

of Representatives, and examined and found truly enrolled by the Secretary of the Senate:

On January 2, 1971:

H.R. 370. 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;

H.R. 6562. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to beer, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7626. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, sirups, and molasses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15623. An act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15728. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17068. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for aircraft manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under temporary importation bond, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide floor stock refunds in the case of cement mixers;

H.R. 17917. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period of qualifications of certain union-negotiated pension plans;

H.R. 17984. An act to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969;

H.R. 17988. An act to amend section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow aircraft to be leased for temporary use outside the United States without a recapture of the investment credit;

H.R. 18549. An act to amend sections 902 (b) and 902 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 10 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 10-percent test is met;

H.R. 18694. An act to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the treatment of certain losses sustained by reason of the confiscation of property by the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 19113. An act to provide for the free entry of a 61-note cast bell carillon and a 42-note subsidiary cast bell carillon for the use of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.;

H.R. 19172. An act 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;

H.R. 19242. An act to amend section 278 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend its application from citrus groves to almond groves;

H.R. 19369. An act to amend section 165 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities;

H.R. 19391. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions;

H.R. 19470. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the nursing service requirement and certain other requirements which an institution must meet in order to qualify as a hospital thereunder so as to make such require-

ments more realistic insofar as they apply to smaller institutions;

H.R. 19562. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain statutory mergers;

H.R. 19567. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968;

H.R. 19627. An act to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income;

H.R. 19670. An act to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until the close of December 31, 1973;

H.R. 19686. An act to amend section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 19774. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in certain cases a spouse will be relieved of liability arising from a joint income tax return;

H.R. 19790. An act relating to the income tax treatment of certain sales of real property by a corporation;

H.R. 19881. An act relating to consolidated returns of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19915. An act to extend the temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement recipients in determining their needs for public assistance; and

H.J. Res. 1421. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 2, 1971:

##### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Carol M. Khosrovi, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

John Oliver Wilson, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, January 2, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*As I was with Moses, so I will be with you: I will not fail you or forsake you.* Joshua 1: 5.

O God, our Father, by whose mercy we have come to the portal of another year, grant that we may enter it with humble and grateful hearts. Confirm us in our resolution to walk more closely with Thee in Thy way and to labor more faithfully for the good of our country and the peace of the world. Thus may this year be a better year and our Nation a better nation because we live and work and pray during these coming months.

Bless Thou our beloved Speaker and his lovely wife. Looking forward, may they feel the support of Thy grace, be sustained by our affection, and find security in their faith in Thee and in our country. Guided by Thy Spirit, may they and we walk along the path that shineth more and more unto the perfect day of Thy heavenly kingdom.

May Thy blessing abide with us and our Nation now and forevermore. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 31, 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 bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6562. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to beer, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7626. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, sirups, and molasses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide floor stock refunds in the case of cement mixers;

H.R. 17988. An act to amend section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow aircraft to be leased for temporary use outside the United States without a recapture of the investment credit;

H.R. 18549. An act to amend sections 902 (b) and 902 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 10 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 10-percent test is met;

H.R. 19369. An act to amend section 165 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities;

H.R. 19391. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions;

H.R. 19470. An act to amend title XVIII

of the Social Security Act to modify the nursing service requirement and certain other requirements which an institution must meet in order to qualify as a hospital thereunder so as to make such requirements more realistic insofar as they apply to smaller institutions;

H.R. 19562. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain statutory mergers;

H.R. 19627. An act to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income;

H.R. 19670. An act to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until the close of December 31, 1973;

H.R. 19686. An act to amend section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 19774. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in certain cases a spouse will be relieved of liability arising from a joint income tax return; and

H.R. 19790. An act relating to the income tax treatment of certain sales of real property by a corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 18251. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide refunds in case of certain uses of tread rubber; and

H.R. 19915. An act to make permanent the existing temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement re-

ipients in determining their need for public assistance.

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. 15628) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, December 31, 1970, he did, on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 16199. An act to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to accelerate the collection of estate and gift taxes, to continue excise taxes on passenger automobiles and communications services; and for other purposes.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 2, 1971.

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

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 8:00 p.m. on Friday, January 1, 1971, said to contain H.R. 17809, An Act to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes, and a veto message thereon.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS, Clerk,  
U.S. House of Representatives.

H.R. 17809, POLICY ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEE WAGE SCALE FOR "BLUE COLLAR" EMPLOYEES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 91-437)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning, without my approval, H.R. 17809, a bill which would fix in law the pay practices applied to Federal "blue collar" employees.

A uniform government-wide wage system for these employees already exists. The Coordinated Federal Wage System which is now in effect is flexible and can respond to changing labor market conditions. The responsiveness of the present method has been demonstrated recently as it provided average wage increases of 9.5 percent during Fiscal Year 1969 and 8.1 percent in Fiscal Year 1970.

H.R. 17809 would also have adverse economic implications. At a time when the Administration is most concerned about inflationary wage settlements in the private sector, this bill would mean that many Federal Employees in a given locality would be paid at much higher rates than those prevailing in the private sector of the same locality. Under the

present system, most Federal blue collar workers are already paid four percent more than prevailing rates. This bill would mean that about two-thirds of these workers would be paid at rates eight percent above prevailing rates.

The costly and unwarranted pay features of H.R. 17809 would add still further to a \$4 billion blue collar Federal payroll. Since the majority of the employees covered by the proposed bill are employed by the Department of Defense, the only way in which the substantial added costs of the enrolled bill could be met would be through further reductions in employment levels. The Department of Defense has been undergoing substantial employee reductions in the past two years and further reductions would not be acceptable at this time.

Finally, it should be noted that when the wages of Federal employees go up, even greater pressures are placed on private employers to raise their own wages—and thus the fires of inflation are fueled.

In order to keep the administrative wage structure flexible, to fight inflation, and to maintain sufficient employment levels, I must disapprove this bill.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 1, 1971.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The veto message was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS DURING THIS CALENDAR DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order during this calendar day for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader give us some indication of what is proposed for this day?

Mr. ALBERT. Mainly the normal end of the session activities and resolutions, a few unanimous-consent amendments to be agreed to, offered by the Committee on Ways and Means, and, of course, we are awaiting the final disposition of the Department of Transportation appropriation bill in the Senate. We expect that to be done, I will say to the gentleman, today, and we hope and expect that it will be done early today.

Mr. GROSS. I will ask the gentleman if that is the only business to come from the other body?

Mr. ALBERT. The only thing I know of, except the adoption of the concurrent resolution for sine die adjournment.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I do anticipate that the Senate will message over two bills that were passed by the House unanimously, to which an amendment has been in each instance added by the

Senate. They are on the way over, I think, now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader put in any kind of time frame the expected adjournment of the House?

Mr. ALBERT. We hope it will be early today. I will say to my friend, but I do not have, and neither does the House, complete control over the situation.

Mr. GROSS. I am well aware of that. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1338) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1338

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members on the part of the House of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, and the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. RHODES.

#### PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1339) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1339

*Resolved*, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Ninety-second Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION FOR ALL MEMBERS TO INSERT REMARKS IN "EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS" SECTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of

House have the privilege of inserting their own remarks in the "Extensions of Remarks" section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therewith brief related extraneous material on one or more subjects; this order to be effective until publication of the last edition of the RECORD authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, but it shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered after adjournment of the Congress.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and the subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK STATESMAN PAR EXCELLENCE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today the 91st Congress passes into American history.

Today when our great Speaker raps the sine die gavel, he completes 42 years of illustrious and devoted service in this Chamber. Fifty years ago, in 1920, Speaker McCORMACK was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. Three years later in 1923 he was elected to the Massachusetts senate where he served 2 years as leader. In 1928 the Speaker was elected to Congress and has been reelected 21 successive times.

Eighteen years as majority leader and 9 years as Speaker sparkles the completion of public service that ranks JOHN McCORMACK with the top dozen of our greatest legislators in the history of our Nation.

He is the last of the old school of self-made statesmen.

By reason of his father's early death he was the prime support of his mother and family during his grade school years. Thus he missed a high school and college education.

Regardless of his financial handicaps in his youth, he served his State and country for 50 years, rising to the third-highest office in the Nation.

No American statesman of this century possesses a record that demonstrates America's opportunity for its youth more than the life of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK.

The history of his astoundingly successful career, extending through his adult life should be must reading for every American boy.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks excerpts from an interview with Commentator William F. Arbogast and the Speaker which was reported in the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune on December 23, 1970:

#### BOSTON'S JOHN McCORMACK NO LONGER TOUGH OLD POL

"Politics," said John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives for the past nine years, "is the art and science of government.

"To be a successful politician, thereto, one must be close to those governed and must understand their needs and desires. I believe the best way to gain this knowledge of what the people want is to remain close to them, to mingle with them and to keep in touch with them.

"Politics, when properly practiced, is an honorable profession, one which should attract the best men and women."

John McCormack, congressman from South Boston, top lieutenant to the legendary Sam Rayburn and finally speaker himself, will leave Capitol Hill when the 91st Congress adjourns.

It will mark the end of 42 years of uninterrupted service in the House, including a record nine consecutive years as speaker.

He did not seek re-election this year, making him the first speaker to voluntarily retire to private life in more than a century.

#### EXPERT DEBATER

"I believe the people are entitled to see their representative in government and to hear his views personally and ask questions, and not through the medium of electronics or press agency," he said in a private interview.

He is his own press agent. He doesn't like prepared speeches. He is best when speaking off-the-cuff and has earned his reputation as one of the best rough and tumble debaters ever to serve in the House.

Some of his ad-libs have been classics.

He once verbally cut down an opponent during House debate by telling him of his "minimum high regard."

McCormack's sharp tongue also served him well in "the little back rooms" where big and tough decisions were made. A lifetime of Boston politics, and three terms as chairman of Democratic convention platform committees, taught him how to knock heads together.

McCormack and his wife of 50 years have no children, and their devotion to each other is a subject of frequent comment in the capital.

Seldom do they fail to have their morning and evening meals together. They avoid the Washington social whirl, spending their evenings together in a Washington hotel into which they moved when they came to the capital. When Mrs. McCormack, the former Harriet Joyce, and a member of the Metropolitan Opera, was hospitalized several months ago, the speaker rented an adjoining room to be with her.

#### PEOPLES LEGISLATE

The McCormack imprint is on much major legislation enacted this century. He was a leader in fights for wage and hour laws, Social Security, health programs, job safety regulations, federal aid to education and lowering of the voting age to 18 years.

A self-made man, McCormack won political success the hard way. His father, a stone-

mason and bricklayer, died when McCormack was 13.

The future speaker, who was to serve in Congress under eight presidents, left school at that age to help support his widowed mother and two younger brothers. The boys had a paper route. McCormack later got a full-time job as a messenger boy in Boston's financial district for \$3.50 a week.

He left that job for a 50-cent raise and a job in a law office that gave him the chance to read law books. He taught himself the law, and eventually was admitted to the bar.

Of the many memorable events in McCormack's life, two stand out in his memory.

"The most memorable," he said, "was the day in 1920 when we were married."

The other was in January 1965, when McCormack administered the oath of the office of vice president to Hubert H. Humphrey.

Until that moment, McCormack was next in line to become President. Lyndon B. Johnson had no vice president for more than three years after the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

"A great load was removed from me," McCormack said. "I have had many happy moments, but that was one of the most memorable."

#### ACTIVE RETIREMENT

Does McCormack think he will have any difficulty adjusting to a life of leisure?

"No. I do not anticipate any difficulty. I'm going to miss the House very much, but so far as adjustment is concerned, I think I have a philosophical mind and there'll be no difficulty in that respect."

Does he have any plans to travel?

"I have no specific plans for the present. As to the future, those are matters that take care of themselves."

How does he feel about Congress trying to limit or restrict presidential action in foreign affairs?

"Congress can express itself, but I think it could be harmful to the national interest to completely tie the President's hands, to freeze his judgment in the field of foreign affairs."

What prompted his decision to retire?

"I had been planning to retire since 1968. I never intended to stay here as long as I did, anyhow. But if I had quit in 1968, with a presidential election on, it might have been construed as desertion of the Democratic party. I would not do that. The Democratic party has been very good to me."

#### GOVERNMENT WAS HIS PROFESSION

Why did McCormack decide to get into politics?

"Politics is a way of life in Boston," he said. "In 1917 I was elected a member of the Massachusetts constitutional convention. Then there were two terms in the Massachusetts House and four in the state Senate."

The only losing political battle in McCormack's long career was in 1926 when he failed in his initial campaign for election to Congress. Two years later he won, and he never lost again.

McCormack said he is concerned about the growing cost of running for public office. It is "serious threat to our form of government," he said, "and could become a wealthy man's field or an area where candidates are subsidized by vested interests.

"There should be an opportunity for citizens to make reasonable contributions to their candidates or parties, with limited deductions on their income taxes."

#### EXPRESSING THE THANKS OF THE HOUSE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) will take the chair.

Mr. POFF assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POFF). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1340) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1340

*Resolved*, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby extends to its beloved Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack, sincere wishes for a long, pleasant, and well-earned retirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is a proud duty which I perform in offering this resolution in appreciation to our great Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK has been a legislator since the year 1920. He was a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives from 1920 to 1922 and a member of the Massachusetts Senate from 1923 to 1926, during which time he served as the Democratic leader of that body.

He was elected to the 70th Congress in a special election and has served as a Member of this body ever since that time.

And, I might say parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, that the first time I was ever in this body was when I was visiting in Washington with my parents. The Congressman from my district, the Fourth District of Kansas at that time, the Honorable Homer Hoch, took us into the gallery. That was during the 70th Congress. I undoubtedly saw the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is now the Speaker of this House, as a very junior Member of this body during the 70th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK has been a Member of the leadership of 13 Congresses. He was elected either majority leader or whip from the 79th Congress to the 87th Congress. He has been the Speaker of the House since the second session of the 87th Congress to the present date.

I think it is worthy of note that at least a portion of this time of which the gentleman from Massachusetts, our Speaker, served in the leadership, could well be called the Massachusetts era. Having graduated from Harvard Law School, I have a great affection for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and also for the people who have represented that great Commonwealth in this body.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., was either the minority leader or the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the 76th Congress to the 85th, and during most of that time JOHN McCORMACK was also either the majority leader or the Democratic whip. The parallel of these two

outstanding citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is so striking that certainly it would not commensurate with the dignity of this occasion not to mention it at this time. They were both great Members of this legislative body. They shared not only a great love for Massachusetts, but a great love of America, a great regard for the privileges and traditions of the House of Representatives. Each of them, in the great positions they held, protected and preserved the rights and traditions of the House and its individual Members to an outstanding degree.

My own relationships with the Speaker started when I was a very junior Member, having lunch with my colleague from Arizona, the late Harold A. Patten. The present Speaker came past the table and "Porque" Patten, in his usual outgoing style, grabbed him by the sleeve and said, "Mr. Whip, I would like to have you meet my new colleague from Arizona." And not only did I meet JOHN McCORMACK at that time but he sat down and exchanged ideas with us. He was so considerate and so kind to a very junior Member of the House that I have never forgotten it, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate it to this day.

The kindness I received from our beloved Speaker on that occasion has been duplicated and expanded so many times that it would be almost impossible to chronicle all the times that I have received better treatment at the hands of our Speaker than anybody should deserve.

I think, however, my main memory of Speaker McCORMACK will be an event which occurred not over 3 days ago. We had a rather important conference report which the House was considering. A very important portion of that report had to do with the conduct of foreign relations by the President of the United States. The Speaker was not in the chair at that time. He came across the well of the House and motioned to me, and I met him right in front of this podium. He said to me, "Is this all right?" I said, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is." He said, "I do not want to ever tie the hands of any President in conducting foreign affairs."

I think if there was any particular hallmark of his public service, it might well have been epitomized by that statement, because he never did tie the hands of any President in the conduct of foreign affairs. He is a loyal Member of the legislative arm of this Government, but he is also an American who realizes that politics ends at the water's edge, and that there is no room for partisanship when it comes to the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country.

Another memory of the Speaker which I will treasure is the fact that he always said that he would protect the rights of every Member, and he always did. I do not know how many times when a Member would be clamoring for attention, that the Speaker would say "The gentleman knows that I will protect the rights of every Member of this House." The great trust which every Member has in the Speaker was always evident, because invariably that Member would resume his seat and invariably also, the

Speaker recognized the Member at the appropriate time and made sure that he did not lose any privileges or any rights, to which he was justly entitled.

Now, I do not intend to have the RECORD show that JOHN McCORMACK is a completely nonpartisan individual. He was not. He was a Democrat, and proud of it. But he knew no politics in protecting Members and their rights.

JOHN McCORMACK is undoubtedly the finest combination of gentleness and toughness that I have ever seen.

As I have said, he is a Democrat, and there is no doubt about the fact that he enjoys it most when the Democratic Party is in the majority in the House and in the Senate—and I say that is great, because this Republic of ours has its cornerstone in the two-party system. If there is ever a time when we do not have strong, partisan Members of the House and the Senate, then this two-party system will be on the way out.

This two-party system has served the country well and JOHN McCORMACK, as one of its chief proponents has also served his country well by promoting it.

On these occasions, we traditionally thank the Speaker, for his great efforts in the session of the Congress, just past. This occasion is different because of our realization that, not having been a candidate for reelection to this body, our Speaker will not resume his office in the 92d Congress.

So not only am I saying to him, "Mr. Speaker, thank you for your great work in the 91st Congress." I am saying also on behalf of myself and my party, Mr. Speaker, for all you are—for all you have been through the years—for the great kindnesses you have shown the Republicans in the House as a party and as individuals—for the great patriotism and for that great gift of oratory and for all the things that have made you a great American, sir, we thank you. We wish you and Mrs. McCormack in the years to come the best of everything and Godspeed. You will never be alone, Mr. Speaker, because the affection and regard of the Members with whom you have served in this House will also be with you wherever you are, whatever you do.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unqualified support of the resolution which my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, has offered and I join him in every comment he has made relative to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In the 92d Congress we shall miss all of our colleagues who will not be returning to it from the 91st Congress.

There is a giant among those who will be missing—a giant among men and a giant among legislators. No footnote can do justice to this man or to his career or to his influence on all of us and on the Nation—nor can any words of mine adequately express the sense of loss that we shall all feel when our beloved Speaker is gone from our midst. He would have been drafted for the Speakership had he sought reelection in his own district.

JOHN W. McCORMACK in his own lifetime has become a symbol, bearing witness to the validity of the American

dream. His public career is a demonstration that our society has during the past generation attained in fact the genuine pluralistic character which previously existed in theory but which was far from true in reality.

The 50 years following the Civil War saw this Nation welcome to its shores an unprecedented wave of immigrants representing diverse national, ethnic, geographic, and religious origins. The successful incorporation of a multitude of widely divergent national strains into American life in 2 generations constitutes a remarkable achievement without historic precedence. Its attainment has, in my view, been an accomplishment comparable to the winning of the West in the 19th century.

Just 50 years ago many immigrants and their children for the most part were still, to use Thomas Jefferson's expression, "the hewers of wood and the carriers of water." With all too rare exceptions, they were confined to the back-breaking menial jobs which no one else wanted. For the most part they lived in intellectual and physical isolation from native-born Americans.

In American history, politics and government have undoubtedly provided the most effective ladder of upward mobility, enabling disadvantaged or depressed groups to rise and attain full participation and power in our society.

JOHN W. McCORMACK is of that generation of Americans of Irish descent who educated the ethnic masses of our great cities as to their potential political power. He and his contemporaries, now for the most part departed, then led them some 30 or 40 years ago in what was, while bloodless, one of the most fundamental political revolutions in the Western World.

How hard it is for us who did not experience the trials and traumas to appreciate the superhuman effort required by the non-Anglo-Saxon peoples of this Nation to climb out of their ethnic enclaves and parochial environment. The immigrant was more often than not the victim of repression on the part of the government of the country from which he had come. There was inbred in him, therefore, an instinctive suspicion and fear of all government and its agents. So deepseated was this feeling that it was generally transmitted to his children—the first-generation Americans. These people were thus inherently non-political in nature. It was the John W. McCormacks who roused them from their lethargy. He and his peers inculcated in these urban masses first an awareness of and then a desire to participate in our domestic political process.

It seems to me that in honoring JOHN W. McCORMACK, a political figure perhaps the like of which we will not see on the national scene again, we are doing more than paying tribute to a successful individual. JOHN W. McCORMACK, rising as he did from the tenements of South Boston to become Speaker of the House of Representatives, is in reality the capstone of success in the struggle of his generation of Americans to achieve full and rightful participation and power in determining the destiny of this Nation.

His retirement is, in itself, a historic act. He is the first Speaker to retire from office voluntarily in more than a century, a man who could have remained Speaker for the rest of his life. We have reluctantly and sadly accepted the fact as we accept the inevitable; but we shall feel the sharp reality of it yet more keenly when the 92d Congress convenes and we find that our friend and leader—our helmsman through five Congresses, is not there. The words "Mr. Speaker," will always bring to mind the face of JOHN W. McCORMACK, who has occupied the office of Speaker with nobility and impressive distinction.

He has been our Speaker and our leader. But he has been much more than that. He has been a friend and mentor to all of us.

We have been enriched by his example as a dedicated public servant, incomparably skilled in the legislative process, unassailably honest and sincere in his dealings with all men, and unquestionably loyal to the principles of democratic government.

We have been inspired by his idealism and his humility. He has worn the cloak of high office with dignity and responsibility, with never a trace of false pride or arrogance of power, for JOHN McCORMACK is a natural gentleman and a true born Democrat. I do not mean Democrat in the partisan sense, although his loyalty to the Democratic Party has always been an integral part of his life. But despite his sometimes frank and fierce partisanship, he has treated all men fairly, and his reputation for fairness has won him the trust and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

We have been imbued by his sense of history. Because he has served through the historic administrations of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson and the first term of Richard Nixon's administration, he has participated in events and decisions that have shaped our national destiny and the destiny of the world. Because of this rich background in government, he has helped us to see ourselves and our obligations in historical perspective.

His warm, humanitarian spirit and his abiding faith in his fellow man, born of his deep religious convictions, have brought out the best in us as we have struggled to perform our legislative duties without falling prey to prejudice, personal animosity, or the urge to achieve power for power's sake.

We have been blessed by his wisdom, his tolerance, his human understanding. Because we have been so enriched by his presence and his leadership, we shall be all the more impoverished by his absence.

As part of the inevitable and orderly change of government, he takes leave of this House. He may be absent in person, but no one will take his place in our hearts. His influence and example will be with us into another generation of politics. We shall miss his daily presence and his guidance. We cannot find it in our hearts to say "farewell"—but from the depths of our hearts we say "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mrs. McCormack, and Godspeed."

MR. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

MR. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the imminent retirement of our beloved House after 43 years of uninterrupted and distinguished service to our Nation, our State, our city and last, but by no means least, his district, I would like to join in tributes with the citizens of the Ninth Congressional District, the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the whole Nation and at the same time express my own personal sense of loss and debt of gratitude, to JOHN McCORMACK.

To him it has fallen, as to few others, to occupy positions of leadership throughout all but one of the turbulent decades of this century. Since World War I, not a year has gone by when our State or our country have not entrusted to him the highest confidence and high office. It is not going to be easy to get accustomed to the years ahead without the leadership of JOHN McCORMACK; it is going to be especially difficult for a man from Massachusetts, such as myself, to get used to the idea. For those of us of the Commonwealth, go back further in history with JOHN McCORMACK than the 70th Congress. JOHN McCORMACK and Massachusetts have been inseparable since the time when a young man from South Boston first attracted the attention of his political elders with his contributions to the historic constitutional convention of 1917-18. Elected office soon followed in the lower chamber of the general court of the Commonwealth and later on, in the senate, where JOHN McCORMACK very early displayed qualities of leadership which catapulted him into the front ranks of his party in that august body. When a still very young JOHN W. McCORMACK took the train to Washington to fill the unexpired term of the late Congressman James Gallivan, he left as Democratic leader of the State senate.

Washington and the House did not have to wait too long for JOHN McCORMACK to make his presence felt as a Representative with considerable legislative experience already behind him. The depression and the misery it unleashed provided JOHN W. McCORMACK with countless opportunities to contribute through constructive legislation solutions to the domestic problems which beset the Nation. No stranger to poverty himself as a young man, JOHN W. McCORMACK proved himself to be a fighter in the best tradition for the economically deprived and unfortunate. The legislative accomplishments of the New Deal are in no small part testimony to the pragmatic reforming zeal of the Representative from South Boston, Mass. And his party did not take long to realize his contributions and recognize his qualities of leadership and staying power and before World War II broke out, he was entrusted with the position of majority leader.

In the years that followed, whether as majority leader or whip, JOHN W. McCORMACK played a continuing role in the highest councils of Government in all the countless deliberations between President and Congress during the dark days of wartime and the immediate post-war period. The team of Rayburn and McCORMACK was a vital team for over 20 years to whomever was in the White House.

The rest is recent history and needs no recapitulation here. Upon the death of his dear friend Sam Rayburn, JOHN McCORMACK was elected Speaker of this House, unquestionably one of the most powerful offices in the land. To the office, he brought in a real sense of the wisdom of the ages—or at least a half century in Government service. The past few years have not been easy on the Nation and at times our problems have appeared well-nigh insoluble. But the Speaker during this period has been a man for whom hard times are nothing new and who has not only seen his share of the seemingly insoluble problems solved but has actively contributed to their solution. As the trusted confidante of Presidents, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and now Nixon, JOHN McCORMACK has been privy to most of the serious threats to this Nation over the past 30 years and actively participated in whatever solutions have been achieved. Without attracting the headlines or stealing the show, more interested in seeing a bill pass than having his own name on it, JOHN McCORMACK has been content to work behind the scenes in conferences and committee sessions where the real work is done. Contributions such as his are too often left unsung, because they are not the things of which high drama or opera is made, but both the Nation and his district, as well as his party will sorely miss him. Experience, practical wisdom and guidance such as his are never in such plentiful supply in any country that the citizens are not that much poorer when they lose it. For JOHN W. McCORMACK will not be leaving the national scene as any glorified elder statesman, but as an activist right in the thick of things up until the final bell. Natural inclination and recent history have combined to make it that way.

Of lesser importance, perhaps, than the loss to the Nation and his district and this body with the departure of this patriot-legislator is my own personal sense of loss. I am losing a valued associate and counselor. If there is any consolation in all of this it is the fact that we in Massachusetts can take some comfort in the hope that we shall continue our association in the years ahead as we welcome home our most distinguished citizen. Well done thou good and noble servant.

Mr. Speaker I include a news column written by one of the Nation's ablest political analysts, that appeared in the Boston Herald Traveler, December 31, 1970, by Cornelius Dalton:

THE GREAT CONCILIATOR  
By Cornelius Dalton

The long political career of John McCormack, which is now coming to an end, has been marked by an interesting paradox.

Throughout most of his years in public life McCormack has been a bigger man in Washington than he has been in Boston.

Here his political domain has been confined to one small congressional district. He has never run for statewide office, and he has never been the leader of his party in his home state.

His real power and prestige have been in Washington, where he has been a Democratic congressman for 43 years and, since 1962, speaker of the House of Representatives, often called the second most powerful office in the federal government.

In the ninth Congressional District, which includes 15 of Boston's 22 wards, McCormack has reigned supreme since he succeeded the late James A. Gallivan in 1928. No Massachusetts congressman is more admired by his constituents. And no constituents in any district have been better served.

But it is in the nation's capital, or more accurately, on Capitol Hill, that John McCormack has spent most of his time, most of his energy, most of his talent.

During his early years in Congress four decades ago McCormack was known as "the fighting Irishman from South Boston."

He has never stopped being a fighting Irishman, but he made an important discovery long ago during the rough and tumble of congressional debate—you can win more fights with a pat on the back than with a hard jab to the jaw.

So McCormack was the great conciliator throughout most of his many years in politics, without losing his love for a lively forensic fray.

If politics is the art of compromise, McCormack has been one of its most artful practitioners.

A Northern liberal who has battled for civil rights legislation, he always has maintained close and friendly relations with Southern Democrats.

This occasionally has irritated some of the younger liberals among the Democrats in Congress, who prefer militancy to mediation. "What they neglect to appreciate," says Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Cambridge, "is that the Democratic party is divided into different groups. Speaker McCormack has kept the party intact and has put through the Democratic programs throughout the years."

McCormack's effectiveness as a conciliator also has been evident at Democratic national conventions when he has guided the deliberations of the platform committee. More often than not, he got little credit for preventing damaging party splits before an election.

But there is a difference between compromise and surrender, and McCormack doesn't have to defend his record as a fighter for liberal causes. It is there for anyone to see, in the roll calls of the House and in the reports of the floor fights he engaged in over the past four decades.

When McCormack bangs down the gavel on the rostrum of the House of Representatives for the last time it will be the end of an era because, as one of his colleagues remarked, he almost certainly will be the last speaker who never attended high school.

But it is worth remembering that John McCormack would want it that way. He did a lot during his 43 years in Congress to make it easier for young people to get an education than it was when he was a boy in South Boston many years ago.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this should really be a time of rejoicing for the House when we Members unanimously say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker JOHN Mc-

CORMACK, a hearty, "Well done." It is a very fine, good-sounding phrase, and we Members all echo "Well done," with sincere admiration, to our friend, JOHN McCORMACK.

I have served with Congressman JOHN McCORMACK since the 79th Congress as he rose through the confidence of his fellow Members to the most powerful position in the U.S. Government, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have served closely with JOHN McCORMACK on the House special Select Committee on Space, where he acted as chairman. The Speaker, then the late Honorable Sam Rayburn, appointed a Select Committee on Outer Space to look into and explore the unknown beyond the world and the atmosphere. To his everlasting credit Speaker Rayburn appointed one of our most progressive thinkers of the House, JOHN McCORMACK, then majority leader, as chairman of that select committee to raise U.S. policy and activities off this earth's surface and out of the atmosphere, into the exploration of the limitless universe in which our tiny Earth exists. What exciting discoveries, perils, and exploration lay ahead, no member could even guess the half of the discoveries so far. This committee work was very rewarding and took a great deal of learning to become competent to formulate U.S. policy among the conflicting views, conjectures, and guesses of scientists, astronomers, researchers, chemists, engineers, and pure visionaries. The select committee of distinguished House Members formulated the legislation for a new and startling U.S. agency that we now know as the NASA—National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The authorization to set up that agency, NASA, was adopted by the Congress with slight amendment in the Senate, and became operational in October 1958.

This legislation also set the directions in space that the United States would take, for the U.S. Government to do the research and development to proceed into space by peaceful means and for peaceful purposes with the discoveries being made for benefit of all mankind. That, to me, is a tremendously resounding phrase that should sound through countless ages of space exploration and is a phrase that I think epitomizes the leadership of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK of Massachusetts.

I have likewise served since the original appointment of the members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics of which JOHN McCORMACK was first chairman. JOHN McCORMACK was also instrumental in setting up the committee through his agreement and understanding, and the confidence of Congressman Carl Vinson, longtime chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. The Science and Astronautics Committee is the product of JOHN McCORMACK's vision, and political sagacity. This House committee served as a vehicle to bring into play the vision and imagination of this great man and the distinguished men who served on the original select committee.

Of course, at various times many Members will recall the ridicule, good natured fun, and jocularities these early

Members interested in outer space took from our more practical minded and precedent minded fellow Members: "Space Cadets"; "where is your bubble-head?"; "how are your feet on the ground?"; and "head in the clouds"; "how are you orbiting this morning?"; and "where did you get back from?"; "have you ever seen any little green men with pointed heads," and so forth.

