a very large system of concentration camps.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY, who is retiring from the Congress at the end of this session.

BILL's work on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and his leadership in chairing the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs has won him the admiration and respect of all of us in the House. He has served in this body since January 1959, and his record of public service to

the people of Chicago dates back to his days on the city council to which he was elected in 1935. It is a record of public service in which BILL can rightfully take pride and which we honor today.

The people of the Third Congressional District in Chicago will miss the dedicated representation of WILLIAM T. MURPHY in the Congress and we who continue to serve here wish him a healthy and truly enjoyable retirement.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to join my colleagues today in the tribute to our distinguished colleague, Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY, of Illinois, who after 12 years of outstanding service is retiring from the House.

BILL MURPHY has been an outstanding representative of the people of Illinois. He has been an able and effective Member of this body. I am proud to have been associated with him.

I hope his retirement from the House will not mean the end of his public service. For the Nation needs the contributions of dedicated men like Congressman MURPHY.

To BILL and his family I extend my best wishes for every future happiness and success.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO).

A new Member of Congress often looks upon those having more experience and expertise with interest, so that he may gain greater knowledge of the Congress.

Our retiring colleague, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, is one to whom I have looked and it has been my good fortune to have worked with him on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

His career in the public service is a long and distinguished one—having served on the Chicago City Council for a number of years and later as a Member of the U.S. Congress. He is a credit to the people of Illinois and to the third district which he has so ably represented.

BILL MURPHY is a close personal friend of mine and I will feel a very real sense of loss when the 92d Congress convenes without him, for his absence will be sorely felt.

My most genuine good wishes and hopes go with BILL MURPHY for his continued success in life. He has set an example which I will remember and value.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to BILL MURPHY who has served this body with great dedication and devotion during the past 12 years. I have had the pleasure of working with BILL MURPHY on the Foreign Affairs Committee, so it is with firsthand knowledge that I speak of his tireless devotion and creativity in dealing with the developing nations of the world; his absolutely unsurpassed knowledge of geography; and his effectiveness as a spokesman for the U.S. Government. BILL's quick intellect and deep understanding of world politics has always added significantly to the deliberations and work of the committee.

BILL MURPHY has brought distinction to the Chicago delegation in this body, and his years of exemplary public serv-

ice are a credit to his city, his State, the House of Representatives, and our Nation.

Besides our serving together on the same committee in the House of Representatives, BILL and I share something else in common with only one other Member of this body—the same birthday, August 7.

BILL MURPHY is a dear friend, an understanding and hard-working Member of Congress, and an uncommonly unselfish individual. His talents and his generous character will be missed in the 92d Congress. I wish him the greatest happiness, contentment, and good health in the years that will follow his retirement.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) for affording us this opportunity to pay tribute to our retiring colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY of the Third Illinois District.

BILL MURPHY's retirement leaves a void in the Illinois delegation that will be hard to fill. He has made a lot of friends on both sides of the aisle during his decade of service in this House. They respect him for his abilities. They love him for his fine personal qualities.

Since my hometown is Champaign, site of the University of Illinois, I have always felt a special affinity for BILL MURPHY, who was an Illini back in the early 1920's before his graduation from the Loyola University School of Law in Chicago. His service in Congress capped a long and distinguished career in the service of the public. God grant that he will have many years of health and happiness to enjoy his retirement years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my good friend and colleague, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, in paying tribute to our retiring colleague from Illinois, Congressman WILLIAM T. MURPHY.

During BILL's 12 years in Congress, he has always been a conscientious and quiet, but very effective and distinguished Member of the House.

He has had the respect and affection of all of his colleagues. He has been one of the outstanding experts on the Foreign Affairs Committee on Asia, Africa, and the Near East and his leadership has proven invaluable to us as Members of the House in discussing and passing legislation involving these troubled spots of the world.

BILL MURPHY's able service in the House of Representatives is a credit to the good judgment of his third district constituents, who returned him to the House for six consecutive terms.

We will all certainly miss him; but he, his ready smile and quick wit will not be soon forgotten.

I know that I am joined by many, both Republicans and Democrats, in wishing BILL MURPHY the best of luck and good health in the future.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Chicago, is retiring from the Congress after giving outstanding service to his congressional district, county, State, and Nation over a period of 12 years. Previous to his election to the Congress of the United States WILLIAM MURPHY

had made an exceptional and outstanding career as a lawyer and Chicago city councilman for over 25 years. As Chicago city councilman he served during this period on a great number of committees, commissions and assignments pertaining to the governmental operations and other municipal projects which have aided in the phenomenal growth of his native city.

During his service in Congress he has served faithfully and with outstanding ability as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and other subcommittees pertaining to Africa and the Far and Near East. He was also a member of Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group and has been assigned by the Speaker on a great number of other special missions pertaining to our foreign affairs.

Congressman MURPHY possesses an outstanding personality and by reason of his education and experience as an attorney has made a record of public service enjoyed by very few attorneys and Members of Congress. He has enjoyed the friendship of all Members of the House and has been very effective in representing his constituents and also in securing welfare aid and Federal projects for his congressional district—the city of Chicago and Cook County. It was sad news for the leadership and other Members of Congress who are his personal friends and who have admired his ability and capacity as a legislator when we heard of his voluntary retirement from this legislative body.

I join with other Members in wishing Congressman WILLIAM MURPHY the greetings of the season and also hoping during his retirement he will continue to be active and further extend his public service to Chicago, Illinois, and the Nation.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues in expressing deep regret that BILL MURPHY has decided to retire from the Congress after 12 years of dedicated and distinguished service. He did not need to leave; no doubt his constituents wished him to stay as do his colleagues.

We will miss him, and his scholarly approach to many issues. He has made a great contribution to the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs through his knowledge and understanding of our international problems. He has my best wishes for the future.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in this tribute to Congressman WILLIAM T. MURPHY, who is retiring after a dozen years of dedicated service to his constituency and to the Nation. It has been a privilege to serve with him in the House where he has been especially faithful in his attendance on the floor during debate and in consideration of bills under the 5-minute rule. I have observed that BILL MURPHY is there when his presence is needed, and that is essential if good legislation is to be passed without injurious amendments. His alertness on the floor has saved important legislation on more than one occasion, and I know how much

the Democratic leadership relied upon him.

BILL MURPHY brought to the House a wealth of experience in urban affairs. He was first elected an alderman of Chicago's 17th ward in 1935 and spent the next 24 years as a councilman. He served as chairman of the city's committee on labor-management, the committee on planning, and the committee on planning and housing. Much of the progress that Chicago attained in those years could be attributed to the hard work of men like BILL MURPHY. His background in city government prepared him to legislate effectively on urban problems.

As a diligent member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, BILL MURPHY soon developed an expertise in foreign affairs. He spent as much time as he could possibly spare from a rigorous schedule studying information on Asian and African nations and has become an expert on the problems, geography, and politics of these nations. He is especially well informed on China. His leadership as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs has been commendable; and his willingness to shoulder a heavy portion of the workload on the African subcommittee has earned the gratitude and respect of his colleagues.

BILL MURPHY's undaunted drive in attaining excellence has been typical of his actions in almost any undertaking. In high school he won nine athletic letters. While working at a full-time job with the Illinois Highway Department, he earned his law degree by spending his lunch hour and evenings in Loyola University Law School.

Drive and dedication have been hallmarks of BILL MURPHY's career both in the House of Representatives and earlier in Chicago. As he enters upon retirement with the respect and esteem of his colleagues, I wish him the best of everything in the years ahead which I hope will be years of continued fulfillment for him.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, upon my return from Vienna, where I had served as a congressional adviser at a biennial conference of the International Agency of Atomic Energy, my friend, BILL MURPHY, asked me if I had visited certain points of interest in the city. At the same time he accurately described their location and the surrounding areas. He was so vivid in his description that I asked, "How long has it been since you were in Vienna?" Imagine my astonishment when he replied he had never been there. His knowledge had come from a life-long hobby of studying maps of all of the world's principal cities. It was thorough and more complete than that brought back by even the most frequent traveler.

This tells the story of our beloved colleague from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY, of Illinois' Third District, who is voluntarily retiring from this body at the close of the 91st Congress. Because of this interest BILL MURPHY has become a most valuable member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It helps to know what you are talking about when you have problems dealing with other parts of the world.

We shall miss BILL on Capitol Hill. Our delegation will miss him for many reasons. His sound judgment; his advice, and counsel of matters coming out of his committee; his appraisal of problems that confront us in everyday work here in the House, his grasp of the needs of our own State of Illinois—all these were of great value to us all.

BILL MURPHY is no Johnny-come-lately in the field of labor management, housing and urban planning. Since the beginning of his career as a public official in 1935—35 long years ago—he has worked in these fields to the benefit of his city, his State, and his Nation. His record of service to his beloved Chicago won him much acclaim. As a member of the city council from 1935 until his election to Congress in 1958 he applied the same study and hard work as he does in his official duty now. Among his many city council assignments was the chairmanship of the committee on planning and housing, 1955-59, placing him among the pioneers in the municipal planning field.

As a member of the legal profession he had the background and logical approach to equip him admirably for the various important tasks that he assumed as a public official. The training has shown in the results obtained.

As chairman of one of the most important subcommittees on the House Foreign Affairs Committee—that of Asian and Pacific Affairs—he is most effective in his important work. In addition he is a member of the Subcommittee on Africa, Far East, and Near East. Between the two subcommittees he is brought into consideration of foreign policy matters concerning more than half of the nations of the world.

And that's where BILL MURPHY's hobby which I mentioned in the beginning of my remarks becomes of great value to the people of the United States. Witnesses who appear before those committees, from the Secretary of State himself, on down through the chain of diplomats, are astounded by his knowledge. Knowledge which he has obtained by years of hard study, and reading of every book that is written on practically every country in the world—together with the first hand information he extracts carefully from the most reliable of sources.

BILL puts much study and great effort into everything he does. He worked tirelessly in behalf of his own constituency. He accomplished much in their behalf. They can look with pride on the record of their Congressman. So with such an outstanding record—service to his country in the Armed Forces, service to his home community as a city councilman, and service to his country as a Member of Congress, BILL MURPHY can leave official life with the personal satisfaction of having been faithful to the trust his people placed in him.

Along with his own constituents, his colleagues here, and the legion of friends he has made everywhere he has walked, I wish him good health and happiness in the years ahead. My wife, Garry, who is so fond of both BILL and his lovely wife, Rose and their family join me in these good wishes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to pay tribute to the legislative contributions and achievement of our distinguished colleague from the Third District of Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY.

During the past 12 years, I have seen the responsible and consistent work of BILL MURPHY the legislator.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has been extremely active in matters involving America's foreign policy and our relations with other governments.

"BILL" MURPHY is respected by the House as a great human being, dedicated, forceful, and a fine legislative companion. He has made his mark in this body, he deserves a happy retirement and the blessings of good health.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The average American family today can purchase one-third more goods and services with its annual income than it could just 10 years ago.

FOREIGN STEEL IS STILL STEALING AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, foreign steel is still stealing American jobs. Stealing widely diversified jobs that many of us thought were safe a short year ago. Our steel industry still needs protection just as badly as do the Nation's glass, textiles, leather, and other industries.

It has been argued the steel industry is not suffering to the same extent as these other producers; that employment still is relatively good. It is true the industry, as a whole, is enjoying a tolerable year in exports, but those facts and figures do not reflect the complete picture of the industry itself. Segments of the steel industry continues to be hit and hit hard by foreign imports.

This is of vital concern to me since 25 percent of the entire Nation's steel-producing facilities are located in and around my 20th Congressional District in Pennsylvania. Our economy floats on steel and our economic raft rises and

falls on the waves of foreign steel imports.

Four times this year we have seen the Federal Government grant financial assistance to workers who lost their jobs to imports and, I fear, the worst is yet to come. The U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau released startling statistics on the effect imports are having on employment in the metal fastener segment of the steel industry. United States Steel Corp., the Nation's largest steel producer, has issued a report expressing serious concern over the status of its seamless specialty steel tube division. If this Nation should lose its domestic market for this product, our national security would be threatened.

The Wood Screw Service Bureau informed me that industry needs annual sales of \$26,218 to support the job of just one employee. Already the impact of imports in this little noticed industry has been so severe that 8,000 to 9,000 American workers lost their jobs. This is just an example of the creeping paralysis which will eventually terminate in economic rigor mortis.

The situation is bound to get worse unless we in the Congress substitute action for rhetoric. By the end of this year, imports of all types of screws, nuts, bolts and rivets will have increased more than 254 percent in the past 6 years. Their total values, which amounted to \$34 million in 1964, will now reach nearly \$121 million by the end of 1970. Foreign imports will already have captured 72 percent of the American wood screw market. This is the frightening situation in this segment of the steel industry.

United States Steel also reports foreign imports in the seamless tube division have increased 2½ times in the past 6 years and foreign producers now supply more than 30 percent of a number of types of seamless specialty tubing used in this Nation. This year, imports of critical, high-value-per-ton stainless and heat resisting alloy seamless steel tubing reached a level of more than 40 percent of the domestic market. Since 1964, imports of carbon steel tubular products increased more than 100 percent; alloy steel tubular products by more than 500 percent, and stainless and heat resistant alloy steel products by more than 400 percent.

How serious then is the situation in steel? Very serious, if I interpret United States Steel's report correctly. It states in one section:

The markets for seamless specialty tubular products in this country are not large enough to support both domestic production and unrestricted imports.

In short, Mr. Speaker, our country "ain't" big enough for both of them.

This may sound like a line of dialog from a class B western film, but the warning is unmistakable. Unless the import trend is reversed, domestic producers of these products in this country and my district face three alternatives: They can put their facilities in mothballs; they can curtail retail and development programs related to their products or they can allow the domestic market to "go foreign," converting their facilities to

other products where there is a local demand.

The odds are, Mr. Speaker, the producers would choose the second alternative which creates more unemployment. In our sagging and sinking economy it is almost impossible to regain losses by converting to other products—first there is no demand because other producers are having their economic troubles; second, the foreign producers will probably already have invaded the second market. Consequently, the cycle repeats itself with no relief in sight.

Where does this leave the American consumer? At the mercy of the foreign producer which we have already experienced in the electronic and television industry. He already is forced to buy foreign products and subjected, without recourse, to any price hike imposed by foreign producers. It is already proven that the American consumer ends up paying more for a foreign-made product than he would have paid for an American-made item.

Our seamless steel tube industry under no circumstances should be permitted to "go foreign." These are products with a myriad of uses; in generating electrical power, chemical and oil refining, marine and industrial equipment, the manufacture of hydraulic equipment, machine tools, auto and aircraft parts, farm and construction machinery, food processing, medical equipment, and our space and military programs.

Since all these industries, in order to function efficiently, are dependent upon some type of seamless steel tubing, it follows then they are exclusively dependent upon the supplier. Should that supplier be foreign, it is reasonable to expect the chaotic conditions which would result when supplies were immediately curtailed by a dock strike, here or abroad; a shipping strike, or by a political whim of a foreign government. It is too frightening to contemplate the disaster resulting from a military decision of an enemy producer.

The steel industry, I am afraid, will not have sufficient time to shift its gears and rise to meet the needs of such an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year I have consistently warned of the dangers our industries, particularly basic steel, face from uncontrolled foreign imports. I have repeatedly declared Congress must move, and move quickly, to protect our domestic markets. The pending trade bill passed by the House is at least a move in the right direction although it leaves much to be desired.

We must continue to revise and strengthen our foreign trade policies. If we are to have free trade for the world, we must also have fair trade for the United States—even if we have to legislate it. I am hopeful the other body will see the wisdom of this proposed legislation and join this body by approving the 1970 Trade Act.

THE PRESIDENT'S POCKET VETO OF THE FAMILY DOCTOR BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the holiday recess just ended, this Congress learned through news reports of one more action by this administration to shunt aside the health care crisis in America. This is the President's pocket veto of S. 3418, the family doctor bill.

By his veto, the President scuttled a determined effort by the 91st Congress to replace talk about health manpower shortages with firm action to overcome those shortages.

This legislation was designed to help medical schools and teaching hospitals improve and enlarge their programs to train doctors of family medicine. Its objective was to overcome the shortage of 50,000 doctors that exists across the Nation.

I am deeply concerned by his action not because a proposal I originally sponsored in the House was the target of his veto, but rather because this veto represents one more in a series of actions and nonactions by the Nixon administration that expose the hypocrisy of its stated concerns about the quality of health care in America.

Having decried the health care crisis soon after taking office, the President has neglected to offer any significant program to combat it to this time. Instead, his response has been to veto appropriations for health, cutback vital Federal support for research efforts, and to veto this measure.

Particularly disconcerting in this instance is that he chose to kill this health measure in a manner which deprives Congress of its legitimate right to override a Presidential veto.

The bill was recorded as having been received at the White House on Monday, December 14. He had from that date until midnight of December 25 to sign it into law or to veto it by conventional means—that is, to return the bill to Congress with a veto message.

If the President had done the latter, I believe both Houses could easily have mustered the support to override. It is significant that during Senate and House passage, the family doctor bill encountered only three opposing votes—one in the Senate and two in the House.

The minority leadership of both Houses obviously recognized the merits of the bill and the critical need for favorable action. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT, was a co-sponsor of the bill on the Senate side. Our colleague, Mr. GERALD FORD, cast his vote for the bill on consideration in this Chamber.

I share with Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas, the chief Senate sponsor of the bill, deep regret that the President could not muster the fortitude to place his position formally before the Congress to be sustained or overridden.

I deplore the course of action followed by the President in this instance and I am convinced it warrants challenge as being contrary to the intent of the Constitution.

The routine veto procedure was available to the President. During 7 of the 10

days provided for Presidential consideration of bills passed by the Congress, we were in regular session and available to receive his veto message. Even after adjournment to a time certain, appropriate officers of the Congress had been authorized to receive messages from the President for disposition upon its return.

The President must have been fully aware that the holiday recess would end some 48 hours after the pocket veto became effective. Under no ordinary circumstances during any session of Congress could a routine veto procedure exercised by the President on a Saturday have been acted upon any earlier than the succeeding Monday. Obviously, the holiday adjournment of Congress to a time certain could not have prevented the President from returning a veto message if he had any desire to do so.

Therefore, I personally can draw no conclusion but that the President lacked the courage of his convictions in seeking to dispose of this important health measure in this manner.

By his action, he has challenged the Congress to spell out in terms which cannot be distorted by whim the precise role of the pocket veto in our legislative process.

THE DISTURBING SITUATION WITHIN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a very disturbing situation within one of this Nation's vital industries—the airline industry. As we all know, most industry groups are reflecting the impact of the national economic downturn. In many cases profits are down, and in some cases, notably among transportation carriers, profits have been wiped away.

Dead last, reports the Air Transport Association, at rock bottom in the changes in earnings scale in this country between 1968 and 1969, are the airlines. During 1969, the major U.S. airlines ranked at the bottom of the list of industry groups, both regulated and unregulated, with a decline in profitability of 74.4 percent from 1968. Among other regulated industries, earnings of the trucking industry dropped 11 percent and rails 17 percent, while intercity buses showed a 1.6-percent increase in profits and electric utilities a 6.1-percent increase.

As a result of poor earnings performance, the decline in the market price of airline common stock has been more than three times greater than the decline in the Dow Jones industrial average. While the Dow Jones index has fluctuated slightly since June 1966 before dropping 21.4 percent by June 1970 for instance, the airline stock index steadily fell 70.1 percent during the same 4-year period.

Yet, during this period, the Civil Aeronautics Board did not approve any fare increases for the airlines until last year. If we look at prices for transportation in the post World War II period, we find that the revenue per passenger mile for

rails increased 61 percent, for buses 95 percent, and for airlines 17 percent. Even the two 1969 fare adjustments have not reversed the trend of declining earnings, and in many cases have been substantially offset by rapidly rising costs.

Bad as this seems, the situation this year is even worse, with the airlines expecting to end 1970 with their financially worst year on record. The plight of the airlines will not be relieved next year, unless a substantial fare increase is allowed very soon.

The CAB has said it would defer any additional fare increases until the conclusion of its ongoing fare investigation, a wide-ranging examination of the airline industry that hopefully will result in Government approval of a new fare increase.

But the airlines cannot wait out the winter. Although the CAB believes it can finish its investigation by early next year, the chances are that Board review of the examiner's recommendations will take some time and the air carriers will not be in the position to implement any resulting fare increase until late spring or the summer of 1971.

Consequently, it is my earnest hope that the CAB will see its way clear and approve one of the fare increase packages currently proposed by a number of airlines, and that the Board will see the wisdom of granting an increase, in the 10-to-12 percent range, that will do the job required.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. AYRES OF OHIO

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago I came to this House with a very dear friend who has served with me for these 20 years, who is leaving the Congress, my good friend and neighbor, WILLIAM AYRES.

As Members know, BILL AYRES has served diligently in these halls on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as well as on the Committee on Education and Labor. He has been beloved by the people of his district and has served them well.

He comes from just a few miles from my home. We share the same airport, the Canton-Akron Airport. He has worked hard and diligently over the years to make it one of the finest in the country.

Mr. Speaker, his service to his constituents in every way has been outstanding. I am sure that all of the Members of the House are going to miss BILL AYRES. The veterans of the Nation owe a debt of gratitude to this fine Congressman for his work in their behalf.

I see my distinguished friend from Illinois on the floor who also came into the Congress with that class, and I am sure that he will remember those early days of 20 years ago, the humor and the good will which we have had with our friend, BILL AYRES, who will be leaving the Congress at the end of this session. It is our hope, however, that he will not be leaving Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful that the gentleman from Ohio has yielded to me in order to provide an opportunity to say a word about my very dear friend BILL AYRES.

I have known BILL AYRES in a very intimate way socially. His wife and my wife and our families have been together many, many times. The Ayres family is one of the nicest, finest, the Fords have ever known.

For 20 years I have known BILL AYRES as an outstanding legislator. He worked himself up the ladder to a position as ranking minority member on the vitally important Committee on Education and Labor. He also worked his way up the ladder as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. So at one time he could have been the ranking minority member on both of these outstanding committees. He served upon those committees with superb excellence. He is a legislator who knows how to get things done in a skillful, quiet, efficient, effective way.

I do not think BILL AYRES made a reputation for a multitude of speeches on the floor of the House or in the well of this Chamber, but when he spoke, what he said made sense and what he did in committee and what he did outside in trying to get legislation that would be workable and effective through the House, BILL was a master.

Naturally, I deeply regret that BILL will not be back with us, No. 1, because of the contributions he has made in the House of Representatives, but, secondly, because I think he could have in an even more meaningful way expanded his influence for good government and good legislation.

BILL AYRES is a close personal friend. I shall miss him very, very greatly, legislatively and otherwise. I have no idea at the moment what his future plans are, but I just hope that a person with his experience and his capability will find a place to make continued contributions to a better America. We need him and the country needs him.

My wife, Betty, is a very close friend of Mary Ellen Ayres who is one of the finest in every respect. BILL and Mary Ellen, two of the best—we will miss you badly and have been the beneficiaries of your friendship. Good luck and God bless you.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago this coming January 13th, the 82d Congress convened. In that new congressional class there were 60 freshmen. There were 39 new Republicans and 21 Democrats. I believe that there are no Democrats left in that class. Out of the 39 Republicans, the gentleman in the well, Mr. Bow of Ohio, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. BELCHER, myself, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. AYRES, and the gentleman from Indiana,

ROSS ADAIR, I believe are the only ones that are left from that class.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I think that the gentleman from Indiana, BILL BRAY, came with that class.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct—and BILL BRAY. So there are six left out of 60, which gives some idea of the attrition.

It has been a great pleasure to serve these 20 years not only with the distinguished gentleman in the well, but also with BILL AYRES, who comes from the same State.

I have visited in Akron in the past, and spoken before the Summit County Bar Association, and have become sufficiently acquainted in the city of Akron to know the great respect in which BILL AYRES and all of his family are held.

It has been a great pleasure for us to know BILL AYRES and his wife socially as well as a Member of this great legislative body. My children grew up with his children and attended the same schools in some instances, so we have known them on a rather intimate basis during all of this time.

BILL AYRES came from a district which is overwhelmingly registered in the other party. It has been remarkable that he has been able to hold this district with that kind of registration for a period of 20 years. In my opinion the only reason he has is because he has been a remarkable Congressman, not only remarkable in the fact that he has been able to get things done, but also by the fact that he is easy to know, he serves his people well, and he actually knows the business which he is about.

BILL AYRES is the kind of a fellow who represents everybody, regardless of party. After you know him awhile, and you find that easy way that he has of knowing you, you can well understand how well the people like him in his own district.

I hope that BILL will be in Washington as a part of this administration after he leaves here on January 3. But I do know that Elsie and I, if he leaves Washington, will certainly miss him and his very gracious wife, because of the great association we have had together. But whatever BILL AYRES does, I want to pay tribute to him for the kind of legislative record that he has made in the Congress, and the way in which he has conducted himself as an individual. In my estimation as a legislator he has been of the highest order.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I also had the pleasure of coming to the Congress in the same class with BILL AYRES. I learned to have a very high respect for BILL in the years that I have known him. He was a hard worker. Of course, he had a good sense of humor, and if you were feeling down and you met him he always would say a word to you, and he would make you feel better.

He is a man who has always been the kind to develop a feeling of trust and happiness in the world. In addition to that, he was a tireless worker on both of the committees on which he served. I have gone to him many times on legislation brought before his committee, and he was a Member from whom you could get information as to what really was in the bill, and the good points and the bad points. I will say frankly that I have never discussed a matter with him but what he had a great depth of understanding on the subject of that bill, and the information that he gave me was always good.

I think about the highest compliment you could pay to a Member of Congress is that as a member of his committee you feel perfectly free to ask his advice, and that you trust him on the information and the advice he gives you.