But, the answer to our present beginnings of space exploration is that it took someone like JOHN McCORMACK with his respect and vision to say this is serious, this is the new frontier, this is the course for America: adopt a gigantic program of exploration of the universal sea in which the world, carrying all of us, floats and its being.

Under JOHN McCORMACK's leadership, when the record book is quoted in the House of Representatives to decide whether Congress should undertake to carry out a \$22 billion scientific research and engineering program of incredible daring and skill, for the United States to go to the moon, the leadership and effective generalship shall certainly rest with JOHN McCORMACK.

It was a privilege to me as a Member to be one of those Members consulted for opinion—could the United States go to the moon, is it possible, are the scientific difficulties too great for this generation, can the United States afford the greatest joint peacetime project and the most daring in human history. Luckily for the American people, JOHN McCORMACK responded with a firm yes—the Senate majority leader Lyndon Johnson said yes, several Members consulted said yes, and President John Kennedy said yes, making his magnificent and stirring statement for the U.S. to land man on the moon and return safely in the decade of the sixties. What a thrilling time to be alive, what dreams, plans, preparations, and excitement.

When the record vote came on the House floor on the authorization, which I demanded, every Member of this House unaniously decided in favor of the Apollo project outlined when President John Kennedy had made the proposal, that in the decade of the 60s the United States would land on the moon safely a man or men and return them safely.

The amazing thing about it is that the United States has accomplished landing two U.S. astronauts on the moon twice, not just once. But that took leadership.

The important question had been whether outer space, the moon and planets would become militarily a new field of conflict by the Great Powers, or whether it would be a kind of a limitless area that would be, first, devoid of the military; secondly, would be productive for mankind and mankind's progress and, third, would be for the benefit of all mankind all over the world.

Now, our U.S. space research and development have been done on the basis that it has been for the benefit of all mankind, which is different from any other country in the world. I ascribe that to the leadership of JOHN McCORMACK specifically and particularly.

Likewise, I think one of the best phrases is the one that I have heard JOHN McCORMACK say, and that is, "Space is

pretty big, JIM FULTON, but it is not big enough for politics."

So, there have been no politics on the Science and Astronautics Committee nor in this House, nor the U.S. Congress in outer space. We Members of both parties have joined together as a team and when we have come to the floor we have been united. I must say that this House has been wonderful in backing the U.S. projects in space, and every Member during this period deserves credit of high order.

When we consider where we Americans are now in space research, development, and exploration, because of JOHN McCORMACK's leadership in space, we owe JOHN McCORMACK a deep debt of gratitude. I repeat, as I have said many times, the United States would never have landed on the moon at all if it had not been for JOHN McCORMACK, his leadership, his enthusiasm, and his willingness to gather we younger fellows into a team. We should look at ourselves in the United States to see what has happened in space up to now. We have worldwide communications from space, we have reconnaissance satellites orbiting the earth for military and peaceful purposes. This is now an open world of open skies, just as President Eisenhower said it should be. As a matter of fact, the United States can now monitor every ship, plane, train, truck, and automobile on most of the earth's surface, in any direction or wherever we want to. The United States can tell if anybody builds a 10-foot extension on a house, and we can even monitor soccer or football games all over the world in case we want to. So that what we have now is worldwide telephoning, worldwide radio, worldwide television—not only worldwide television, but moon television from 240,000 miles away, both black and white as well as color. This can be used to educate the developing peoples of the world.

Space speeds are increasing so tremendously that it is almost the difference between the horse and the automobile. We have performed fly-bys of the planets Mars and Venus, and I have watched real time live action television in black and white as our U.S. capsules glow over Mars. What a thrilling experience. For instance, on the Mariner II fly-by on its pass of Venus, Mariner II was going in excess of 80,000 miles an hour. It was incredible, even in the 60s, to think of such speeds. Also U.S. programs are moving up into bigger chemical boosters, both solid and liquid fuels with higher specific impulse, and the U.S. moves up into construction of nuclear powered orbiting vehicles such as the Nerva, under the leadership of JOHN McCORMACK which had the vision to lead research and development through the years. We can expect to have speeds that will be five times the speed of any other country or any other vehicles in space, and have space-durable vehicles and have space-storable fuels that we can maneuver by merely moving a stick in and out of the reactor through ground control.

I have heard just recently, and wish to tell the House, of some of the changes which have occurred in world communications. For instance, from London to New York you can now dial by telephone

via satellite, a New York number, and be charged only for the time you are connected and without a minimum charge, only pay approximately 20 cents a second for just the time you use the phone, which is very cheap.

We are now checking weather, storms, hurricanes from space, checking forests and fields for disease and fire, checking amounts of snow on mountain ranges to prevent floods, and to answer adequate irrigation.

We have made incredible advances in medicine, geodetic astronomy, knowledge of man, miniaturization of instruments and machines, development of engines, valves, fittings, components, and parts, metals, alloys; yes, and even industrial management, and construction and engineering techniques that were not possible without leadership in space, and not possible to even comprehend or visualize a short 12 years ago.

JOHN McCORMACK has been a main-spring in these scientific and technological developments, which I know from firsthand knowledge and experience in working with him through the years, as ranking minority Member on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, as well as an adviser on space to our U.S. mission to the United Nations.

Our U.S. research and development in space is opening up the world. It has made our many peoples advance to a world community of interconnected and mutually dependent links that give us all hope for tremendous progress and peaceful development in the future.

I want to say in conclusion that it has been wonderful years. What a privilege it has been to serve on such a fine committee as the Committee on Science and Astronautics under such leadership as JOHN McCORMACK has given. This mutual service has made us not only good friends but great boosters. And to you, JOHN, we always want you to remain a big booster to the House, and a big booster of space research, development, and exploration. The stars are no limit.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to the splendid remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Arizona, the distinguished majority leader, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I think I can say for all of the Members here that we are experiencing a feeling of great sadness.

Our sadness arises from the knowledge that these are the closing moments in this House of a brilliant career of a man who has served for 42 years here, and years before that in his native State.

We are proud, though, in the knowledge that under the leadership of JOHN W. McCORMACK, we have lived through the most challenging period in the history of our country, and we have seen our country meet those challenges.

One can think of World War I, the great depression, World War II, the cold war, Korea, Vietnam, the coming of the space age, and the great growth in strength of the United States, all during the period of time that JOHN McCORMACK served here.

He has contributed to the greatness of this institution. Our Founding Fathers made this the House of Representatives the representatives of the people.

From the very beginning, the Members of the House of Representatives have had to be elected. It has only been in recent times, in this century that the Members of the other body are elected. So this has indeed been the place where the people are heard.

The story is told of one of the early Congresses held over in the first Hall of the House of Representatives about Alexander Hamilton, a great American, bringing a visitor to the gallery over there. The visitor looked down and saw some of pandemonium that sometimes prevails on the floor and he said to Mr. Hamilton, "What goes on there?"

Mr. Hamilton said in response, "There, sir, the people go."

Well, that is true today as it was then because many men have passed on their love of this institution and their knowledge of this country and their devotion to its institutions to the men who came along behind them.

The distinguished majority leader spoke of all the lessons he had learned—and I might say in all humility of all the lessons I have learned, working day-in and day-out, session after session with JOHN McCORMACK, and of his patience in imparting his knowledge of this institution to us and to all the Members of this body.

I was pleased to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) said about the space program. I might say that only this morning, as he was leaving his last press conference, I heard a member of the press turn to Speaker McCORMACK and say, "How do you look at the future?" His reply was, "I look to the future as I have looked during the years I have served here—with hope and with optimism."

That has been the code of JOHN McCORMACK. It was not surprising that he should head up the space program—that he should chart and build the framework of this program because during all of the years he has served, he has not been afraid of change—he has sought innovative methods to meet the problems of our country in the 20th century. We have met those problems in large measure because of JOHN McCORMACK's leadership.

I recall one day in 1941 when Hitler had practically overrun all of Europe and by one vote—one vote—we kept the American Army intact. That was just 6 months before Pearl Harbor. There was great dissension then in the country, and JOHN McCORMACK was doing what he did then and what he has been doing since then, namely, as he has said so many times, "If I have to err, I want to err on the side of strength rather than weakness."

I dread what would have happened had he not been able to mobilize that majority of one vote in 1941.

His love for this body is traditional—it is legendary.

I recall another day, in 1963—an event that shocked this Nation and that shocked the world—an event that occurred in a great city in our country, in Dallas. I rode out to Andrews Air Force Base, and I watched Air Force No. 1 land. I remember the event so vividly, as I saw that lovely lady get off that aircraft, splattered with blood, I saw the body of the late President removed and the new President walk off the plane.

We came back here and went to his office. The Speaker asked me, "Who is that out in the office?"

I did not know, but it was an FBI agent or a Secret Service agent. JOHN McCORMACK had become in a matter of minutes the second ranking man in the hierarchy of the United States. But true to his devotion to this institution and the profound doctrine of the separation of powers, he refused to let anyone, whether it be the FBI, Secret Service, private police, or whoever it may have been, guard his person, because he felt that to do so, he would then become a member of the executive branch rather than the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, during the time you have served here you have seen the enactment of legislation which would take many days to categorize and label. But just to name a few of them, they include child labor laws, minimum wages, social security, medicare, broad programs in education, in health, in environment, and in consumer legislation. These you have pursued with a passionate devotion to the people of this country because, as the majority leader has so aptly said, despite the heights that you have attained, you have never lost touch with the people.

One of your great strengths in this body, Mr. Speaker, has been your close and intimate association not only with the Members of this body but with the people who work for this body. Many times I have seen you pick up the telephone and call the clerk of a committee or even one of the secretaries and know that person on a first-name basis. I see Mr. John Martin, the distinguished counsel of the Ways and Means Committee, nodding his head. I know how many times you have called him and others. This has been one of the secrets of your success.

The essayist, Emerson, wrote an essay some years ago entitled "Friendship." He said that a man was fortunate, as he went down the path of this life, to have one friend—to have one man that he could truly call his friend.

Mr. Speaker, you are very wealthy indeed, because as you look about this body and as you recall the memory of the thousands with whom you have served in this body, they are all, without exception, without respect to party, friends of JOHN McCORMACK.

Finally, as I was sitting and listening to the others speak, I looked up above the Speaker's rostrum and I saw the only quotation that one can find in this whole body. One can look about and see the

figures which depict the great lawmakers of all of history. But the only quotation is above the Speaker's dias, above the clock, and it reads as follows:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up all of its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

That was said by a great citizen of Massachusetts, Daniel Webster. If ever a man has lived up to that statement, it is JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. Speaker, your not being here is something I find difficult to contemplate, because I remember among the dearest people I have ever known JOHN McCORMACK and his wife. They have been my friends, my wife's friends, my family's friends, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will come back many times and visit with us, because although you leave in person, your spirit, your dedication, your devotion, your example will live with all of us who have known you as long as we live.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

I now yield to the gentleman from California, who is about to accept gracefully his demotion to the other body.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Arizona for being so kind as to yield to me out of order.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for the opportunity to be heard out of order because in about 10 minutes I am going to be sworn in as a Member of the other body.

I wanted very much to have the opportunity to tell you today my thoughts about your leadership and my thoughts about the friendship that you have displayed to me.

I remember when I was first elected to the House in 1964, I got a handwritten letter in the mail from the office of the Speaker, a letter that you wrote to me congratulating me on having won election to the prestigious body, the House of Representatives, this great law-making body, perhaps the greatest in the world. I think it is the greatest. I remember your saying that you knew my father very well and that you had the opportunity on numerous occasions to discuss philosophy and religion with my father, and you said, "I know that you are going to have a great career, and anything that I can do to help you, please let me know."

I was tremendously touched by that gesture, because here you were in such a powerful, preeminent position, and you took the time to write a letter by hand to a freshman Member and to make him feel important.

I think that is what the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, was talking about when he said you, Mr. Speaker, have this extraordinary empathy, this extraordinary compassion for other people, no matter how high they are or how low they are in the pecking order of society. I think this is the thing that really distinguishes great men from lesser men, the ability to empathize and put themselves in the position of another man and say, "How would I feel?"



I think one of the reasons that you have achieved the greatness you have achieved and the reason that you became the Speaker was that you understood how important it was to other people to feel they were important.

I cannot speak the way others can, so fluently about the things you have accomplished in your record in the House of Representatives, because I have been here for only 6 years, and you have served for 42 years, but I just want you to know that as a man speaking to another man whom I greatly admire, I want to thank you for what you did for me, for the courtesies you showed me continually while I was in this body, for the fact that I could always pick up the phone and speak to you if I wanted, and you would always return my call, and the fact that you would on occasion put me into your office and philosophize with me about the House of Representatives and the meaning of being a Member of Congress and the honor it was and the responsibility that it entails.

I am reminded of a fragment of a poem by Boris Pasternak, that great Russian humanitarian, who wrote:

To win before you die the friendship of the spaces  
And hear the future speak, means living  
a life and not a lie.

I think that is what you have done. You have lived your entire life, a life for other people, and that is why I have such deep respect for you. I thank you so much.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the many expressions of appreciation and best wishes being extended the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on the occasion of his retirement as Speaker and as a Member of this House.

It is difficult indeed to imagine this Chamber without his presence. He has served the people of his Boston district since 1929. He has held the speakership for 9 years. In terms of consecutive service this is longer, I am told, than any of the other 48 Speakers who have presided over this body since the First Congress convened in 1789. Before becoming Speaker, he served his party as majority leader for a total of some 16 years. Although the list of honors and awards that he has received over the years is indeed long and impressive, there is no better testament to the high regard with which he has been held than his extraordinary record of service as Representative and party leader—for it springs directly from the people and his colleagues.

It has been my privilege to serve in the Congress throughout his term as Speaker, and even though we come from different sides of the aisle, I have always been impressed by his fairness to all Members regardless of party. This is a true measure of greatness for any Speaker. I also wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude for the many personal courtesies and kindnesses he has extended me since I have been a Member of this body.

When Speaker McCORMACK leaves this Hall, he takes with him a very large, eventful and important chapter in the history of the House of Representatives and of our country. He also takes with him the high admiration of his colleagues and the best wishes of the Nation he has served so devotedly.

As Speaker McCORMACK concludes his service in the Congress, both he and Mrs. McCormack have my very best wishes for their health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity which the gentleman from Arizona has provided for us, in connection with his splendid resolution, to join in paying tribute to our beloved Speaker on the occasion of his retirement from the House of Representatives.

I do not want to repeat what has been said, but I should like to make just a couple of remarks which come from my own experience and which may be somewhat unique with respect to the service and the life of JOHN W. McCORMACK.

As many Members are aware, I first had the privilege of coming to the House in 1941 as a secretary to a Member of Congress from Massachusetts, former Congressman Thomas H. Eliot of Cambridge. As a matter of fact, I believe it is clear that getting one's start in politics in Massachusetts is always very helpful. They play politics for keeps in that State, and I have always treasured the opportunity I had to get my initiation in the State of Massachusetts.

I came down here as a very young secretary, one whose eyes were wide open to take in all these most impressive experiences. Although I had not had the privilege of meeting him personally during the preceding campaign, I knew that JOHN McCORMACK was not only majority leader of the House but also one of the most respected men in Massachusetts. When I arrived here in Washington I had the opportunity to meet him personally.

I often watched the action on the floor from the galleries, probably more often than I should. Probably I should have been back in the office handling the mail, but it was too great a temptation to come over here and follow the debates.

To me the most exciting part of those debates was when the majority leader, JOHN McCORMACK, tangled with the minority leader, Joe Martin. It has been said that off the floor the two were the best of friends, but certainly the debates which took place were sharp and spirited. As I am sure all of us who have seen the distinguished Speaker engaged in that kind of debate know, nobody ever could match JOHN McCORMACK. He played a very important role in the legislation of those days. I know the Speaker has often recalled his activities in those days.

I was in the gallery at the time when they had that cliff-hanging vote by which the draft was continued in August of 1941 by a single vote. JOHN McCORMACK was certainly active on the floor during

that tense period when it was not quite sure whether we were going to continue to have an Army or not. He had a lot to do with the final, successful outcome.

Incidentally, it was quite an opportunity for any young secretary to meet with Gene Kinnaly, the late Gene Kinnaly, who had been Mr. McCORMACK's secretary through so many years. He was a secretary's secretary. If one wanted to know how to handle a congressional office, Gene Kinnaly would always take time to explain how it was done.

No one could have been returned from any district, no matter what its composition, as many years as JOHN McCORMACK has been returned unless he had an office which operated efficiently and effectively in representing the desires and the interests of the people of his district. And they respected him and loved him for that service.

Then in 1958 when I was fortunate enough to come back here on my own, having been impressed so much by this House that I was determined to see if I could do it on my own, I went to the Speaker, and I remember the gracious way in which he received me in his district office up in Massachusetts. I asked for his help to get on the Armed Services Committee. He promised me he would do what he could. He did not make any commitments, but somehow I ended up on that committee, and I have always been grateful to the Speaker for it.

Those who were in this Chamber when Speaker McCORMACK was still majority leader will remember that that same forensic brilliance which I had observed earlier, was displayed particularly when he and Charley Halleck were debating on this floor.

Indeed, one of the sad features of your having been elected to the speakership, Mr. Speaker, is that we have not seen as many of those exciting exchanges that we used to see in those earlier days. It was something, certainly, to gladden the heart of anyone who hoped to be able to emulate that kind of debating ability, even though few of us will ever be able to match it.

There is one other thing that deserves to be mentioned. We who read the papers frequently know that the columnists and the experts tell us that a Speaker of the House ought to be someone who can crack the whip over the various committee chairmen and have them meekly fall into line, with the membership also falling in line. Well, I do not think that any real American would want to be a part of a legislative body that was operated in that way in a democracy.

In a democracy, leadership is provided by understanding and the ability to persuade, and this is the kind of leadership which JOHN McCORMACK has provided as our Speaker.

I had a very graphic example of this point brought to my attention just a few weeks ago, in regard to the legislation which turned out to be the final piece of legislation brought to the floor of this House by our late beloved former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the late Mendel Rivers, a resolution of commendation for those who had par-

icipated in the Sontay raid to try to rescue our prisoners of war.

It was a resolution which came out of the Armed Services Committee. The day the prisoner resolution came up Speaker McCORMACK called me into the lobby and made reference to the final sentence contained in that resolution, since it was my resolution. He said, "You know I think this probably could be misunderstood. I think, perhaps, we ought to make a change in the wording."

I said, "Well, I would have no objection, since I understand what you mean. This wording was added in the committee," I said, and pointed out that Chairman Rivers had been largely responsible for the wording. So the Speaker went over to Chairman Rivers, who was even then planning, unbeknown to most of us, to go into the hospital the next day for open heart surgery, in an effort to persuade him to agree to make a change in that language. Mr. Rivers was reluctant to have that language changed, but the Speaker and he talked the subject over for several minutes, and finally the Speaker came up with an alternative suggestion.

Mr. Rivers countered with an alternative of his own; and eventually a new wording was agreed upon, a wording that in my judgment more accurately reflected the views of the Members of the House. The bill was then passed overwhelmingly.

That is the kind of thing we really mean by leadership in a democracy. That is the kind of leadership that JOHN McCORMACK has always provided, not by cracking the whip, because you cannot do this in this body or any other body of real men, but by knowing the people he is dealing with and having the skill and wisdom and charm and all of the other characteristics that we know so well about JOHN McCORMACK to get his point across by persuasion and persistence.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay this small tribute to you as one who has had an excellent association with you, over a longer period of time than most other Members of this body except the very senior ones.

To me it has been a privilege and a thrill to be a part of this team and to experience your brand of leadership. I am sure that all of us here in this body hope that when we come to the end of our legislative service we will have a record just half as good as the job that you have done over all these many years. We salute you and wish you and Mrs. McCormack long life and Godspeed.

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

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it may be somewhat presumptuous of me, a freshman Member and of the opposite political persuasion, to participate in this eulogy, but in a sense, and indirectly, I am probably here today because of our beloved Speaker. I was born in Boston, Mass., of Irish parents. I was particularly interested in what our distinguished majority leader

said in this regard. And it is because of men like JOHN McCORMACK that my father, a lifelong Democrat, I might add, was so interested in politics.

I believe that my figures are right—that the beloved Speaker was elected to Congress the year I was born, and all throughout my early life I noted the reverence with which the name of JOHN McCORMACK was mentioned in my family. The fact that I took a turn in the road in politics from that of my father and the beloved Speaker has diminished in no measure my respect for him and his devoted service to the country. Even though I do not know the Speaker as well as most of the more senior Members here on the floor, I did want to pay him tribute. I want to say that in the short time I have been here I have come to respect and admire him and to be aware of his wisdom and his fairness, but, in addition to that, my knowledge of him goes back a long, long time, from the time I was a young child. I wish him Godspeed in the years ahead.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join our colleague from Arizona in urging support of this resolution honoring the distinguished Speaker of this House, JOHN W. McCORMACK.

I believe our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) stated the case most succinctly when he said that historians will list JOHN McCORMACK as one of the 10 most important Americans in the history of our Republic. There is no question but that in the years he has been here, both as a Member of the House and as a majority leader, and now as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, People's assembly, his great wisdom, his philosophy, his deep understanding, his compassion for the complexities of freedom, have brought this country to the highest pinnacle ever reached by any society. JOHN McCORMACK indeed today takes his place as one of the 10 most important and significant Americans in the history of this Republic. He joins such immortals as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others. It is a privilege for every one of us as Members of this House to have been able to serve with him. I feel sorry for the new Members of the 92d Congress who will not have that privilege, for all of us are so much the wiser because, indeed, JOHN McCORMACK has taught us, above all, compassion. That has been his hallmark—compassion for the problems of people, compassion for the oppressed, compassion for those suffering; compassion for man's own weaknesses. Yes, JOHN McCORMACK has been a great leader.

What an enormous source of pride it must be to the Speaker and to his lovely wife, Mrs. McCormack, and to his whole family, including his brilliant young nephew, Eddie McCormack, to know that on five successive occasions the majority of this House has elected JOHN McCORMACK as their leader, starting in 1962, on January 10, and right on through the 91st Congress. And what a great source of pride it must be for a man to know

that in this assembly where each of us has to go into our respective districts every 2 years to be elected or reelected, that the majority of those elected then went a step further and elected JOHN McCORMACK as their Speaker.

We Americans have a tendency to glorify our Presidents and in some cases to glorify the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

But too often Americans forget that the Congress of the United States is a coequal branch of our Federal Government—coequal—one of the three branches of government. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is the traditional leader of this coequal branch of government. JOHN McCORMACK, as Speaker, has brought dignity to this coequal branch of government.

JOHN McCORMACK has that fantastic faculty to be able to see the enormity of the Republic—200 million people, 50 States, rich people and poor people—laboring people—and people who are princes of industry. One of the great strengths of JOHN McCORMACK has been his ability to see the entire picture of the Republic. Each of us fights tenaciously for the parochial interests of our respective congressional districts, and properly so, for if there is any validity in representative government, it is our duty to look at things in the interest of the people who sent us here. But it was JOHN McCORMACK's enormous problem and challenge to see the totality of the Republic and to measure every issue that came before this House in terms of not only how it would help a particular group but also how it would help the entire country.

He has been the keeper and the protector of the whole country, to make sure that what we did here did not hurt any particular group or any particular segment of the Nation while it might help other groups and other parts of the country. So I tell you that this has been an awesome job. I do not believe the American people realize what an awesome responsibility the Speaker of the House bears on his shoulders. Those of us who have served in this House have certainly seen the magnificent way in which he has discharged that responsibility. There have been times when many of us would run to the Speaker and think that he ought to do things our way because we thought our way was the best way. Perhaps when viewed in the light of the parochial interests of our own district, it might have been best—but his enormous task was to look at the whole picture and see how it would affect the whole country.

I tell you that it has been a great source of pride to serve with JOHN McCORMACK for JOHN McCORMACK could have been Governor of the State of Massachusetts. He could have been a Senator from his State—he could have been Vice President of the United States, and I dare predict that had he sought it, he could have had the nomination of the Democratic Party for the Presidency.

Yet, he chose to stay here in the people's assembly—because this is the heartbeat of the Republic. This is where men and women assemble who are elected by

their peers and who transact the business of the Republic. He chose service here because he saw the opportunity to serve the people of America.

They will not have to build any monument to JOHN McCORMACK. There are monuments to his ideals all over America. You can walk through any university campus—visit the new libraries and the dormitories and the school buildings themselves—they all represent a tribute to JOHN McCORMACK—a leader in the field of education.

You look at the 28 million American veterans in this country who are enjoying veterans' benefits under Federal law and you see a living monument to JOHN McCORMACK, who has been a great friend and has always understood their needs.

Look at the hospitals in America. Had JOHN McCORMACK not provided the leadership in this field under the Hill-Burton Act and various other acts that have been passed by the Congress during the time that he has been Speaker of the House, we would not have had them.

Look at the 22 million Americans on social security, 72 percent of whom today find their sole source of income through social security. JOHN McCORMACK was in the forefront of that.

We have enjoyed 25 years of major peace simply because JOHN McCORMACK looked at those monuments out there on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the Archives Building. One of them says, "What is past is prologue," and the other says, "Study the past."

We remember well what unpreparedness has meant to America and how it dragged us into World War II simply because we were unprepared. JOHN McCORMACK has been in the forefront and has been the champion of a strong Defense Establishment as the only guarantee for lasting major peace.

So we see here more than four decades of great and profound leadership by a man who had vision and understanding. I might say, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very hard to have anybody fill your shoes in the years to come.

You can look today to the future of America and say, "Yes, I have built a firm foundation." I am not surprised that you told the press today that you look at the future with hope and confidence, because you have built a foundation, as a leader of this Congress; you have forged a base, a foundation upon which this Republic now rests, stands, and will grow.

You saw this country go through the most horrible depression that any nation has suffered, and under your leadership you saw us enjoy 10 uninterrupted years of economic growth and progress, to the point where, this year, we have observed and celebrated a one trillion dollar gross national product, a pinnacle of success never before reached by any civilization and, I dare say, never dreamed of when the Founding Fathers created this Republic.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to you today in joining others speaking on the resolution.

I remember one little footnote, JOHN McCORMACK's life is full of footnotes. Every one of us can add a new, exciting, inspiring footnote. I remember the one

that I heard about the great decision which had to be made on the hydrogen bomb. Scientists were saying, "You can't do it. It won't work. You are going to waste a lot of money."

JOHN McCORMACK sat in on those discussions. JOHN McCORMACK saw the threat. JOHN McCORMACK realized that America had to be ahead if she were to survive. It was he who prevailed upon President Truman to move ahead with the project, and we can all say a prayer of thanksgiving for his wisdom, understanding and dedication, for, indeed, it was only 10 months later that the Soviets discovered their own hydrogen bomb. The whole course of history could have been changed had JOHN McCORMACK not prevailed on Truman.

So in every single experience and aspect of our social endeavor we see imprinted the great understanding of JOHN McCORMACK.

JOHN McCORMACK, as Mr. RHODES has said in his remarks, will never be alone, for he has a grateful nation and grateful Members of Congress constantly and eternally thanking him that he walked by here and gave us the chance to glory in his great experience of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you many years of health and happiness. I have only one additional wish. I know there is a great tendency for everyone to write a book. If anyone should ever write a book, the Speaker of this House ought to write one so that the social scientists and political scientists for generations to come can look back and understand the great and glorious epoch of American development under his leadership. We were a primitive nation, so to speak, until coincidentally you came into the Congress, and as your leadership grew and as your impact grew and as you found answers to difficult problems, the country flourished and moved forward. I do believe that you owe it to a free people, you owe it to the political scientists of this country, to record for posterity what it took to put together these fantastic combinations that brought America to where it is today.

I want to wish you many, many years of health and happiness in retirement so you can continue serving your country in that way.

Mr. RHODES. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time on the closing day of the 91st Congress to pay tribute and express my gratitude to the distinguished Speaker of this House for the past 10 years—the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK.

When I came to this body 16 years ago, he was the majority leader, the counselor, and devoted friend of every Member of this body. He was kind, understanding, and compassionate. When he became Speaker, he retained all of these fine human virtues—and he remained accessible to every Member.

In these past 10 years, Speaker McCORMACK has provided a new dimension to the dignity of the individual Member. He gave every Member of this body an equal and fair opportunity to present his

case and take his position. He "protected" the rights of every Member—including occasions when he vigorously disagreed with that position or action. He never used the discretionary power which the Speaker possesses to suppress the individual Member's right to parliamentary action. He was fair beyond duty.

Mr. Speaker, you have brought great honor to the Nation, to the State of Massachusetts, and to your community. But you have also brought great and often unrecognized honor to the individual Members of this House. In your time as Speaker, individual Members were encouraged to stand up and take part and positions on every vital issue. You have given them courage to be strong; to represent their positions; to be stand-up men and women. The great reforms which are underway were begun by your inspiration, by your kindling the initiatives which have already produced great reform and which are still at work. If from this, Congress is made more responsive and responsible—if new great leaders emerge, as they will—it results from your handiwork and encouragement.

Speaker McCORMACK, you have championed and labored over every legislative act which has moved this Nation dynamically toward its obligation to serve the people. No living American has done more to make the law serve so many.

I do not know where history will place the work of this fine man as Speaker—but it must be near the summit. Our Speaker has set for every Member an example as to how to serve in dignity. He demonstrated how partisanship can achieve legislative goals without compromising patriotism for the Speaker's loyalty to the Nation—to this House and to his own principles—provide the widest dimension to the term.

This fine man of the House gives all of us an inspiration to serve our fellowman with dedication and high purpose.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in your retirement—and may your days be many and of good health—that you will write of your times and of your experience. We have Cannon's volume on "Rules of Procedure." I hope we can have the benefit of "McCormack on Leadership," a manual to guide those who lead and those who must understand the mission and the problems of such service.

My thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, for your invaluable contributions to our democracy and the institutions which make it work.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

I yield now to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today we mark a truly historic occasion. This is the first time that a Congress of the United States will be adjourning sine die on the day before the new Congress legally convenes, but history will definitely record and it will be better known that this day was the day on which the already legendary JOHN W. McCORMACK retired as Speaker and as a Member of this House.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that great events make great history, but on close analysis we find that great men make those great events which make history, and JOHN W. McCORMACK will be listed high among those men who have made our system of government the greatest that mankind has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, what has been said here on the floor I fully subscribe to, and I do hope that some historian will compile the remarks made here today, so that future generations may be inspired by the life of one who rose from the humblest of origins to the heights of greatness.

But what is even more important in times of shifting values, as we are witnessing today, is that JOHN McCORMACK will be known even more for his goodness than for his greatness.

I recall distinctly, Mr. Speaker, when, in one of our first informal and friendly conversations in his office, Speaker McCORMACK inspired me with one of his many inspiring remarks. In effect, he said to me: "If I were given a choice to be known as a great man or as a good man, I would choose to be known as a good man."

Who can deny that in JOHN W. McCORMACK we have the rare combination of true greatness and genuine goodness? History will record, if it will record fully and accurately, that here was a man who brought heart and goodness to Government.

Mr. Speaker, as one of more than 200 million grateful Americans, with tears of gratitude swelling in my heart, I say, "Thank you for having contributed so much to the greatness of this Nation and to the betterment of mankind."

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Hawaii, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I add my voice to the others that have been heard here this afternoon in tribute to you, both because I am a citizen of the country which you have helped to preserve and also because as an individual I have benefited from your personal friendship.

I especially enjoy the privilege of conveying the good wishes of my father to you, Mr. Speaker—my father who respects you, sir, as one of the dearest friends he has on this earth.

Finally I should like to say that as one who has agreed with you, sir, far more often than not, yet who has not on some occasions, I have deep gratitude for your tolerance of any Member or any person who follows his conscience even if his conscience carries him on a different path from your own.

So I wish you God speed in your retirement, which, as has been said, will hardly seem like a retirement, because I believe, sir, you will continue to make great contributions toward the leadership of this country, towards progress and peace for all mankind.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have heretofore addressed this House in paying tribute to a dear and a great American. This is an occasion, as noted, which is truly historic. We are present in this Chamber during the final hours of the career of one of the most remarkable lawmakers in all history.

I share the emotions which are evident in this Chamber today, the feelings of sadness and regret as the clock ticks away and we watch this historic moment approach.

Mr. Speaker, I count myself as fortunate in the extreme that my service in the House of Representatives commenced 2 years before your service in this Chamber terminated. I will treasure the friendship and the association that I have gained from those 2 years. I will be forever grateful that the Speaker whose time and energies are subject to so many awesome demands has always had the time for a freshman Member and, indeed, a freshman Member from the minority side of the aisle.

As I review the 2 years that it has been my privilege to know you, there are, of course, many personal characteristics that stand out and will live in my own memory. Many have been referred to here earlier today. There is that sense of fairness, gentleness, kindness, and understanding that have always characterized your service. But if I were to identify one characteristic that will perhaps be most vivid in my own memory, it is one of strength. Even after 42 years of service in this body and at the close of some very long and difficult days, you have always projected strength, strength of voice, and of conviction. We always knew that our Speaker was in command, in a way that inspired confidence among the Members of this House. We are grateful for a strong leader. We are deeply in your debt, Mr. Speaker. All of us who have been privileged to serve with you and have benefited from your remarkable talents, all of us whose lives have been enriched by your leadership and your service, all Americans, indeed, all throughout the world who love freedom, are deeply in your debt.

After today, our Speaker will no longer be with us as our Speaker and colleague. JOHN McCORMACK will have left this House as a Member and as Speaker and he will be greatly missed.

I know that the spirit of JOHN McCORMACK will never leave this House, moreover, that it will always be here to provide inspiration, encouragement, strength and guidance for those who will serve here.

As you depart this Chamber today for the last time, as our leader and colleague, Mr. Speaker, I know that I echo the sentiments of the millions who love you when I bid you on this occasion goodbye and God bless you.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in these com-

ments the valedictory—and I choose that word because I prefer to think we are not indulging in a eulogy for JOHN McCORMACK here today, but a valedictory. We have been fortunate to have been here during the time of his service to the country and address him now as an alumnus, one who leaves an illustrious institution, a great institution, in the best possible condition because of his leadership.

I am delighted that my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), took the time today to express what I think is the combined judgment of the entire New York delegation in paying respect and deep affection to our great Speaker.

As the largest delegation in the majority in the House of Representatives, we in New York like to think that JOHN McCORMACK belongs to us and, indeed, to history as much as he belongs to the State of Massachusetts and to all the people of the United States.

We tend today to think back upon the personal moments that we have had with our great Speaker. Some 10 years before I was a Member of this body, and a little in awe of all of the great figures in Washington, I was called upon in behalf of a veterans organization to come to Washington and seek redress, to seek the easing of a burden which had inequitably fallen upon the family and the person of a veteran. We had exhausted all the doors and places of remedy available. Through the aegis of a former Member of Congress I was brought to the door of the rooms of the majority leader, and thought that it would be some assistant or functionary in the office of this great man we would see but instead we saw no less than the majority leader himself. Within a matter of hours things were done for a veteran, and for his family, to help us redeem the belief we all must have in the fact that this Government lives for its people.

Ten years later, when I was privileged to take the oath and to cast the first of my five votes for JOHN McCORMACK, I felt in a sense I was taking part in the making of history that let us participate in the greatness of JOHN McCORMACK by voting five, or 10, or as many times as we would with him, because he has always voted his conscience thinking of all the American people.

I heard with great interest also the reference made by our distinguished majority whip to the words that appear above the Speaker's rostrum, the words of Daniel Webster, I believe, in terms of what should be our commitment to the people whom we serve in this Chamber. I am reminded of what is not an anecdote, but something which actually took place to show that JOHN McCORMACK belongs to the young people of this country as much as he belongs to history and to our predecessors.

One of my sons was with me in the Chamber—and I had cautioned him to be still and silent, and not to intrude his presence verbally on the deliberations of the Chamber. I had to do this more than once—like father like son, I might add. He looked around, and he looked up at the Speaker's rostrum, and

said, "Why can't I speak? Are we in church?" I said, "No, we are not in church, but we are in the Chamber of the House of Representatives." My son Paul, looked up at the Speaker Mr. McCORMACK and said, "Well, then, what is God doing up there?"

Well, to some of us JOHN McCORMACK looks like God when he sits up there. Yet, in all cases, he would dismiss such a thought immediately. The only place we note God in this Chamber day after day, and I hope for the infinite future of the country, is in those words that are up above the Speaker's rostrum, "In God We Trust." I think it is an open secret that JOHN McCORMACK caused those words to be placed there, because he is a man of the people, a man of his party, a man of the country, Speaker of the House of Representatives, who has placed his trust in God and held his country's trust most deeply in his heart. He has always been a man of God, deeply committed to the opportunities and obligations which God has given him.

He, of course, has lived during the most vivid moments of history of our lifetime, second only to the President of the United States in possibly the greatest crisis of our generation, surely the greatest crisis of this decade, in the dark days of November 1963, and responsive to that crisis in terms of readiness, preparation, ability, and stability to meet it.

It has been my experience that whenever we walked into this Chamber, and the House was in session, whether the Speaker was in the chair or not, or whether he had yielded the gavel to one of us lesser Members of the House so that we could have a moment in that chair, you always knew who the Speaker was, whether he was in the chair or not.

So in a sense, in my valedictory today I do not want any other hope for the Speaker in retirement, as he terminates his service in this Congress, but that he will continue his life of momentous service to the American people.

We could offer him all the orisons and all the compliments which he has always brushed aside, because he has always been a simple man, a common man. He has never sought any kind of personal honor, and has eschewed personal preference, but has always sought to have the highest honors for this body among the men whom he loves and serves.

I would like to think that the valedictory we could give him today would be that we go on and try to carry on the work of JOHN McCORMACK. He does not leave us with a void or vacuum of leadership. In a sense JOHN McCORMACK has challenged everyone of us, in the majority and in the minority, to try and equal his gift of service and his gift of greatness during his forty-two years of dedicated and devoted service to this body and to the country.

We have a model to emulate and we have no vacuum or void of leadership because there will be among us men and women whom we will choose to fill the various vacancies created by the retirement of Mr. McCORMACK and other Members. I trust we will choose according to the style of leadership and the depth of commitment and the democracy

of leadership which has been the hallmarks of the Speakership of JOHN McCORMACK.

That democracy of leadership is exemplified by the fact that the door at the end of the hall has been open to all of us at any time, day or night, whether we might be the chairman of a committee or the lowest ranking member. You could go to the Speaker and sit with the Speaker and counsel with the Speaker and so improve your service to your people through his guidance and counsel and devotion.

Although we are all losing a friend here today, we can make a great contribution to the country if we will dedicate ourselves to doing from here on in just as much as we can to live up to the legacy JOHN McCORMACK gives us. I hope he will always be available to us to give us his counsel in the days ahead as we proceed forward on the path of the progress that he has clearly marked for us.

I asked him the other day if there would be any rooms in the Capitol where we could find him in the 92nd Congress or any future Congress, room where we could find JOHN McCORMACK during his presence in the Capitol—and I hope his visits to the Capitol will be most frequent. I realized at once, that it was an inappropriate inquiry to make of the Speaker.

He said, "Oh, no, no, I will not have any room here." Then I thought to myself—of course, not—because every room in this Congress has an open door for JOHN McCORMACK just as his door has always been open to us. In a sense—this Chamber and all of the rooms in this Capitol have the touch of JOHN McCORMACK upon them.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will consider yourself, among other things, an honorary Member of the largest delegation in the House—a full fledged member of the New York delegation. Because you have done so much for us and so much for our State and so much for the American people and so much for this body in which we have been privileged to serve under you as Speaker of the House of Representatives, we of New York welcome you as one of us.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, hail and farewell. May we see you on many, many days here and around our country exerting that great force for good and for leadership which has been so characteristic of your days as majority leader and as Speaker of the House.

I hope you will remember that JOHN McCORMACK is not going into retirement so far as the affairs of this country are concerned. If I have to demonstrate that, let me recall that we have a bigger majority now in this body since the last election because of the work JOHN McCORMACK has done for this party. I think the best statements that were made just prior to the last election were those which originated from the Speaker and which appeared in the press throughout this country when he spoke in the leadership of his party and spoke in such a way that he helped every contending majority Member of this body to gain election and return to this body.

Mr. Speaker, as you spoke last November, may you be speaking through all the months and years to come as a great leader of the Democratic party and as a great leader of the United States.

So far as I am concerned, you are the leader in statecraft in this country in this century because of your Speakership in this great body.

Mr. RHODES. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the many Members who have been delivering eulogies to a great American. I believe it is a privilege to have this opportunity.

One of the qualities that the Speaker embodies is taking time to exercise some of the niceties of life. I well remember a visit I had from some of my people back home, the Sharkey family. We stopped at the Speaker's office and dropped in to visit Mr. McCORMACK. You can well imagine the wonderful time that the Sharkeys and the McCormacks had. Good old Ireland showed through.

This family returned to their home. One of the greatest events in their visit to Washington was the fact that the Speaker of the House, Mr. McCORMACK took time to say to those people from back in the Midwest, "Howdy, folks."

Reference has been made to the humble background of Mr. McCORMACK. I think perhaps many of us share that kind of background. But Mr. McCORMACK makes people feel comfortable in his presence. When you walk into his office, he makes you feel at home, and that is a tribute to him.

For many years we have seen his fierce advocacy of causes in which he believes; yet, at the same time, we have always seen his fairness in dealing with those who may have a different opinion.

I know I speak the feeling of the entire Minnesota delegation when I say, "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We wish you Godspeed. You are a great American."

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another distinguished Member of this House from the State of Massachusetts who will be missed by all of us in this Congress, a good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN).

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the opportunity given me to say a few words about our dear friend whom we all love so dearly.

Throughout his long, illustrious career in this body, our beloved Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK has made tremendous contributions to the American people, this Nation and the world.

He is admired and loved by all who know him, and his fame, outstanding leadership, and achievements are recognized, not only in our own country, but throughout the world. His are among the most noteworthy, significant contributions in the history of this Nation.

As our greatest Speaker takes leave of this famous, democratic body after 42 years of magnificent, dedicated service to the Nation and the world, anything I might say concerning this great leader, and beloved friend, would be all too in-

adequate. Truly, one of the great leaders of the Congress is leaving the House.

Speaker McCORMACK has served and given unselfishly of himself for many years, and this distinguished service has been far beyond the call of duty.

This great House, and Government, and everyone in this country, is better for his memorable accomplishments, his concern for the poor, the helpless, the sick and the elderly, and those who, in large measure these days, must depend on Government to assist them, for his determined, successful work in building and strengthening our Nation, providing proper defense for its security in this very dangerous world, and his laudable, persistent efforts, and effective leadership, in providing the climate, the legislative tools and laws to promote the prosperity and well-being of the Nation in an era of marked growth and expansion in almost every field of human endeavor.

It would be impossible in the time allotted to touch upon all the great things this famous American has done for our country and the people. History will record his memorable work, his great deeds, his dynamic labors, his creative leadership, his zeal for social, economic advancement and his untiring efforts for world peace to which he has given so much of his valuable time.

I want to express my deep appreciation for all he has done for me during my service in this body, his wise counsel, his invariable support and encouragement, and his loyal friendship that has helped me so much in performing my duties to constituents and the Nation.

I want to thank him for his tremendous contributions to the House, the country, and the nations of the world.

His leadership and labors will always be a brilliant chapter in the history of America, always an inspiration to those who seek to serve, always a guide and a source of encouragement to those who continue to serve in this House, and who will be the leaders of the future. They will learn a great deal from his example in brilliant political leadership, of sound, far-sighted, forward-looking statesmanship, and compassionate service to the Nation and the American people.

May the good Lord shower his choicest blessings upon our beloved friend, Speaker McCORMACK, and his lovely helpmate and wife and devoted companion, Mrs. Harriet McCormack, who has inspired and assisted him in ways that are both innumerable and without stint or limit, and to whom she is so deeply devoted in love and loyalty.

While he is leaving this great House which he has so brilliantly adorned for years and the public service on which he has made an indelible mark, I wish for him, his wife, and lovely family all choicest blessings of the Divine Master in whom his stanch faith and devotion has been such a dominant part of his life.

May he, our great Speaker, and his dear ones enjoy good health, peace of mind, and happiness, and may his contributions in the form of counsel, guidance, and direction in our national affairs continue for many years to come.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this commendation of the Speaker. America has been indeed fortunate to have had Speaker McCORMACK in a great leadership position for the many years of his public service. He came to the House of Representatives as a veteran of World War I and as a veteran in Massachusetts legislative leadership, having been democratic leader in the Massachusetts Senate. His voice has always been raised here in such a spirit of personal conviction that he automatically attracted his listeners to his point of view. I have never heard a more persuasive speaker; and I attribute it primarily to his strong personal convictions and his consequent commitment to the point of view taken on the issues at hand.

His force has been on the side of protecting this country from its enemies abroad and at home, on the side of helping the poor and the unfortunate wherever they might be; and on the side of progress for every section and component of our great Nation. America is greater because of him. He and his lovely wife, his teammate, go from here with the gratitude and love not only of all of us here but of every thoughtful and true American.

I want to say that one of the most inspiring things about the Speaker, to me, is that he was never parochial about anything he did in this House of Representatives.

All of us are deeply grateful to him for the personal kindnesses he has shown to us. I believe, above it all, however, that we appreciate the fact that he was never parochial. He is the greatest advocate I know of in public life; but he has done it in a way to be always a part of the answer and never a part of the problem.

I am reminded of a very recent event which occurred in our joint life, and I shall conclude with this. It was when he and I walked over together for a little prayer service for our beloved departed Member, Mendel Rivers, not long ago, at the prayer room of the Capitol.

To me the unifying thing about our Speaker, is that he truly believes in the brotherhood of man, because he really understands that God is our Father, and he really understands we are all each other's brothers.

The greatest expression I have ever had from the Speaker, since I have been an associate of his in these many years, is his great faith in our Father above. I am grateful for that.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMÁS).

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman's yielding to afford me an opportunity to make one observation which may touch upon another facet of the career of our beloved Speaker, one which especially struck me when I first came to the Congress some 12 years ago.

Our present Speaker was, of course, then majority leader. Sitting on the floor of the House of Representatives while

he was speaking, I was struck by the great and fiery eloquence with which he conducted himself in prosecuting the case for the majority side of this body in debate with another Member of the House at that time, a man from my own State, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Halleck. I must say I had never before heard, and have seldom heard since, such skill in debate and such effective oratory.

Mr. Speaker, we here in the House of Representatives are all—most of us, in any event—men and women who enjoy combat, who enjoy strife, who enjoy the give-and-take of what the late Adlai E. Stevenson used to call combat politics. But I believe I have observed few Members of Congress or indeed few men in public life who have so clearly enjoyed and taken zest in the combat of our free and open political system as the Speaker of the House of Representatives whom we today honor.

I remember sitting a few weeks ago in the office of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS), at a meeting of the whips, when Speaker McCORMACK was present with us and when the Speaker was engaging in some reminiscences of his earlier experiences in politics. I count that opportunity to have been on hand when Speaker McCORMACK was engaged in that period of reminiscence as one of the real privileges I have had since coming to the House of Representatives because the Speaker so obviously, enormously enjoyed recalling his earlier political battles, most of which, if I recall correctly, he had won.

I said to him, as he and I walked out of the majority whip's room together, how much I had enjoyed being present, and the Speaker then told me something which I am sure he will not scold me for here repeating, because I was urging him to undertake what some historians in the country now are doing a great deal of, to contribute to an oral history project. I urged the Speaker to make available his reminiscences and recollections to historians of this period of Congress, and he said that, indeed, from time to time in recent weeks he has been engaged in, I believe I am correct in saying, oral interviews with scholars in which he is commenting on some of his many experiences in public life.

I believe the Speaker here gives further evidence of his sensitivity to the important role that he has played in the life of our country and still more particularly to the important role which the Speakership of the House of Representatives symbolizes in our American constitutional system, for Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK is a living repository of some of the most important decisions taken in the history of the United States in modern times.

I am therefore, pleased to have today this opportunity to join in paying tribute to Speaker McCORMACK—for his skill as an orator, for his leadership of his party, for his fairness as presiding officer of the House, for his sense of history, and for his kindness to all of us. I wish finally here to thank him for his great kindness to me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENDEL).

Mr. SCHWENDEL. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, paying of tribute and saying "Thank you" for a job well done happens too infrequently in our society. So Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join this accolade of a much deserved tribute to a great American. I will be very brief but I do want to point out some very important points that I think need pondering upon in a situation like this, and this opportunity presents itself very well to do this.

Here is a man who has been a part of history for 42 years. He was helping to make history, and some rather important history, that we comment upon here today.

One of the things I like about him is that he could and did speak for the House as a body and he could defend each individual Member if they needed to be defended in their right to be heard and to speak, to have his day in court.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very close and personal interest in one activity and one for which I am grateful for the assistance of the Speaker, and that is the Capital Historical Society designed to bring about a better understanding and a better display of history, an endeavor in which the Speaker never failed to cooperate.

Mr. Speaker in the words of Edwin Markham when writing about Lincoln said:

Here was a man to hold against the world,  
a man to match the mountain and the sea.

They are apt and appropriate as we speak of JOHN McCORMACK.

I am glad to join in this genuinely deserved accolade to a great American.

Finally Mr. Speaker, good luck and God bless you as you carry on from here and seek to serve your fellow man in another opportunity.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, although my voting record could hardly be said to be in complete accord with the gentleman from Arizona, there is no resolution which has been sponsored in this House that I support more enthusiastically than the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

I join in these richly deserved tributes to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK. There is not a single American whose life has not been affected for the better as a result of the work he has done and leadership which he has shown. In fact, this is true of the people all over this world. The schoolchildren who enjoy a better education, the college students, the sick who now have medical care, the workers whose hours and wages are now adjusted fairly, the elderly who have social security—and millions of others, even those yet unborn, who owe so much to the leadership and vision of our great Speaker.

In the larger issues involving the strength of this Nation, the Speaker has always exerted his influence on behalf of strength.

But it is in his relations with the individual Members of the House that he has most of all earned the title of "The Member's Speaker."

We wish the Speaker well, along with Mrs. McCormack, in his years of richly deserved retirement. As we bid him farewell, I recall so much personal incidents which speak highly of his character, his leadership, and his qualities as a human being. Thousands of young people had the rare opportunity to meet and exchange ideas with him, and derive inspiration from his informal answers. On many occasions when I know the Speaker was extremely busy, he unfailingly took time out to meet with large groups of young people on the House floor, in his office, or on the steps of the Capitol. And he always had time to work out what probably seemed to each Member larger human problems—yet he always through his helpfulness made every problem seem small.

I salute you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding.

I take this time to pay my tribute to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

It seems just yesterday when I was privileged to be elected to this body although the calendar says it was 1949. It was the first special election following the year of 1948, the so-called Truman landslide. In that first election for a seat in the House it was my good fortune to be selected by the people of the 26th District of Pennsylvania to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

After receiving the greetings of the other Members, I shall never forget the beloved Speaker, who was then the majority leader, coming up and welcoming me to this body.

There had been a great deal of fanfare and a great deal of publicity from coast to coast in the election in which I had been successful, and JOHN McCORMACK gave me some words of wisdom that I would like to recall to him, and to the other Members of the House of Representatives. He said to me, "Young man, I welcome you to this body. I want you to know that no Member was ever defeated by the speech he did not make." And, 22 years later, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I have tried to follow your advice. The only time Members should come on the floor and make a speech is when they know more about the subject than any other Member, so that in the debate that takes place in this great body they are able to handle any issues that are presented to them from either side, and it is only when you know your subject and know your business that you are able to survive.

One of the reasons you have been a great Speaker in the House of Representatives is that you have never in the 22 years it has been my privilege to be

here and to serve with you, taken this floor in any debate in which you did not know more about the subject matter than any other Member of this body. That is a great record. And as you leave us, with the great honor of having served longer continuously than any other Speaker, and as the first Speaker in the history of this country to ever retire, you are a man who has made a great mark in the history of our country, and so I say to you and to your dear wife that in your retirement I wish you and she all of God's great blessings.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I merely wish to comment to the Speaker pro tempore on how well you look as occupant of the chair of this great body. And I hope that it is not the last time that you will occupy this great chair.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you everything that is good, and I even wish you this, sir: The winters in Massachusetts are hard. I know that they are, because I have spent winters in Massachusetts, and it would be my hope that you and Mrs. McCormack might decide to come to Arizona. I understand it is something like 70 or 72 degrees in Phoenix today, and not only because of that, but I can assure you of a most enthusiastic welcome by all of the citizens of Arizona. There is only one proviso I would like to make, sir, and that is if you should happen to come to Arizona that you not run for the House of Representatives, because while I am not unduly alarmed about my own future, you would be possibly a constituent and a possible candidate.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the outpourings of good will which have been registered here indicate to you the feelings of all of the Members of the House of Representatives, because they all feel that way.

I note that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is on his feet. Does the gentleman desire that I yield to him?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Arizona would yield to me.

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the congressional career of Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK draws to a close, it is fitting and proper that the House pause to pay tribute to a great American who has served our Nation with total dedication throughout four critical decades: the 1930's, the 1940's, the 1950's, the 1960's—each a crucial decade, each a decade marked by crisis at home and abroad. During this period JOHN McCORMACK led the House of Representatives in seeking solutions to the critical problems of the times. As majority leader from Franklin D. Roosevelt to John F. Kennedy, he was in the forefront of legislative change from the New Deal to the New Frontier. As Speaker under Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, he has presided over the House of Representatives for a longer continuous period than any other Speaker. When the history of this era is written, the name of JOHN W. McCORMACK must necessarily loom large and luminous.

During the past 10 years it has been a privilege for me to know and to serve with JOHN McCORMACK. I have always

enjoyed those times I have spent with him in his office, at luncheon, and on the floor. We have had many discussions. Although there were times when we disagreed—sometimes quite sharply over fundamental policy issues—he has always been willing to listen and to respect my point of view. I have always found him courteous, fair and frank—even when I did not succeed in convincing him.

But there were occasions when I was able to persuade him. I recall the genuine humaneness and compassion of the Speaker on more than one occasion when I went to him to ask his intervention on behalf of civil rights leaders who were subjected to harassment and arrest for exercising first amendment freedoms. I found that he would recognize injustice and quietly and without fanfare act affirmatively to help.

My most recent experience with the Speaker occurred on Tuesday of this week when he responded immediately, sympathetically, and affirmatively to my suggestion that the House formally protest the persecution of Soviet Jewry by passing a resolution. And we did so on December 31.

And earlier on December 7, when he realized the harm that might be done to Vietnam peace negotiations at Paris by the language in the prisoner of war resolution reported out by the Armed Services Committee, the Speaker prevailed upon Chairman Mendel Rivers to change that resolution. The magnanimity of the Speaker was demonstrated when he later thanked me for using the parliamentary tactics that gave him time to go to work and convince the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to change the resolution.

As this session adjourns out of respect to our beloved Speaker, I want to wish him great happiness in the years ahead. I hope they will be years of continued fulfillment for him. As he leaves us, he fully deserves to carry with him the respect and affection of his colleagues in Congress and the gratitude of all the American people for his devoted years of service to our country.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege to join with my colleagues in paying honor and tribute which is so richly deserved to our great Speaker.

No man within memory has served this body with more dedication and distinction than our beloved Speaker. It will be difficult to match a career such as Speaker McCORMACK has had. He was always available for advice and counsel to new Members as well as to a chairman of a major committee. His sincerity and willingness to give guidance was a boon to old as well as to new Members.

The Speaker exemplifies all that is good. His sterling qualities, his righteousness, his consideration for others, and his brilliant mind are some of his attributes that have endeared him to all Members and to others fortunate enough to have known him.

He treated every Member with kindness and helped each attain the best results from his individual efforts.

Heavy responsibilities rested upon his shoulders, especially in crucial times when the welfare, in fact, the preservation of our Nation, was hanging in the balance.

He has consummate faith in Divine Providence and I feel that his decisions on these critical occasions were answers to prayer.

To the Speaker and his devoted wife, I join with my colleagues in extending to them my very best wishes for happiness and good fortune in the future.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in the House to pay honor to you today. Few men have enjoyed the respect which men freely give to you. It is difficult for me, as a freshman, to characterize to you the deep and abiding admiration which I shall always hold for you.

I had been in Congress for less than a week when I called upon you for help. As I approached your office I suppose I should have done so with some degree of trepidation. I confess that I had no fear because I needed help and from all that I had heard about you, I somehow knew that you would help me. Mr. Speaker, you lived up to your reputation. You helped this new Member of Congress. My problem was in the nature of a dispute with a Member of the other body over office space in my congressional district. The statement had been made that the Member of the other body was senior to me since I was in the House. This bristled you, Mr. Speaker, because you have long insisted that both Houses are co-equal branches of Government and the rights and privileges of the Members of this House are not subordinate to those of the Members of the other body. I want to thank you again for coming to my aid on that occasion and utilizing your expertise in solving my problem regarding office space.

Mr. Speaker, during my 2 years in Congress you have counseled with me on many occasions. Your door has always been open to me. I will never forget how you advised me recently on the proper manner to get recognition on the floor for the purpose of sending a preferential motion to the desk. When I expressed some reservation about getting on my feet timely, you smiled and comforted me by saying, "I'll protect you." Those words, Mr. Speaker, have come to symbolize you to the Members of this House. All of us know that as long as you were informed of what we were attempting to do, you would protect our rights.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of nine black Members of this House. You and I have had many discussions regarding your philosophy and your dedication to the eradication of discrimination in every walk of American life. Indeed, you have been steadfastly concerned that the House of Representatives reflect itself as an equal employment opportunity employer. Your record and your philosophy in this respect is impeccable. As a liberal, your name has been associated with every piece of liberal social legislation to come out of this body for the last 42 years. I know of no other American who has such a record.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to serve in the House of Representatives.

It is an even greater honor to have served under your speakership. I hope that you enjoy your well earned and deserved retirement. History in its own way will record what each of us says here today. It has also recorded for posterity what you have done here for 42 years. I am sure that historians, in writing of you, will say as I have said on many occasions, "He is truly a great Speaker."

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the high privileges and great pleasures of the 8 years during which I have had the honor of serving in this House has been the opportunity of association with the distinguished Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK.

As has been his unvarying habit with new Members, he was friendly and helpful to me when I came first to the Congress, and I realized at once that his respect and love for the House were matched by his sincere concern for the Members and, indeed, for his every fellow man.

I found the Speaker always accessible, and generous with his counsel and assistance.

It would be superfluous for me to attempt to recount the Speaker's achievements, but I did want to add these few words of respect and regard for him in these final hours of the 91st Congress.

I wish to him and Mrs. McCORMACK the very best for the future.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, one can scarcely find words of praise for JOHN McCORMACK which have not already been spoken. I will add only a personal anecdote.

On the occasion of his impassionate and tremendous speech to the House in support of the 18-year-old vote, Mr. McCORMACK's galleried listeners included my 15-year-old son Jeffrey.

At home, later, Jeffrey told me how moved he had been by Speaker McCORMACK's address, then asked: "Why is Mr. McCORMACK retiring?"

During those few minutes in the well of the House, I realized, JOHN McCORMACK had successfully bridged a chasm equivalent of two-thirds of a century.

May we all strive to do as well.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding statesman and servant of the American people, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

His long history of outstanding and dedicated service to his country is without parallel in this century. For his many personal legislative achievements and those legislative accomplishments performed under his direction as majority leader and Speaker, the American people are much the better. His legislative skill and great personal diplomacy have resulted in legislation being passed which seemed to be hopelessly tangled in the legislative process.

I personally appreciate the Speaker's many individual acts of kindness. He found time in an incredibly busy schedule to give wise counsel and advice to me as a junior Member and guide me in the procedures and customs of the House. I am certain I could not have learned at the hands of a more wise, experienced or understanding mentor. I only hope that I will be as considerate of and patient



with the special needs of new Members as the Speaker was with mine.

Mr. McCORMACK's kindness to my mother will always be an especially fond remembrance I have of him as a gracious and hospitable man who was never too busy to remember those small personal acts of courtesy which to me are the mark of a truly understanding gentleman.

All too often we do not recognize the good deeds of a great man and I am extremely pleased that the House has passed to pay tribute to an uncommon American who, when this body reconvenes on January 21, 1971, will most assuredly be missed.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK. Our great Speaker has meant much to each Member of this body. His fairness to each Member, and his many individual acts of courtesy are well known by his colleagues and by the American people.

Not so often recognized about our Speaker, however, is that fact that, although he represents one of our greatest urban areas, he has consistently supported legislation designed to aid our rural sections. Those of us who represent less urbanized areas appreciate his interest, for example, in soil conservation programs and in agriculture legislation. This is just one indication of his national outlook and his nonparochial approach to the problems which have faced this Nation during the four turbulent decades of his service in the House of Representatives. I could go on for pages in praise of his unprecedented service in this body. But in a sense, all that is unnecessary for the very legislative history of the past 40 years is in large measure a living record of his service. National defense, aid to the poor and disadvantaged, and assistance to our veterans, their widows and orphans; these are all a part of his record.

JOHN W. McCORMACK is a world figure, a man intimately involved in those great decisions since the time of World War II that have shaped world history. He is known and respected the world over; in the histories of this epoch, he will rank with those great international leaders such as Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. And yes, when we think of that tragic event of November 22, 1963, we think also of the days that followed, when JOHN W. McCORMACK, as Speaker of the House of Representatives, was but a heartbeat away, in line of succession, the Presidency. His strength of character and resolute service helped in leading our Nation through that sad time with stability and confidence.

JOHN McCORMACK's service to a grateful Nation began with his answer to the call in World War I, followed by his service in the Massachusetts Legislature and then his four decades in the U.S. House of Representatives. This service to Nation will, we hope, continue as JOHN W. McCORMACK recounts for the benefit of future generations, his unique store of knowledge concerning the operation of this great body.

My constituents and all the people of South Carolina, as well as Mrs. Dorn

and my family, join me in wishing continued good fortune and happiness for our great Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Arizona for proposing the resolution which is presently before the House. I agree with him that it is fitting and proper for the House to pay tribute to one of its great Members in this manner, and I urge that the resolution be adopted.

There is little that I can add to the eloquent speeches that have been delivered earlier today in this Chamber. They have most fairly expressed the affection and admiration which I believe all of us have for our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

It was exactly 22 years ago today that I first met Speaker McCORMACK. I was elected 2 months earlier to the 81st Congress and before leaving for Washington, had a conversation with a distinguished industrialist of Milwaukee who happened to be a good friend of Mr. McCORMACK. He told me how fortunate I was to be going to our Nation's Capital at a time when the Congress of the United States had two outstanding leaders—the late Speaker Rayburn and the then majority leader, JOHN W. McCORMACK. My Milwaukee friend, although a Republican, counseled me to emulate the majority leader and to follow his leadership.

I have tried to do so in the 22 years which have elapsed since that winter of 1948-49. And I must say that serving in the House with Speaker McCORMACK, and working under his leadership, has been a most rewarding experience.

The Speaker's many talents and virtues—all but one—have been described in some detail by my colleagues. The one which seems to have received little attention has always impressed me the most: it is the Speaker's virtue of patience and understanding.

I have stood here in the well, time and time again, and watched the Speaker handle the most trying situations without once losing his temper.

I have seen him subjected to personal attacks, to the anger of others, and to various other pressures. Never, however, have I seen him respond in kind to his detractors, or to abandon the courtesy which he has always shown to others.