BILL AYRES has had a difficult district for many years, a district in which you had to overcome a majority in order to win. Districts such as that finally pay no attention as to the results that have been obtained in the past. We are very deeply sorry that BILL AYRES lost. But he has been a great Member of this body, and a Member who will be sorely missed. I certainly hope that as a Member of this administration he continues to assist in good government on the other side of the Hill, downtown, just as he has done for the many years that he has been here.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the service of WILLIAM H. AYRES in the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 19590) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1799)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 19590) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," having met, after a further full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 46, 54, 55, and 57.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 10, 12, 22, 24, 43, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,842,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,368,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,426,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,988,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$85,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$107,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,268,687,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,729,410,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,157,136,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,017,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,465,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,377,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,600,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,137,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,744,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$443,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided further, That nothing in clause (1) of the first sentence of this subsection shall be construed as authorizing the use of any such funds to support Vietnamese or other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. Forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Sec. 845. After June 15, 1971, no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to support in excess of 138,000 personnel of the Department of Defense (military and civilian) assigned to activities managed under the Intelligence and Security Program of the Department of Defense."

And the Senate agree to the same. The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 26, 31, 49, and 53.

GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT L. F. SKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
JOHN M. SLACK,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JOHN STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON, (except
amendment No. 17),
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain of the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 19590) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying con-

ference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SENATE AMENDMENTS PREVIOUSLY AGREED TO

The House, on December 16, 1970, adopted the first conference report on the bill (H. Report 91-1759) and then adopted motions relating to amendments reported in technical disagreement. Four amendments of the Senate which had been reported in technical disagreement—Nos. 15, 18, 29, and 48—were concurred in by the House without change. Thus, those four amendments are not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military personnel, Army

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$7,842,450,000 instead of \$7,822,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,861,750,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum available for Permanent Change of Station Travel is \$505,391,000 instead of \$485,391,000 as proposed by the House, and \$524,691,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Military personnel, Navy

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$4,368,600,000 instead of \$4,360,100,000 as proposed by the House, and \$4,377,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum available for Permanent Change of Station Travel is \$221,465,000 instead of \$212,965,000 as proposed by the House, and \$229,965,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Military personnel, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$1,426,700,000 instead of \$1,422,700,000 as proposed by the House, and \$1,430,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum available for Permanent Change of Station Travel is \$101,225,000 instead of \$97,225,000 as proposed by the House, and \$105,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Military personnel, Air Force

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$5,988,350,000 instead of \$5,973,350,000 as proposed by the House, and \$6,002,425,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum available for Permanent Change of Station Travel is \$398,760,000 instead of \$383,760,000 as proposed by the House, and \$412,835,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that a reduction of \$16,075,000 shall apply proportionately to Communications and Intelligence as proposed by the House.

Reserve personnel, Air Force

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$85,200,000 instead of \$86,200,000 as proposed by the House, and \$84,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Guard personnel, Air Force

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$107,500,000 instead of \$108,500,000 as proposed by the House, and \$106,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance, Army

Amendment No. 7: Provides \$3,634,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House. This action is associated with amendment number 48.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$6,268,687,000 instead of \$6,269,011,000 as proposed by the House, and \$6,228,687,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The House agrees to the Senate increase of \$1,700,000 for civilian personnel and the increase of \$8,000,000 for Automatic Data Processing operations. The conferees agree to an amount of \$40,000,000 for unforeseen operational costs instead of the \$50,000,000 included by the House and deleted by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Navy

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$4,729,410,000 instead of \$4,731,910,000 as proposed by the House, and \$4,685,410,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The House agrees to the Senate increases for civilian personnel and headquarters operations of \$500,000 and \$7,000,000 respectively. The Senate recedes from its decrease of \$4,000,000 for the Antarctic Operation. The conferees agreed to an amount of \$40,000,000 for unforeseen operational costs instead of the \$50,000,000 included by the House and deleted by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$402,743,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$399,943,000 as proposed by the House.

The House agreed to the Senate increase of \$1,500,000 for civilian personnel and \$1,300,000 for Marine Corps headquarters operations.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$6,157,136,000 instead of \$6,167,136,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,093,236,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to the House allowance of \$23,900,000 for the retention of five Air Force reserve units and the conferees agree to an amount of \$40,000,000 for unforeseen operational costs instead of the \$50,000,000 included by the House and deleted by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$343,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$337,600,000 as proposed by the House. The House agreed to the Senate increase of \$6,000,000 for aircraft fuel and oil and other operational costs.

National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$100,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$65,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—PROCUREMENT

Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$2,908,500,000 instead of \$2,933,100,000 as proposed by the House, and \$2,930,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Under Aircraft, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$62,000,000 for LOH helicopters as proposed by the Senate instead of \$64,200,000 as proposed by the House; the amount of \$2,100,000 for OV-1 aircraft modification as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House; and the amount of \$8,000,000 for avionics/armament spares as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Missiles, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$51,900,000 for the XMIM-72A Chaparral Missile as proposed by the Senate instead of \$76,400,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to provide a total of \$58,200,000 for the XMIM-23B improved Hawk missile, instead of \$43,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$81,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, with the understanding that no fiscal year 1971 production would be contracted for, with the added funds used to stretch out the production already under contract. This action will provide sufficient time for necessary tests of this missile scheduled during fiscal year 1971.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$8,800,000 for Nike-Hercules modifications as proposed by the Senate instead of the \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$34,900,000 for the initial production of the

XMGM-52A Lance missile as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided no funds for this purpose.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$5,300,000 for XMGM-31A Pershing missile modifications as proposed by the Senate instead of the \$10,300,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$15,000,000 for the Land Combat Support System (LCSS) and \$5,000,000 for LCSS, spares as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided no funds for this purpose. The conferees also agreed to provide \$1,700,000 for LCSS modifications as proposed by the House. The Senate had deleted the funds requested for such modifications.

Under Weapons and Combat Vehicles, the amount of \$12,000,000 for the M577A1 Tracked Command Post Carriers as proposed by the Senate was agreed to by the conferees instead of \$2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to delete the amount of \$6,400,000 for the Chaparral missile carrier, and the amount of \$1,300,000 for the Vulcan Gun Shop Test, as proposed by the Senate, instead of funding these items in those amounts as proposed by the House. The conferees also agreed to provide \$23,900,000 for M16A1 rifles as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Tactical and Support Vehicles, the conferees agreed to provide the amount of \$28,800,000 for the XM705 1½ ton truck and \$1,100,000 for XM705 truck initial spares. The House had not allowed these funds. None of the funds made available for the XM705 1½ ton truck are to be obligated for that purpose until after the evaluation of the modified M715 truck is completed and a determination made that the latter vehicle will not essentially meet Army requirements. If it is determined that the modified M715 truck will essentially meet those requirements, the funds provided for the XM705 truck may be used for termination of the existing XM705 production contract, and funding of the initial procurement of the modified M715 truck.

Under Communications and Electronics Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$9,300,000 for STARCOM Communications (Other) as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,800,000 as proposed by the House; and the amount of \$53,000,000 for Defense Communications Planning Group projects as proposed by the Senate instead of \$78,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to delete the amount of \$600,000 for the RC-292 Antenna Group and \$1,100,000 for the SB-22 Switchboard as proposed by the Senate. The House had funded these items in those amounts.

The conferees agreed to restore the \$4,000,000 House reduction for the RATAC Field Artillery Radar Sets as proposed by the Senate with the understanding that any future procurement of this equipment shall be from a domestic producer.

The conferees also agreed to the amount of \$11,400,000 for miscellaneous items under \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Other Support Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$800,000 for the LCM landing craft and \$4,400,000 for the LCU landing craft as proposed by the Senate. The House had not provided funds for those purposes.

The conferees also agreed to the deletion of \$16,500,000 for a classified project as proposed by the Senate. The House had allowed those funds.

Under Production Base Support, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$182,500,000 for provision of industrial facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of the \$187,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the transfer to this appropriation of \$50,000,000 from the Army stock fund. It was concurred in by

the House without change on December 16, 1970, and thus is not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

Amendment No. 16: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$3,017,900,000 instead of \$3,005,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,127,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Under Aircraft, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$112,500,000 for twelve A-6E Intruder Attack Aircraft and \$11,400,000 for A-6E aircraft initial spares as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$72,500,000 for six A-6E aircraft as proposed by the House. The House had provided \$5,700,000 for A-6E aircraft initial spares to support only six aircraft.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$64,000,000 for the AV-8A Harrier (V/STOL) attack aircraft as proposed by the House, instead of the \$96,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement of the Committee of Conference is based on the procurement of these eighteen aircraft in the United Kingdom.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$23,000,000 for the E-2C Hawkeye Early Warning Aircraft, in addition to the \$20,000,000 in advance procurement funds provided in the bill for the fiscal year 1971, instead of the \$92,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted the latter amount. The conferees also agreed to delete the \$8,500,000 allowed by the Senate for E-2C initial spares, as proposed by the House. The \$43,000,000 total thus provided for long lead-time items is in full accord with the current Department of Defense plan to award a production contract for eleven such aircraft in fiscal year 1972. The action of the conferees should in no way be construed as an effort to delay this important program.

The conferees also agreed to the amount of \$72,000,000 for Variable Avionics Shop Test (VAST) equipment as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$28,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Authorizes the transfer to this appropriation of \$100,000,000 from the Defense stock fund. It was concurred in by the House without change on December 16, 1970, and thus is not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended", as proposed by the Senate.

Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$2,465,400,000 instead of \$2,694,400,000 as proposed by the House, and \$2,276,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$166,000,000 for an additional SSN-688 class nuclear attack submarine above the President's budget, and \$22,500,000 in advance procurement funds above the President's budget for another SSN-688 class submarine to be funded in fiscal year 1972, as proposed by the House. The conferees also agreed not to provide other funds above the President's budget in the following amounts and for the listed purposes:

AS submarine tender	-----	\$102,000,000
AD destroyer tender	-----	103,000,000
Service craft	-----	24,000,000

The Senate had not allowed any of the funds provided by the House for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, above the President's budget.

Amendment No. 21: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1975, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended", as proposed by the Senate.

Other procurement, Navy

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$1,487,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,443,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Ship Support Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$900,000 for Submarine batteries as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,200,000 as proposed by the House; the amount of \$4,900,000 for SHORT-STOP electronic warfare system ship alterations as proposed by the Senate, instead of no funds as allowed by the House for that purpose; and the amount of \$500,000 for small boats as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Communications and Electronics Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$2,400,000 for the AN/SPS-40 radar set as proposed by the Senate, instead of no funds as allowed by the House for that purpose. The conferees agreed to delete the \$4,000,000 allowed by the House for miscellaneous items, as proposed by the Senate.

Under Aviation Support Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$4,000,000 for the CBU-55/B (Fuel Air Explosive) cluster bombs. The House had allowed no funds for that purpose.

Under Ordnance Support Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$14,500,000 for the MK-46 torpedo as proposed by the Senate, instead of no funds allowed for that purpose as proposed by the House; the amount of \$110,600,000 for the MK-48 torpedo as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$80,600,000 as proposed by the House; and the amount of \$30,800,000 for Ordnance Replenishment spares as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$34,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1972 as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Procurement, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$175,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$171,700,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to the amount of \$4,200,000 for the XM705 1½ ton truck as proposed by the Senate. The House allowed no funds for that purpose. The same understanding with respect to this truck set forth under Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army, will prevail under this appropriation.

Amendment No. 25: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1973 as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended", as proposed by the Senate.

Aircraft procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$3,219,300,000 instead of \$3,203,000,000 as proposed by the House, and \$3,201,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Under Aircraft, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$9,200,000 for F/RF-5A/B aircraft as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,300,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to provide the amount of \$18,000,000 for the International Fighter Aircraft, instead of the \$30,000,000 provided by the House. The Senate had allowed no funds for that purpose. The action of the conferees does not constitute a full production decision on this aircraft.

Under Modification of Inservice Aircraft, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$99,000,000 for modification of B-52/FB-111 aircraft to accommodate the Short Range Attack Missile (SRAM), as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$71,300,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees also agreed to the amount of \$14,000,000 for Additional SEA Requirements as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$31,000,000 for F-111 aircraft initial spares as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$19,800,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$399,400,000 for replenishment spares as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$405,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended", as proposed by the Senate.

Missile procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$1,377,200,000 instead of \$1,372,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,380,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Under Ballistic Missiles, the conferees deleted the amount of \$3,200,000 for LGM-30F/G Minuteman II/III Operational Base Launch Program as proposed by the House instead of allowing that amount for that purpose as proposed by the Senate.

Under Other Missiles, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$99,500,000 for the AGM-69A Short Range Attack Missile (SRAM) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees also agreed to the amount of \$10,800,000 for SRAM initial spares as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$5,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Authorizes the transfer to this appropriation of \$50,000,000 from the Defense stock fund. It was concurred in by the House without change on December 16, 1970, and thus is not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

Amendment No. 30: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended", as proposed by the Senate.

Other procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$1,338,700,000 instead of \$1,381,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,345,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Under Munitions and Associated Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$731,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$752,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Under Electronic and Telecommunications Equipment, the conferees agreed to the amount of \$5,000,000 for cryptographic equipment as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agreed to delete the \$6,400,000 for the Minuteman Operational Base Launch Program as proposed by the House instead of allowing such amount for that purpose as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to delete the amount of \$800,000 for Elimination of Compromising Emanations as proposed by the Senate instead of allowing such amount for that purpose as proposed by the House.

The conferees also agreed to the amount of \$5,000,000 for Training Equipment as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,800,000 as proposed by the House; the amount of \$41,000,000 for spares and repair parts as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$44,200,000 as proposed by the House; and the amount of \$11,400,000 for Class V Modifications as proposed by the Senate, instead of the \$13,200,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees further agreed to a general unspecified reduction of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. This reduction was based on the fact that there are prior year balances available in that amount which can be used to fund fiscal year 1971 programs.