The late President John F. Kennedy said on one occasion that true courage is grace under pressure.

In all the years I have had the privilege of knowing him, Speaker McCORMACK has been an embodiment of that definition.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss you greatly. You have been a tower of strength and an inspiration to your colleagues and to the people of our Nation during the 42 years that you have served in the Congress. You have been steadfast in upholding the highest ideals of our Constitution, and in championing the public good. And you have earned a place in the heart of the American Nation that few will ever attain.

We wish you and Mrs. McCormack our Lord's choicest blessings in the years that lie ahead—and we hope that you will return frequently to the Capitol and

continue to share with us your wise counsel and your friendship.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, how can anyone add to what already has been said here in testimony to the greatness of our beloved Speaker, as a leader and as a man, except to voice agreement a thousandfold with every word uttered by those men and women of the House who love and respect him so much?

JOHN McCORMACK had already established himself as an effective leader of the House by the time I came to Congress in 1945. Like SAM STRATTON, of New York I had had the opportunity to observe him in action for many years prior to the beginning of my first term in the House. Like Mr. STRATTON, I, too, had spent 10 years as a congressional secretary. I remember the Speaker's great ability as a floor leader and his demonstration of the qualities of leadership which eventually carried him to the speakership.

Our beloved Speaker retires voluntarily after having set the record for continuous occupancy of the Speaker's chair, and after a legislative career that stamps him as one of the greatest statesmen in the history of our Nation.

The Democratic whip, Hon. HALE BOGGS, has enumerated the major legislative achievements of JOHN McCORMACK and the main areas of his interests. He devoted a lifetime of service to mankind—and the energy and experience he put into the enactment of social reforms indicated his concern for his fellow man.

To say JOHN McCORMACK was my friend is to repeat what every Member of this House can say. He loved the House and he drew no distinction among its membership—every single Member was important to him. Everyone received the same fair treatment from him. It is to be regretted that the new Members who will join us in the 92d Congress will not have the opportunity to serve under JOHN McCORMACK's speakership and to know him as all of us know him.

My wife, Garry, joins me in expressing every good wish to the Speaker and to his beloved wife, Harriet. We shall think of them always and keep them in our prayers.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of a career of a great American and a great man. For nearly 42 years, JOHN W. McCORMACK has been the House and the House has been JOHN W. McCORMACK. His devotion to the House has only been surpassed by his devotion to his wife and his country. He has been a champion of liberal causes who has never forgotten the little man.

All of the Members of the House have been touched by the many acts of kindness bestowed by our devoted Speaker, and I know that I join all of the Members of this body in wishing Speaker and Mrs. McCormack "Godspeed."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, words are weak in expressing our affection for and appreciation of our dear friend, colleague, and leader, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. He has been a help and inspiration to us all in more ways than we could possible count, but if any quality stands out above his many great attributes it is the sterling example that he has set for all of us as a Christian gentleman and a patriotic American. His

fierce and yet gentle devotion to his church and his country characterized his great personal power for good and has given all of us a flawless goal of emulation. Mr. McCORMACK has left the country and the Congress much the better for his having been a part of it and we will long miss him in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, in our system of Government, the Speaker of the House of Representatives can only be compared with the President of the United States in power and prestige. The Speaker's position stems partly from the method of his election, partly from his duties and responsibilities, and partly from his role as chief of one of the principal branches of the Federal Government. The Constitution merely says that: "The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers," but remains silent upon his status and functions. The Speaker has always been elected, like the President and Vice President, on a national basis, for he is chosen by the Representatives of the whole people. He has been the elect of the elect. No law can be enacted without his signature, and in the event of the death or disability of the President and Vice President, the Constitution now provides that the Speaker succeed as President.

Perhaps some have wondered, what kind of person becomes a leader within Congress? Usually he is one who recognizes that measure of individuality or independent freedom necessary to the other Members. He is a man with a great "feel" for the national interest. He rarely behaves autocratically, even in little things, and only within certain limits in great things when the public interest dictates. He evokes admiration for his skill and sureness of touch, for his sense of fair play and his hard work.

All of these things and more I have observed in Speaker JOHN McCORMACK. He is warmly admired and respected by everyone, a great leader, but above all other qualities, he brings to my mind the definition of the true gentleman which was learned in my college days:

The true gentleman is the man whose conduct proceeds from good will and an acute sense of propriety; whose self-control is equal to all emergencies, who does not make the poor man conscious of his poverty; the obscure man of his obscurity or any man of his inferiority or deformity; who is himself humble if necessity compels him to humble another; who does not flatter wealth, cringe before power or boast of his own possessions or achievements; who speaks with frankness but always with sincerity and sympathy; whose deed follows his word; who thinks of the rights and feelings of others rather than his own; a man with whom honor is sacred.

We will all miss seeing JOHN McCORMACK in the Speaker's chair, but we still look forward to his companionship and leadership in the years ahead.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal privilege to join with all the Members of this House in this well merited "parting" salute to my Massachusetts colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, as one of the greatest men, greatest legislative leaders

and greatest Speakers in all our Federal legislative history.

Since 1928, the heart, the voice, and the hand of JOHN McCORMACK has been influentially associated with the advance and adoption of every substantial legislative measure for social progress that has occurred from that time to this day.

Through these years, and by virtue of his recognized character and integrity, diligence and dedication, competency, and compassion, he was consistently endorsed by his party colleagues for progressive positions of legislative responsibility and leadership up to the third most powerful and important office in the U.S. Government.

For more than 40 years, as an ordinary Member, majority leader, and Speaker, the dedicated hand and voice and heart of JOHN W. McCORMACK has made a substantial contribution to the adoption and operation of every legislative proposal designed to promote the social welfare of his fellow Americans, expand their economic opportunities and to keep them secure from all enemies. His is an unparalleled record of constructive legislative service and his image will be forever enshrined in the most glorious pages of our national legislative history.

But above and beyond these accomplishments it is for the example of his high character that this Nation will remain forever indebted to him.

Throughout his life JOHN W. McCORMACK has become universally recognized for not only his tolerance of the beliefs of others, but by his gentlemanly graciousness to others with whom he differs. He has presented his own beliefs with all the vigor and persuasion within his command, but he has been equally vigorous in proclaiming the right of others to freely and fully speak their own beliefs, and in the rare instance where his own causes could not prevail he has reserved no rancor. With his devout faith in God and his sympathetic understanding of his fellow men the spiritual nature of the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK, could not permit him to act otherwise.

He has, throughout his glorious career, consistently developed and demonstrated, in his public and private life, the basic virtues of indestructible integrity, unswerving patriotic devotion and unsurpassed competence in leadership. He is now and will ever be a legendary inspiration for all fellow Americans, and the personification of the traditional American without whose attributes this country could not have begun and only in the practice of which it can endure.

As our distinguished colleague and beloved Speaker leaves this House I know you will join in my prayer that the good Lord will bestow His choicest blessings upon the Honorable and Mrs. John W. McCORMACK, because they have, together and in truth, been "good and faithful servants."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve in this House under many distinguished Speakers—Longworth, Garner, and Rayburn. But none of these men were more courageous, more just, or more able than the great Speaker who now presides over this House—the distinguished gentleman from Mas-

sachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK. And when we speak of such great men—men who have made an indelible mark on the national fabric of this country—we are inclined to speak in glowing terms of qualifications and accomplishments which call up images of some distant and ideal portrait in classic marble or unmoving bronze. But JOHN McCORMACK is much more than a great leader and statesman—he is a great man and a warm and loyal friend.

No position reveals so clearly the true stature of a great man than that of Speaker of this House where legislative crosscurrents are constantly at work and where the most tranquil surface can in a moment become a vortex of conflicts. A great Speaker must possess the technical skills of an inspired parliamentarian, the wisdom of a philosopher king, and patience as time defying as interplanetary space. These are the remarkable attributes that JOHN McCORMACK possesses. But beyond all of that, our Speaker is a grand human being with the tang of everyday salt in his style and makeup. He has boldly mingled in the fray of countless battles, and his proud scars speak of brave endurance when most have fled the field. And if he has enemies, they stand in deep shadow where his sharp eye cannot find them.

Speaker McCORMACK's leadership has been a wonderful inspiration to all of us; his wisdom has enlightened us and has so often pierced the dense clouds surrounding the most complex and trying of issues. Every speech he has made has taught me something, and usually a great deal. And although I am not a member of his church, I feel that every Member of the House of Representatives shares in his abiding faith and that every Member is the fortunate beneficiary of his great and singular devotion.

True greatness has broad dimensions that are not easily summarized, and a few words of eulogy cannot succeed in adequately portraying or praising what a great and profound man has accomplished over the course of a lifetime. But if I were to attempt to characterize our beloved Speaker in one sentence, I would simply say this: JOHN McCORMACK is a man of indomitable conscience.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to add my words of tribute to one of this country's outstanding public servants, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, who came to Congress 42 years ago in the 70th Congress, following a splendid career in the Massachusetts State Legislature.

When history records the story of JOHN W. McCORMACK's tenure in the Congress which will end with his service as Speaker of the House of Representatives, the highest honor that can come to a Member of either House of the Congress as a whole, it will state that he served as chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. After the Soviet Union succeeded in placing Sputnik I in orbit on October 4, 1957, a select committee composed of 13 Members of the House and 13 Members of the Senate was named and after conducting hearings for a period of 1 year prepared and passed through the

House and the Senate the legislation creating the Space Agency and shortly thereafter the necessary resolution setting up the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

On the initial select committee we had seven members on the Democratic side composed of JOHN W. McCORMACK, chairman, together with Representatives Overton Brooks, Brooks Hays, Leo H. O'Brien, LEE METCALF, WILLIAM H. NATCHER, and B. F. SISK. On the Republican side we had as the ranking minority Member, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., together with Representatives LESLIE C. ARENDS, Gordon L. McDonough, JAMES G. FULTON, Kenneth B. Keating, and GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to say that, in addition to having served a long and honorable record in the Congress, history will indeed record the fact that one of the outstanding assignments performed by JOHN W. McCORMACK during his entire tenure in political life was when he served in his important capacity on this particular select committee.

The chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration in the Senate was Lyndon B. Johnson who, at that time, was the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate having this opportunity to pay my respects to one who has served so long both as a majority leader and Speaker during many of the most crucial and momentous years of our Nation's history.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from the Speaker's office, and a mixed feeling of regret, sadness, and nostalgia, pervades my mind and soul.

My mind flashed back to the first encounter with the great American, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, on the day I was sworn into the Congress, January 10, 1962; a host of memories continue to invade the mind: the constituents I have brought into the Speaker's room to have them meet the third ranking American leader in Government, the ever-present charm and hospitable reception, the fulsome praise for the Member—all of these thoughts inundate the mind as I contemplate the empty offices of the Speaker. But it has been said the true memorial are not those of stone and marble and steel, but those in the hearts and minds of our fellow men. By this standard JOHN McCORMACK will live on forever.

What a tremendous and awe-inspiring record: A noble but humble American, of poor Irish stock comes to the House and almost immediately is recognized and assigned prestigious posts.

He authors and guides the most definitive and dramatic legislation affecting the American people over a period of 45 plus years. There is social security, lend-lease, declaration of war, minimum wage, and so forth—all these bear the imprimatur of JOHN McCORMACK.

It can be said: very seldom, if ever, have so many owed so much to one man.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in praising our beloved Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK, as he takes his leave from the House of Representatives, after his many years of distinguished service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that about the greatest thing to be said of any man is that he is good man JOHN McCORMACK is a good man. It has been my privilege now for 25 years to have known the Speaker. I am better off in many ways for having had his association. His influence will live forever in these Halls of Congress and his service here is a living monument.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for you and Mrs. McCormack the very best of health and happiness and that in your retirement you will find contentment and immeasurable satisfaction in the knowledge that you have contributed so much to our Nation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, many are the accolades which in solemn truth could be expressed upon this occasion. Your career is a beacon and your life an inspiration. For many years to come, the deeds you have done will provide light for the way to those entrusted with the public weal.

To describe you as one of the truly outstanding lawmakers of all time is surely no exaggeration; yet it seems a redundancy to speak of this. Above your legislative triumphs, which are legion, arises something even more profound—your very example of manhood, your standard of leadership.

Kipling put it well when he wrote:

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,  
or walk with kings nor lose the common touch.

Surely those words are peculiarly descriptive of the career of JOHN McCORMACK. You have been in the finest sense of the term a leader of men. Your leadership has been that of example, of inspiration, of rational persuasion; never that of coercion or intimidation. Consistently you have appealed to the best in each of us, never to the worst.

And so on this occasion, as much as could be said and truly should be said, I simply want to add that because of what you are each of us has become a little better. I know of no greater tribute that could be spoken of any man. In earnest and abundant truth it applies to JOHN McCORMACK.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, because there are so many Members of the House who could not be here today but who would want to extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, I ask unanimous consent, first, that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK from the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POFF). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK), the distin-

guished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues and dear friends, I am deeply touched by the resolution that has just been adopted by the House and by the kind and generous remarks made about me and about the character of my public service and what I represent, as JOHN McCORMACK—an individual and a human being.

It is only natural that taking leave of the House of Representatives after my 42 years of service and hearing in mind the honors that have been conferred upon me by my party in the House of Representatives brings forth in me great feelings of emotion.

Next to God and Mrs. McCormack, I love the House of Representatives. To me the House of Representatives is the greatest legislative body that has ever been devised by the creative mind of man.

During my service here, as a Member, occupying positions of party leadership and the position of Speaker of the House, I have always insisted that the rights and prerogatives of the Members of the House and the dignity of the House of Representatives be preserved and strengthened.

I hope I leave with the feeling of my colleagues that I have been fair and that I have carried out and enforced the rules of the House of Representatives in a manner that has protected the rights of all of my colleagues. Even in disagreement at times with some of my colleagues, I have always respected their views and their right to entertain their views in disagreement with myself.

It is not my purpose to make lengthy remarks about the legislative history of our country during the past 42 years on either domestic legislation or from the angle of national defense and a firm foreign policy.

My record in support of and fighting for progressive legislation and for legislation against discrimination, racial or otherwise, since the days preceding World War II, when Hitler came across the scene, and the necessity for a strong national defense and a firm policy, is well known and is a part of the congressional record of all time.

My purpose in my last remarks as a Member of the House is to express to my colleagues my deep feelings of appreciation for the many kindnesses and the considerations they have extended to me, not only my colleagues of today, but also my colleagues of yesterday.

I have said that I love the House. I have been happy being here serving our country in this Chamber and in meeting colleagues from all sections of the country and in the making of friendships, which I shall always treasure.

I have fulfilled my brightest dreams in this Chamber in association with my colleagues. I have gained the greatest wealth that a human being could have gained, the opportunity to serve in the House of Representatives, the opportunity of meeting men and women from all sections of the country who are elected to this body, representing the greatness of our country, and in the

making of friendships with them, because friendship is of paramount importance. It overshadows party.

You have heard me say that the middle aisle sinks into insignificance where friendship is involved, and it is the friendships I have made that are most meaningful. My coming into the Chamber with a "Hello, Jim," "Hello, Don," "Hello, Pat"—those friendships, those salutations, more than anything else, I will miss. Sitting down at the table at which Members have an opportunity of penetrating my thoughts or when, we might say, outside the Chamber, they might rib me—how much I have enjoyed it. And, I might say, it gave me an opportunity to find out some things also.

The people of my congressional district have been very kind to me. I shall always treasure their confidence and support, without which I could not have been elected by my Democratic colleagues to the important position of majority leader and, in 1962, selected in caucus by my Democratic colleagues to be the nominee to the great office of Speaker and elected by the House of Representatives as its Presiding Officer.

While I shall no longer be a Member of the House, my heart will always be in this Chamber. I will also have uppermost in my mind the friendships that I have made.

I intended—and I hope my remarks are of a personal and warm nature and will be so construed—I intend them as not "goodbye," but as "good day."

As I conclude particularly I pay my respects to my dear and distinguished friend, the exceptionally distinguished majority leader, CARL ALBERT. He has been a bulwark of strength to me during these past 9 years. His kindness and his acceptance of my weaknesses—and I thank all of you for your kindness and acceptance of my weaknesses, because we all are human—and his loyalty and devotion have made an impression upon me and upon all Members of the House.

I also want to pay my respects and appreciation to the outstanding majority whip, HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, whose friendship and loyalty I greatly value.

I want to express, also, my deep gratitude to JOHN MOSS, the deputy whip for his splendid and understanding cooperation, and DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, as chairman of the Democratic caucus.

I might say, relating to my friend CARL ALBERT again, and all of these gentlemen I have mentioned, that they have served with remarkable ability throughout my tenure as Speaker, and their closeness and loyalty to me is something that has been a bulwark of strength in the performance of my duties.

I want to pay my respects also to RAY MADDEN, who is chairman of the steering committee, for the wonderful cooperation he gave me and for his friendship throughout the years.

I wish to thank the chairmen of the various committees and subcommittees and also the members and the Democratic whip for their splendid cooperation and for their loyalty and devotion to me.

I am particularly appreciative to our very able minority leader, GERALD R.

FORD, and the able minority whip, LES ARENDS, whose services to their party and to the House of Representatives have been outstanding. Their courtesy to me personally as Speaker has been particularly impressed upon my mind. Our cooperation and understanding have been always very close. They have their responsibilities as leaders, as have Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BOGGS, and I, as leaders of our party, but there always existed between us understanding minds and friendship.

Looking back on the past years, I am fully aware of the important roles played by the many employees of the House who have performed their duties with diligence, and who certainly deserve the thanks of every Member, and I extend to them my thanks. I wish time permitted me to mention each of them. I do, however, want to pay my respects to the Clerk of the House of Representatives Pat Jennings, to the Doorkeeper Bill Miller, the Sergeant at Arms Zeake Johnson, and the Postmaster Hap Morris, and our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Latch, but over and above that, I want to extend my very special gratitude to that great human being, that man equally brilliant and practical, that fount of wisdom, our great Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

I also desire to express my thanks to Bill Cochrane, and to my own staff in the Speaker's office. Therefore, I express particularly my thanks to John Monahan, and to those in my district office, to my staff at present headed by Mrs. Edythe Pargament, and I want especially to express appreciation to my staff in Boston, to Mr. James V. Hartrey, who has been with me for many, many years. My Boston office has always been very loyal I say to those who constitute my secretarial staff, I am most appreciative for your years of devotion to me.

I also want to pay my respects to John Barriere for his valuable assistance as staff director of the democratic steering committee. He has been most helpful to Chairman MADDEN and to the majority leader and to our majority whip and to me in helping us process our legislative programs.

I also want to extend my thanks to the Official Reporters of Debates of the House as well as the Official Reporters of committees.

I also thank the pages.

They are a very important part of our work, and I am very proud of them. They serve us in a very able, loyal, and diligent manner.

These Halls and Chambers have been the scene of whatever triumphs I may count; and, yes, the scene of reverses, too.

I only hope, that as I leave, you may honestly say of my time here, that when the fighting was the fiercest, JOHN McCORMACK was in it; honestly fighting for what he believed in, seeking ever to influence and never to destroy and, as Speaker, always protecting the rights of Members of the House of Representatives and the dignity and prerogatives of this great body.

I hope that you may say of JOHN McCORMACK—that it may be said of me—

"He was a good representative of the people." But I hope in your minds, my dear colleagues and friends, you will say of me that JOHN McCORMACK was a Member's Speaker. I would leave here happy if that characterization of JOHN McCORMACK accompanied me. In addition to whatever service I may have rendered during my 42 years as a Member of this body, as a Speaker of the House of Representatives, I always preserved the rights and dignities and prerogatives of the House and the rights of every Member under the rules of the House—and a little bit beyond the rules of the House, if necessary—and if, in the minds of my colleagues, JOHN McCORMACK leaves here as the Members' Speaker, I will be very happy.

So as I take my final leave of this Chamber I love so deeply, of friends without regard to the middle aisle for whom I have an affection, may I take liberty with Tennyson's verse to fit my own feelings:

Twilight and adjournment bell, and after that we part  
And may there be no sadness of farewell as I embark.

God bless you all.  
[Prolonged applause, the Members rising.]

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THE SPEAKER laid before the House, the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

1:25 p.m., JANUARY 2, 1971.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective immediately I hereby resign from the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. TUNNEY.

#### AMENDING SECTION 905 OF THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Mr. BOGGS, Mr. Speaker, I might say, by way of introduction, I have a series of bills to call up, which passed the House and to which the Senate has offered some amendments. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Wisconsin has examined all the amendments which will be called up and concurs therein.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17984) to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, 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 1, line 7, strike out "and (4)" and insert "(4) and (5)".

Page 1, line 9, strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "money." and insert "money."

Page 2, after line 17, insert:

"(5) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to a distribution of stock by a corporation organized prior to December 1, 1969, for the principal purpose of providing an equity participation

plan for employees of the corporation whose stock is being distributed (hereinafter referred to as the "employer corporation") if—

"(A) the stock being distributed was owned by the distributing corporation on November 30, 1969,

"(B) the stock being redeemed was acquired before January 1, 1973, pursuant to such equity participation plan by the shareholder presenting such stock for redemption (or by a predecessor of such shareholder),

"(C) the employment of the shareholder presenting the stock for redemption (or the predecessor of such shareholder) by the employer corporation commenced before January 1, 1961.

"(D) at least 90 percent in value of the assets of the distributing corporation on November 30, 1969, consisted of common stock of the employer corporation, and

"(E) at least 50 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the employer corporation is owned by the distributing corporation at any time within the nine-year period ending one year before the date of such distribution."

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my intention to object, we have a lot of bills that will be called up. I think it might be well, rather than to go into each one individually, to make a general statement with respect to them.

As the gentleman from Louisiana has said, the amendments in all cases are germane to the five bills that relate to the Internal Revenue Service Code. The amendments all relate to the Internal Revenue Service Code, is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And, the final bill has to do with the Social Security Act. It has to do with the bill we passed last week providing for what we refer to as the \$4 pass through. The amendment in that case relates to the pass through. Our bill made it permanent. This makes it just for 1 year, but in all cases the amendments are germane. The staffs have checked them all and as far as I personally am concerned, I approve of the amendments that have been made. I think they represent improvements in the code in the various instances and so I shall not take time on each bill to go into the subject matter but expect any Member who has a question to feel free to make a reservation.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. And, I might say for the benefit of the House it is my intention to ask unanimous consent to put a full explanation of each amendment in the Record as they are considered.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the bill is H.R. 17984. As passed by this body, this was an amendment to section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 adding an additional transitional rule. As you will recall, the 1969 act provides that a corporation is, in general, to be taxed on appreciation in value of property used by it to redeem its stock. As originally adopted, the 1969 act contained a number of transitional rules, to save from the

effect of the amendment, corporations which had already begun a plan of redemption. Our amendment in this bill added one more transitional rule to cover a case in which a redemption was planned before the 1969 act and a large part of the plan had already been executed before enactment.

The Senate adopted our bill without change and added an amendment providing an additional transitional rule to cover a special case. The transitional rule added by the Senate provides for situations which arose because of the desire of a corporate employer to provide a type of deferred compensation for its employees. In these cases the stock of a corporate employer—which is an operating company—was placed in a holding company and employees of the operating company were permitted to purchase convertible common stock in the holding company which was to be converted into the stock of the operating company at the time of the employee's retirement or earlier.

Under the amendment made by the 1969 act, the distribution of the operating company's stock to an employee at the time he converts will give rise to a taxable gain to the distributing holding company and may also generate ordinary dividend income to the employee. Since these tax liabilities were not foreseen when the compensation plans were first arranged it is appropriate to make provision for nonrecognition of gain under a transitional rule, to the extent these arrangements were entered into with existing employees before the adoption of the Tax Reform Act. Accordingly, the Senate amendment providing for no recognition of gain in situations in existence when the 1969 act was passed should be accepted by this body.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TO AMEND SECTION 165(i) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 18693) to amend section 165(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, 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 3, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 172(b)(1)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to carryover of foreign expropriation losses) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: '(or, with respect to that portion of the net operating loss for such year attributable to a Cuban expropriation loss, to each of the 15 taxable years following the taxable year of such loss)';

"(b) Section 172(b)(2) of such Code (relating to amount of carrybacks and carryovers) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following:

', and, if a portion of a foreign expropriation loss for the loss year is attributable to a Cuban expropriation loss, such portion shall be considered to be a separate foreign expropriation loss for such year to be applied after the other portion of such foreign expropriation loss'.

"(c) Section 172(k) of such Code (relating to definition of foreign expropriation loss) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The term 'Cuban expropriation loss' means, for any taxable year, a foreign expropriation loss sustained by reason of the expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking of property, before January 1, 1964, by the government of Cuba, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing. The portion of a foreign expropriation loss for any taxable year attributable to a Cuban expropriation loss is the amount of the Cuban expropriation loss.'

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply in respect of foreign expropriation losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the treatment of certain losses sustained by reason of the confiscation of property by the government of Cuba."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 18693, as passed by the House, permits Cuban expropriation losses on property held by a taxpayer for investment to be carried back 3 years and carried forward 5 years. Cuban expropriation losses with respect to other classes of property may be carried back or carried forward under present law.

The bill, as passed by the House, also permits the carryback and carryover of Cuban expropriation losses with respect to personal-use property acquired by the taxpayer after December 31, 1958, which is the cutoff date under present law.

The Senate accepted the House passed provisions without change. In addition, it added an amendment to the bill to increase the net operating loss carryover period for Cuban expropriation losses on property used in a trade or business from 10 to 15 years.

In the Revenue Act of 1964, we included a provision allowing taxpayers to elect a 10-year carryover for foreign expropriation losses, instead of using the normal 3-year carryback and 5-year carryover period. We provided this 10-year carryover because of the magnitude of some foreign expropriation losses, particularly those that resulted from the Cuban expropriations. The Senate Finance Committee added the amendment extending the 10-year period to 15 years because it was informed that some taxpayers had losses so large that they could not be used up against income even in the 10-year period. This is particularly true of small businesses that cannot generate large amounts of income each year to offset their expropriation losses.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not oppose the enactment of the bill as amended.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**TO AMEND SECTION 278 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954**

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 19242) to amend section 278 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend its application from citrus groves to almond groves, 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, after line 17, insert:

"Sec. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 278 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to requirements of showing total cost on airline tickets) is amended by—

"(1) inserting 'and' at the end of paragraph (1) thereof,

"(2) striking out paragraph (2) thereof, and

"(3) renumbering paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and striking out in such paragraph 'paragraphs (1) and (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'paragraph (1)'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section (relating to requirements of showing total cost on airline advertising) is amended by striking out the word 'only' in paragraph (1) and by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) if any such advertising states separately the amount to be paid for such transportation or the amount of such taxes, shall state such total at least as prominently as the more prominently stated of the amount to be paid for such transportation or the amount of such taxes and shall describe such taxes substantially as: 'user taxes to pay for airport construction and airway safety and operations'."

"Sec. 4. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to transportation beginning after June 30, 1970."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 19242, as passed by the House, provides generally that expenses incurred in planting and maintaining an almond grove in the first 4 years of its existence are to be capitalized rather than expensed. This is the same treatment which applies since the Tax Reform Act of 1969 to citrus groves.

The Senate accepted the House-passed provision without changing it. However, it added an amendment dealing with another tax provision of the Internal Revenue Code. This last fall the House passed as a part of another bill a provision which removed the prohibition against separate statement of the airfare and ticket tax for domestic flights, both on the airline ticket and in the airline advertising, but continued to require that the tickets show and the advertising—if it refers to the cost of transportation—state the total of the fare and the tax to be paid by the passenger.

The Senate did not act on the basic bill to which this amendment was attached by the Committee on Ways and Means. However, it has added to H.R. 19242 a provision which is substantially like the House-passed provision. The only substantive difference between the

House-passed provision and the Senate amendment is that if the tax or fare price is shown separately in the advertisements the Senate amendment requires the total to be shown at least as prominently as either the ticket cost without the tax itself. This is a minor difference from the House version.

In view of the fact that the amendment added by the Senate is substantially similar to a previously House-passed provision and also due to the fact that it removed an unintended restriction on how airline tickets are made out and advertising occurs, I believe that it is entirely appropriate for the House to accept this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONSOLIDATED RETURNS OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES**

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 19881) consolidated returns of life insurance companies, 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 4, after line 7, insert:

"Sec. 3. (a) For purposes of applying section 1212(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by section 512 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969) in the case of a corporation which makes an election under subsection (b), any net capital loss sustained in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, may not be carried back to any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1970, for which it was subject to taxation under section 802 of such Code, if the carryback of such loss would result in an increase in such corporation's income tax liability for any such taxable year.

"(b) An election to have the provisions of subsection (a) apply shall be made by a corporation—

"(1) in such form and manner as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate may prescribe, and

"(2) not later than the time prescribed by law for filing a claim for credit or refund of overpayment of income tax for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, in which such corporation sustains a net capital loss.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act relating to consolidated returns of life insurance companies, and for other purposes."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate accepted the provisions of H.R. 19881 as passed by the House. These provisions deal with the manner in which life insurance companies which file consolidated income tax returns are to compute the amount of their investment yield which is taken into account in determining their taxable income.

In addition, the Senate added a provision to the bill to ameliorate an unin-

tended hardship which can arise in the case of life insurance companies from the application of a relief provision contained in the Tax Reform Act of 1969. That act provided corporations with a 3-year capital loss carryback in addition to the 5-year capital loss carry-forward previously allowed. Although this provision was intended to give relief to corporate taxpayers, it can result in increasing a life insurance company's tax for a pre-1970 year—that is, a year before the enactment of the 3-year carryback—if a capital loss is carried back to such a year.

This can happen in the following manner. Initially, the carryback would reduce the life insurance company's tax on its capital gains which are offset by the loss carryback. In other words, there would be a reduction of the 25-percent capital gains tax. Then, however, the carryback could cause a so-called phase III tax to the company, and this tax is imposed at the ordinary tax rate of 48 percent. This 48-percent tax could well more than offset the reduction of the 25-percent capital gains tax. Accordingly, the loss carryback could result in a net increase in tax for the life insurance company.

Since the 3-year capital loss carryback was intended as a tax relief provision, the provision added by the Senate to this bill, in effect, allows those life insurance companies who would be adversely affected for a pre-1970 year by reason of a capital loss carryback to elect not to have carryback provision apply. In other words, it is provided that if a carryback of a 1970—or later—capital loss to a pre-1970 year would increase a life insurance company's tax for any pre-1970 year, then the company may elect to not carryback the capital losses to a pre-1970 year.

In view of the stated purpose of the 3-year capital loss carryback provision, the Senate amendment to this bill appears to embody an appropriate and desirable means of correcting an unintended situation. It prevents the occurrence of an unintended hardship from the application of a relief provision—a hardship which could neither have been foreseen nor otherwise avoided by a life insurance company.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**TO AMEND THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969**

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17917) to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1969, 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 401(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain union-negotiated pension plans) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Multiemployer' in the heading, and

"(2) by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) such trust was created pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement between employee representatives and one or more employers."

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954, but only with respect to contributions made after December 31, 1954."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period of qualification of certain union-negotiated pension plans."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17917, as passed by the House, contained provisions relating to a transitional rule for the moving expense modifications made by the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Since substantially the same provisions were included by the Senate in H.R. 17473, which has been passed by the Congress and has been sent to the President, the Senate deleted those provisions from this bill.