Amendment No. 32: Makes funds available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as pro-

posed by the House, instead of "available until expended", as proposed by the Senate.

Procurement, Defense agencies

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$38,910,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$45,310,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agreed that the funding of \$6,400,000 for the procurement of automatic data processing equipment for the World-Wide Military Command and Control System would be deferred until the General Accounting Office has reported on the feasibility and cost of the system.

Amendment No. 34: Makes the sum appropriated for Procurement, Defense Agencies available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$1,600,200,000 instead of \$1,608,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,589,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Conference agreement includes \$15,300,000 for the Pershing Missile System as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,500,000 as proposed by the House. A total of \$6,000,000 is provided for Electrical Power Sources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides for a general reduction of \$14,100,000 instead of specific reductions in low priority programs totaling \$24,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Makes the sum appropriated for R.D.T. & E., Army available for obligation until June 30, 1972, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$2,137,900,000 instead of \$2,156,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,130,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Conference agreement provides \$3,500,000 for the LAMPS Destroyer Helicopter System as proposed by the House instead of \$10,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement on a general reduction of \$18,300,000 instead of specific reductions in low priority programs totaling \$32,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Makes the sum appropriated for R.D.T. & E., Navy available until June 30, 1972, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$2,744,100,000 instead of \$2,701,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,744,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Conference agreement includes:

(1) No funds for the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy program, as proposed by the House, instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

(2) \$61,000,000 for Minuteman Rebasing as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House. The sum provided deletes the amounts requested for the Mobile Minuteman and Hard-Point Defense concepts, as stated in the Senate Report.

(3) \$87,000,000 for the Airborne Warning and Control System as proposed by the Senate instead of \$63,500,000 as proposed by the House.

(4) \$10,500,000 for the Minuteman Operational Base Launch program instead of no funds as proposed by the House and \$19,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum provided is only for equipment at Vanden-

berg Air Force Base and the Western Test Range needed for range improvement and not related only to the Minuteman Operational Base Launch program.

In deleting funds requested for the Minuteman Operational Base Launch Program, the conferees are in agreement that if a firm decision is made that such firings are required and will be conducted, consideration will be given to a budget request in a future fiscal year.

(5) A general reduction of \$25,000,000 instead of specific reductions in low priority programs totaling \$43,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Makes the sum appropriated for R.D.T.&E., Air Force available until June 30, 1972, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, defense agencies

Amendment No. 41: Makes sum appropriated for R.D.T.&E., Defense Agencies, available until June 30, 1972, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$443,600,000 instead of \$438,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$445,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount of \$3,500,000 is approved for Climate Modification Research (Nile Blue) as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees restored the \$1,500,000 reduction in the laser program which was proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to a \$3,000,000 general reduction for the Defense Atomic Support Agency.

Emergency fund, Defense

Amendment No. 43: Deletes specific transfer authority as provided by the House which is now covered in Section 836.

TITLE VI—COMBAT READINESS, SOUTH VIETNAMESE FORCES, DEFENSE

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$300,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$358,500,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees strongly favor the Vietnamization program of the Department of Defense but believe that the \$600,000,000 in transfer authority provided under Section 836 of the bill could be used to provide for any additional requirements for this program. If additional funds are required above that which could be obtained under the transfer authority, the President can submit a supplemental request to the Congress.

Amendment No. 45: Deletes transfer authority of \$150,000,000 which was proposed by the House. All transfer authority is included under Section 836 as general authority.

TITLE VII—SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Amendment No. 46: Makes the appropriation for the Special Foreign Currency Program available for obligation until June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House, instead of "available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 47: Section 807. Imposes a ceiling of \$136,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$134,400,000 as proposed by the House on funds available for the schooling of minor dependents of military and civilian personnel stationed in foreign countries.

Amendment No. 48: Section 807. Involves language authorizing rest and recuperation trips for dependents of senior advisers in Vietnam who voluntarily extend their tour of duty. It was concurred in by the House without change on December 16, 1970, and thus is not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

Amendment No. 49: Section 836. Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the Part of the House will offer a motion which will provide general transfer authority between appropriations totaling \$600,000,000 instead of specific transfer authority of \$600,000,000 as proposed by the House and general transfer authority of \$700,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Committee of Conference is in agreement that all transfers made under this authority shall be considered to be matters of special interest to the Committees on Appropriations under the reprogramming procedures.

Amendments Nos. 50, 51, and 52: Section 838. (1) Imposes a limitation of \$2,500,000,000 on funds available to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in support of Vietnamese forces and local forces in Laos and Thailand. (2) Limits payments to members of free world forces to the amounts which can be paid for equivalent services to members of the Armed Forces of the United States. (3) Limits U.S. financed military support of Governments of Laos and Cambodia by free world forces to actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war.

Amendment No. 53: Section 842. Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion which will restrict the period of availability of balances in Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation appropriations, as proposed by the House, and provide for the merger of the old balances with appropriations in this bill; and will repeal Section 642 of the Defense Appropriation Act of 1970, which was to have accomplished the purposes of this section but which proved to be ineffective, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55: Section 843. The Conferees agree to the deletion of "Cambodia" from this section. The House language prohibited the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand. The Senate proposed the addition of Cambodia to the section.

Amendment No. 56: Section 844. Updates citation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Section 845. Deletes prohibition inserted by the Senate on the use of funds for research not directly related to a specific military function or operation.

Amendment No. 58: Section 846. Changes section number and inserts language proposed by the Senate limiting the number of military and civilian personnel in intelligence operations in the Department of Defense to 138,000.

Conference total—with comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1971 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1970 total, the 1971 budget estimate total, and the House and Senate bills follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	\$72,667,032,144
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	68,457,666,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971	66,806,561,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971	66,417,077,000
Conference agreement	66,595,937,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	—6,071,095,144
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	—2,149,729,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971	—210,624,000

Senate bill, fiscal year 1971 ----- +178,860,000

GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
JOHN M. SLACK,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 19590) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House for today.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the second conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971. The House passed the first conference report on December 16. It went over to the other body and, after midnight last night, the conference report was tabled by a voice vote.

The first conference report had been signed by all of the Senate conferees except one and had been signed by all of the House conferees. But the bill was tabled last night by a voice vote in the Senate. So we went back into conference with the Senate today.

There were two items that Members will be especially interested in and I think I should make a few remarks in order to make the legislative history of what we are doing reasonably clear.

One of the items related to the use of American ground combat troops in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand, and the other issue related to our support of South Vietnamese and other free world forces in Cambodia or Laos.

SECTION 838

On October 7 of 1970, the defense procurement authorization bill became law—Public Law 91-441. In that bill, language with respect to the use of defense funds to support South Vietnamese and other free world forces in Cambodia or Laos was carried as follows:

Nothing in Clause A of the first sentence of this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing the use of any such funds to support Vietnamese or other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos.

This provision appeared to be a direct denial of any right on the part of the President to use funds in the Defense appropriation bill for the support of the South Vietnamese or other free world

forces in their efforts to prevent a Communist takeover in Cambodia or Laos. From the standpoint of the House conferees on the Defense appropriation bill, this language, which had been enacted into law, was intolerable at this particular point in time.

Almost identical language was incorporated in the Senate version of the Defense appropriation bill. The House conferees refused to adopt the language, tie the President's hands, and make it impossible for him to use funds in the bill to support South Vietnamese and other free world forces in their efforts to prevent a Communist takeover in Cambodia or Laos.

So, in the first conference we had with the other body, we left this language, which became known as the "Fulbright amendment," in the bill, but we modified the amendment by attaching the following proviso:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit support of free world or local forces in actions designed to promote the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war.

That language gave the President considerable latitude in the use of Defense funds to support the Vietnamese and other free world forces in their efforts to make Vietnamization operative, in their efforts to make the disengagement of U.S. troops possible, and in their efforts to prevent a very drastic deterioration in their military situation by a complete Communist takeover in Cambodia or Laos.

So, in the conference today with the other body we agreed to include the objectionable language, which I have quoted, but we insisted upon a proviso which in substance is approximately the same proviso as was contained in the original conference agreement. This relates to section 838 of the Defense appropriation bill. The new proviso is as follows:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war.

We thought that this sufficiently modified the provision in the bill which relates to the same subject and which was very restrictive upon the President.

The fact is that the language in the Defense Procurement Authorization Act—Public Law 91-441—raised grave doubt in my mind as to whether or not that language actually would control the Defense appropriation bill carrying the money, but since this language had been almost identically repeated in the Defense appropriation bill in the Senate, it was thought we should take some action to modify what we consider to be the very damaging language to which I made reference.

So it seems to me the House of Representatives has performed a good function in making it possible for the President to have the latitude which is required to exercise his judgment, to meet the situation in Southeast Asia from the

standpoint of the use of South Vietnamese and other free world forces.

SECTION 843

Now I would like to turn to another provision in the bill that relates to the use of American ground combat troops in Cambodia. The language which we sent to the Senate, the language which passed the House, provided:

In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds appropriated by this section shall be used to finance the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand.

To that the Senate added "or Cambodia." In the conference today, the words "or Cambodia" were stricken out.

In the original conference report, which was adopted by the House and tabled by the Senate, we had a proviso which expanded the President's authority as follows:

Provided, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit the President from taking action in said areas designed to promote the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war.

In the conference with the Senate today, when we considered the use of American ground combat troops in Cambodia, the House was compelled, in order to get a conference agreement, to strike out this proviso which the House supported originally, and which the House conferees would have continued to support. We yielded in order that a conference report might be placed before the House today for reconsideration.

One of the controlling factors in our decision to agree to the elimination of this proviso is the fact that the President has stated repeatedly that he has no intention of using U.S. ground combat troops in Cambodia. In a press conference on December 10, the President stated the following. The question to the President was:

Mr. President, Secretary of State William P. Rogers assured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today that there is no present intention of ever using American ground forces in Cambodia. Can you foresee any circumstances whatever under which you would use ground forces in Cambodia?

The response of the President was:

None whatever.

In view of the fact that the President said he could not foresee the use of American ground combat troops in Cambodia, the House felt that it could safely yield in that respect.

There is another piece of legislation which refers to this proposal on the use of American ground combat troops in Cambodia.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I should clarify a point: in section 843 as passed by the Senate, the prohibition against use of U.S. ground combat troops was extended from Laos and Thailand, which was in the House bill, to include Cambodia, and in the latest conference be-

tween the two bodies, the words "or Cambodia" were stricken.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

This language which was contained in the House bill was inserted in the Defense bill last year, by the other body, and it became part of the law. There was no serious objection to it, although the members of the House Committee on Appropriations were never impressed with this language, but under the circumstances, we hardly had any alternative.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. RHODES. The legislative history stated by the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct. The language was in the appropriation bill last year, and it means exactly the same thing, as far as we are concerned, this year as it did last year. There has been no change in the legislative history as far as that is concerned, except the fact that the other body put the words "or Cambodia" in, and that was stricken in conference today.

Mr. MAHON. I know of no one, Mr. Speaker, who advocates that we use U.S. ground combat troops in Cambodia at this time, but no one can foresee just what the future developments may be.

The House conferees were anxious to do what we could in order to give the President as much flexibility as possible to meet unforeseen situations. We in no way advocate the use of U.S. ground combat troops in Cambodia, but we did not want to deny the President that option if unforeseen developments should make this appear to be desirable.

Nevertheless, under all the circumstances we felt that we could safely yield to the Senate position in that regard, and the Senate agreed to eliminate "or Cambodia" from the bill.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the contention, if there is further contention, would be over the language dealing with the assistance to third countries, or what the gentleman describes as free world forces.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has put his finger on the key point.

Mr. GROSS. And the contention is not among the conferees of the House and the Senate. The contention would be, if the conference report were not adopted, in the same place as it was before, on the part of other Members of the other body who are not members of the conference; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. One member of the conference did not sign, but I believe his reason in not signing did not relate to this point. The other conferees on both sides signed the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. A majority of the conferees on both sides, the House and the Senate, did agree?

Mr. MAHON. Overwhelmingly.

Mr. GROSS. And they have agreed to the language which the gentleman read to us this evening with respect to assistance to third country forces?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. One final question, if the gentleman will indulge me. There has been no change in the money figure of the bill as a result of the last conference?

Mr. MAHON. There has been no change in the money figure. It is \$66.6 billion. All dollar actions agreed to in the first conference report are agreed to in the second conference report.

In my judgment, I might say the total is a lower figure than we will be confronted with next year, in view of the urgent need to modernize our forces in order to deter war and promote peace.

Mr. GROSS. Would there be any point in the House voting on this, as support for the House conferees? I assume that nothing would be gained by that?

Mr. MAHON. I doubt it. I believe it is well understood that a majority of the Congress approves aid to South Vietnamese and other free world forces.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if I might proceed for a moment, I should like to make further reference to the section dealing with the introduction of U.S. ground combat troops into Cambodia. I should like to call particular attention to the supplemental foreign aid authorization bill (H.R. 19911), which relates also to Cambodia. It was a supplemental authorization bill that provided funds for Israel, but it also related to military aid to Cambodia.