In addition, the Senate amended the bill to provide for retroactive qualification of certain union-negotiated pension plans. More specifically, the bill, as amended, authorizes the Treasury Department to treat as qualified pension plans for tax purposes union-negotiated pension plans entered into between union representatives and a single employer, as well as with multiemployer plans which presently qualify for such treatment. This treatment is conditioned, as under present law with multiemployer plans, on the Treasury Department determining that the plans meet all requirements of law, that no disbursements in past years were made contrary to the provisions of law, and that contributions to such plans were not used in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of the beneficiaries. Since this treatment is presently available for multiemployer plans, there appears to be no reason why this same treatment should not be extended to cover union-negotiated single-employer pension plans.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to this bill as amended.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISREGARDING INCOME FROM OASDI AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 19915) to make permanent the existing temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement recipients in determining their need for public assistance, 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That section 1007 of the Social Security Amendments of 1969, as amended by section 2(b) of Public Law 91-306, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1007. In addition to the requirements imposed by law as a condition of approval of a State plan to provide aid to individuals under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, there is hereby imposed the requirement (and the plan shall be deemed to require) that, in the case of any individual found eligible (as a result of the requirement imposed by this section or otherwise) for aid for any month after March 1970 and before January 1972 who also receives in such month—

"(1) a monthly insurance benefit under title II of such Act, the sum of the aid received by him for such month, plus the monthly insurance benefit received by him in such month, shall not be less than the sum of the aid which would have been received by him for such month under the State plan as in effect for March 1970, plus either

"(A) the monthly insurance benefit which was or would have been received by him in March 1970 without regard to the other provisions of this title plus \$4, or

"(B) the monthly insurance benefit which was or would have been received by him in March 1970 under the provisions of this title,

whichever is less (whether this requirement is satisfied by disregarding a portion of his monthly insurance benefit or otherwise), or

"(2) a monthly payment of annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, the sum of the aid received by him in such month, plus the monthly payment of such annuity or pension received by him in such month (not including any part of such annuity or pension which is disregarded under section 1006), shall (except as otherwise provided in the succeeding sentence) not be less than the sum of the aid which would have been received by him for such month under such plan as in effect for March 1970, plus either

"(A) the monthly payment of annuity or pension which was or would have been received by him in March 1970 without regard to the provisions of any Act enacted after May 30, 1970, and before December 31, 1970, which provides general increases in the amount of such monthly payment of annuity or pension plus \$4, or

"(B) the monthly payment of annuity or pension which was or would have been received by him in March 1970, taking into account the provisions of such Act (if any), whichever is less (whether this requirement is satisfied by disregarding a portion of his monthly payment of annuity or pension or otherwise)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend the temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement recipients in determining their need for public assistance."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 19915, as passed by the House on December 22, 1970, would have continued indefinitely a provision of law which guaranteed aged, blind, and disabled people on welfare that they would benefit by at least \$4 a month from the 15 percent social security benefit increase, effective in January 1970. This provision was enacted in conjunction with that 15-percent

benefit increase as a temporary measure and it expired at the end of last October.

I am pleased that many of the States have taken action to meet the \$4 pass-along requirement by increasing their payments for adult recipients generally, but there are still a number of States that need to have the pass-along provision extended to permit them to continue applying their income disregarding provisions.

The Senate has passed H.R. 19915 with an amendment which would extend the pass-along provision through December 1971. I urge the House to adopt this bill as amended by the Senate. This will guarantee that the \$4 provision will continue to be effective. There will be sufficient time during the first session of the 92d Congress to take further action on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment, a joint and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 1421. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 799. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, January 2, 1971, and that they stand adjourned sine die.

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

S. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to sign enrolled bills and resolutions.

The message also announced that the Senate passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 507

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

#### TO AMEND THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO THE RATE OF DUTY ON OLIVES PACKED IN CERTAIN AIRTIGHT CONTAINERS

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 18564) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on olives packed in certain airtight containers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman if he will explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that this is an attempt to provide a separate tariff classification on the importation of green olives which are packed in airtight containers, each of them holding not more than 9.5 pounds.

I might bring to the attention of the Members of the House that the bottlers of green olives have established a business in this country over the past 100 years in setting up and creating these airtight containers, and they have created a market, and they now find themselves in a position where Spanish green olives are being imported into this country in airtight containers that weigh less than 9.5 pounds, where the price of bulk olives has been increased in price as high as 15 percent that are shipped into this country in casks weighing up to 650 pounds. And then we find that the importers of green olives in small 2-ounce jars—and you realize that there is a lot of labor attached to that in trying to push these olives down into these 2-ounce bottles, and they can ship those bottles of olives into this country without paying any duties on the bottles or the labels, or the bottle tops, and this results in a very unfair disadvantage to the bottlers of green olives here in this Nation.

This bill merely tries to equalize or give the bottlers in this country a competitive position where they can deal not only with the low-cost labor that these foreign imports have, that gives them an advantage over the bottlers here, but it also gives them a chance to take care of this unfair increase in price of 15 percent on bulk olives.

In other words, if we do not pass this legislation it is going to mean the extinction of the green-olive bottlers in this country.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

**AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE OR ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE AND SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate Concurrent Resolution, which was read:

S. CON. RES. 89

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, or the Acting President pro tempore be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.*

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT**

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a report.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

**AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND HOW IT WORKS: 1001 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS"**

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 785) with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out all after "printed" over to and including "thousand" in line 1 on page 2 and insert "nine hundred and eighty-one thousand".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "two hundred and six thousand" and insert "one hundred and three thousand".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled 'Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GETTYS)?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**THE 91ST CONGRESS**

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to thank all Members of the House for the many courtesies they have shown the leadership on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, today, at long last, the work of the 91st Congress will be completed. This has been a long Congress. It has been a hard Congress. In my opinion, it has been a good Congress.

Members of this House can be justly and rightly proud of the manner in which they have exercised the trust bestowed upon them by the people of the United States. Both last year and this year this House has labored late in the year in order to fulfill our Constitutional responsibilities as representatives of the American people. Certainly none of us will agree with all of the decisions which have been made in this House this year and last year but we can agree, I believe, that we have done our job. We have lived up to the burden and the responsibilities of office.

I am proud of the record of this House and will, as customary, insert in the RECORD at an early date a comprehensive report on our activities. While it has been a long session, it has been a productive one, and I believe we can be proud of our record and the passage of landmark legislation such as the Voting Rights Act extension and the 18-year-old vote, the postal reorganization bill, the legislative reorganization bill, increased support for education, health, and water pollution and environmental control.

As this session comes to a close, we look forward to a new year, a new Congress, and a new generation of legislators to carry on the tasks that are never finished.

There is always a flurry of excitement, a fresh charge of hope and optimism, with a new session. But there is an undercurrent of sorrow, too, for the loss of those members who will not be with us when we reconvene on January 21.

Before this session passes into history, I would like to pay personal tribute to our colleagues who began the session with us, who worked side by side with us in common cause, and who will not be returning with the 92d Congress. We shall miss them. They have earned the friendship and admiration of all of us, the gratitude of the constituents they served, and their own footnote in history.

Mr. Speaker, in a separate address I will pay tribute to our respected and beloved Speaker.

I want to thank my good friend and distinguished colleague from Louisiana, the Democratic whip, HALE BOGGS, and his valuable assistant whips without whose untiring efforts the work of this House could not go on and without whom the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives could not function. We are all deeply appreciative of the fine and dedicated service the whips have given us, the House of Representatives, and this country.

Also, I take this time to salute my good friends across the aisle. I want particularly to thank my coworker and friend, the distinguished minority leader, for the cooperation he has given me and the leadership on this side of the aisle. While we have stood on opposite sides of many issues, we have always stood together in zealously trying to guard the prerogatives of the House of Representatives and the rights and privileges of each Member of the House.

I want now to express my appreciation to his distinguished assistant, Republican whip LES ARENDS, and other leaders on the minority side, who have constantly worked with the Democratic leadership



to carry forward the legislative program. Not only the members of the Republican Party but indeed all Members of the House are appreciative of the service they have rendered and the leadership they have given.

I must express my appreciation personally and the appreciation of all Members, to our great Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, without whom we would constantly find ourselves in a parliamentary morass. Lew's advice and counsel has contributed immeasurably to the good works of this body. Without him we would be lost. He has always acted fairly, impartially, and judiciously and I know my friends on both sides join me in expressing to him our deepest thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I extend the thanks of all of us to the other officers of the House of Representatives. To our distinguished Clerk, W. Pat Jennings, to William M. "Fishbait" Miller, our distinguished Doorkeeper, to Zeake Johnson, the able Sergeant at Arms, to H. H. Morris, our fine Postmaster, and to Dr. Edward Latch, our beloved Chaplain, goes my deepest appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, a special word of thanks to the other employees of the House of Representatives who labor long and hard without much recognition in order that we may be able to accomplish our tasks. To them—to the employees in the cloakroom, the clerks at the desk, the fine official reporters, the doormen, the pages, the custodians, and the others—we owe a great deal. I am confident that no other agency of Government, legislative, executive, or judicial, has a more competent staff of loyal employees than does the House of Representatives. Again, to all Members on both sides, I extend my deepest and most sincere thanks for your friendship and for all that you have done to assist me in my duties.

#### NOTRE DAME VANQUISHES TEXAS IN COTTON BOWL

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the 91st Congress prepares to adjourn today, after a lengthy and often fatiguing second session, I rise to express my great delight at one very happy event ushering in the New Year.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have the great privilege of representing in Congress the district in which is located the Nation's No. 1 football team, the University of Notre Dame.

Although my colleagues from Nebraska may wish to dispute that judgment, I am confident that my friends in this body from the State of Texas will not wish to do so.

For, Mr. Speaker, all who yesterday watched the mighty Irish of Notre Dame, coached by that great Irishman, Ara Parseghian, vanquish the outstanding University of Texas team in the Cotton Bowl, by a decisive score of 24 to 11, will, I am sure, agree that the Notre Dame team is a superb one and played superbly in one of the most exciting football games within memory.

To Coach Parseghian, to his coaching staff, to all the members of the Notre Dame team, I extend my warmest congratulations.

To my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE), with whom I entered into a wager on the outcome of the game—a wager he won last year—I extend my condolences. The bet, by the way, was a football signed by the coach and all the members of the winning team. Mr. PICKLE, we are now even—and I look forward to seeing Notre Dame make it 2 to 1 a year from now in another Notre Dame-Texas Cotton Bowl encounter.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the following news article from the New York Times of today, January 2, 1971:

#### ARTICULATE PRIDE OF SOUTH BEND: ARA ROUL PARSEGHIAN

DALLAS, January 1—When Ara Parseghian arrived for his first Cotton Bowl news conference several days ago, he looked at the battery of microphones in front of him on the dais and smiled.

"It looks like a couple of presidential candidates are here," he said. Parseghian then sat down next to Darrell Royal, the Texas coach, and awaited the first question, but a silence followed.

"Want to talk about Vietnam?" Parseghian said to Royal.

Ara Roul Parseghian is at home in the world of the Wishbone-T, the Wall Street Journal, world politics or behind a piano. He plays the piano remarkably well for someone who never took a lesson.

"You could be a nightclub entertainer," a friend once told Parseghian, after listening to Parseghian play a medley of tunes.

"I couldn't stand the pressure," Parseghian replied.

#### BUILDER OF WINNING TEAMS

Since 1964, when he was hired to rebuild the sagging football fortunes of Notre Dame, Parseghian has withstood the pressures of college football's most difficult coaching assignment. Including today's 24-11 victory over Texas, which snapped the Longhorns' 30-game winning streak, Irish teams under Parseghian have won 58 games, lost only 10 and tied four.

Yet even this impressive record had failed to quiet a critical minority that continually insisted before today that Parseghian "couldn't win the big ones," or "would blow at least one game a year."

"Success in football is relative," Parseghian said, earlier this season. "If you take a job at a school that finished with a 1-9 win-loss record the year before, you're a good coach if you finish 5-5 with the team in your first season."

#### A GOOD LISTENER

Parseghian inherited a Notre Dame team that had finished 2-7 in 1963. In his first season, the Irish won 9 of 10 games. No Parseghian-coached team at Notre Dame had lost more than two games in a single season and today's triumph brought the Irish record for this year to 10-1.

Despite his image as tense and close-mouthed, Parseghian is known as a "needer" among friends. He also is considered one of the more enlightened coaches in a profession that has come under fire in recent years for its rigid authoritarian concepts.

"I sometimes wish Ara would drive us a little harder," one Notre Dame player said, before the Cotton Bowl. "But he seems to feel that we should learn to accept some responsibility."

Last spring, during the various campus disorders that flared across the country, Parseghian listened intently to a group of play-

ers who asked about issuing a protest statement against the war on behalf of the team.

#### PIZZA, ARMENIAN STYLE

"It would be hypocritical for Ara to tell his kids not to be involved, when he's so active politically," said Roger Valdiserri, the Notre Dame sports publicist. Parseghian publicly endorsed John Brademas, a Democrat from South Bend, for re-election to Congress in the last election. Some friends believe that his ultimate goal after coaching might be politics.

He is a member of the National Multiple Sclerosis Board, Boy Scouts of America and Big Brothers.

Parseghian was born May 21, 1923, in Akron, Ohio, of Armenian parents. One of his favorite lunch snacks, in fact, during the football season is a type of Armenian cracker-bread with cheez-whiz, which he kiddingly calls "Armenian pizza."

Parseghian enlisted in the Navy after graduating from high school and played football under Paul Brown at Great Lakes Naval Training Center. After his discharge, he entered Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, known as the "cradle of coaching" because so many of its graduates have become successful coaches. He played briefly with the Cleveland Browns after graduation. An injury ended his playing career.

His first head coaching job was at Miami for five years—from 1951 through 1955. He moved to Northwestern in 1956 before accepting the Notre Dame assignment.

Parseghian has turned down several head coaching positions in pro football and has been mentioned in connection with current vacancies. But yesterday, he again reaffirmed that "right now, I have no intention of going into pro ball."

Parseghian remains active athletically, playing golf (he shoots in the low 70's) and handball. He also runs two miles every morning before work.

He married the former Kathleen Davis. They met while they were students at Miami. They have two daughters, Karan 20, and Kristan, 18, and a son Mike, 15.

Yes, Mike plays football.

Mr. BURLERSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAMAS. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLERSON).

Mr. BURLERSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, alibis are never in order, but I think it will be interesting to Members to know that there is a lot involved other than just the results of this game yesterday. As a matter of fact, we are becoming a little self-conscious about what possibly might develop into a bitter jealousy. There is a deep philosophical motive involved here. The Texas University football team felt that they would render a service by passing this thing around a little bit and so they were willing to relinquish it for this year, and looking forward and on down through the years, we feel that in this way we can keep that great rapport with the rest of the Nation which we so fervently desire.

Mr. BRADEMAMAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's observations and I was glad to yield to him today just as I was glad to see Texas yield to Notre Dame yesterday.

#### THE NOTRE DAME-Texas FOOTBALL GAME

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that as of January 1, 1971, Notre Dame unquestionably was the No. 1 team, as of the year 1971.

I would like the RECORD also to reflect that there was no question as to who the No. 1 team for the year 1970 was; Texas. Furthermore, we shall determine by the end of 1971 whether that distinguished team from South Bend, Ind., can retain their present position of No. 1, for the entire year. I wish to also pay tribute to our neighbor to the north, the University of Arkansas, to whom was awarded the trophy for the finest sportsmanship for the year—1970—by the Southwest Conference.

**VICE PRESIDENT JOSEPH COFFEE  
OF EISENHOWER COLLEGE  
SPEAKS OUT ON STUDENT LEADERSHIP**

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision which upheld the act of Congress giving 18-year-olds the right to vote in Federal elections will give young people a greater voice in the affairs and decisions of the Nation than ever before. It will also allow the silent majority of youth to be heard—the responsible young people who have been largely overlooked in the avalanche of publicity afforded to campus radicals.

With this new responsibility it is more important than ever that young people gain experience in responsible civic service. Many methods to provide this experience have been proposed.

Joseph D. Coffee, Jr. recently made a new and different proposal, which I believe would be of great interest to my colleagues. Mr. Coffee is the executive vice president of Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y. As a member of Eisenhower's board of trustees, I have become acquainted with Mr. Coffee's keen awareness of the problems that face campuses today and his positive approaches to dealing with those problems.

Mr. Coffee's proposal, entitled "Can Youth Develop Representative Leadership" follows:

**CAN YOUTH DEVELOP REPRESENTATIVE LEADERSHIP?**

(By Joseph D. Coffee, Jr.)

I am not interested in patronizing youth, nor do I want to be considered unfairly critical of my contemporaries. There are, however, problems in our society which have not changed except to worsen over the years and which demand solution. This is what exercises all thoughtful youth today.

The question I pose: "Can Youth Develop Representative Leadership" should have been answered in an affirmative program years ago. Unfortunately, so many who can find a podium at which to speak or a column of copy to fill are prone to criticize the extremes of youth or the ineffectiveness, or spinelessness of college administrators or faculty in failing to maintain peace on the campus. Few, if any, have come forward with

proposals which seek to eliminate the communication barriers which frustrate the expression and prevent thoughtful consideration of the ideas of responsible youth. What a loss!

Out of real concern for the imminent dangers in continuing on such a blind course, I will risk the role of fool and make a proposal, which in purpose, if not in specific content, might lessen tension and, of even greater importance, encourage responsible youth to declare themselves.

I am sure to be interpreted by some as moralizing or lecturing. That is not my intention for I am truly groping for an answer to the question of how to give youth a more meaningful voice in society.

To a great extent the college graduate is prepared at graduation to make a living and to live, yet I question whether they are prepared to assume a forceful and deliberate role as citizens. I would hope so but I doubt that we have given them adequate opportunity to test themselves in the give and take of decision making in pursuit of a better society—not anymore chance than I was given at their age. Those in college now have that chance in part, at least. They have a final free chance to engage in critical discourse on values and what will be the purpose of their lives. Never again. I'm afraid, will they have such an opportunity to weigh the meaning of active citizenship in charting a purposeful life.

It was good to hear Michael Collins last Friday on this campus declare how small the gap was between the generations and of how much alike were the objectives of youth and adults. His was a calming and reasonable voice. However, as in medicine and law or in architecture, theology, in journalism or politics there seem to be no final answers. Look at the contradictions in the opinions of the most prestigious leaders of this and other countries. I am not suggesting I have a final answer, yet in the context of there not being "Final Answers" I hope I will spark your thought and action.

In looking back to my own graduating year—30 years ago—I can say that today's youth are more aware of the world around them and of the circumstances of life than I or my contemporaries were then, and possibly even now. In that relatively short span of years there has been an amazing change in the sophistication of young citizens. To what avail, however? Does this sophistication also imply commitment?

As a teenager, I had the vicarious thrill of seeing a younger brother serve as Boy Governor of New York. Thrilling as it was for him and all of the other boys who served in that one day administration, I can only state that it was a mighty empty honor. Surely, it was a well intentioned effort to inspire youth toward achievement but it lacked true involvement. In the intervening years there has been noble effort to raise the degree of youth involvement in governmental affairs through Boys State and Girls State. But this isn't enough.

Those on the verge of full citizenship, likely soon to be lowered to 18 years of age, need fuller opportunity to deal with the realities of society to help prepare them for the day when they will have the controlling responsibility.

I seek a means whereby the best constructive thought of youth can be researched and refined—whether of conservative or liberal persuasion, Democrat or Republican in origin.

The history of youth revolt, in this country and abroad, makes shockingly clear, how poorly youth has been represented—causing all youth to be maligned as irresponsible and dangerous yet what sincere effort has there been made to listen to the opinions of youth, even when youth has demonstrated to obtain a hearing.

While it is easy to criticize the campus condition—and I am not overlooking the problems there—there has been very encouraging progress in new and effective communications on large numbers of campuses.

As I look back to my own college days when I served in Student Government, it was a mighty empty experience. Today, on this campus and elsewhere, there is substantial movement toward student involvement in important advisory or decision making roles while in college. This is good, although long overdue.

Too easily, the expression or resignation of growing numbers of our citizens is that they are confused. And, for you and for me this can be devastating for the more we talk about being confused the more it will become true.

It may sound simple but I commend to you the value of seeing how fortunate we are and that we should strive to improve matters rather than accept defeat which too many have already accepted.

So long as there are ills in our society—and who can dream we will ever eliminate all ills—we must stimulate creative and uninhibited solutions to our problems.

My appeal to youth is that they commit themselves to sharing in the deliberations to determine the best possible solutions, and that they help to devise new procedures for sustained involvement of youth in the legislative process.

I am not oversimplifying nor do I wish to hide the problems which exist but I do wish to suggest there continues to be reason for optimism—that we can, if we wish, benefit from the conflicts which have shaken so many campuses. We admire the concern of our Eisenhower students about the problems of society and we are proud of the ways they have devised to involve the student community and the larger community in free discussion, thereby, enlarging the understanding of each group in national and local problems and in seeking solutions to these problems.

Yet, I am convinced that we have not found the means to encourage the full involvement of our youth in the affairs of the country. Rather, it is my observation that we blunt the interest of the large numbers who would like to work for the improvement of society while permitting free reign to those whose interest is destructive, not constructive.

The passing of time guarantees that from each youth generation some of the leaders of this country will come in the years ahead. To what extent, though, in anticipation of this responsibility, have they as individuals or as representatives been involved in studying and advising on the goals of society which they believe should be realized in their lifetime. When will they have that chance? Do they have regular communication with their Congressman or State Legislator. Do Congressmen or State Legislators communicate with those who represent youth, other than superficially at election time? I doubt it! I doubt that it happens anyplace in this country—with the country being the loser.

I am talking about enlivening our representative democracy—with great emphasis on representative.

I don't see this as feasible among the older generations. They have been satisfied for too long to do without. There must be a new spirit, a new belief in the representative system and it can come only from youth who can believe in the worth of new, sustained and imaginative involvement.

The present political party organizations, much as I believe in their essential function, do not answer the need of vitalizing and renewing our procedure of electing representatives.

Similarly, the young Republicans and young Democrats do not fill the need.

The present party structure exists to present candidates who can win specific elections. They deal principally with issues—not ideas—in my judgment, and, in most cases the issues are manufactured for the visibility of candidates at election time.

No national student organization or conference fills the need in my opinion.

It was interesting to observe the plans for the second annual President to President's Conference two weeks ago in Washington. The conference was sponsored by the Association of Student Governments and aimed to assemble the leaders of the campus and the nation to "Explore the problems that plague the Nation."

It was a commendable purpose but hardly possible of real achievement in two and one-half days. I'm not opposing the idea but merely that it can't do more than scratch the surface of the problems and can hardly provide real understanding of the interrelationship of Government and the campus.

President Nixon, in his greeting recently to the members of the Association of Student Government, said so clearly, "Young people today have an unparalleled opportunity to participate in the search for solution to the many problems which confront us as a Nation and as a people". In full agreement, I say we must provide the opportunity to participate.

While the President, in extending his greetings, focused on the problems of the college and university campus it seems to me that we should also examine the problems inherent in our present elective structure which inhibits consideration of the ideas of youth and their willingness to help solve even larger problems.

Ad hoc conferences, in my judgment, will not suffice to meet this need and the heavy emphasis on the campus as the problem area is out of focus. Campus unrest is the result in large measure, I judge, in their being no way for responsible youth to be heard by their elected officials or representatives.

We need a new, ongoing, permanent structure to provide representation of the opinions and creative judgment of our youth. Don't misunderstand me. I am not advocating a means to encourage revolutionary thought and destructive action. I do advocate, however, the establishment of an elective procedure which insures consideration by our legislative leaders of the best thought of able representatives of all of our youth. It will take time to develop but it can be worth it.

I could enter into a long discourse on the campus scene but I would be troubled in doing so for I can see no value in it. It can have only negative results. To talk about the campus scene in general is unfair to the large number of campuses which have resolved their problems without conflict or out of conflict have found new relationships within the campus community which provide for effective communication. I would rather focus on what I believe contributes to unrest and what has brought about new demands from youth.

Do we know what motivates people to community service? We have explored and tested people's motivation toward every other commercial and personal interest but in an area of such great meaning to the country, I would be delighted to hear that research had been conducted which might enlighten us on the way to attract everyone to play their part in making their own community a better place in which to live.

If we are to have responsible representation at the Federal, State and local level, five, ten or fifteen years from now there must be a new means of encouraging voters that their opinions and judgments are being listened to by the elected representatives. This might well be one conclusion of such research.

Failure to do so will result in a continuing and worsening apathy on the part of the electorate leading to decision by demonstration, a frightening prospect for this country.

Great as is my respect for the Academy, I fear the likely drift into rule by an intellectual elite unless we strengthen the representative system.

The growing plea of those who wish to take advantage of the built-in apathy of the large, poorly informed percentage of our electorate whose votes, if they are exercised at all, are given in response to superficial claims and promises, is that we should leave the decisions to those who know.

I have been a successful candidate for office—not high office I'll concede—but I have had first hand observation of the difficulty in arousing voters to do other than respond to emotional appeals. Too frequently the response has been to deny rather than to affirm the basic rights of citizens. And, the inconstancy of voters in exercising their voting rights is shocking to me. I trust it is just as shocking to you. It will require great determination by large numbers if we are to change this trend. Continuation of the trend can lead only to loss of the rights of the citizen and abdication to those who want to control.

We can't claim that adults have meaningful representation today because to a great extent they have already aborated their rights, and have lost desire to be involved. They too were frustrated in youthful days and, to a great extent, never became involved.

Frankly, I don't believe that the best thought of youth has a chance for full consideration today, for outside of superficial opinion polls, there is no way to determine what youth does think. Those who speak so loudly do not necessarily represent youth and it is this judgment which prompts me to place before you thoughts, hardly final or necessarily right, which could lead to the development of a way for youth to be heard with respect and appreciation.

It is essential that we do more to educate and train those who will enter careers in Government.

The greater need, in my judgment, is that we educate and involve the largest possible percentage of the electorate in governmental affairs. And, we have no choice but to start with youth.

Youth has been given a bad image—they all suffer for the disruption caused by a few. Too easily, adults identify adolescent with delinquent yet a very small percentage of youth have ever bordered on delinquency, and this has been true throughout history. Actually, as E. M. Eppel of the University of London points out: "The earliest recorded lamentation on the behavior of young people seems to have been about 3000 B.C. It has continued in each generation as the older people seem to conclude that the current younger generation is morally more reprehensible than its own. The more you are engaged in discourse on morality the better prepared you will be to examine and re-examine and possibly change your values out of personal experience and knowledge. Yet we must look at the large percentages who have found and believe in humanitarian causes in the obvious belief that it is people that matter." Yet we continue to treat the balance of youth as if they were all of the same stripe.

There is a new striving for participation in the election process whereby some colleges will close for a period of time preceding the major elections to allow students a direct role in campaigning. I believe it is worth the try when the academic calendar will permit it but I fear it will lead to further frustration, and disenchantment, because of the short period of time available in which to sense achievement and real involvement. Our Eisenhower students have devised, again, an interesting method of being involved in the election process yet not requiring the close of College. They will operate an office in Seneca Falls up to election time on behalf of all candidates—serving as an information center and persuader to exercise the right to vote.

It is easy today to blame campus disorder on international conspiracy, the affluent age, permissiveness, ineffective institutional administration, or the new freedom. Take your pick of one or more reasons and you are likely to be partly right. Each of these may have contributed to our present uneasy situation but I would like to argue for an additional cause—one which I believe brought about the demise of college student government when I was in college, and which in the intervening years has made for general student frustration, now triggered into violence—on some campuses. It is lack of real involvement in the decision process. Not, in making final decisions but significant involvement in the decision process.

Officials on many campuses have studied this factor and have initiated ways to involve students in the decision making process on campus. Unfortunately, the problems which have created the greatest frustration are not campus problems but are national, state or local questions. Yet there is little avenue for effective dialogue with the national, state or local legislator so it is the campus which has suffered.

Until youth finds a means of effective and continuing dialogue with their legislative representatives and community leaders I predict a continuation of tension and unrest.

In questioning the sincerity of many who have led the violence, I declare respect for the sincerity of most students who do not seek to overturn but who wish to correct what they see to be inequities in human terms and what they judge to be unsound policies and procedures in organizational terms.

For the lack of procedures which give them a chance to be heard and to be answered they have had no choice but to demonstrate. In many cases those most responsible and dedicated young leaders have lost credibility because policy and decision makers have not listened. The result has been to undermine the reasonable approach and play into the hands of those who seek to destroy.

I am not happy in arriving at this conclusion for I believe much of what has happened to create unrest on our campuses could have been avoided if we had been willing to be flexible in agreeing to suggestions made earlier by responsible leadership but now adopted under pressure.

I am not trying to whitewash the failures of the campus. I do insist, however, that representatives of youth, those on and off campus, must find ready and continuing access to their representatives in the legislative halls. This is not to assume the correctness of the conclusions of youth. It is to state that our legislators need accurate information on the attitude of youth so they can avoid expedient decisions or capitulation to the demonstrators.

The college campus and the community in which the college is located can serve as a learning center in the world of politics and civic affairs but I doubt that it will ever serve as the scene of real involvement for large numbers of students.

I believe that must be done in the home community of each student who becomes motivated to express his or her views or to become involved in some peaceful action group working toward some good purpose. And, most important, to work closely with that 50% of their own age group who did not go to college. Another frightening prospect for the country will be a continued polarization of the college educated and the citizen who did not attend college. In my experience, many of the most constructive and dedicated citizens are among those who chose not to attend college. We must not permit a wall to develop between these major groupings in society.

Impractical or visionary as you may think me to be I can see no alternative, if we wish to maintain a representative system of gov-

ernment—and I do—to the election on all levels of government of youth representatives, young men and young women, between the ages of 18 and 25, who will be authoritatively positioned as informed spokesmen for youth. In no other way can I foresee the opinions and creative ideas of youth gaining respectful attention by our legislators. Accordingly, I propose the following:

**SPECIFIC PROPOSAL TO ORGANIZE YOUTH COUNCIL AND PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF YOUTH REPRESENTATIVES**

In view of the need for representative spokesmen of youth on questions of public policy and in view of the intolerable situation which exists today in the United States (and in other countries) in the excesses of non-representative youth, and in view of the need of our elected legislative representatives to have realistic advice on the attitudes of youth as well as the need for the involvement of large numbers of youth in the processes of government, it is proposed:

1. Youth Councils on Public Policy to be organized on a Congressional District basis as well as on state legislative district basis.

2. Non-partisan considerations should govern in the nomination of 30 outstanding young people between the ages of 18-26 from lists of candidates proposed by each Superintendent of Schools within the particular district. Membership of Councils to be appointed by appropriate legislator for specific term of office, probably for no longer than two years.

3. Youth Councils to be composed of young persons of the broadest possible representation covering all economic, social and political backgrounds, including but not limited to those who attend or have attended college.

4. Youth Councils to serve in an advisory capacity to legislator on attitudes and beliefs of youth on pertinent public issues of the day or of the future.

5. Youth Councils to select Chairman who will have right to announce for public attention the various advisory judgments of the Council after presenting their views to legislators who appointed them.

6. With proof of the effectiveness of Youth Councils, state and national funding can be provided to underwrite expenses of full time youth representatives for each member of the Congress and each state legislator. The Youth Representative would continue to work with his Youth Council in developing representative and responsible statements of the views of youth.

I believe more of this youth generation are more concerned about injustice, intolerance and social inequality than preceding generations. With such conviction they can do wonders in retaining and reinforcing the spirit of this country. If it is to be done, they will do it—provided they are given the opportunity to be heard.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION 1336 CONCERNING CONTINUED INJUSTICES SUFFERED BY JEWISH CITIZENS OF THE SOVIET UNION**

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who was privileged to be a cosponsor of the resolution condemning continuing injustices suffered by Jewish citizens in the Soviet Union, I am delighted that the House adopted this resolution (H. Res. 1336) by an overwhelming voice vote on Thursday, December 31.

Mistreatment of Jewish citizens within the Soviet Union has been a deplorable

reality for sometime, but the imposition of death sentences on two Jewish citizens the other day suddenly brought this whole deplorable situation to worldwide attention in a most dramatic way.