The supplemental foreign aid authorization conference report was approved by the House and Senate on December 22, 1970. The language in this bill also relates to the use of U.S. ground combat troops in Cambodia, and states the following:

Section 6. (a) In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used to finance the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia, or to provide United States advisers to or for Cambodian military forces in Cambodia.

So that language, having been approved in the supplemental foreign aid authorization bill on December 22 by both bodies, was another reason why the House receded in part from its position with respect to the use of U.S. troops in Cambodia.

Now, the language in the foreign aid supplemental authorization bill continues as follows:

(b) Military and economic assistance provided by the United States to Cambodia and authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to Cambodia for its defense.

There is nothing in this Defense appropriation conference report that would commit the United States to the defense of the Government of Cambodia other than for the protection of the U.S. forces in South Vietnam and the maintenance of our forces as we undertake to with-

draw and disengage and settle the war which is in progress there.

In support of the language that appeared in the supplemental foreign aid authorization bill, a letter was written by the Secretary of State to Senator CHURCH before the action was taken to prohibit the use of U.S. ground combat troops in Cambodia.

The Secretary stated:

Confirming Assistant Secretary Abshire's conversation with you, I should like to reaffirm that the Administration's programs, policies and intentions in Cambodia in no way conflict with section 6—

That was the section I just read to you.

of H.R. 19911 or with the concerns expressed in the colloquy on the floor of the Senate on December 15.

I felt that although it may be a little tedious, this ought to be spelled out in the RECORD at this time in order that all might understand the interpretation which the House conferees and, I hope, the House places upon the actions which have been taken.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman yielding, and I have appreciated his statement.

I simply want to ask one question. In view of all the give-and-take that has been necessary in order to bring this report here for what we all know is approaching final action, is there anything in the finally agreed upon conference report that would preclude action on the part of the American military or friendly allies in relieving the nonhumanely kept prisoners of war in any areas of the aggressor nation?

Mr. MAHON. No. The answer to the question is "No." There is a proviso in the Defense appropriation bill relating to South Vietnamese and other free world forces, section 838, which is as follows:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of United States Forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war.

There is no prohibition in any legislation of which I know that would prevent incursions by the United States into North Vietnam for the purpose of rescuing Americans held as prisoners of war, and that is where our prisoners are, with the exception of about three, as I understand the situation.

Mr. HALL. I can appreciate the gentleman's statement. I think this is very important, because we must not tie the hands of the military, acting under ultimate civilian authorization, to make such forays in any effort to bring about the release of our non-humanely kept prisoners of war, or if necessary for the early conclusion of the war with honor and protection of our men while they are withdrawing under the Vietnamization plan. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

I would say that this language with respect to Americans held as prisoners

of war, in the judgment of the House conferees, should have been applied to the language relating also to the use of our own U.S. troops in Cambodia. However, we were not able to preserve the language as fully as we would have liked. The language relating to prisoners of war was not in the House or Senate versions of the original bill, but was written in the conference upon the insistence of the Members of the House.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to nail down the point which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) made. As far as I know, speaking as one conferee, there is nothing in this bill that prohibits the President from taking any action which he deems to be appropriate to release any Americans held as prisoners of war, using whatever forces the United States has available, and there is no prohibition against financing the use of South Vietnamese and other free world forces, for that purpose, either. And that is the intent of the conferees, and I am sure that is the import of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I should like to say, as a part of this record, that in my opinion as far as the majority of the House conferees are concerned, and certainly for my own part, I do not think we can write anything into the law to abridge the Constitution of the United States or to deny the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief the right to take such actions that may be required for the defense of our U.S. fighting forces. So it may be that, fundamentally, much of the language about which we have had so much controversy is relatively unimportant, because I do believe that the President of the United States, under the Constitution and as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, does have wide latitude in regard to the use of the Armed Forces. This is a question that has been debated at great length, and I will not try to extend my discussion on that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify one matter which I think is important in connection with the colloquy between the chairman and the gentleman from Iowa relating to the necessity for a record vote here.

Is it the intention of the chairman to obtain a rollcall vote on this conference report?

Mr. MAHON. I have not crossed that bridge. I do not believe there is any problem involved, but, of course, a rollcall vote will be easy to secure at this time. I am certainly not opposed to it, and would probably prefer to have one except for the lateness of the day, and the fact that we do have another conference report coming up on the heels of this one.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I just wanted to express my own strong feelings that the House should—and I hope over-

whelmingly will—put itself on record in support of the House position here in connection with this language. Actually, the language was the only part that was in controversy, and the only part in consideration here, because we have already expressed ourselves on the conference report as a whole when it came before us previously.

But that is the only matter that is really now before us, a matter that was treated in what might be termed a cavalier fashion late last evening, and certainly in a manner that gave us the impression that we were jousting in shadowland. We did not have any disagreement with the men with whom we sat in the conference room, but they feared that their agreements on these provisions, no matter how well founded, could not receive approval at that or any other hour of the night. And I have a strong feeling that it is in order that we make it clear to everyone concerned, whether it be the executive department, the Congress, or others who are looking at us from other parts of the world, that we do not propose to have the President's hands tied as they would have been, not only because of the language which appeared in the defense appropriation bill, but the language which appears in other legislative acts which have already cleared the Congress. I think the situation is one that does require a resounding rollcall vote in order to clearly substantiate the position that we have taken with respect to this language.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, very clearly, we are engaged in a worldwide struggle of ideology, principle, influence, and power, on the ultimate result of which the future fate of our own country and that of the world depends.

Every recent national administration, Democratic or Republican, has recognized this fact of international life, has acted upon it, and has left no doubt—by its actions—that it fully intended for the United States of America to be successful in this struggle.

The Nixon doctrine calls for a generally lower American profile and for greater effort toward self-help on the part of our allies and friends; but it does not contemplate for one moment, as I understand it, a withdrawal by our country from the role and the responsibilities of a world power; and, specifically, it does not envisage an American surrender or concession of the Southeast Asia area to the Communist side.

In the light of these cardinal facts, the semantic struggle in which we have been engaged over the language of this bill seems to me unfortunate.

The great majority of the House of Representatives—the House nearest to the American people—obviously recognizes the realities of the situation in the world, and particularly and specifically the realities of the situation in Southeast Asia, and intends and desires to act on the basis of those realities; and the House wants the President of the United States to have and to retain enough flexibility to do likewise.

The House does not wish to send American ground combat forces into Cambodia, Laos, or Thailand for the pur-

pose of supporting the governments of those countries, and it has only recently made of record its belief that such forces ought not to be dispatched to foreign countries in any normal situation without prior congressional approval and consent, and that, in exceptional cases, when and if these arise, prompt report after the fact is to be made to the Congress. But the House knows that we have military advisers in Laos now—and a majority of us think that it is cheap at the price, if a Communist takeover is thereby avoided in that country, to keep these advisers there.

We know—despite senatorial language inserted by that body in the supplemental foreign aid authorization and given far too little attention in this body—that a need for similar advisers might be indicated in the event of a deteriorating situation in Cambodia. We realize that without involving American ground troops, it might, under some circumstances, become important to our interests—and quite in accordance with the principles of the Nixon doctrine—to be able to give some financial assistance to South Vietnamese or other free world forces for operations by those forces in some of these same areas of Southeast Asia.

Certain politically powerful and highly vocal members of the other body do not appear to share in these same realizations—or, if they do, they adamantly refuse to admit it.

The unfortunate net result is that we now have a bill which, in effect, seems to deny all flexibility in this vital area to the President of the United States in one paragraph, and then to give it back again—if the proper interpretation is applied to the language used—in the sentences that immediately follow.

It is an exercise apparently necessary in order to have needed legislation passed at all; but it fails to squarely face up to important issues; and it leaves those of both schools of thought in large measure free to accuse the other side of lack of frankness or bad faith at some later date, when the inexorable march of events may have led to certain actions which may have been, in fact, inevitable, but which, arguably, either were or were not denied or permitted to the executive branch by the “off again, on again” language of the present enactment.

It is a regrettably unsatisfactory fashion in which to have to deal with fundamental policy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 18, not voting 180, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—234

Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara
Adams	Frey	Olsen
Addabbo	Friedel	Passman
Albert	Fulton, Pa.	Patten
Alexander	Fuqua	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Galifianakis	Perkins
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallagher	Pettis
Annunzio	Garmatz	Philbin
Arends	Gaydos	Pickle
Ashbrook	Gonzalez	Pike
Ashley	Goodling	Podell
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Poff
Barrett	Griffin	Preyer, N.C.
Beall, Md.	Gross	Price, Ill.
Bell, Calif.	Hall	Pryor, Ark.
Bennett	Halpern	Pucinski
Betts	Hamilton	Quie
Bevill	Hammer-	Quillen
Biester	schmidt	Rarick
Blanton	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hansen, Idaho	Rhodes
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Robison
Boland	Harsha	Rodino
Bolling	Harvey	Roe
Bow	Hastings	Rogers, Fla.
Brademas	Hathaway	Ruth
Bray	Hays	St Germain
Brinkley	Hogan	Schadeberg
Brooks	Horton	Schmitz
Brotzman	Hosmer	Schneebeil
Brown, Mich.	Hunt	Schwengel
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Scott
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Shriver
Burke, Fla.	Jacobs	Sikes
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Sisk
Burleson, Tex.	Jonas	Skubitz
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Slack
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Camp	Kazen	Smith, N.Y.
Carey	Kee	Springer
Carney	Keith	Stafford
Carter	King	Stanton
Cederberg	Kluczynski	Steed
Chamberlain	Kyl	Steele
Chappell	Kyros	Steiger, Wis.
Clancy	Landgrebe	Stephens
Collins, Tex.	Latta	Stratton
Conable	Leggett	Stubbiefield
Conte	Long, Md.	Stuckey
Corman	Lukens	Symington
Coughlin	McCloskey	Taft
Crane	McClure	Taylor
Culver	McDade	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	McFall	Teague, Tex.
Daniels, N.J.	Macdonald,	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	Mass.	Tiernan
Dellenback	MacGregor	Tunney
Dennis	Madden	Udall
Dent	Mahon	Van Deerlin
Derwinski	Mailliard	Vander Jagt
Dickinson	Marsh	Vigorito
Dingell	Matsunaga	Wampler
Donohue	Mayne	Ware
Dorn	Meeds	White
Downing	Meicher	Whitehurst
Dulski	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Duncan	Mills	Widnall
Eshleman	Minish	Wiggins
Feighan	Mink	Williams
Findley	Mizell	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Mollohan	Wilson,
Flood	Monagan	Charles H.
Flowers	Montgomery	Wright
Flynt	Morgan	Wylie
Foley	Morse	Wyman
Ford, Gerald R.	Natcher	Young
Foreman	Nelsen	Zablocki
Forsythe	Nichols	Zwack
Fountain	Nix	
	Obey	

NAYS—18

Conyers	Koch	Scheuer
Harrington	Mikva	Thompson, N.J.
Hawkins	Nedzi	Vanik
Hechler, W. Va.	Rees	Waldie
Helstoski	Roybal	Wolf
Kastenmeier	Ryan	Yates

NOT VOTING—180

Abbutt	Ayres	Broomfield
Adair	Belcher	Brown, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Berry	Broyhill, N.C.
Andrews, Ala.	Biaggi	Buchanan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bingham	Burison, Mo.
Aspinall	Blackburn	Burton, Calif.
	Brasco	Burton, Utah
	Brock	Bush

Button
Cabell
Caffery
Casey
Celler
Chisholm
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Colmer
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Devine
Diggs
Dowdy
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Fish
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Gray
Green, Pa.

Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hanna
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Hollifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Landrum
Langen
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McKneally
McMillan
Mann
Martin
Mathias
May
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Mize
Moorhead
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.

O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Pirnie
Poage
Pollock
Powell
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Rallsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Riegler
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Rousselot
Lloyd
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Sebelius
Shiple
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Stokes
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wydler
Yatron
Zion

Mr. Mann with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Mathias.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Mize.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Reuss with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Lowenstein.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Roberts with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mrs. May.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bush.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Riegler.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendment No. 26, Page 18, line 18, strike out "\$3,203,000,000" and insert "\$3,201,300,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert the following: "\$3,219,300,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 20, line 7, strike out "\$1,381,200,000" and insert "\$1,345,100,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert the following: "\$1,338,700,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 43, strike out:

"Sec. 836. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may, if he deems it vital to the security of the United States and in the national interest to further improve the readiness of the Armed Forces, including the reserve components, transfer under the authority and terms of the Emergency Fund an additional \$300,000,000: *Provided*, That the transfer authority made available under the terms of the Emergency Fund appropriation contained in this Act is hereby broadened to meet the requirements of this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

And insert:

"Sec. 836. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$700,000,000 of the appropriations contained in this Act between such appropriations: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following:

"Sec. 836. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$600,000,000 of the appropriations contained in this Act between such appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Zion.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Yatron with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Denney.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Celler with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Langen.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Blackburn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14, Page 15, line 4, strike out "\$2,933,100,000" and insert "\$2,930,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert the following: "\$2,908,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

appropriation to which transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 46, strike out:

"Sec. 842. Appropriations heretofore made available for Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army; Procurement of Aircraft and Missiles, Navy; Other Procurement, Navy; Procurement, Marine Corps; Aircraft Procurement, Air Force; Missile Procurement, Air Force; Other Procurement, Air Force; Procurement, Defense Agencies; and Special Foreign Currency Program shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1973. Appropriations heretofore made available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1975. Appropriations heretofore made available under the headings Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy; Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army; Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force; and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1972."

And insert:

"Sec. 842. (a) Amounts, as determined by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the Office of Management and Budget, of any appropriations of the Department of Defense available for procurement (except Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy) which (1) will remain unobligated as of the close of any fiscal year for which estimates are submitted and (2) which have been available for obligation for three or more fiscal years, shall be withdrawn and shall revert to the general fund of Treasury.

"(b) Amounts, as determined by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the Office of Management and Budget, of any appropriations of the Department of Defense available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy which (1) will remain unobligated as of the close of any fiscal year for which estimates are submitted and (2) which have been available for obligation for five or more fiscal years, shall be withdrawn and shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) Amounts, as determined by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the Office of Management and Budget, of any appropriations of the Department of Defense available for research, development, test and evaluation (except Emergency Fund, Defense) which (1) will remain unobligated as of the close of any fiscal year for which estimates are submitted and (2) which have been available for obligation for two or more fiscal years, shall be withdrawn and shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(d) The Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the internal system upon which the determinations required by this section are based and shall submit to the Congress, prior to April 1, 1971, a report as to the adequacy of such internal system.

"(e) Section 642 of the Department of Defense Appropriation, 1970 (Public Law 91-171, approved December 29, 1969), is hereby repealed."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following:

"Sec. 842. (a) Appropriations heretofore made available for Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army; Procurement of Aircraft and Missiles, Navy; Other Procurement, Navy; Procurement, Marine Corps; Aircraft Procurement, Air Force; Missile Procurement, Air Force; Other Procurement, Air Force; Procurement, Defense Agencies; and Special Foreign Currency Program shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1973. Appropriations heretofore made available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1975. Appropriations heretofore made available under the headings Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army; Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force; and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1972. Each such appropriation shall be merged with and shall be available for the same time period as appropriations made in this Act under the same head.

"(b) Section 642 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970 (Public Law 91-171, approved December 29, 1969), is hereby repealed."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on the bill H.R. 19590, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of discussing the program. I observe that the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, is present.

Tonight we have one other conference report, the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, and on disposition of that, we will finish the legislative business for today, as far as I know.

Tomorrow, as all Members know, the funeral of our late beloved colleague will be held. The Members attending the funeral will be back sometime in the neighborhood of 5 o'clock, and we expect to start business at 5 o'clock tomorrow, starting with the food stamp measure. I would also like for the benefit of Members to state that the Speaker will recognize, under suspension of the rules tomorrow, if we get to it—if not, on Thursday, but hopefully tomorrow—S. 4268, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

I make this announcement about the suspension of the rules without prejudicing, of course, the right of the Speaker

to recognize for suspension of the rules without such an announcement.

I do this for the purpose of keeping the Members as well advised as I can. We do not expect to have any legislative business between 12 noon and 5 o'clock tomorrow. In view of that, I now ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the distinguished majority leader that he wants permission by unanimous consent for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time between the hour of 12 o'clock noon and the resumption of business at 5 p.m. on the return of the funeral delegation?

Mr. ALBERT. That is right. I would like to have a little more leeway in case something should happen on the other side of the Capitol, and we need to wait a few minutes. That would be of benefit to have that.

Mr. HALL. Let me assure the distinguished majority leader I have no intention of objecting to that, and I want him to have the leeway necessary, but as I understand his request that would mean from any time from 5 p.m. until midnight tomorrow night, the Speaker could also declare a recess, but I would certainly ask that the gentleman bring that request up tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will amend my request. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair any time before 8 p.m.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17867, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 17867) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1800)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17867) "making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," having met, after further full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 18, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 9, 10, 30, and 31 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$353,435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$166,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$82,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$103,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,980,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$287,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$420,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$51,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"PEACE CORPS

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, including purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for use outside the United States, \$90,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,476,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,649,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 17, 19, and 24.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CLARENCE D. LONG,
JOHN J. McFALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
CHARLOTTE T. REID,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GALE W. MCGEE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOSEPH M. MONTTOYA,
HIRAM L. FONG,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain of the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17867) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO PREVIOUSLY

The House, on December 16, 1970, adopted the first conference report on the bill (H. Report 91-1745) and then adopted motions relating to amendments reported in technical disagreement. Two amendments of the Senate which had been reported in technical disagreement—Nos. 14 and 15, relating to use of deobligated funds—were concurred in by the House without change. Thus, those two amendments are not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT ACTIVITIES

Funds appropriated to the President

Economic Assistance

Amendment No. 1: Technical assistance: Appropriates \$353,435,000 instead of \$310,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$396,870,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount will be distributed as indicated in amendments numbered 2, 3 and 4 below.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$166,750,000 for World-wide technical assistance instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$183,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$82,875,000 for Alliance for Progress technical assistance instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$90,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$103,810,000 for multilateral organizations technical assistance instead of \$85,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$122,620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: American schools and hospitals abroad: Appropriates \$12,895,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,600,000 as proposed by the House.

The amounts appropriated under this section shall be available solely in accordance with the allocations set forth on pages 10 and 11 of Senate Report No. 91-1370 with the exception of the sum proposed for Igud Lelluf Hanoar which the committee of conference has reduced by \$500,000. In lieu of the \$500,000 reduction mentioned above, the committee of conference has included \$500,000 for the Hospital and Home for the Aged, Zichron-Yaakov, Israel.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which would waive the 1971 and 1972 payments due on certain Public Law 480 loans from the Weizmann Institute and the Bar-Ilan University. The committee of conference felt it was sufficiently meritorious to include the Bar-Ilan University in the waiver of certain Public Law 480 loan repayments for 1971 and 1972. This action should not be considered as establishing a precedent for other institutions to follow.

Amendment No. 7: Indus Basin Development Fund, grants: Appropriates \$4,925,000 instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Indus Basin Development Fund, loans: Appropriates \$6,980,000 instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,960,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Supporting assistance: Appropriates \$414,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$375,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Contingency fund: Appropriates \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Alliance for Progress, development loans: Appropriates \$287,500,000 instead of \$225,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$337,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Development loans: Appropriates \$420,000,000 instead of \$280,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$570,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Administrative expenses, AID: Appropriates \$51,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$51,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Relate to use of deobligated funds. They were concurred in by the House without change on December 16, 1970, and thus are not at issue in the accompanying conference report or amendments in disagreement.

Overseas Private Investment Corporation

Amendment No. 16: Overseas Private Investment Corporation, reserves: Appropriates \$18,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$37,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Social development assistance

Inter-American Social Development Institute

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which would allow the Institute to commence operations and place a limitation of not to exceed \$10,000,000 to be available to fund this program during the current fiscal year.

The committee of conference agrees that no construction of any type should be undertaken by the Institute until proper justification has been presented to and approved by the appropriate committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Amendment No. 18—Section 107: Makes available not to exceed \$9,000,000 for research under section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, as proposed by the House instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$200,000,000 instead of \$272,500,000 as proposed by the House. The Senate deleted this item.

The managers on the part of the House agree that the credit sales program in fiscal

year 1971, as provided for above, should fund a program with a credit authorization of not to exceed \$235,000,000.

TITLE III—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)

Amendment No. 20: Conforms title number.

Peace Corps

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$90,000,000 instead of \$94,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House deleted this item on a point of order due to the lack of authorizing legislation at the time it was considered by the House. The Peace Corps is now authorized by Public Law 91-352, approved July 24, 1970.

It is also provided that of the amount appropriated above, \$30,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses instead of \$31,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Army—Civil functions

Ryukyu Islands, Army, Administration

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$6,476,000 instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,952,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of State

Migration and Refugee Assistance

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$5,649,000 instead of \$5,511,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,787,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Funds appropriated to the President

International Monetary Fund

Increase in Quota, International Monetary Fund

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which would provide for an increase of \$1,540,000,000 in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund.

The committee of conference has deleted the proviso which stated the appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 25: Conforms title number.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 26: Conforms title number.

Amendment No. 27—Section 501: Conforms section number.

Amendment No. 28—Section 502: Conforms section number.

Amendment No. 29—Section 503: Conforms section number.

Amendment No. 30—Section 504: Deletes language proposed by the House which would have required an audit by the Comptroller General of the United States of any project or activity financed by the International Financial Institutions funded in this bill.

Amendment No. 31—Section 505: Deletes language proposed by the House which would have required detailed justifications to be available to the Senate and the House of Representatives on any project or activity financed by the International Financial Institutions funded in this bill.

Conference total—with comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1971 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1970 total, the 1971 budget estimate total, and the House and Senate bills follows:

	<i>Amount</i>
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970.	\$2,710,490,000

Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	2,876,539,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971	2,220,961,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971	2,603,639,000
Conference agreement	2,534,310,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	-176,180,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	-342,229,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971	+313,349,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971	-69,329,000

¹ Includes \$200,000,000 which in the first conference report was reported in agreement (Amendment No. 19), but which in this report is reported in disagreement, and on which a motion will be offered to insist on a \$200,000,000 appropriation for military credit sales.

² Consists of a net of (1) \$90,000,000 added for the Peace Corps, for which no provision was made in the House bill, (2) \$295,849,000 in concessions on various increases made in the bill by the Senate, offset in part by (3) \$72,500,000 reduction from the \$272,500,000 in House bill for military credit sales.

³ Consists of a net of (1) \$4,500,000 reduction from the Senate provision for the Peace Corps, which was not in the House bill, (2) \$264,829,000 in reductions below various increases made in the bill by the Senate, offset in part by (3) \$200,000,000 increase for military credit sales, for which no provision was made in the Senate bill.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CLARENCE D. LONG,
JOHN J. MCFALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
CHARLOTTE T. REID,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17867) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. PASSMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a few minutes to explain why we are back with the second conference report. The day is late, the year is late, and certainly I shall not consume much time.

We are back with the same conference report that passed this House on December 16. The first conference report was unanimously agreed to by the conferees

on the Senate side and the House side. The House approved the conference report, but it was rejected by the other side.

There is only one item that is in true disagreement, and that is on the military credit sales provision. For the benefit of the Members, in order to refresh their memories, the House passed the military sales authorization bill in the amount of \$272,500,000 early this year, and the Senate provided only \$250,000,000. The bill has been tied up in conference not so much because of the difference in amounts but there is another item not germane to the military sales program which kept the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate from reaching agreement.

As far as I know, the authorizing committees in the other body and in this body and, for that matter, the membership are in favor of the military credit sales program, but inasmuch as the other body rejected the conference report, it was necessary for us to go back to conference. We return the conference report, asking the House to support the position of the House conferees. We are not appropriating the entire amount that we could have under the rules. We have provided only \$200 million of the \$272,500,000 which was provided by the House for the military credit sales program.

I have no further comment on the conference report. Would the distinguished gentleman from Kansas like me to yield to him?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield briefly, I should like to concur in the statement of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. The minority is in complete agreement with the statement the chairman has made, and we do agree the military credit sales program is needed and this is also the position of the administration.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there are three other items in technical disagreement, and under the rules, of course, we have to resubmit them for House approval. I might also state that the conference summary table which appeared on page 41934 of the December 16 RECORD is still valid as far as this present conference report is concerned. The only difference is that the \$200,000,000 military credit sales item was brought back in disagreement in this second conference report.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: On page 2, line 20, insert: "and the payments due in 1971 and 1972 on loans made for the benefit of the Weizmann Institute of Science by the Agency for International Development from funds available under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480) are hereby waived."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: ", and the payments due in 1971 and 1972 on loans made for the benefit of the Weizmann Institute of Science and the Bar-Ilan University by the Agency for International Development from funds available under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480), are hereby waived."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 5, line 19, insert:

"SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
"INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
INSTITUTE

"The Inter-American Social Development Institute is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (331 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs during the current fiscal year."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the period at the end of the amendment and insert the following: ": Provided, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out the authorized programs during the current fiscal year."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 10, line 5, strike out:

"TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT
SALES

"FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

"For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Military Sales Act, \$272,500,000."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT
SALES

"FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

"For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Military Sales Act, \$200,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 14, line 7, insert:

"INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
"INCREASE IN QUOTA, INTERNATIONAL MONETARY
FUND

"To finance an increase in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund, \$1,540,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 18306, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
"INCREASE IN QUOTA, INTERNATIONAL MONETARY
FUND

"To finance an increase in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund, \$1,540,000,000 to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

SOVIET UNION SHOULD BE TAKEN
BEFORE THE U.N. COMMISSION
ON HUMAN RIGHTS FOR ITS VIOLATIONS
ON HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker there is an old saying:

The more things change, the more they are the same.

How true this is in the case of the Soviet Union.

Czarist Russia was known throughout the world for its cruelty to its Jewish citizens. They were singled out for bloody pogroms, degrading discrimination, and crushing taxes. The czarist autarchy paid little attention to world protests against their uncivilized anti-Jewish practices.

When the revolution came in 1918, the people of the world looked hopefully to enlightened changes it might bring. Certainly the Jewish citizens of Russia looked to their new government for freedom from the tyranny which had been their lot under the deposed autarchy, and

for a greater measure of rights enjoyed by Russians of other faiths. Those whom the revolution had placed in power promised fulfillment of such hopes.