I am glad that the Soviets finally did back down in the face of world humanitarian opinion, and commuted those death sentences, just as General Franco did earlier in the case of the Basque separatists. But the problem of injustices to and mistreatment of Jewish citizens in the U.S.S.R. continues. Only the sustained, aroused anger, and concern of freedom-loving peoples around the world can be effective—as it has already been in the commutation of these death sentences—in ending the many injustices still being meted out to Jewish people in the U.S.S.R.

That is what House Resolution 1336 today is designed to do. I hope it will help to keep this worldwide concern and pressure alive in the months ahead, so that we can indeed begin to see a genuine improvement in the lot of Jewish citizens residing in the Soviet Union, as well as a willingness on the part of the Soviets to let those Jewish people who desire to do so, emigrate to Israel.

**CORTLAND COUNTY, N.Y., SETS AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF FRIENDSHIP AND CHRISTMAS GOODWILL FOR AMERICAN GIs SERVING IN VIETNAM**

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, early in December the late beloved chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, successfully persuaded the Pentagon and the CAB to approve a unique Christmas present to American servicemen serving in Vietnam. This was the arrangement permitting any GI who was eligible for the customary R and R leave in Vietnam, following at least 5 months of combat service, to get in place of those 5 days of R and R the opportunity for a 2-week leave back home over Christmas at very drastically reduced rates, something under \$400 for a round trip from Saigon to California.

This was, of course, a tremendous opportunity, and the cost involved was probably less than many of these GIs would have spent during their R and R in Bangkok, Sydney, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Taipei, or Honolulu.

Nevertheless, even at these drastically reduced rates the opportunity to come home for Christmas was still out of reach for many Vietnam servicemen, or represented too severe a financial hardship on them and their families.

Recognizing this situation, a very able, imaginative, and distinguished lady legislator in Cortland County, in my 35th District in central New York, Mrs. Florence Fitzgerald, chairman of the Cortland County Board of Supervisors, began a campaign in Cortland County to raise enough money to bring back home for Christmas all the Cortland servicemen who were eligible to take advantage of

this unique new opportunity, with Cortland residents paying the round trip airfare.

In a very short time Chairman Fitzgerald succeeded in raising nearly \$10,000 and arranged for the return of some 16 Cortland servicemen from Vietnam on the day after Christmas.

Nothing nicer could possibly be imagined as representing the true spirit of Christmas. Mrs. Fitzgerald and all the people of Cortland County have won the admiration, the affection, and the gratitude of all the people of America. No community has done more to honor and aid and support our brave men in Vietnam, and at a time when this has not always been easy to do.

The press accounts of this great humanitarian action deserve to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am happy at this point to do so:

[From the Cortland Standard, Dec. 24, 1970]  
**ALL 14 SERVICEMEN ARE ELIGIBLE FOR FLIGHT HOME FROM VIETNAM**

The project to bring local servicemen in Vietnam "Home for the Holiday", begun one short week ago by Florence Fitzgerald, chairman of the Cortland County Board of Supervisors, has reached fruition and can be termed a complete success.

All 14 men who were termed eligible from the local standpoint, have been granted leaves by their respective commanding officers, and the drive for funds to pay their round-trip fares has exceeded the goal completely beyond imagination.

According to Mrs. Fitzgerald, confirmation has been received this morning, both through Congressman Samuel Stratton's office and through the local Red Cross office in cooperation with the American Red Cross Field Director's Office, that the 14th local serviceman, Spec. 4 Edward Barrella, will be on the plane from Saigon, due to leave there tomorrow at 1 p.m. Saigon time, along with the other local men. The flight will arrive at Kennedy Airport, N.Y., at 12:30 a.m. Dec. 26, and private planes, arranged by Robert Crocker, manager of the Cortland County Airport, will transport the men to the local airport. According to Crocker this morning, the weather looks good and the local arrival is slated for about 2 a.m.

Harry Taw, president of the First National Bank, who has served as treasurer of the "Home for the Holidays" fund, said this morning, "I can hardly believe it myself," in reporting the total of \$9,250 collected in such a short time. This is well above the goal of \$7,700 which is needed to cover the fares of the 14 servicemen.

According to Mrs. Fitzgerald and her co-chairman, Ralph Jordan, executive vice-president of the Cortland County Chamber of Commerce, the excess funds will be used either to bring other men home for a holiday at a later date, or to sponsor telephone calls home by servicemen in Vietnam not eligible for the current project.

A complete financial accounting and list of donors will be released at the conclusion of the program.

Mrs. Fitzgerald today cited the many persons who contributed their time and support to the program. In addition to the many telephone calls made by herself and Mr. Jordan, several persons made the initial fundraising contacts with all the organizations in the county. Included were Mrs. Jay Peck, Robert Blatchley, Miss Shirley Cobb, Mrs. David Hobart, Grayden Haynes, Walter Goodale, Ted Doty, John Morgan, Bart Gifford, John Talbot and Ira Blixt.

Numerous other contacts were necessary within each organization, she added.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1970]  
HEARTS SOAR IN CORTLAND AS 12 SERVICEMEN  
FLY IN

(By Murray Schumach)

CORTLAND, N.Y., December 26.—"Must be an antiwar rally. They can't be waiting for us."

This was the comment today of Andrew Barber, a Navy engineman-fireman, as the light plane in which he was riding taxied to a stop in the early-morning darkness past scores of faces squinting into wind-driven snow at the airport here.

The laughter in the plane was tonic. He and the 11 other servicemen in three light planes had become increasingly worried that they would break down emotionally in reunions with families, sweethearts, friends and members of the community, who raised more than \$10,000 to pay their way home from Vietnam for a two-week Christmas leave.

But as soon as the servicemen leaped from the planes, they forgot their fears amid the cheers, embraces, tears, handshakes, backslapping and shouts.

In a matter of minutes, bottles were being opened and Christmas toasts were being drunk from paper cups.

Soon, parents were content just to be touching their sons as they stood in the snow or in the little whitewashed hangar.

"It's all a dream," said Specialist 4 Frederick Lindley, as he and his parents and brothers formed one of the many small clusters in the community gathering of about 150.

He is the sixth member of his family to have been in service in the last 13 years.

"This is something to remember for the rest of our lives," said his mother, Mrs. Maurice Lindley.

Some of the servicemen rather shyly embraced Mrs. Florence Fitzgerald, chairman of the County Board of Supervisors, who started the drive for funds that spread across Cortland County, involving almost everyone from schoolchildren to senior citizens' groups.

"People thought I was crazy," she recalled. It sounded just as unbelievable to the servicemen when they were told in various parts of Vietnam to get ready to leave for home for Christmas.

All of the servicemen who were questioned said they would not have been able to get home if the community had not raised the money for them.

They are home under the new Army program doubling the leave period to permit visits to the United States, providing the serviceman can pay the round-trip fare. The chartered airlines have put greatly reduced rates into effect to enable the servicemen to return.

In the light planes that picked them up at Kennedy International Airport in New York City at 2 A.M. today, after they arrived by chartered Trans International Airlines from Saigon, they recalled their first reactions.

Sgt. James Evener of the Air Force, was about to take off in a helicopter in Vietnam when he was pulled off and told to see his commanding officer.

"I was scared," he recalled. "Then when I saw my commanding officer, he told me he had a message from home. I was even more scared."

"Then he told me I was going home for Christmas. I thought he was joking. He handed me the message. I just looked at it and dropped it on the floor. I'm going to frame that message."

#### VIETNAM NOT MENTIONED

Since their arrival here virtually no one has been asleep. The one unwritten rule of this homecoming seems to be that no one must mention Vietnam until they prepare to leave on Jan. 8.

Another unwritten rule seems to be that no one is wearing a uniform during this leave.

In many homes here, Christmas dinners were postponed pending the arrival of the servicemen.

No effort was being made by city officials or civic groups to set up a formal program over this weekend. The assumption in this city of 22,000 surrounded by seven snow-covered hills was that the time belonged to the servicemen and their families to do with as they wished.

#### NO PLANS MADE

And parents, taking a similar view, did not try to tell their sons how to spend their leaves.

Some went into town and just chatted with friends in Chaffee's Coffee Shop at Main and Church Streets.

"They wouldn't take my money," said Specialist Lindley. At the Barber home, in nearby Homer, Mrs. Barber laughed and said her son had just taken off with friends and she did not know where he was.

"This house has been a madhouse," she said happily. "Nobody has been to bed. We just sat around and the phone keep ringing. We're going to have a ball. I don't know how, but it's going to be a ball."

At the Evener home in Marathon, the sergeant had been to visit his grandparents and had returned.

"We're going to munch on the Christmas dinner, we just couldn't eat yesterday waiting for him to come home," said his mother.

Pfc. Donald Snell was sitting contentedly at home watching the Baltimore-Cincinnati football game on television.

Though the community paid for 16 servicemen, three had returned on other flights and a fourth was met at Kennedy International Airport and had gone to St. Albans Hospital to visit his wounded brother.

For all of the servicemen who came home on this community project the action was just proof that their home town was a wonderful place to live.

Even the snow as they were flying up in the morning, which would have bothered most airplane passengers, pleased the servicemen, nearly all of whom had been born in and around here.

"What can you say about something like this?" Private Snell asked.

"They're just wonderful people," he said.

"And look at this beautiful Cortland snow," Sergeant Evener said. "No mosquitoes." As their plane began to descend, they peered intently out of the windows.

Then, suddenly with loud explanations, they called out landmarks at home.

They shouted out the dark winding Taftoka River, the yellow lights of Homer High, the sprawling buildings of Cortland State College.

"The most beautiful sight in the world," said Engineman Barber, and the others.

#### SEVEN HOME IN KANSAS

OLATHE, KANS., December 26.—Seven Olathe servicemen—their trip from Vietnam paid for by local residents—barely made it home for Christmas.

Eighteen days after the community of 18,000 launched a drive for funds to bring all its eligible servicemen back for the holidays, a private jet landed at Kansas City Municipal Airport. The time was 11:55 P.M. Christmas Day.

The men wore summer khaki uniforms. Some were in short sleeves, but the glow of being home and with their families apparently helped them shrug off the 26 degree temperature and brisk winds.

Most of the men had a stubble of beard as a result of the long flight from Saigon via Chicago. The arrival was two hours behind schedule.

Specialist 5 Fred Clark saw his three-week old son for the first time after descending

from the private jet supplied for the trip from Chicago by United Utilities, Inc., a telephone company in Westwood, Kans.

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Times-Union, Dec. 27, 1970]

CORTLAND GI HOME FOR CHRISTMAS, THANKS TO FUND DRIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE STRATTON

CORTLAND, N.Y.—Two days ago, Army Spec. 4 Edward Barella was on an intelligence mission in Vietnam's Mekong Delta as part of a seven-man unit.

Saturday, the 21-year-old soldier, wearing a sports shirt and jeans, stepped out of a small plane into 15-degree weather for a two-week Christmas reunion with his family here.

The event climaxed a two week fund-raising drive by local citizens who raised \$9,200 to finance the leaves for 16 servicemen from this Central New York county.

Barella was the final one to be confirmed, and could only be located through a last-minute effort involving the Red Cross, the Pentagon and Rep. Samuel Stratton, D-N.Y.

"It was only a few hours before he had to leave that they got hold of him," explained Barella's father, Louis, a city fireman.

"Then on the jeep trip to Saigon, there were a few shots fired at them and he said to the other guys, 'Not now. Just let me get home.'"

About 150 persons, from families and community organizations, were at the Cortland County Airport as the three small, chartered planes landed from New York City at 3:55 a.m.

The servicemen, wearing light fatigues and civilian clothes, stepped into the glare of television lights and chilly weather as their families ran to meet them.

"Such happy faces, you never saw," said Mrs. Florence Fitzgerald, who spearheaded the fund-raising effort. Not many words were exchanged between the men and their families.

Mrs. Rose Roe called the return of her son, Army Spec. 4 Robert Roe, the "nicest Christmas gift I've ever had."

"It's great to be back," Roe said. "But it's cold. It was cold when we landed in Japan and it got colder all the way back."

Roe, assigned to Davis Station near Saigon, said his only definite plans were "to do some skiing."

Mrs. Betty Sheridan said her son, Army 1st Lt. Joseph Sheridan, a helicopter pilot, was called back from a mission to go home.

"They radioed RTB—return to base—," she said. "And he came back in the same clothes he was wearing then."

Sheridan returned on Christmas Eve, two days before the others. A 16th soldier was met in New York City by his parents to visit a relative in St. Albans Naval Hospital.

The fund drive was started by Mrs. Fitzgerald Dec. 15, after she learned of a similar effort in Olathe, Kan. Civil groups joined resources to raise the \$500 needed for air fare per man. The area GIs were found by the Red Cross, the United Service Clubs of New York City and in one case, by a congressman.

"We couldn't find Barella," Mrs. Fitzgerald explained, "so I called Sam Stratton and got him out of bed at midnight the 21st. He checked with the Pentagon, and they contacted Barella."

Barella's father said his son, a teletype operator, was not allowed to reveal his position.

"The last letter we got was marked Dec. 15," he said, "and he said things were getting quite hairy."

Of the 16 returnees, at least nine knew each other well from high school. Mrs. Fitzgerald, who is chairman of the Cortland County board of supervisors, said she is now trying to arrange a meeting between the men and the local benefactors about mid-week.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 28, 1970]  
CORTLAND HAS PRAYERS AND PARTIES FOR ITS  
SONS, HOME ON VIETNAM LEAVE

(By Murray Schmach)

CORTLAND, N.Y., December 27.—This was a day for special prayers and parties in this city that raised \$10,000 to fly back 16 of its servicemen from Vietnam for a two-week Christmas leave.

Twelve of them arrived about 4 a.m. yesterday, to be greeted with tears and cheers at the airport by parents and friends. Three others returned on other flights and one went to St. Albans Naval Hospital in Queens to visit his wounded brother.

In churches here today pastors called for a prayer that the war would end soon. And in the homes of those who flew back, relatives and friends pitched in to make Christmas feasting last until Jan. 5, when the men have to leave from New York City for Vietnam. "The two weeks at home were made possible under an Army program doubling the leave period to permit such visits. The servicemen must pay their own round-trip fare.

The city itself seemed to catch the right atmosphere. The fresh snow covering the seven hills that surround this central New York City of some 22,000 were brilliant in sunshine. On the slope of Beaudry Park, children went bellywhopping. There was not even a puff of smoke from factories. Holiday silence was profound over Cortland State College. Very little traffic moved along Main Street.

#### MOTHER SPEAKS IN CHURCH

Frederick Lindley, one of those flown back early yesterday, attended services in the Second Congregational Church, a small, white frame building.

During the simple service, the pastor, the Rev. Roger C. Marmon, invited the young man's mother to talk to the congregation about her son's return.

She walked to the front of the church with her son, and, standing before the altar, said: "I didn't believe it until I saw the planes coming in. At that moment I think I was closer to God than at any time in my life."

A little later, in accordance with a tradition in this church, those who had a birthday during the month were invited to make a contribution in a tiny model of the church on a table before the altar.

A young woman walked to the front with an envelope. The congregation of about 35 then sang its usual birthday song.

Friends later said that she was Debbie Packard, 19 years old. The boy she had grown up with in Virgil, near here, and to whom she was engaged—Charles Puderbaug—was one of 17 from this area killed in Vietnam.

Just before the congregation sang "Silent Night, Holy Night," Mr. Marmon pleaded for an end to war but asked that "we remember the boys who are serving the United States in Vietnam and other places."

At the more spacious St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church, the Rev. Carl Denti observed that the faith of this community that had prompted it to raise the money to bring its men from Vietnam for the holidays "is the kind of faith we should have, the kind of religion we should have."

Lou Berella, father of Edward, one of the servicemen, was at this service, but not his son.

"This was one time we felt he needed some sleep," he said. "He's catch up with church later."

#### MEALS BY HIS ORDER

The Berella home was one of those in which festivities were continuing for the second day. The son had requested macaroni and sauce for today and eggplant parmesan for tomorrow.

"I've been waiting for this kind of food a long time," he told his family as he left the house to tinker with his car, pick up his

girl and bring her back to the house for dinner.

His 18-year-old sister, Valerie, was preparing the sauce, supervised by her mother, who had injured a leg.

At the home of Andrew Barber, another of the servicemen, a rollicking family gathering was getting under way. His mother, after getting to bed at 6 o'clock this morning, was awakened two hours later so that she could start on the cooking. She prepared a venison stew.

At the home of James Evener, his mother was laughing as she learned that the number of guests already invited for today's party had passed 40.

"How often does something like this happen," she said.

At the St. Anthony rectory, Father Denti, who was the moving force behind the erection of an eternal light on carved black granite in memory of the Vietnam dead from this area, remarked:

"I hope there will be no more names to put on this stone."

#### IT IS NOT A HAPPY NEW YEAR ON THE FARMS AND RANCHES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. MELCHER. This is not a Happy New Year for farmers, Mr. Speaker.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture on December 31, in its monthly Agricultural Prices Report, revealed that farm prices on December 15 stood at 67 percent of parity, the same as in December 1933—37 years ago—near the depths of this Nation's worst economic crisis.

The principle difference between then and now is that in 1933 there was a national administration initiating new, and what was then daring, programs to get farm prices back up. Currently, the administration in power has released the bad news of low farm prices together with a brand new statement on the front page of the Agricultural Prices report which says:

These ratios reflect changes in these relationships (prices and costs) since the base period of 1910-1914. They are only price comparisons and do not take into account changes in efficiency, technology, volume of production or other factors. No such ratio realistically reflects the current status of the income or welfare of farmers.

Whenever a ratio of prices to costs fails to reflect on the income or welfare of farmers we will be living in a new sort of economic system, Mr. Speaker.

One USDA spokesman told reporters that the parity ratio is as imprecise as taking the temperature of an individual—it does not reflect the extent or seriousness of his or her illness.

The parity ratio, of itself, does not register the exact nature of agriculture's illness but, as in the case of the thermometer, it certainly indicates whether the patient is sick, or hale and hearty.

Agriculture is sick—desperately sick, economically, and the fact that the parity ratio has dropped seven points in a year to 67 is evidence of that.

The Department of Agriculture is trying to make a case that low prices are not important; that productivity, volume and technology have changed all that.

But the administration has very poorly concealed a certain amount of joy over declining farm prices. The Secretary of Labor and the President and two economic aides went on TV last month to hail a decline in the rate of inflation as a result of a decline in food prices. They showed a great deal of satisfaction in announcing that the rate of inflation or increase in the cost of living in November was the lowest this year. They gave no indication whatever of concern for the farmers and ranchers at whose expense this supposedly "good" news was made possible.

Mr. Speaker, as a veterinarian, I do not think my profession or the medical profession ought to throw away their thermometers, and as a Congressman I do not think this country ought to throw away the parity standard as to price-cost relationships in agriculture, and I intend to call together like-minded Members of the House of Representatives in both parties later this month, first, to defend the parity standards, and second, to see what can be done to get the patient's temperature back up to a healthy 100 percent of parity.

It is my hope that the Department of Agriculture will cooperate in that effort, in keeping with the Department's proper role as their spokesman and representative in the Government. Unfortunately, at this moment there is every indication that the Department is pulling grain out of resale, setting price supports low and gearing farm programs—not to achieve parity for farmers as at least three enacted laws direct—but to knock prices down for the benefit of the grain trade and to make more Brownie points on inflation.

Farmers and ranchers know that the parity index is an excellent barometer of their well-being. They know the need for it as a measure of their prices and costs. That is what the parity index does. It shows them that prices, now at 396 on the parity index, have climbed far faster than their prices, which are at 265 on the index, or only 67 percent of the old ratio of prices to costs.

When 1933 ended with parity at 67 percent there was a bipartisan effort to revive agriculture and to improve farm income, to help lead this country out of the great depression.

It is mandatory that there again be a bipartisan effort to bring agriculture out of its worst depression since 1933, to reverse the low price policies now being pursued, to end the liquidation of farmers and the rural migration to cities which already have their own crises, and to rebuild a sound economy for our primary producers.

To that end, it is my hope that we can build a bipartisan rural coalition when the new Congress convenes which, like the farm bloc of the 1930's, will operate without regard to party to save the people of rural America.

#### CRITICISM OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening Star of December 31, 1970, under the byline of Stephen Green, a story appeared relating to the House Committee on the District of Columbia. This story appears to have originated from a criticism of the committee by a Member of Congress whose statements are so devoid of truth and fact as to provide little color of accuracy.

As chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I feel it a duty to set the record straight since the members of this committee have fulfilled their legislative duties as fully and as carefully as any other committee of this Congress. This comment is directed to some of the major distortions and misrepresentations contained in the criticism which has been reported in the press.

The criticisms are made of the actions of the committee as a whole. The statement that the committee has "consistently" violated its own rules is without basis in fact. In effect the complaint is that the committee did not adopt rules preferred by the critics.

#### NOTICES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Contrary to the complaint, the committee records show conclusively that notices of hearings, subcommittee meetings, and executive sessions of the full committee were placed in the mails at least 2 days in advance of scheduled meetings, except in the case of a committee session which was to be continued on the following day, and in those cases notices were given to the offices of Members, whether they had been present or absent.

During the 91st Congress there were 30 full committee executive sessions. Such meetings were scheduled on the first Monday of the month, as stated in the committee rules, when possible. When the House was in recess, or when a sufficient number of committee members was not available to make a quorum, other days were set for the convenience of the committee.

No rule requires notice to the committee members of subject matter to come before such committee meetings, contrary to the statement in the press. When the meeting was for consideration of specific subject matter, the notice so stated. When the meeting was for the purpose of receiving reports from subcommittees, the notice so stated. At meetings called for the latter purpose, subcommittee chairmen have the privilege of bringing up for action by the full committee any legislation reported by the subcommittee.

#### FILING OF REPORTS

Issue is raised concerning the filing of minority or additional views to legislation ordered reported by the committee. Although it is not a committee rule, the committee observed the practice of permitting any committee member to timely file for inclusion in the report his separate views. At the time legislation is ordered reported to the House for action, every member of the committee is on notice of the imminence of filing of a report on it and of the need to give

notice of his intent to prepare and submit his statement within the time limits set by the House for receipt of such report.

#### AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS AND AMENDED BILLS

As to the complaint of nonavailability of committee reports in advance, during the entire 91st Congress, as in past Congresses, this committee has filed its reports and amended bills as promptly as possible after approval by the full committee of such legislation. In every instance, the date and time of such filings have been such as reasonably to assure the availability of this material to the Members of the House prior to the day set for floor consideration thereof. The fact is, however, that conditions at the Government Printing Office, particularly during the past year, have been such as to cause delays in printing which have, in some instances, resulted in these documents not being delivered to the committee until the day for floor consideration.

The chairman has regretted this situation, and has made every effort to assure the availability of this material to the members as early as possible. However, as with other committees, it has not been possible for this committee in all cases to adjust its schedule of legislative action so as to offset this problem of log jam at the printing office.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE DESIGNATION BY NUMBER

As to the complaint about subcommittee designation by number and not name, at the organizational meeting of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for the 91st Congress, held on February 20, 1969, the question was raised as to whether the subcommittees should continue to be designated only by numbers, as has been the practice for a good many years, or designated by legislative subject areas as is the case in the Senate District of Columbia Committee. Several veteran members of the committee offered reasons why the present system of numerical designation has proved more practical in the operation of this committee, and it was decided to continue this practice.

Thus, the will of the committee on this subject was expressed, and the chairman was guided thereby and continued, as in the past, to assign bills to subcommittees according to his best judgment. The record of legislative accomplishment of this committee for the 91st Congress, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 29, 1970, is eloquent testimony to the efficacy of this system.

#### APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE CONFEREES

As to the selection of conferees, it should be known to all Members of Congress that the chairman of a committee does not appoint conferees on the part of the House in regard to bills on which the two houses of Congress are in disagreement. The chairman can only recommend names for such conferees to the Speaker, who can actually appoint as conferees any Members he wishes. It is true, however, that the present Speaker, as well as those who have preceded him in that office, has without exception accepted the recommendations of the

chairman of this committee in regard to conferees, and this is an evidence of the Speakers' confidence in the chairman.

In recommending conferees on House-approved bills reported by this committee, the chairman has endeavored in every instance to request representation by members of the subcommittee which handled the particular bill, and also conferees who will support the position of the House of Representatives in conference with the Senate. The importance of both of these standards for conferees is self-evident.

#### "CHARTER COMMISSION" BILL

As to the complaint of nonaction on the so-called Charter Commission bill, on July 13, 1970, Subcommittee No. 3, voted to postpone action on this bill until a later time, when it might be considered in connection with H.R. 18562, Congressman BROYHILL's bill to reorganize the District of Columbia government.

On July 28, 1970, Subcommittee No. 3 considered and approved H.R. 18562, with amendments, and in view of this action the Charter Commission bill was not further considered.

Hence, the Charter Commission bill failed of approval in subcommittee and thus was never brought up for consideration by the full committee.

#### DISTRICT BUDGET

The committee reported out two revenue bills for the District of Columbia during the 91st Congress, one in October 1969 and the other in December 1970. In addition, during the second session, the committee has, when legislation resulted in increased costs to the District, included in the bill, revenue to cover those costs. For the past 7 years the District has come to the Congress with an out-of-balance budget—a matter of great concern to many Members, particularly because the increases in the budget soar—and in those 7 years, the committee has reported out five revenue bills. The committee has been responsive to the fiscal needs of the District and has acted on revenue measures as expeditiously as is judicious.

#### THE CHAIRMAN'S AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

The committee in its organization meeting, by vote, set rules and gave powers for carrying out rules to the chairman specifically authorizing him to appoint subcommittees, refer legislation, appoint personnel, recall legislation from a subcommittee, and to exercise other powers. The criticism based on these points resolves into the simple allegation that the majority of the committee was wrong because it did not follow some personal proposal is conceived by the critic. In other words, the unhappy complainant would have the committee and its business controlled by the minority. Thus, when the chairman indicated the possible recall and rereferral of a bill in conformity with the committee rules, the committee is accused of some nebulous impropriety and the chairman is branded as "arbitrary."

#### DISTRICT PROPOSALS

The committee has not ignored legislation recommended by the District of

Columbia government. In fact, many of the District's proposals have been approved and are already Public Law. Specifically, complaint was made of 18 draft bills which it is erroneously charged have not been subject to any hearings. Apparently reference is made to those introduced in July 1970. At that time, more important matters such as the delegate bill and revenue proposals were being studied. Actually, hearings were held on some of these bills or the subject thereof, and some have been passed. However, one of them, much sought by the District government; namely, to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons, has been given no action by complainant's Subcommittee No. 2 to which the bill was referred on July 21, 1970.

As has been reported earlier, some 306 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee during this Congress; hearings were held on 121 of them. It is not possible to conduct hearings on each piece of legislation referred to the committee.

#### TRIBUTE TO HONORABLE WILLIAM MURPHY OF ILLINOIS

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as the time approaches when we shall part to go our separate ways, we realize that one of our most distinguished colleagues will not be returning. Congressman BILL MURPHY of Illinois is a good friend we will all greatly miss.

I have had the opportunity to work closely with Congressman MURPHY as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. His wise counsel and pleasant help in the areas of Asian and African affairs were an immense assistance to us in our dealings with the burdens of the U.S. Government policy. His leadership of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs is a fine example of a dedicated American who has served his country with distinction. His retirement is a great loss to us who know him so well.

I remember the trips we took as fellow members of the Foreign Affairs Committee where his personal knowledge of foreign policy and world conditions enlightened all who participated.

BILL MURPHY's understanding of the complexities which this country faces in the area of foreign relations is outstanding. Few men I know have the breadth of his background on the history, peoples, and conflicts of China, the Asian Continent, and the island chains of the Pacific.

Rose and BILL MURPHY are a well-liked and well-loved couple in the U.S. House of Representatives. We as personal friends send with them at this time our best wishes for a happy and rewarding future, and hope that our paths will cross many times in the future as loyal, devoted, and admiring friends.

#### SORRY ENDING

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the 91st Congress is coming to an ignoble end—an end forced by what is left of a warped and eroded Constitution of the United States.

Despite the inflation that was then gnawing into the vitals of the Nation's economy, the 91st Congress began 2 years ago by handing the President a 100-percent increase in pay, by increasing the salaries of Members of Congress 41 percent, and equal or greater percentage increases to the Federal judiciary and executive branch of Government.

The 91st Congress ended by giving millions of class act and military personnel a pay increase costing more than \$2 billion, although each of these employees had one or more pay increases in the last 2 years.

The 91st Congress spent billions of dollars that must be borrowed for things not needed or which could have been deferred. It leaves as a legacy a deficit of perhaps \$20 billion; a national debt that is approaching \$400 billion, rampant inflation, vast delegations of powers to the President, and a confusion and insecurity the people of this Nation have not known in modern times.

This is not a proud moment in the history of Congress.

This is the time and place for a funeral dirge.

#### BENEFITS TO VETERANS IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether what the gentleman from Iowa has said is true, but I do know that in my 20-and-some years of service in the Congress, this has been the greatest Congress ever so far as veterans affairs are concerned. This Congress has done more for veterans than any Congress since I came to the Congress.

#### VETERANS' AFFAIRS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to give due recognition to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who has just very accurately reported a year of accomplishments with respect to the veteran and the benefits rightly accruing to the veterans of this country. But I think in all modesty the chairman forgot to mention it was his single-minded, energetic intention to bring about these changes over the course of years that finally paid off in the second session of this Congress. I think we ought to recognize the achievements of our fellow Texan. We call him "TIGER TEAGUE," and there is a good reason why we call him "Tiger."

In all due justice we shall recognize his achievements and the contributions

that he has made as chairman which have made it possible for us to say that this has been the greatest Congress for achievements in behalf of the veterans of the United States.

#### THE SUCCESSFUL 91ST CONGRESS

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the question arises, as we finish this Congress, whether we House Members go out with a whine and a growl, or whether we go out with our heads up, proud to have served in this 91st Congress. It is a rewarding privilege to have worked hard these 2 years in the 91st Congress with my fellow Members of both parties.

For one Member, I am sure, and every Member here, looks around and says, "You are fine patriots. You are fine Members." We Members have had tremendous problems. We have done our best.

I believe the 91st Congress has been a successful Congress. I believe that we Members have aimed forward for progress for this country—yes, and for peace for all mankind. I believe we have supported the President in effectively reducing the Vietnam war, both in casualties and cost. I believe we have also reduced the Federal budget much below what it could have been with the tremendous demands by various groups, each claiming the highest priority of their special field of interest. I honestly believe that the present budget level has been maintained below the expected increase due to inflation and new programs but is below what the administration had requested. Our current budget figure for fiscal year 1971 will be much below the administration's budget recommendations for fiscal year 1972.

In closing, I would like to say, too, that it comes with ill grace for any one of us in this House to say that any others of us have not done a good job. I believe that for the American people who have elected this Congress, that the Members have produced a good job. So to those Members who stay for the 92d Congress, "congratulations," because over 90 percent of the Members of the 91st Congress that ran again on November 3, 1970 for the 92d Congress have been re-elected to the 92d Congress by the American people, which is a tremendous pat on the back.

To those Members who are voluntarily retiring or have lost the election, it has been a pleasure to serve with you. As a Member from the Republican side of the House, I congratulate my House Democratic colleagues as well as my House Republican colleagues through cooperation and bipartisan effort on a good job and a fine job well done in the 91st Congress, for the benefit of every U.S. citizen.

#### THE WORK OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

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



Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that in looking over the record of this Congress, I believe we have performed a great work in moving this Congress toward its constitutional responsibilities. I believe this is one of the greatest and perhaps the most significant of the achievements of this Congress. In addition, this Congress has enacted a Legislative Reform Act, which, although it does not meet all of the goals and expectations of every Member, it will be a great milestone and it will be a great instrument in making the legislative process in this body more effective.

I want to join my colleagues who have directed attention to these hallmarks of achievement. I think the process is infinitely better than before we came.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think that the chicanery that has held up the normal operations of the Congress will be eliminated in the new Congress when the new rules are in effect that the gentleman has spoken of?

Mr. VANIK. I think we have come a long way. I think we have made a tremendous improvement in the legislative process. It is not a perfect achievement. It is a beginning, and it is an improvement many of us never expected.

#### SLAUGHTER IN THE COAL MINES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, shortly after noon on Wednesday, December 30, the Finley Coal Co.'s interconnected coal mines Nos. 15 and 16 on Hurricane Creek near Hyden, Ky., blew up and killed 38 coal miners. This tragedy occurred on the first anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, and was the worst coal mine disaster in Kentucky's history.

This Congress enacted landmark legislation when it passed the 1969 Coal Mine Safety Act. You, Mr. Speaker, were one of the great leaders in helping to forge this important law. I recall your influence behind the scenes in insisting that both the health and safety provisions be tied together in one piece of legislation, at a time when some lobbyists were attempting to weaken the effort of Congress by separating out the health and safety features. As a result, the 1969 law is a strong and effective law. Ever since its passage I have repeatedly called attention to the failure to enforce this excellent law, and the Kentucky mine disaster furnishes a number of glaring examples of what can happen when good legislation is not properly enforced.

The Finley Coal Co. mines are comparatively new, No. 15 having been opened in March 1970 and No. 16 in June 1970. They are both located on Hurricane Creek, about 4 miles east of Hyden, Ky., off State Highway Route 80 in southeastern Kentucky. The coowners and operators of the Finley Coal Co. mines are Holt Finley, Stanley Finley,

and Charles Finley. No. 15 mine produced a daily average of 600 tons of coal, while No. 16 mine produced 800 tons a day.

#### SHOCKINGLY DANGEROUS CONDITIONS

The inspection records prior to the December 30 tragedy reveal shockingly dangerous conditions in these mines. The owners and operators should have corrected these dangerous conditions. There is a serious breakdown in the inspection system, for if the law had been properly enforced the lives of these 38 men would have been saved.

On June 19, 1970, only 2 months after the No. 15 mine had been opened, Federal inspectors ordered the mine closed because of imminent danger. Listen to this inspection report on the hazardous conditions which constituted an imminent danger:

Dangerous accumulations of loose coal and coal dust were present along the shuttle-car roadways from the loading point to the faces of the six main entries, a distance of about 400 feet. Rock dust had not been applied to within 160 to 240 feet of the faces of the main entries. Trailing cables were run over unnecessarily. Evidence of smoking was present underground. Short-circuit protection was not provided on any of the cables for the direct current face equipment. Gas tests were not made before and after blasting. The trailing cable for the mining machine and mobile drill contained three uninsulated splices each. Gas tests were not made before electric face equipment was taken in by the last open crosscut or every 20 minutes thereafter.

#### NO CIVIL PENALTIES ASSESSED

At the time of the June 19 closure of the mine, 12 violations were found. In the case of most of them, the inspector noted that:

In compliance with the Restraining Order issued on April 23, 1970, Civil Action No. 70-C-50-D, United States Court of the Western District of Virginia at Abingdon, Virginia, this Notice is for information purposes only and no penalty will be assessed.

Therefore, the civil penalty of \$10,000 provided by Congress under the 1969 act was not assessed because of the court action, and the tortured interpretation by the Department of the Interior that the court action tied their hands from assessing penalties.

The No. 15 mine was closed for 3 days between June 19 and June 22. At the time of inspection, the Bureau of Mines commented on this condition within the mine:

The high-volatile bituminous coal dust is explosive.

The notation was also made that the mine is classified as nongassy. On frequent occasions, Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, I pointed out that a coal miner can be killed just as dead in a so-called nongassy mine as in a gassy mine.

#### SAFETY RECOMMENDATIONS IGNORED

On August 12, 1970, one coal miner was blinded and a second received a punctured eardrum as a result of an explosion in No. 15 mine. The mine was closed but reopened the same day, with the following comment by the inspector:

A withdrawal order was issued at the time of the investigation (spot inspection) for

trailing cables being run over by mobile equipment and not being properly protected to prevent damage. The Order was terminated the same day.

At the time of the investigation of August 19, four recommendations were made, as follows:

First. Explosives and detonators shall be handled and transported only by approved means.

Second. Trailing cables shall be adequately protected to prevent damage by mobile equipment.

Third. Coal dust and other combustible materials, including lubricants, shall be cleaned from and not be permitted to accumulate on electric equipment.

Fourth. On each coal-producing shift, the working section shall be examined for hazardous conditions as often as is necessary for safety.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, these steps were not taken.

#### TWENTY SAFETY VIOLATIONS IN OCTOBER

Matters got worse. An inspection report on October 19, 20, and 22, 1970, revealed no less than 20 violations in No. 16 mine of the Finley Coal Co. Here are some of the violations: samples of respirable dust in the mine atmosphere were not being taken. The roof support plan was not being followed, in that roof bolts were installed more than 5 feet apart, and crosscuts were more than 22 feet wide. The quantity of air reaching the faces of No. 5 and No. 6 main entries were too low to be measured by an anemometer. Weekly ventilation examinations were not made. A ventilation system, methane and dust control plan were not submitted by the operator. Float coal dust was deposited on the rock-dusted surfaces in all crosscuts along the main conveyor belt haulage entry from the portal to the loading point. Water or water with a wetting agent was not used to abate the dust created by mining operations. Rock dust had not been applied to within 200 feet of the face of No. 1 main entry. The operator had not submitted a list of all electric equipment at use in the mine. The trailing cables for the loading machine and coal drill contained several temporary splices.

All these violations and more were cited only a little over 2 months before the December 30 tragedy. Once again, civil penalties as authorized under the 1969 law were not assessed because of the Department of the Interior's interpretation of the Abingdon, Va., court injunction.

#### FATAL ACCIDENT ON NOVEMBER 9

On November 9, 1970, Charlie Wagers, a tractor operator, died instantly from massive head injuries sustained when his head was caught between the rib and corner of the tractor, after mechanical trouble with the tractor, which got stuck in reverse while Charlie Wagers was trying to move it forward. The inspector-investigators made this comment on the cause of the fatal accident:

Management's failure to take the defective tractor from service for repairs, and to assure that the battery-powered equipment was in good mechanical condition before being placed in service was the direct cause of the accident.

The investigation report added this recommendation:

Mine officials shall use closer and more strict supervision at all times in this mine.

The inspectors added this significant comment:

The overall safety program at the time was not effective.

An imminent danger order was issued that the tractor not be used until repaired, and the order was lifted on November 16, 1970.

#### SELF-RESCUE MASKS NOT SUPPLIED

The last inspection of the fatal Finley Coal Co. mine prior to the December 30 tragedy occurred on November 19, 1970—51 days prior to the disaster. This was a spot inspection. Five violations were cited. Among them was the direct violation of section 317(m) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act which requires that all employees be provided with self-rescue masks to enable them to survive in noxious fumes like carbon monoxide for an hour or more. The inspector noted that the self-rescue devices "are on order and have not been received." An order was issued requiring that they be on hand by December 22, 1970—8 days before the tragic explosion. I am informed that these self-rescue devices were not in the hands of the men who were killed on December 30. It is conceivable that had these self-rescue devices been available as required by law, some of the men and perhaps all of the men might have been able to use the hour or more to proceed to safety, or barricade themselves and later be rescued.

In addition to the above violation, the November 19, 1970, spot inspection revealed that the cumulative concentrations of respirable dust analyzed from four samples collected by the operator during an original sampling cycle conducted in the working environment of the coal cutting machine operator amounted to 33.9 milligrams of respirable coal dust. A notice of violation was issued, requiring, as with the other violations cited, that the violation be abated by December 22, 1970.

#### NO REINSPECTION ON DECEMBER 22

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that once again the inspection system broke down and a recheck was not made to ascertain whether the Finley Coal Co. had complied by December 22, 1970, with the orders issued on November 19.

As reported by that able writer Ward Sinclair in an article in the Louisville, Ky., Courier Journal of January 1, 1971:

The Barbourville, Ky. office of the Bureau of Mines, which is staffed by six men, last week went on to a holiday schedule. On the 22d, when the Hyden mine should have been rechecked, two of the six men were on leave. The next day, December 23, three of the six were off. On Dec. 24, five of the six were off. On Dec. 28, four of the six were still on leave after the long holiday weekend. Tuesday, the day before the tragedy struck Finley No. 16 and its interconnecting No. 16 mine, two men remained on leave.

A Bureau spokesman said that the Hyden mine was not revisited because the men who were on duty were assigned to other "high priority" work such as inspection of ventilation systems and roof controls elsewhere—important elements in mine safety.

#### SHORTAGE OF INSPECTORS

Mr. Speaker, the shortage of mine inspectors is well known, and the massive new responsibilities required by the 1969 legislation have, of course, increased the demand for more trained inspectors. I am not going to engage in a numbers game, because official sources disagree on how many inspectors are authorized, available, needed, in process of being trained and projected. An accurate reporter, Mr. Ward Sinclair indicated the following in his January 1, 1971, dispatch:

In August, the U.S. Senate Labor Subcommittee held hearings to review criticism of the safety program and to hear the Interior Department's side of the story. The department argued that it was doing the best it could, given the shortage of trained personnel.

Assistant Secretary Hollis Dole said that because of the personnel-hiring problem, the department would not be in a position to conduct all the legally required inspections at least until next June.

The new law requires four yearly inspections at each mine, plus regular spot inspections at mines where excessive amounts of methane gas are liberated or where other dangerous conditions exist.

A Bureau of Mines memorandum of Aug. 17 said the bureau expects to be able to make about 30,000 inspections—something like 85 per cent of the required number—during fiscal 1971.

But at the present rate of hiring and adding new men to the inspection force, most bureau officials concede that the agency will be hard put to meet the June deadline set out by Dole at the subcommittee hearings.

The bureau's plans call for increasing the inspection and supervisory force from 350 men to 1100 during the present fiscal year. About 300 of these would be supervisors and technical specialists—not necessarily on-the-line inspectors.

The best available figures yesterday indicated that the bureau now has only 231 men actually inspecting, with 151 still in training—a total of 382. Some 172 more are said to be "in the process of being employed."

Mr. Speaker, it would be too simplistic to point the finger of blame for the tragedy exclusively at the dedicated inspectors out on the firing line who went home for Christmas. Also, it is not entirely correct to say that all we need are more inspectors in order to stop this slaughter in the coal mines. It is my own feeling that even if you had inspectors swarming over every mine every day, you would still have accidents as long as the coal operators in their pell-mell pressure for more production continue to cut corners and refuse to comply with basic safety regulations.

#### SAFETY-CONSCIOUSNESS STARTS WITH THE PRESIDENT

Now, Mr. Speaker, how do you obtain a safety-consciousness up and down the line? I say it starts with the President of the United States himself.

Let me quote from a New York Times dispatch of January 1, 1971, written by a very astute observer, Ben A. Franklin:

The White House issued a statement today extending the President's "deepest sympathy to the family and friends" of the dead miners and pledging "every appropriate step" to prevent future disasters. That was the first public statement of concern about mine safety from the White House since the law was passed a year ago.

#### STRIKES WERE STAGED

Last summer there was a series of wildcat strikes in the mine fields to protest alleged lack of enforcement of the new law. But although Administration spokesmen expressed some concern then about the impact of such walkouts on critically short coal supplies, the White House and the Interior Department appeared to pay scant attention to the safety complaints.

The Bureau of Mines is an agency of the Interior Department.

At a time when the demands of enforcing the complex new law were taxing the bureau more strenuously than at any point in its 60-year history, the agency had no director for seven months. President Nixon dismissed John F. O'Leary, a Democrat, last March 1 and did not select his successor, Dr. Osborn, former vice president of Pennsylvania State University, until Oct. 7.

The disaster yesterday raised the 1970 death toll in coal mines to 250, the highest since 311 were killed in 1968. That year 78 miners were lost in an explosion and fire at the Consolidated Coal Company's No. 9 mine at Farmington, W. Va. Since the 1969 safety act went into effect on March 30, the death toll has been 204.

The White House press secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, told newsmen this morning that Mr. Nixon had talked by telephone twice since last night with Kentucky's Governor, Louie B. Nunn, and would have flown from Washington today to the disaster scene except for a heavy Appalachian snowstorm that closed all the nearby airports.

White House spokesmen said that a plan to send to Kentucky a "special task force" of high-level Presidential aides, headed by Robert H. Finch, counsel to the President, was still under consideration tonight.

Mr. Nixon's statement today declared:

#### INSPECTIONS RECALLED

"Those who go into the mines perform a vital task on which the country depends. The nation owes them its very best efforts to reduce their risks and to improve their working environment. In recent years we have made great strides in this direction, particularly since the new Coal Mine Health and Safety Act went into effect last spring.

"The explosion along Hurricane Creek reminds us, however, that the work of ensuring mine safety is not yet complete and impels all concerned to carry that work forward with greatest urgency."

#### DOES THE PRESIDENT REALLY CARE?

I am pleased to note that the President has now expressed concern. During the consideration of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, the White House lobbied behind the scenes to weaken the bill. For example, the White House unsuccessfully attempted to retain the infamous Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Board of Review, stacked with coal operators, to review and reverse orders designed to protect the health and safety of the miners. The White House also sent word threatening a veto of the bill if it contained the highly beneficial provisions making payments to those suffering from pneumoconiosis. The President waited until his allowable 10 days had almost expired before signing the bill, and declined to receive a group of widows of the Farmington tragedy who made a special trip to Washington to urge him to sign the bill. The President then signed the bill without ceremony, almost furtively, and immediately boarded a plane for San Clemente, Calif., leaving behind a statement which was less than enthusiastic about all the provisions of the bill.

The President was quoted as informing Senator Cook that he would support additional legislation if necessary. I do not feel that additional legislation is necessary; the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 is a tough and effective piece of legislation, if it were enforced. The President is in a position to insist that it be enforced.

## LAW AND ORDER

Let him send out the word that if he is really interested in law and order, here is the place to start.

Let him send out the word that the coal miner deserves just as much protection under the law as the mineowner who keeps pleading that safety is slowing down his production.

Let the President send out the word that he will relentlessly oppose the permissiveness that allows the coal operators to get away scot free with the violations of the law cited in the inspection reports I have cited.

## VIOLATIONS OF LAW BY UMWVA

Let the President send out the word that his own Department of Labor is not enforcing the law against the violations by the leadership of the United Mine Workers of America. Nine months ago, the Department of Labor went to court to void the 1969 election of Tony Boyle as president of the United Mine Workers of America, on grounds of election irregularities, but the Labor Department has done little or nothing to press the case. The Labor Department has refused to press to trial the 6-year-old court case against UMA trusteeship, and waited until after the recent district 5 election was over before moving in to impound the absentee ballots which had been tampered with.

Mr. Speaker, we will never have safety in the coal mines until the coal miners themselves are represented by a strong union and a clean union, a union which obeys the law, a union which stands up for the rights of the individual miners, and which every day calls attention to the safety violations such as exist at countless mines throughout the land.

Is it any wonder that coal miners continue to be killed, maimed, gassed, and crushed when the highest law-enforcement officials in the land wink at non-enforcement of the law?

Mr. Speaker, I have said very little publicly about the new Director of the Bureau of Mines, Dr. Elbert Osbourn. He has received a good press up to now. We have all given him a honeymoon to see if he can rise to the responsibilities of his job. But I hope that Dr. Osbourn will repudiate a quotation attributed to him in the January 1, 1971 New York Times. He declared:

But this disaster was not unexpected. We've had two good years since the last disaster at Farmington and I think we can almost expect one of these a year.

## DOES FATALISM CONSTITUTE LEADERSHIP?

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of fatalism which has encouraged apathy toward coal mine accidents down through the years. When you have fatalism in the top position of leadership, you cannot expect much better throughout your organization. The Director of the Bureau

of Mines must be determined to put a stop to the slaughter in the coal mines. He must work night and day toward that end. He must insist that the coal industry be imbued with a radically different attitude toward safety.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced several bills last year which would transfer the Bureau of Mines to the Department of Labor. I feel that the Department of the Interior is production-oriented, rather than employee-oriented. The Department of the Interior has traditionally taken the side of those eager to increase the production of coal, rather than protect those who mine the coal. Yet as long as the present Secretary of Labor takes such a supinely permissive attitude about enforcement of the law against the United Mine Workers of America, I hesitate to renew the suggestion that coal mine safety be transferred to his jurisdiction.

## LACK OF LEADERSHIP AT CABINET LEVEL

Unfortunately, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was interested in too many other useful projects to concern himself with coal mine safety. Not until John F. O'Leary took office as Director of the Bureau of Mines just 1 month before the Farmington tragedy in 1968 was there any appreciable activity in the Department of the Interior on behalf of protecting the safety of coal miners. To be sure, President Johnson did send up a new coal mine safety bill in the closing weeks of the 1968 session of Congress, but it received little attention. Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel, despite the fact he surprised many people by the vigor of his activity on behalf of conservation, did little to further the cause of adequate enforcement of the new Coal Mine Safety Act. In fact, Secretary Hickel's major action was a negative one, the firing of Bureau of Mines Director John F. O'Leary last March 1. Then followed a long period during which the Bureau of Mines was completely leaderless in the crucial early months when the new act went into effect. The President appointed a man who was completely unqualified for the job, and there was additional delay before his nomination was withdrawn, and finally Dr. Osbourn was appointed.

## WHAT WILL ROGERS MORTON DO?

Now we will have a new Secretary of the Interior, our distinguished and able colleague, the Honorable ROGERS MORTON. Will he be able to rise to his responsibilities? Will he as prior Secretaries of the Interior have done, allow the Bureau of Mines to drift without leadership or direction, subjected to the traditional heavy pressures of the coal operators and the abdication of its responsibility to the coal miners exhibited by the United Mine Workers of America? With the highest respect to our able colleague who is taking office as the Secretary of the Interior, I hope he does not follow the path of least resistance and let matters drift and take their own course—or else the slaughter will continue in the coal mines.

I am somewhat heartened by the fact that the Director of the Bureau of Mines feels that the coal industry must be made to feel more safety conscious. The New

York Times of January 1, 1971, quotes the Director of the Bureau of Mines as stating:

The industry must become more safety conscious. The coal industry does not have a really tough safety sense. We must have more safety education, among the miners and at the management level, before these accidents stop.

## THOSE DROWSY SAFETY SEMINARS

Well, of course, but why not try enforcing the law at the same time? I don't put much stock in safety seminars where overweight coal owners doze in overstuffed chairs listening to dull lectures on safety. All that is meaningless window-dressing. We are dealing with matters of life and death.

In the entire calendar year 1969, 203 coal miners were killed. More than that number have been killed in 1970 in the shorter period since the safety provisions of the 1969 law went into effect on March 30, 1970. It now appears that the total number of miners killed since March 30, 1970, is 204, and the total for the entire calendar year 1970 appears to be 250.

This is a sad commentary on one of the Nation's most economically healthy businesses. The demand for coal has increased by leaps and bounds in the past several years. The Nation's coal executives are striving mightily to meet this demand. They have found new and improved techniques to increase production. The coal operators have placed heavy pressure on the coal foremen and other supervisory personnel to increase production so these executives can supply the coal needed by this Nation and for foreign exports.

## HIGH PRODUCTION, LOW PROTECTION

These production-conscious executives excel in providing effective training and modern equipment for increased coal production. They show great initiative, along with the mining machinery manufacturers who helped develop the fabulous continuous miner—a great producer, but scarcely a lifesaving machine.

The outstanding production record of the coal operators shows a brand of excellence which they fail to display when it comes to enforcing the safety standards of the 1969 law. They opposed those standards when Congress was developing them, because they cried that if they were to comply with them production would be cut down and our Nation faced with a fuel shortage. The coal barons argued that they could not withstand what they said would be a huge public outcry if a shortage of coal resulted in a shortage of power. They fail to recognize that the people of this Nation are human beings who demand the end of the slaughter of other human beings.

The coal barons have urged that the Bureau of Mines inspectors should balance health and safety enforcement with the need for production—of course with greater weight given to production.

This tortured logic of the coal executives has at least the tacit support of the Bureau of Mines and the Department of the Interior. When miners are killed by twos and threes, very few people notice. But when a Farmington or a Hyden tragedy occurs, suddenly the limelight shines and shows up the unsafe practices

and conditions in the coal mines. The public is outraged.

The Farmington tragedy produced the 1969 law. Yet the coal monarchs considered the law to be oppressive, and they sought ways to flout it. The officials of the Department of the Interior always seem ready to accommodate these coal monarchs.

#### THE ABINGDON, VA. SUIT

The suit of the 77 small mine operators in Abingdon, Va. is a case in point. The Federal district court, although it granted an injunction against certain aspects of the law, also warned that the law must be enforced. The Department of the Interior reacted in an incredible fashion, expanding the fruits of the lawsuit to the entire Nation, not alone to the coal mines owned by the 77 owners who filed suit. Thus, all the coal monarchs benefited from the lawsuit.

Amazingly, even new mines not yet in existence when the law was signed also benefited from this injunction. The Hyden mines, just opened this year, were such beneficiaries. The operators of the Hyden mines were not required to meet the provisions of the new law before opening Mines 15 and 16 on Hurricane Creek. As the record shows, these two mines were extremely hazardous, have an atrocious safety record, and were allowed to operate with many safety violations that should have been abated even before the mines opened.

#### PENALTIES NOT ASSESSED

When the lawsuit was finally dropped by the 77 coal operators, with the consent of the Department of the Interior, this Department then "wiped out" some 2,300 violations of the new law, according to a statement in the January 1, 1971 New York Times. This incredible action is explained in the following excerpt from a dispatch by Ben A. Franklin:

Officials at the Bureau's Board of Mine Operations Appeals, for example, said today that although the new Act provides, for the first time in any Federal safety law, stiff cash penalties of up to \$10,000 for each safety infraction, not a penny in penalties has yet been levied.

"This is true although the Bureau, in the first few weeks of operations under the law last spring, accumulated a docket of about 2,300 citations for mine safety violations, all of which were subject to penalties.

"The entire docket of 2,300 penalty cases was 'wiped out', one official explained, when a handful of small-mine operators from Kentucky and Virginia filed a suit in Federal Court last April alleging that the Bureau had hastily and improperly promulgated the detailed standards and regulations for safety enforcement.

#### RESPONSIBILITY OF COAL OPERATORS

Although the enforcement of the new law is woefully weak, I still feel that the major share of responsibility rests on the shoulders of the coal operators. They are the ones who are short-circuiting the safety standards every day in their pressure for higher production. They are the ones who continue to lobby to weaken both the law and its enforcement. They are the ones who could take the initiative to make the mines safer through self-policing, through cleaning up violations when they occur, and by putting the priority where it belongs—that a hu-

man life is worth more than a ton of coal.

#### WHO RUNS CONGRESS?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented mess in which the other body found itself in the closing days of this Congress raises some very serious questions about whether the growing needs of America can be served by a bicameral Congress.

The spectacle of seven filibusters going at the same time in the other body, obviously makes all of us wonder not only what goes on in the other body, but who actually runs the other body. I believe that unless there are some very strong reforms enacted by the other body, there will be a growing demand on the part of the American people to carefully consider a constitutional amendment which would create a unicameral Congress.

The criticisms being hurled against the other body are intensified when one reads articles like one that recently appeared in the New York Times Magazine section by Mr. Robert Sherrill, entitled, "Who Runs Congress?"

Mr. Sherrill's penetrating and well-documented article raises some very serious questions which all Americans ought to be thinking about.

No Member of the House can suggest reforms for the other body, but it does occur to me that the Members of the other body themselves ought to be seriously concerned with revelations such as those by Mr. Sherrill. I appreciate the fact that a bicameral Congress does provide, hopefully, a system of checks and balances, which, at least in theory, prevent major legislation from being enacted in haste or under emotional stress of a nation.

I respect those who argue in favor of a bicameral Congress, but I believe we should study the merit of those who urge that a unicameral Congress can more efficiently and rapidly fulfill the needs of the Nation.

I am not too sure that it would not be wise for the country to consider a constitutional convention which could create a unicameral Congress and provide wider powers for a line-item veto power to the President.

Under our Constitution, it would take a constitutional convention to make such changes.

While I am not prepared at this time to argue that such a change would be desirable, perhaps, it would be wise for the House next year to appoint a committee of distinguished citizens and spokesmen from both the House and the Senate to start a national dialog on whether or not a unicameral Congress will serve our needs more efficiently than our present system.

Indeed, if the revelations by Mr. Sherrill have any merit, it does occur that two Senators representing a populous State like California or New York or any of the other populous States of our Union,

do, indeed, have difficulty in staying abreast of all the issues.

I noted with interest Mr. Sherrill's statement that Members of the House are better informed on individual issues than Members of the other body.

The New York Times and Mr. Sherrill have performed a notable public service by bringing the problems of the other body to public attention.

It is my hope that Mr. Sherrill's timely article will provoke a national dialog and that the American people will respond with workable alternatives.

Mr. Sherrill's article follows:

#### WHO RUNS CONGRESS?

(By Robert Sherrill)

WASHINGTON.—When Senator John Williams of Delaware said he was going to quit Congress this year, he explained that he did not want to hang around until he became so mentally broken down that his work had to be done by staff aides, a fate he said had befallen some senile colleagues.

It was the kind of wholesome remark that Williams—grown somewhat forgetful but still very sharp—knew would get a sympathetic response from a public that often wonders if the old boys of the Federal Legislature (the average age of the powerful committee chairmen is 68) are really able to cope.

But Williams must also have known that it was a misleading statement. It implied that, with the exception of those who have drifted comfortably into the euphoria of age, members of Congress are always vigorously and intimately involved in the writing of our laws, are attentive to the details of committee work and preside over their staffs like elephant-borne maharajas directing beaters on a tiger hunt.

That's not quite the way things are. The old complaint attributed to Czar Nicholas I—"Not I but 10,000 clerks rule Russia"—could be adapted to the democratic context and restated by the czars of Capitol Hill, most of whom are critically dependent upon their office and committee staffs.

This dependency has only a routine relationship to most of the 10,000 or so men and women on Congressional payrolls; naturally, the lawmakers can't personally attend to the case work and massive trivia that inundate Congress. Senator Fred Harris was determined to do just about everything when he came to Washington from Oklahoma. He would read what his constituents wrote and answer every letter; each morning the mail was dumped on his desk and he waded in. The deluge of mail accompanying the Medicare debate washed out that resolve in two months.

Clerks and typists and secretaries and lesser functionaries are not the topic here, not those on personal staffs, who often serve valiantly (some members of Congress have been known to hurl books at workers), and certainly not those strange lifeless creatures in some committee offices who seem to be preserved forever in an odorless, colorless bureaucratic formaldehyde.

But at the top of the heap, among the newsmen and lawyers and economists and professors who have gone to work for Congressmen and Senators in the feudal spirit of being totally their "men," the transfer of responsibilities is complete enough that one can, practically speaking, say that the power is divided almost equally between legislators and staff members.

For instance, Senator Mike Mansfield, as the Majority Leader, has the last word; but Charles Ferris, 37, whose main responsibility is to Mansfield, can do many things his boss cannot. When the Democratic Policy Committee meets to decide which bills to let through for debate and when to let them come up, there is only one man who is sure

to have ready every bill or at least every committee report on the bills, and that one man isn't Mansfield, it's Ferris. A former physicist, graduate of Boston College Law School ('61), former Justice Department trial lawyer and since 1963 the chief counsel for the policy committee, Ferris has made himself indispensable, especially as a floor technician, to the Democratic party. When it comes to parliamentary tactics, most members of Congress are babes. No more than a dozen Senators know much about parliamentary procedure (most of these are Southerners, who are more interested in winning a point than in making an issue); the others would literally be lost if somebody like Ferris weren't there to advise them not merely on what the rules are but also on how to manipulate the rules to advantage. Sometimes, too, he helps members write amendments on the spot, and he is constantly telling them when to offer their amendments. "Timing is the key to much of this," he says. "I've seen many amendments get through that two hours earlier wouldn't have had a chance. The mood changes. Few Senators are on the floor for long periods, but I'm there most of the time and I can see the mood change." Knowing that he is constantly watching this pendulum, members side up to him all day.

There are plenty of exceptions, of course, and there are degrees of involvement, but as a rule it is the administrative assistants, the legislative assistants, the staff counsels and the staff economists—not the members—who think up the legislation, make the deals, listen to the lobbyists, keep the back-home political pipes flushed out, determine what mall the member sees and what he misses and determine who gets to see him and who has to settle for a flunky. They rewrite the Congressional Record to make their employers sound coherent. They write the immortal speeches, the magazine articles and books that carry their bosses' names (Senator William Proxmire recently remarked, "I was reading a book the other night . . ." and then decided that was not quite the way to speak of a work he was supposed to have written).

New pressures have increased the importance of the staff. Jerome N. Eller, Senator Eugene McCarthy's administrative assistant, has been around the Capitol long enough to retire and says almost seriously: "In 1948 we got letters. In 1954 we started getting wires. By 1959 it was telephone calls. And around 1964 people started showing up. Now you get here in the morning and you find people waiting." Understandably, this frightening development has resulted in the building of a higher and thicker dike of personnel. Most staffs have tripled in size in the last two decades. Of the aides at Eller's level McCarthy explains: "You need them for protection—to go to lunch for you."

The dike has become inhospitably thick. Shortly after the Cambodian invasion, a trainload of New York lawyers came to Washington to lobby for peace. There they were, many of them reeking of Wall Street retainers, carrying alligator briefcases and the best of credentials, a few of them even representing President Nixon's old law firm, and all buoyed up with the textbook innocence of those who think that Washington politicians welcome visits from solid citizens. In many offices they couldn't get beyond the pound-cake smile of the receptionist. Well, they can take comfort in knowing that even financial backers sometimes run into the same problems. Says one administrative assistant: "What I wouldn't give for a gal to sit out there and know on sight the difference between the Mr. Jones who is important to me and my boss and the Mr. Jones who has a sewer backed up."

One of the few outside pressures with a noticeably progressive effect on Congressional staffing has been the ascendancy of the executive branch. Since World War II, there

has been a sharp decline in the theoretical cooperation between the White House and Congress in war-making and treaty-making activities. When the Senate is asked for advice, the request usually arrives with deceptive or incomplete information, and when the Senate is asked for consent, it is usually after the fact.

Chairman William Fulbright and his sympathetic colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, being pretty rigidly orthodox, were slow to move until a lack of information had put them in a number of embarrassingly stupid positions. Finally, though, they shifted to a new concept, permitting the committee's staff to develop into Congress's own foreign service.

The committee now deals with the Pentagon and the State Department almost as one country with another; and before taking the word of any department on an important issue, the staff director, Carl Marcy, now dispatches his own "diplomatic" team to bring back independent data. Out go the staff investigators: William Bader (since moved to the Ford Foundation) to uncover the Pentagon's peddling of arms to underdeveloped countries or to try to reconstruct the steps by which the Senate got suckered into passing the Tonkin Gulf Resolution; James G. Lowenstein and Richard M. Moose, who put together last year's report on Vietnam and this year's report on Cambodia, and Walter Pincus, a troublesome bird of passage who moves back and forth between careers in journalism and government. He's the fellow who won awards in the early sixties for exposing the unsavory conduct of foreign agents in this country, and his was the hand that recently turned up the secret war in Laos and the hiring of mercenary troops to fight in Vietnam.