It was not long, however, that the beautiful phrases and glowing promises proved to be without substance. Over the years, it has become increasingly apparent that the officialdom of Soviet Russia from the highest levels to the lowest are as anti-Jewish as the czars' bureaucracy. The latest example is the decision by the Soviet rulers to place on trial and to impose heavy penalties, including death sentences, upon a number of Jewish citizens, allegedly because they proposed to flee Russia. More trials involving Jews are in the offing and will be convened within the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the more things change, the more they are the same. The barbaric behavior of the rulers of Soviet Russia against their Jewish citizens makes a mockery of that nation's pledges in support of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I would urge President Nixon to take steps to bring to the attention of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights the actions taken by the Soviet Union in violation of the Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the eloquent letter written by Mr. Raymond Epstein, president of the Jewish Welfare Fund of Chicago, to a group of elected officials.

LETTER BY RAYMOND EPSTEIN

There are times when the cause of humanity transcends national boundaries and political differences—and in such a time the act of remaining silent becomes immoral.

The case of Soviet Jewry—3,000,000 unwilling prisoners, victims of discrimination and active persecution—is clearly such an instance. The parallel to the situation in Germany during the early Hitler days is frighteningly clear and the results of world disinterest at that time are still vividly in the minds of all decent people.

The Jews of Russia, at great personal sacrifice, have begun to speak out. Unfortunately, the major reaction has been within Russia where repression and reprisal are mounting—the outside world has not yet responded in any meaningful way. The trial of 32 victims now beginning in Leningrad, a "show" trial by any objective judgment, is the latest evidence of Russian reaction.

Past events have proven that the Russian government is aware of, concerned with and sometimes influenced by world opinion. Certainly this is the time to make known to them that Americans of all faiths are watching their actions and expressing their concern. Premier Kosygin is on record with a statement that Jews would be permitted to leave to rejoin families abroad but there has been little implementation of this promise.

I appeal to you to make your voice heard, both within our own government and directly, personally—as an important elected official—to Russia, to the United Nations and to other leaders throughout the world. In the American tradition and in the name of humanity.

ALTON SAYS NIXON SEEKS REVENUE PLAN

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great disappointments of the 91st Congress has been the failure to act on the President's revenue-sharing legislation. Hearings on this much needed measure must be a top priority in the 92d Congress.

The major expansion of public services in the 1960's took place at the State and local level, in the areas of education, health, welfare, transportation, and police protection. Local sources of revenue are being taxed near the limit to meet these needs. The result is a fiscal mismatch that is not adequately cured by categorical grant-in-aid programs administered by the Federal Government. These programs rest on the invalid assumption that the Federal Government knows what is best for every State and local government in the country. Categorical grant-in-aid programs, however well intentioned, mean redtape and a topheavy bureaucracy in Washington. They are not the answer to the fiscal needs of local government in the seventies.

I would like to include in these remarks a copy of an article from the Annapolis Evening Capital of November 24, 1970, in which County Executive Joseph W. Alton, Jr., of Anne Arundel County, Md., discussed his meeting with the President on revenue sharing. I share their commitment to the program, and will be pressing for action in the next Congress. The article follows:

ALTON SAYS NIXON SEEKS REVENUE PLAN

President Nixon said yesterday that unless Congress passes a comprehensive revenue sharing plan in the near future, "local government is going to be a casualty of the early Seventies," County Executive Joseph W. Alton, Jr. reported today.

Alton, who has frequently called revenue sharing "the most burning domestic issue today," said Nixon was "even stronger than I expected him to be" on the bill which would require the federal government to grant unencumbered funds to local jurisdictions. Alton, along with some 20 other county executives from across the country, met with Nixon yesterday in the President's Oval Office. The meeting, which was scheduled to last 30 minutes, ran on for an hour.

The executives met with Nixon aides Robert Finch, John Erlichman and Daniel P. Moynihan, for a work session following the meeting with the President, Alton said.

Alton said Nixon "unquestionably" places a high priority on revenue sharing. He said it was obvious the President does not expect passage of the bill this Congressional session. It has been tied up in the House Ways and Means Committee for several months.

"He said, I want to be very candid with you. It has no chance this session," Alton reported. "He said it isn't a partisan thing. He said people in Congress from both parties don't understand the problems the counties and other urban subdivisions face."

Alton said Nixon asked the county executives to urge members of Congress from their respective states to push for early approval of the bill.

Alton has long favored revenue sharing, contending that only by the granting of funds with no strings attached can local jurisdictions hope to cope with the problems of the coming decade.

The federal government normally grants funds to local governments for specific projects following application to Washington.

NATIONAL AIRPORT AND BIGGER JETS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a first order of business of the 92d Congress should be the consideration of legislation to establish a Washington, D.C., regional airport authority which will accommodate the Maryland-Virginia-District of Columbia air traffic needs while giving the community at the same time a voice in planning regional airport affairs.

During this past Congress, I sponsored H.R. 17667, which would establish such an authority. Identical legislation, S. 3128, by Senator Spong, of Virginia, was considered by the Senate Commerce Committee during hearings in June. At that time I testified along with other Members of Congress, representatives of the Federal and local governments, and private industrial and aviation groups.

The responsibility to develop properly the full potential of Dulles Airport according to its design capabilities and to serve the total interests of the region cannot be left to the airlines and the Federal Aviation Administration. Dulles Airport built with the taxpayers' dollars must not stand half used but must serve the public. Present operations have caused the scheduling of disproportionate increases of air traffic into National Airport and the accompanying concentration of the jet noise over the Potomac Valley communities while the other regional airports are not experiencing the growth for which they are designed.

The Washington-Baltimore area's three airports comprise one market for air carriers, and commonsense calls for adoption of an integrated system of operation and planning for the three facilities of National, Friendship, and Dulles. The first step in this direction would be the establishment of the authority I have recommended.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 27, 1970, which speaks of this issue:

NATIONAL AIRPORT AND BIGGER JETS

One of the documents we look forward to reading as the new year begins is the report from the Federal Aviation Administration on the use of "stretched" jets at National Airport. In particular, we're fascinated to know how the FAA will explain its action in falling to reimpose the ban at National against stretched 727s which it "temporarily" lifted last spring during the strike of air traffic controllers. We suspect we may know why the FAA has continued to let the larger planes land there—this helps the airlines financially and provides a wedge for expanding that airport—but it would be nice to see these things put into writing.

You have to go back to the time when jets were first permitted into National to put this situation into perspective. Remember what happened in the summer of 1966, just after the jets got permission to land? The terminal was so crowded that it was hard to turn around, let alone get to or from a ticket counter or a gate; and a limitation had to be placed on the number of planes that could land each hour in order to keep the place functioning.

Well, the difference between a regular 727 and a stretched 727 is the difference between 131 passengers and 170 passengers, almost 30 per cent. And until the strike last spring these bigger planes were kept out—to keep down the crowds, to prevent any potential damage to the old runways, and to avoid funneling to National passengers who would otherwise use Dulles or Friendship. The strike, of course, put a premium on the biggest possible airplanes and the FAA quite properly lifted its ban to get more people flying in fewer planes. But when the strike ended promptly, the ban was not reimposed, and in October, 1 out of every 12 planes using the airport was a stretched jet.

There hasn't been a congestion problem on the ground yet, so far as we know, but one would seem inevitable when and if airline traffic gets out of the slump that has plagued the industry in the last year. And then will come the push to build a new and larger terminal at National, expand the runways, and so on. Beyond this, the continued use of stretched jets at National will further postpone the time when major parts of the airline business are shifted to Dulles and Friendship. An internal FAA report pried loose by Senator Spong last May said, "There does not appear to be any practical way in which the stretched 727 decision can be conditioned to avoid compromising the growth of Dulles and Friendship." FAA Administrator Shaffer told Spong last spring that he is not sure this is true and that he wanted to study the situation. We trust that the study the FAA has conducted since that time has not focused solely on the convenience of the airlines but has kept in mind the goal—the only proper one in our view—of making Dulles this city's principal airport as quickly as possible.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for their untiring efforts, cooperation, and diligence during the three sessions of the 91st Congress.

The House Committee on the District of Columbia, by its almost continuous legislative activities in this Congress, has again demonstrated its dedicated and abiding interest in the Nation's Capital, and in helping the Congress to meet its responsibility as set forth in article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which defines the powers of Congress and provides that the Congress shall "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District—not exceeding 10 miles square—as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

The devotion of committee members to their duties has been well demonstrated in this session—one of the busiest our committee has experienced—when more hearings have been held and, therefore, more necessary action by the full committee as well as by subcommittees, than in prior sessions of the Congress.

Regretfully, while the House passed 48 bills reported out by the House District Committee, only 31 of these bills were approved by the other body and signed by the President—three others,

pending before him, are expected to be approved.

The most important legislation considered this year by the House District Committee was the omnibus anticrime and court reorganization bill—including provision for 17 additional judges—much of which was initiated by the committee, passed overwhelmingly by the House and the Senate, and approved by the President. It is a composite of 27 House bills, a few sponsored by the administration as needed court reforms, but most of them amendments to the Criminal Code and Bail Reform Act, sponsored by House Members. It is aimed point blank at the crime situation in Washington and amends present police and court procedures for the handling, treatment, and sentencing of criminals.

The purpose of this law is to give to the people in Washington, its citizens, and those temporarily sojourning here, as well as the millions of visitors who come here annually, some measure of surcease from the ever-growing criminal element which too long, outrageously and indensively, has been a threat to life, limb, and property in the District of Columbia.

The crime rate in the Nation's Capital has been a national disgrace far too long, and the House District Committee has been in the forefront for many years endeavoring to secure enactment by the Congress of appropriate legislation to help stem the criminal tide in Washington.

Other important and major legislative proposals are two revenue acts which together increased by \$36 million—from \$90 million to \$126 million—the permitted annual Federal payment to the District; raised the estimated debt ceiling for general fund borrowing from \$392.3 million to \$610 million; increased the borrowing authority in the District's special funds to new ceilings; namely, to \$72 million for the sanitary sewage fund; \$110 million for the highway fund; and \$57 million for water fund; provided an estimated \$25 million from income tax increases and \$300,000 revenue for highway repairs from truck fees; \$200,000 from a tax on rental of linens; and a \$200,000 saving to District by HEW inspection of milk and dairy products.

Also authorized was a \$6.2 million subsidy for the District of Columbia medical and dental schools, and it was enacted that land grant funds are to be equally divided between the Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute.

Legislation from the committee also authorized 20-year leases of space for the District of Columbia government, and provided for a study of Potomac River pollution and resources.

In addition, the House District Committee reported and the Congress approved authorization for a Federal contribution of not to exceed \$1,147 million and the District's share of \$216.5 million of the net project cost of a regional rapid rail system expanded to 97 miles, with total estimated cost of \$2,494.6 million; exempting FHA and VA mortgages and loans, cooperative associations, and the institution of higher learning in the District, from interest and usury laws; amending the District's Minimum Wage

and Industrial Safety Acts; providing appreciable pay increases and increased retirement benefits for teachers, police, and firemen; creating the position of Delegate to the House from the District; and establishing a commission to study the operation of the District government.

Specifically, I wish to report on the overall activities of the House District Committee in the three sessions of the 91st Congress, as follows:

First. During this Congress, 306 bills and joint resolutions have been referred to and considered by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, 269 of these being House bills and joint resolutions and 37 being Senate-passed bills.

Second. Public hearings consuming 101 days have been held by the District Committee and subcommittees on 121 bills and resolutions which have been referred to them.

Third. Sixty-three executive sessions have been held by the full District Committee and by subcommittees on various bills.

Fourth. During this Congress, 54 bills have been favorably reported by the District Committee to the House; 48 of them passed the House, and 31 of them have been signed by the President—three are pending before him awaiting his expected approval.

CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, our courts are the final bulwark in the sense of individual liberties, and I believe their protection should be afforded all Americans and not curtailed for some. That is why I believe Governor Reagan's veto of \$1.8 million for California rural legal assistance should be overturned by the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, D.C.

For the first time, the Nation's rural poor are assured skilled representation in civil matters, many of which touch directly on their constitutional rights. The mere fact that the CRLA has won all five of its cases that have been appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court significantly underscores the grave questions of individual rights and freedoms that are at stake.

Unquestionably, the CRLA has ruffled some administrative feathers in Sacramento and this may explain the extraordinary hostility of some of the official memoranda on which the Governor based his veto. But the overriding public good demands that the poor, as well as the rich, have access to our courts. Our Nation would ossify and our liberties would diminish if all Americans did not have a free voice, through legal and orderly procedures, to challenge the status quo.

Clearly, without the courts, with their traditions of civility and dignity, there would only be the streets in which to redress grievances. Force would supplant reason and our freedoms would be ridiculed in the crossfire between repression and anarchy.

The CRLA represents new hope for thousands of Californians to rightful representation in our courts, and it should not be extinguished now—or ever.

TREATMENT OF RUSSIAN JEWS

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, individual crime is no less deplorable than national crime, and certainly the one should not become an excuse for the other. Clearly, the hijacking of an airplane is a criminal offense, but, just as clearly, such a crime should not mask a larger national crime of ethnic persecution and subjugation.