That last example is illustrative of Fulbright's work with the staff. He simply told Pincus to find out anything he could about the pseudo-diplomatic games generals play. So, with the help of Senator Stuart Symington, Pincus obtained a five-volume top-secret thing from the Pentagon that told, with as little candor and as much military assistance. Somehow Pincus managed to stay awake through the whole thing, and his vigilance was rewarded. He came upon an intriguing phrase—"Thal contingency plan."

How, Pincus asked, could we have a contingency plan with Thailand when we have no bilateral treaty with that country and contingency plans almost always hang from such treaties? That began the slow ritualistic process of trying to drag a full and candid response from the Pentagon. Letters went out. Several months later, letters came back with incomplete answers. Then more letters, both ways. The answer that finally emerged was: The agreement was made between our generals and Thailand without the advice or knowledge of Congress.

Like the State Department, the Fulbright committee has in recent years produced its own white papers—the "old myths and new realities" speech of March, 1964, something of a landmark at the time, which Fulbright later turned into a book; and the lectures Fulbright collected into a book with that catchy title Lyndon Johnson hated so much, "Arrogance of Power"; and the 83-page speech Fulbright made a couple of months ago, with considerable fanfare, suggesting that Israel be offered a mutual defense pact in return for pulling back from the territory seized in the 1967 war with the Arabs. They all sounded solidly professorial, as was natural, not because they were written by Fulbright, a former college president; they weren't. They were written by Seth Tillman, an assistant professor of political science at M.I.T. before he joined Fulbright nine years ago. He's one of the best speech writers around. Of course, Tillman demurs, "I don't want to be a goodie-goodie aide, but the

truth is that Fulbright had a great deal to do with those things."

Certainly, Rhodes scholars seldom sit still for total spoonfeeding. But the "great deal" usually consisted of Fulbright's having an idea or approving an idea proposed by Tillman or another staffer, then telling Tillman to "think it over"—which meant that in a couple of weeks or so, Tillman returned with the finished product, subject to Fulbright's editing, of course.

If it is true, as some claim, that the work load of the men and women of Congress has been doubling every five years, the accumulation does not seem to be measured so much by weight as by speed. In talking to aides one gets the feeling of desperate haste, of their bosses' rushing to keep ahead of some out-of-control machine. William B. Cherkasky, executive assistant to Senator Gaylord Nelson, says: "If somebody calls in here from another office and asks me to read a bill and see if Nelson would like to co-author it, I never call back. If he can't give me a brief oral description of the bill or a note describing it, forget it. I haven't got time to read bills." What's true for Cherkasky is twice as true for his and every other Senator.

Wes Barthelme, who has worked for two Senators and two Representatives, says: "The primary means of communication is by voice. Usually any memo or any piece of written matter that runs more than two pages they balk at. You haven't got a lot of academicians or scholars up here—they want to get it quick and fast. The one I work for now [Senator Frank Church], he's a real reader and very studious and well-read, but for the most part it's on the fly, it's cursory. Lots of things go by them that they catch in the corner of the eye, like a quarterback."

How else can a Senator from a major state operate? New York's Jacob Javits sits on seven committees and 19 subcommittees. He may be confronted with half a dozen hearings in a single morning; in which case, he becomes a political wraith, floating from one to another, usually giving none of them more than 30 minutes. He makes the best of an impossible situation by assigning an aide to each of the hearings to keep tabs. When Javits arrives, the staff man greets him with a fast summary of what's been done. Javits tries to push in a question out of turn, to make the record reflect the presence of a body, then he is off to the next meeting.

Meanwhile, the morning mail has brought a thousand or so letters from constituents (during the Cambodia debate the mail went up to several hundred thousands a day); political queries are coming in by phone from New York, and he has yet to review what he's going to say on the Senate floor.

But Javits will be saved by his faithful retainers. Among them: Charles Warren, a 1965 Columbia Law School graduate and former Wall Street lawyer who is chief legislative assistant. Doubtless anticipating his own future, Warren says that the turnover of aides under Javits is heavy because "you get ground down. You run out of ideas, and he loves ideas." Warren handles Javits's legislative schedule, recommends which committee hearings to attend, writes speeches and memos in the areas of housing, crime, Social Security, environment and taxation, gets the bills drafted in those fields, makes sure Javits knows what's coming up on the floor and what amendments he will offer, and, if Warren has time to spare, looks over the letters that have come in relating to his specialties.

There are still other delicacies to be considered, best described by oldtimes like Stewart McClure, who was with the late Senator Guy Gillette of Iowa before shifting to committee-staff work. "When you see an aide mumbling something over the shoulder to his Senator at a hearing," says McClure, "the range of the coaching can be indefinite. He certainly isn't always talking about the legislation. When the staff guy leans in, he's

likely to be saying, "That sure would work hell in Phoenix," or "The White House is hot for that." He's got to know the political input, what the lobbies are saying, what the constituent reaction is liable to be—as well as the content of bills."

The classic representation of aide-legislator relationship is the famous photo taken at the 1954 Army-McCarthy hearings: Roy Cohn, McCarthy's dour counsel, and his hand a conduit to his mentor's ear. Cohn may have been advising some official mischief about the investigation at hand; but he may just as easily have been telling McCarthy to show more of his left profile to the TV cameras. An aide must always be tuned to petty as well as lofty considerations.

William Welsh, now among those trying to shore up the Democratic National Committee but previously an assistant to Senators Herbert Lehman, Philip Hart and Hubert Humphrey, says: "The key to being an aide is to organize the flow of information. You can walk down the hall with Hart or Humphrey and say, 'These are the six things you have to remember—tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick.' And they'll remember every detail. But it wouldn't have done a damn bit of good to give them the information a week ahead.

"There is the process of putting things into the current framework, starting the recall process. 'Remember, Senator, three years ago we tried to get this bill through, and the situation has changed in these ways,' et cetera.

"Or you may say, 'If you get into a Q-and-A situation, I suggest you handle it in this way.' The Senator may argue like hell with you—maybe he really disagrees or maybe he's just testing the material.

"The most important thing I could do for Phil was to walk down the hall with him to a subcommittee hearing and say, 'While you're there, take this up with so-and-so and get us a reading on this.' Much of the Senate work is done on a one-to-one basis. Some things simply can't be accomplished on the staff level or in writing.

"There are some very basic guideposts. The channel has markers on it, which an aide begins to understand in terms of a politician's philosophy, his ethics, his relationships with other Senators, the realities of his home state, other irons he has in the fire. And there are two other things you've got to remember. These guys are human, they're tired and they have families. Also, you have to understand that the Founding Fathers set up this Government machinery in such a way as to keep things from happening—to keep the President from becoming king—or otherwise you'd go out of your bloody mind."

Other things may nearly drive an aide to that point. "You're sitting there on a stool beside the Senator during debate," says McClure, "and boy, oh boy, sometimes they won't listen to you and they make an ass of themselves and you have to fix up The Record. And after you fix your Senator's mistakes, you may have to call the staff of the other Senator and say, 'How about changing your guy to saying something else so my guy will make sense?' You're not supposed to correct the contents of The Record, but we do—it's better than having the wrong thing in there because the courts use it for guidance.

"Maybe the Senator has been to lunch with a constituent and he's come in late and he hasn't seen the bill for six months, and you have to fill him in fast. Whether he listens depends on whether he has confidence in you or wants to play god. Usually everything is moving so fast in debate he has to trust you. You just say, 'Look here' and stick the information in front of him and brief him in a phrase, and he catches on and goes boom, boom, boom.

"These guys are smart. They catch on fast. Maybe there aren't as many experts as there

used to be—Bob Taft used to read the Treasury's report at 7 o'clock every morning, and that kind of expertise seems to be losing ground—but all of the members are smart just by osmosis. It's almost impossible not to know a lot around here."

And while that advisory approach is common, there are exceptions. Miss Frances Henderson, administrative aide to Senator Clifford Case, says: "He does not like to be whispered at during debate."

Members of the House, who generally are expected to be familiar with the legislation of only one important committee, have more time to do their own thinking, reading and writing. This is especially evident when they confront Senators to haggle over bills in conference.

When the Federal aid to higher education bill reached a conference committee in 1963, an aide who was on hand recalls: "The House members weren't John Dewey's, but they knew what was in the bill. On the contrary, the Senators simply didn't. The Senators started turning to education-committee staffers and asking them questions. 'What's the definition of a life science?' or 'How many dollars are in that bill?' And pretty soon Senate aides like Jack Forsythe and Charlie Lee, edging up so they could hear the questions better, would find themselves up at the conference table instead of deferentially three paces to the rear. In fact we hadn't held many sessions before they were carrying on negotiations with the House. At one point, I remember, Mrs. [Edith] Green asked 'Senator Lee, do you mind if I ask Senator Morse a question directly?'"

Loyalty—which appears to be genuine and unfeigned with all the important aides—has its dangers. At one end it frazzles out in a kind of servility. The administrative aide for a New England Senator says: "I don't think you should have an opinion different from your boss's. I have no right to an opinion. I don't have any opinion before he announces his own, and after that his opinion is mine."

At the other end, the staffer passes beyond loyalty and begins to see himself as the Congressman or Senator. "They enjoy saying 'I'm introducing such-and-such bill today,'" says Eller. "They don't even say 'we.' Or they may be generous enough to include their boss by saying something like, 'Ned Kenworthy is covering us this week.' Kennedy guys are prone to say 'we' and 'us.'"

It can take a nasty turn, as illustrated in the career of Martin Sweig, who for a generation was the administrative assistant to House Speaker John W. McCormack and not only spoke too often for him but enjoyed imitating McCormack on the phone when talking to agency officials he wanted to impress. Sweig is now appealing a conviction for perjury.

Two Washington Post reporters, Richard Harwood and Laurence Stern, who have covered the Capitol for years, believe that the Sweigs and the Bobby Bakers are not uncommon. "Quite often," they have written, "these unknown 'public' servants become shadow Senators and Congressmen for private-interest groups—businesses, unions, industrial lobbying groups, churches, Government agencies, sometimes even foreign powers."

One reason you don't read more stories about aides fronting for special-interest groups is that a lot of Washington reporters wouldn't agree with Harwood and Stern. Jerry Landauer, who covered the Capitol for two years for United Press International and for four years for The Wall Street Journal, says: "That sounds awfully exaggerated to me. I'm not acquainted with many aides on the House side, but over the years I've known a couple of dozen really well on the Senate side, and at the moment I can't think of any that would fit that category. They're shadow Senators, all right—some of them are Senators—they make key decisions and so forth, but not for churches and foreign states."

William K. Wyant, who makes the rounds for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "I'm pretty selective, I guess. In the fields I cover and the aides I deal with, I find most are on the side of the angels, by my definition. And often the surrogates are far better than the men they're working for."

When aides do front habitually for special-interest groups, it is probably because this, too, is an extension of their employers' positions. Otherwise the odds are they would be spotted and fired. As another newsman put it, "The politicians around here worth talking about are strong-minded men, continually sniffing the air for hostiles. That's how they got here. They're very wary, of their staffs as well as others. They've been burned a number of times, they've been ambushed—and most of them are pretty skeptical."

Until the Senate recently changed the rules to avoid what appeared to be a drift toward corruption, pushy aides could in fact sign their Senators' names to special-interest bills and drop them in the hopper without their bosses knowing. The results were sometimes embarrassing, occasionally funny. One young lady from Senator Nelson's staff, motivated by conservationist impulses, signed his name to a bill that would have turned the famous tourist spa, Catalina Island, off the coast of California, into a national park. When then Senator Thomas Kuchel learned of that, he threatened to introduce a bill that would have made the entire state of Wisconsin a national park.

The closest relationships and the most comfortable transfers of power seem to occur between those lawmakers and aides who started out together in pre-Washington politics, pairings like Senator Birch Bayh and Robert Keefe, or Harold Hughes and Park Rlnard, or Edmund Muskie and Don Nicoll. Nicoll met Muskie in 1954, the year Muskie first ran for Governor of Maine and Nicoll became secretary of the state Democratic party. After a tour on a House staff, Nicoll moved to Muskie's office in 1960 and became his administrative aide in 1962. "I have to commit him sometimes without talking to him, but there's no question about who casts the votes and who's got the best political judgment," says Nicoll. "The most difficult thing an aide does is learning to draw the line of his authority. He's in a position of enormous power and the temptation is to say, 'I know what should be done.' It's easy to fall into the trap of thinking you can make decisions you shouldn't make."

A lobbyist who once served a Western Senator for 14 years says: "You're the Senator's alter ego in 60 to 70 percent of the work. And even when he has to make the decisions, he'll do only that much and tell you, 'You handle it from here on.' Some of the assistants get mixed up and begin upstaging the boss. It's easier to see from the outside looking in. The Senator isn't aware of it because the assistant's demeanor is different around the boss, and an outsider, especially a lobbyist, isn't going to say to the Senator, 'Hey, your aide is upstaging you.'"

The most striking contrast in approaches to upstaging is between the top men on the two armed services committees. In the Senate this is Ed Braswell, who is an extremely potent influence in his own right but shies from publicity. It was reportedly Braswell who, by persuading Chairman John Stennis, got the Senate committee to block further defense authorizations for equipment to be used in Cambodia beyond the sanctuaries—an unexpected support for the doves who wanted to close down our part of the Cambodian operation.

Braswell's counterpart is John R. Blandford, in whom staff omnipotence—if not upstaging—reaches its zenith. Blandford is the 52-year-old chief counsel of the House Armed Services Committee, a tough-talking Marine Corps Reserve general who has been given carte blanche by committee Chair-

man Mendel Rivers, Blandford, born in Buffalo, graduated from Hobart College cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa, in 1939, served with the Marines in South Pacific hot spots during World War II and got his Yale law degree in 1946. He joined the committee staff the next year and has run it since 1963. "I find it hard to imagine the Armed Services Committee operating without him," says Rivers. "I think it's safe to say that he knows more about the armed services than any one in the Pentagon—or anywhere else around Washington." Blandford has much the same opinion of himself. Washington newsmen have noticed that in photos of the committee Blandford is always in the center, with other staffers gathered at his feet like disciples. It is commonplace for him to scold Congressmen who seem vaguely to criticize River's actions, and he has been known to upbraid Cabinet officials, too, for veering from the Rivers line. He warned Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans Jr. that if the Secretary failed to support the development of the F-5 with money, "you are liable to wind up supporting it out of your own hide." As for newsmen, their questions are sometimes turned away with: "I answer to Mr. Rivers, not to the public."

For the most part, though, top aides seem to settle for the kick of building up their employers, getting headlines for them. It is done quite calculatingly.

Vic Reinecker, Senator Lee Metcalf's executive assistant, is in the midst of a propaganda drive aimed at a new plan to bring private utilities—telephone, electric, gas companies—under tighter regulation. "Now, winning that in a fight with the most powerful corporations in the country," says Reinecker, "is obviously a long-term project. Our timetable is to bring it to fruition in 1973. I've got a list of 1,200 names—newspapers, consumer groups, state legislators, etc.—and we keep our stuff going to them. I got my idea from Joe McCarthy. Sitting on The Charlotte News desk in the McCarthy days, I saw how the McCarthy frank was educating the press. It showed me how a lot of people were getting their information."

Welsh recalls that when he began to set up Hart in the Senate, "We went in to him and said, 'Here are the kinds of things you can build a reputation on. Here are the long-term investments—you won't accomplish them in one or two years.' What I was able to do for Senator Hart was to say to him, 'No matter what committee assignments you get, we'll make good use of them.' Well, there he was sitting on the Agriculture Committee with Eastland and Holland—hardly the likeliest company—but we carved out an area for him in conservation and school lunches and the food programs.

"I remember one day we were sitting around the office and trying to figure out how to use Kefauver's offer to let Hart chair a few antitrust subcommittee hearings. We wanted to cut out a new area for him. Somebody wandered in with an article from the Consumers Union magazine and said, 'How about this?' It was about consumer packaging. [Former Senator Paul] Douglas has already coined truth-in-lending. So we came up with truth-in-packaging."

The fellow who wandered in with the clipping was Jerry S. Cohen, later chief counsel to the Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee and now a private attorney in Washington. As Welsh said, it turned out to be a long-term project; Cohen worked on it for the next five years, but it paid in newspaper space.

Former Senator Maurine Neuberger gets public credit for the cigarette-label warning: staffers say the mastermind was Michael Pertschuk, 37, a Yale law graduate who is now chief counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee. Senator Nelson gets credit for leading the fight that blocked the intrusion of the world's largest jetport into Everglades

National Park; it was John Heritage, formerly a conservation writer on The Minneapolis Tribune and now one of Nelson's five legislative aides, who talked him into taking on the fight and led him through it. Senator Proxmire is credited with the law that permits civil-defense agencies to give their millions of dollars in stockpiled drugs to nonprofit institutions rather than burning them (it took five years to get that law); the aide who thought up the project was Tom van der Voort. Senator Russell Long got quite a reputation as a man of the people by tying amendments to appropriations bills to prevent the giving away of Government-sponsored developments to private industry; the man who steered him into and through these fights—including the famous, futile filibuster to prevent the Government's space communications program from being looted by private industry—was Ben Gordon, staff economist on the Small Business Committee who for years was known sardonically around the Capitol as Long's "man for populism." Just about every lively staff has such a proud ghost, which is to be expected; that's what they're hired for.

The C-5A budgetary debacle became a public affair on Nov. 13, 1968, when Senator Proxmire, in a hearing held by the Joint Economic Committee, asked of Ernie Fitzgerald, a Deputy Assistant Air Force Secretary, "Is it true that the costs of that contract will be approximately \$2-billion more than was originally estimated and agreed on?" Fitzgerald at first fudged, saying, "I don't believe that that is a correct figure for any single contract." But Proxmire kept hammering away, and eventually Fitzgerald conceded that the C-5A contract cost overrun might be 100 per cent. Then he kept talking to the point that he was fired and became one of the second-team heroes of the anti-Pentagonists.

The real hero of this episode, however, was a truncated, curly-headed staff economist by the name of Richard Kaufman whose coaching of Senator Proxmire has transformed the Joint Economic Committee—though it has no legislative powers—into Washington's best substitute for a real military-program watchdog.

In May, 1968, Proxmire told Kaufman he was tired of piddling around with paint-up, fix-up hearings and wanted to really squeeze some of the big military-hardware programs to look for waste. When Kaufman moved on to the Pentagon, he ran into the expected counterattack. Twelve officials took him into a conference room and worked him over with charts, graphs, slides and a pep talk on the excellence of the total package-procurement concept. Kaufman kept interrupting with questions steering them back toward the C-5A; they said if he didn't want to listen, they had other things to do. Over the next five months Kaufman kept poking around. He found some Pentagon officials willing to talk a little, fitting together scraps from here and there and shortly before the November hearing that broke everything open, was convinced—and convinced Proxmire—that the overrun might indeed reach \$2-billion, the biggest budgetary goof for one item in Pentagon history. Thus Proxmire's question.

Considering the size of its debts and the chaos of its management, the Penn Central Railroad would probably have foundered anyway, but its failure to get an anticipated \$200-million loan under the Defense Production Act doubtless speeded the bankruptcy process. The Congressman most responsible for throwing the switch was Wright Patman, the politely cantankerous member from Texarkana. He kept jawing so loud about the illegality of the loan that finally President Nixon, at least partly motivated by the desire to shut Patman up, decreed that no loan would be made.

But Patman's role should be clarified; on this occasion he fits Senator Williams's description of an old member, leaking steam,

who is pumped up again by ingenious aides. Earlier on the day Nixon made the decision to refuse the loan, Pennsy officials, including the company president, Paul Gorman, had met with Patman in a last-ditch effort to win him to their side. With Patman in that meeting were four of his men, including Dr. Paul Nelson, staff director of the Banking Committee, and Jake Lewis, best described as a Patman troubleshooter. Nelson and Lewis are as populist as Patman and are longer in the tooth.

The Penn Central officials came away with a strong inkling of what had been going on. "Patman and his staff absolutely licked their chops," one railroad man told a reporter. "It was a complete farce. Nobody lost their temper, but Patman's staff was especially provocative."

The railroaders might have been even more furious with the staffers if they had known that Patman's intransigence was to a great degree their handiwork. A week earlier, after Patman first learned of the railroad's troubles and was told about the pending \$200-million Federal loan, he had not been ready to take any action that could bring down on his head the blame for crushing one of the nation's major corporations. Then Nelson and Lewis began to work on him, reminding him that this was a once-in-a-populist-lifetime chance to show the decadence of big business. Patman, under their haranguing, was soon Patman once again.

The most impressive effort since World War II to whittle the Pentagon budget began—if a movement so sprawling can be said to have a precise genesis—in a memorandum William Miller, Senator John Cooper's special assistant for foreign affairs, passed to the Senator one day during the military-appropriation debate of late 1968. Miller, who had come to Cooper's staff from the State Department says: "I had got very interested in the ABM after I had talked to one of its inventors and he said it wouldn't work like the Administration said." Miller's memo suggested that an amendment be introduced to delay deployment until the Pentagon could prove that the device would perform as the generals claimed and that it would cost what they said it would cost. Cooper scribbled one on the spot.

The amendment lost, 31 to 28, but losing that narrowly in a challenge to the sacred Pentagon budget was as electrifying as Billy Conn's lasting 13 rounds with Joe Louis. Suddenly it seemed that something might be won after all. Members on both sides of Congress began squeezing into their schedules meetings with anti-Pentagon science experts. Seminars on military gadgets were started for the Congressional aides.

John Holum, who handles this area for Senator George McGovern, recalls: "By developing a competence on the ABM, members and their staffs saw that the issue of arms wasn't that complicated. It could be understood. One of the things that had held members back was that they had not wanted to be made a fool of by Stennis."

"We felt that we had discovered ABM by accident, and that if it was that bad, other weapons systems must be worse."

Hart, Cooper, Church, McGovern, Goodell, Hatfield and like-minded Senators are the names the public will remember from the debates to cut back or delete funds for the B-1 bomber, the nuclear aircraft carriers, the main battle tank, MIRV and military manpower; but in a way just as responsible for the budgetary putsch were these aides from the Senate and House: Wes Michaelson, Steve Engelberg, Steve Vossmeier, Sam Black, Peter Stockton, Robert Sherman, Holum and Miller. They prepared the arguments.

It started something. Congressional staffs ordinarily are as isolated as mountaineer families, but "in the wake of the military budget fight," says Holum, "there's been a lot more getting together on any legislation,

the Vietnam amendment, hunger, the Supreme Court fights. Twenty-five or thirty aides will turn out for these affairs to trade information."

Their near-anonymity prevents staff men from becoming legends, but some are treated with considerable awe. Like Ben Stong and John Blair. Stong, a former editor of The Knoxville Times, whose brother, Phil Stong, wrote "State Fair," is the wise man on the Hill on farm matters, and he used to be one of the big guns on water resources and conservation. It was his unseen hand that kept pushing former Senator James E. Murray and Senator Clint Anderson through seven years of hearings that resulted in the Wilderness Act, setting aside 14 million acres to be preserved in their original state.

McGovern became leader of the farm bloc by one thoughtful action—he hired Stong for his staff. Then Congressman John Melcher got to sponsor the coalition farm bill in his freshman year simply by hiring Stong away from McGovern.

Although Blair was dumped earlier this year in an intraoffice feud, after which he retired to a scholarly roost in the Library of Congress, he must still be considered a ghost staffer; there are plenty of Congressional offices that can't break the habit of calling him for advice on economic subtleties.

Quarrelsome—"impossible" is the way some former colleagues describe him—Blair was chief economist for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee. When he came to Washington in 1938 carrying a B.A. degree from Tulane, he fell in with what Spiro Agnew would call a bad crowd—"radical liberals" like Maury Maverick Sr. and Gardiner Means. In those days some of the important men around Washington still thought they could actually force big capital to be competitive and could do away with endemic price-fixing and the like. After a variety of so-so bureaucratic jobs, Blair went to work for Senator Estes Kefauver. Over the next 13 years Blair became a hated figure to many in the business world as he called on the carpet such men as Roger Blough of U.S. Steel, George Romney of American Motors and John Connor of Merck—uncovering 1,000 per cent markups in drug prices, automobile parts of fraudulent quality and collusion in the oil industry which Blair says costs the consumer \$7-billion a year. Hearings he put together and directed fill 41 volumes, a total of 24,614 pages. After Kefauver died in 1963 and Hart took over the chairmanship, the fun of assaulting errant capitalists was apparently never again quite the same for Blair, although it was in the Hart period that he did some of his most impressive studies of the concentration of economic power.

Blair believes the character of Congressional staffs has changed for the worse. Disappearing, he says, are the "oldtime, intractable, dedicated, difficult staffers who say, 'Goddammit it, no!' to their bosses. Today we're getting coze creeping up to the top. The new staffers aren't dumb and they aren't yes men. They're sharp. But they are imbued with the idea that they are more skillful politicians than their bosses. They temporize where he wouldn't. It is a 180-degree change from what the attitude was when I first came. That is the one principal reason why today you are getting such little leadership."

But for all their faults, says John Blair—who has lectured at European universities and, while there, poked around in the machinery of other legislative bodies—the staffs on Capitol Hill are unique.

"There is a heartfelt need by members of all other parliamentary bodies—in Germany, France, England—for what exists only in the Congress of the United States," he says. "Those bodies are rubber stamps. If a member is with the Government, he votes for the Government's legislation. If he isn't, he doesn't. They would like to make contributions of their own. They can't because

they don't have staffs. The U.S. has—in a way that hasn't been recognized anywhere in print that I know of—responded correctly to what is an absolute necessity for a technological age: a competent staff."

That appraisal of the U.S. response is not shared unanimously. The executive assistant of a Western Senator thinks staff competence is highly overrated. "It's not bad enough that the Senators rely so totally on us," he says. "We rely on the executive branch's bureaucracy downtown. I can't tell you if we need a bill for V.A. benefits until I check with the Veterans Administration. We make hundreds of calls a day to the agencies. All these bills are so complex we can't understand them without help from the bureaucrats. At the conference-committee hearing on an education bill, say, somebody is constantly running out in the hall to ask one of the H.E.W. finkies hanging around the door to call down and find out what a particular formula means. We're in their hands. There's only one branch of Government—the executive."

A legislative assistant for a Midwest Senator adds: "It's unusual for the staff to take on a deep study of anything. Congress is quite an accidental institution. Its oversight duties are a joke."

Another Midwestern aide is particularly depressed by the fact that "we are least prepared in the area of most importance—the budget. The only place to get information is from the appropriations subcommittees that handle the various sections of the budget, and each chairman holds everything in his fist. Have you ever seen an appropriations bill? Well, it's a monstrous riddle, and two days after it comes out of committee it's up for a floor vote. You're flying by the seat of your pants. You hope that whoever is handling it knows what he's doing, is protecting the party and the people. But God help you as to finding a way to brief your Senator on it."

Granting the accumulative evidence of the presence of bright, imaginative staffers, the production of Congress also indicates that more often than not both management and labor are grossly over-rewarded. Let us, for laughs, illustrate with the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Aside from periodically changing the Foreign Assistance Act and the Peace Corps Act, the committee has considered what its survey of activities calls "a wide range of critical world problems," such as a resolution favoring active participation by Federal agencies in the Ninth International Congress on High-Speed Photography and a resolution to pay our share of the U.S.-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship. Assisting the committee in its deliberation of these profound topics is a staff of 12. Three are paid \$35,505 a year; one gets \$33,835; two \$33,342, and the others \$25,970, \$24,822, \$22,084, \$20,291, \$19,708 and \$16,281. The top five salaries are more than Congressmen earned two years ago. Drop by the committee offices in the Rayburn Office Building sometime and observe, if you can, the activity these salaries inspire.

Traditionally Congressional payrolls have given our lawmakers a chance to show that they are friendly folk, eager to do favors for colleagues and, sometimes, for their own families.

A former Veterans Administration official who had allowed his pension rights to lapse 20 years earlier was fixed up with a sinecure by Speaker McCormack for a few months so that he could revive his pension and go home to Massachusetts to live it out.

Representative James Collins of Dallas carried a Texan on his payroll at \$1,008 a month while the young man completed his final quarter at Stanford University, in Palo Alto, Calif. "There was nothing illegal about it. I checked. He was supposed to be working for me out there," says Collins. "But I'm not sure just what he did. He reported to my administrative assistant. I understand

that's the way offices are supposed to be run." The long-distance staffer never did get to Washington, or even to Collin's Dallas office; after graduating, he went into other employment.

Congressman Otto Passman assured me that relatives are sometimes the very best people for staff jobs. He hired his brother, Otis, at \$9,212 to handle the work in one of his Louisiana district offices because "much of the area is too rough to ask a woman to travel around for you, and the man I hired turned out to be a drunk who was sticking my mail pouches in the back end of a garage and forgetting about them. Well, I never had hired a relative before, but I asked a local banker and the local TV station if they thought it would be all right and they thought I would be stupid not to."

Congressman Samuel Friedel of Maryland, Chairman of the House Administration Committee, through which all House staffing must be processed, has been one of the most effective wardheelers, placing friends on payrolls all over Capitol Hill. Among the Friedel staff names worth mentioning are David Mandel (\$20,276), who is an uncle of Maryland's Governor, Marvin Mandel, and Suzanne Hays (\$7,643), the niece of Congressman Wayne Hays of Ohio. Now that Congressman Friedel has been turned out by the voters, Congressman Hays is scheduled to take the chairmanship and will be in a position to return the favor.

But money and cushiness are not the only attractions of committee staffs. Some also offer travel. Congressman Rivers sent five of his secretaries on a Government junket for two weeks in Spain, Italy, Germany and England. The rationale was that during their three days in Spain they would investigate "dependent's housing." When journalists asked to see the secretaries' report, Rivers said it couldn't be shown for national security reasons. When Congressman Barrett O'Hara was dumped by Illinois voters two years ago, the 86-year-old Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Africa decided he would take one more inspection tour abroad for his country. So—accompanied by the several staff members who could tear themselves away from writing resolutions—he spent two fun months touring South Africa, Somalia, Malagasy, Senegal and Guinea.

It is probably this kind of thoughtfulness that accounts for whatever efficiency exists on some of the staffs of the 300 or so committees and subcommittees (the count may be low; they keep splitting like amoebae). As for the personal office force, if work is sometimes required, the lawmakers are not ungrateful. Or at least they aren't often ungrateful. But Jim Haught had his doubts. Haught was a top reporter for The Charleston Gazette in West Virginia when he was recruited to be the legislative aide for Senator Robert Byrd. "One weekend when I was cutting Senator Byrd's lawn," Haught recollects, "and I had just been given orders to return the next weekend to wallpaper the hall, I decided it was time to give my old editor another chance."

More often, however, the satisfactions are like those arising from the relationship between Eller and McCarthy. When McCarthy leaves the Senate at the end of this session, Eller will retire also. He has served his master well, as McCarthy concedes: "Jerry's been a good aide—I guess—I never had any other. But I didn't exploit him. He's going out with as good a liver as he came in with."

Which, at the staff level, may be an excellent measure of what the Founding Fathers had in mind.

#### RECORD OF THE 91ST CONGRESS IN THE FIELD OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from



Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the 91st Congress has been a long one, and only history can be the true judge of its legislative accomplishments. Today, however, I wish to review only the field of anticrime legislation. As we all know, from its early days this Congress received a number of clear and urgent requests from the executive branch for the enactment of specific legislation to combat various aspects of crime. What happened to these requests will be the subject of my discussion.

#### ORGANIZED CRIME

On April 23, 1969, the President advised us of his concern with deep penetration of organized crime into broad segments of American life. In his first major crime message, President Nixon indicated that the Attorney General had delineated a need for new legislation in this area, and urged swift action on his proposals. While it would be stretching the word to describe our subsequent actions as "swift," I believe we were ultimately responsive when we presented the President with the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970