The severe sentences handed down by a Leningrad court against 11 accused Soviet hijackers—nine of them Jewish—raises such a specter. The trial itself, held in secret, gave further substance to reports that the Soviet Union may be launched on a ruthless and wholesale discrimination against its Jewish citizens.

The United States, through all diplomatic means, must make clear her indignation against any possible diabolical distortion of the alleged offense of the 11 hijackers into a massive policy of repression against Jews.

Justice is a cornerstone of civilization and world order, and our Nation must underscore to the Soviets—by Presidential declaration if necessary—that any policy of theirs to deny justice to Jews fans the fires of tension and distrust which so long have kept the world in turmoil. At the same time, the United States must not relax her commitment to attacking racism within her own borders and must continue to expand the promise of opportunity and dignity to all her citizens.

The ageless heroism of the Jews—displayed currently in the steady courage of Israel in the face of Soviet arms on the Suez—is an inspiration to all who cherish their religion, their heritage and their individual worth. This heroism shall not be forsaken now in the Soviet Union.

The United States will continue to support Jewish aspirations; she will continue to help arm Israel for self-defense; she will support realistic peace efforts to bring security to Israel and stability to the Middle East; she will oppose anti-Semitism at home and abroad.

Additionally, she must take the lead in mounting world indignation against possible Soviet persecution. She must emphasize to Soviet leaders the jolting world repercussions of any program. She must undertake efforts to win safe conduct for Jews to their historic homeland in Israel. Congress must stand ready to support these goals and to urge the President to proclaim them to the world.

LET THEM LIVE AND LET THEM LEAVE

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, countries around the world are shocked by the

savage act of the Soviet Union in sentencing to death two Soviet Jews and to long prison sentences nine other Soviet citizens all of whom were Jews with the exception of one. Their crime was to seek to depart from a country which will not let them live and will not let them leave. The latest anti-Semitic acts of the Soviet Union should really not shock any one of us in view of the long history of oppression against Jews living in Russia from the days of the czars, through the terror of Stalin, to the reign of Kosygin-Brezhnev.

The Leningrad trial is the beginning of a modern-day pogrom—this time in the form of a legalized lynching. Similar actions taken by the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia which take their signals from the U.S.S.R. make it quite clear there is now a deliberate drive throughout Eastern Europe to fan the fires of anti-Semitism.

It is at a time like this that one who is not a Jew might begin to understand the feelings of Jews around the world in their support for their oppressed brethren and their love for the State of Israel. For in truth we should recognize that there are few countries in the civilized world which have not sometime in their history engaged in the vilest of anti-Semitic practices running the gamut from expulsion, as was the case in Spain and England, restriction on citizenship as was the situation in France and Italy, to the ultimate "final solution" adopted by Nazi Germany. And what must also be recognized is the fact that were the Soviet Union by some miracle to permit the 3½ million Jews now held prisoner in that country to freely emigrate, there would be no country, and that includes our own, which would open wide its doors to accept them—with one exception and that is the State of Israel. Is it any wonder that Jews throughout the world, and that includes those fully integrated here in the United States, must have on their minds the safekeeping of that single sanctuary to which our brethren elsewhere oppressed and prevented from practicing their religion, may flee and know that they will receive a warm welcome?

The Soviet Union should be condemned before the United Nations and in the Security Council for its revival of anti-semitic practices, and the U.S. Delegate should be the first to bring those charges.

I say to my Jewish kin and to my non-Jewish friends and colleagues that all of us should keep in mind that ancient plea first uttered at the waters of Babylon by a people who had been held captive and in exile, just as the Jews in the Soviet Union are held today:

If I forget thee, oh Jerusalem, may my right hand wither.

If the world stands by and permits the Soviet Union to continue with its oppression including death and imprisonment and the cultural genocide of the Jewish people, then indeed the right hand of every man alive who sits back and does nothing should wither.

If there is one country whose citizens have demonstrated over the years their concern in matters of this kind, it is the United States and we must take the lead

in awakening the conscience of the world. Hopefully, we will not be found wanting.

THOROUGH INVESTIGATION NEEDED

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have, in the past, called attention to the highly questionable activities of former Assistant Postmaster General William J. Hartigan in connection with the award of highly lucrative airmail contracts to an air taxi service named the Sedalia-Marshall-Boonville Stage Lines, Inc., of which he is now an official.

Now the General Accounting Office has issued a report to Senator GORDON ALLOTT which points up the irregularities that took place in the award of these and other airmail contracts during Hartigan's tenure at the Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I am today asking the Department of Justice to make a complete investigation of the award of these contracts to determine whether any Federal laws have been violated by the individuals and firms involved.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of Mr. BROOMFIELD's special order on December 30, 1970, and to include therein extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for December 30 through January 3, on account of official business.

Mr. MOSHER (at the request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania), for today and remainder of week, on account of attending sessions in Chicago of American Society for the Advancement of Science on committee business of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. RANDALL, for Tuesday, December 29, 1970, on account of official business (annual date, first Monday after Christmas for personal interviews with approximately 50 Academy applicants for appointment to the three service Academies).

Mr. WINN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of personal business.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO), for 60 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, tomorrow, for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK, for 1 hour on December 30, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD, on December 30, for 1 hour.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, on today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, on today, for 1 hour.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. GAYDOS, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS, today, for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK, to follow the remarks today of Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include extraneous matter and tables, during his remarks on conference report on H.R. 17867.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. ERLBORN.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. MCKNEALLY in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in five instances.
 Mr. HOGAN in five instances.
 Mr. ROBISON.
 Mr. WHALEN.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. WIDNALL.
 Mr. COUGHLIN.
 Mr. LANDGREBE.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.
 Mr. REES.
 Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.
 Mr. BOLLING in two instances.
 Mr. O'HARA in three instances.
 Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. FASCELL.
 Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.
 Mr. FEIGHAN.
 Mr. CHAPPELL.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7311. An act to amend item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes;

H.R. 10517. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13493. An act to change the name of certain projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River;

H.R. 13810. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. Poehlein;

H.R. 14645. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain uses of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, and of the seals of the President and Vice President, and to authorize Secret Service protection of visiting heads of foreign states or governments, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16745. An act to limit, in the case of certain special service vessels, the application of the duties imposed on equipments and repair parts purchased for, and repairs made to, U.S. vessels in foreign countries;

H.R. 17473. An act to extend the period for filing certain manufacturers claims for floor stocks refunds under section 209(b) of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17901. An act to improve judicial machinery by providing for the appointment of a circuit executive for each judicial circuit;

H.R. 18306. An act to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19333. An act to provide greater protection for customers of registered brokers and dealers and members of national securities exchanges;

H.R. 19857. An act to name certain Federal buildings;

H.R. 19885. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19911. An act to provide additional foreign assistance authorizations, and for other purposes

H.R. 19342. An act to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 19928. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purpose; and

H.J. Res. 1420. Joint resolution authorizing the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the Cavaliere di Gran Croce, of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica, an award conferred by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 11. An act to reinforce the federal system by strengthening the personnel resources of State and local governments, to improve intergovernmental cooperation in the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to provide grants for improvement of State and local administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to provide grants to State and local governments for training of their employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities, to facilitate the temporary assignment of personnel between the Federal Government, and State and local governments, and for other purposes; and

S. 2984. An act to permit certain Federal employment to be counted toward retirement.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 22, 1970:

H.R. 212. An act to clarify the status and benefits of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 380. An act to amend section 7 of the Act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968);

H.R. 956. An act to rename a lock of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal the "Henry Holland Buckman lock";

H.R. 3107. An act to officially designate the Totten Trall Pumping Station;

H.R. 4982. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Beck;

H.R. 4983. An act for the relief of James M. Buster;

H.R. 6049. An act to amend the definition of "metal bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States;

H.R. 6100. An act for the relief of Hershel Smith, publisher of the Lindsay News, of Lindsay, Okla.

H.R. 6778. An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6854. An act to provide for the free entry of a peal of eight bells and fittings for use of Smith College, Northampton, Mass.;

H.R. 7264. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl C. Davis;

H.R. 7334. An act to designate the lake formed by the waters impounded by the Libby Dam, Mont., as "Lake Kococanusa";

H.R. 8933. An act to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the "Jackson lock

and dam" on the Tombigbee River, Alabama, shall hereafter be known as the Coffeerville lock and dam;

H.R. 9183. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that imported articles, which are exported and thereafter reimported to the United States for failure to meet sample or specifications shall, in certain instances, be entered free of duty upon such reimportation;

H.R. 10150. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.;

H.R. 10704. An act for the relief of Samuel R. Stephenson;

H.R. 11547. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to increase the loan limitation on certain loans;

H.R. 12128. An act for the relief of William Heidman, Jr.;

H.R. 12584. An act to rename a pool of the Cross Florida Barge Canal "Lake Ocklawaha";

H.R. 12621. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert J. Scanlon;

H.R. 13182. An act for the relief of Frank E. Dart;

H.R. 13676. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

H.R. 13806. An act for the relief of Irwin Katz;

H.R. 13862. An act to authorize the naming of the reservoir to be created by the Little Goose lock and dam, Snake River, Wash., in honor of the late Dr. Enoch A. Bryan;

H.R. 14271. An act for the relief of Jack A. Diggins;

H.R. 14683. An act to designate as the John H. Overton lock and dam the lock and dam authorized to be constructed on the Red River near Alexandria, La.;

H.R. 15270. An act for the relief of Thaddeus J. Pawlak;

H.R. 15272. An act for the relief of David L. Kennison;

H.R. 15505. An act for the relief of Jack B. Smith and Charles N. Martin, Jr.;

H.R. 15911. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates, income limitations, and aid and attendance allowances relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation; to exclude certain payments in determining annual income with respect to such pension and compensation; to make the Mexican border period a period of war for the purposes of such title; and for other purposes;

H.R. 15979. An act to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the agricultural credit insurance fund shall be included in gross income;

H.R. 16502. An act for the relief of Gary W. Stewart;

H.R. 16506. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the applicability of the exemption from income taxation of cemetery corporations;

H.R. 16940. An act to extend until December 31, 1972, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum;

H.R. 16965. An act for the relief of Richard N. Stanford;

H.R. 17255. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air;

H.R. 17750. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the city of Boston to construct, maintain, and operate a causeway and fixed-span bridge in Fort Point Channel, Boston, Mass.;

H.R. 17825. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17853. An act for the relief of Carlo Bianchi & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 18858. An act to change the name of the West Branch Dam and Reservoir, Mahon-

ing River, Ohio, to the Michael J. Kirwan Dam and Reservoir;

H.R. 19436. An act to provide the establishment of a national urban growth policy, to encourage and support the proper growth and development of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, and towns with emphasis upon new community and inner city development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19504. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19855. An act to designate the lake formed by the waters impounded by the Butler Valley Dam, Calif., as "Blue Lake";

H.R. 19877. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19890. An act to name a Federal building in Memphis, Tenn., for the late Clifford Davis; and

H.J. Res. 1162. An act to amend Public Law 403, 80th Congress, of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

On December 24, 1970:

H.R. 7311. An act to amend item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes;

H.R. 14645. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain uses of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, and of the seals of the President and Vice President, and to authorize Secret Service protection of visiting heads of foreign states or governments, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17473. An act to extend the period for filing certain manufacturers claims for floor stocks refunds under section 209(b) of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17901. An act to improve judicial machinery by providing for the appointment of a circuit executive for each judicial circuit;

H.R. 18306. An act to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19333. An act to provide greater protection for customers of registered brokers and dealers and members of national securities exchanges;

H.R. 19857. An act to name certain Federal buildings;

H.R. 19885. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19911. An act to provide additional foreign assistance authorization, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1420. An act authorizing the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and

wear the Cavaliere di Gran Croce, of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica, an award conferred by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect for our deceased colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 30, 1970, 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:

2633. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of various facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2634. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 14th annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to 70 Stat. 105; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2635. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report showing information on the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by the Commission during fiscal year 1970, financial statements of proceeds derived from licenses issued by authority of the Federal Power Act, and the names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission during that period, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2636. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the improvement needed in the administration of the Federal program of aid to educationally deprived children in Ohio, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2637. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness of revised procedures implementing the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2638. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in evaluating design requirements for construction and modernization of Veterans' Administration

hospitals; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Final report. (Rept. No. 91-1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 1419. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance, by the Joint Committee on the Library on behalf of the Congress, from the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, of preliminary design sketches and funds for murals in the east corridor, first floor, in the House wing of the Capitol, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 91-1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-1797). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 1626; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1798). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 19590; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1799). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 17867; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1800). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 20013. A bill to name a certain ship channel the "Fallon Channel"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 798. Concurrent resolution relative to establishment of an emergency economic program to combat inflation and recession; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 1320. A resolution condemning the persecution of any persons because of their religion in the Soviet Union; urging the Soviet Union to permit the free exercise of religion and pursuit of culture by Jews and all other citizens; and urging that the Soviet Union allow the emigration of its citizens who wish to emigrate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Tuesday, December 29, 1970

(Legislative day of Monday, December 28, 1970)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount

up with wings like eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.—Isaiah 40: 31.

Help us, O Lord, to run when we can, to walk when we ought, to wait when we must. In everything do through us only what is best for the United States, and give us wisdom to leave undone that for which we are not ready.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter: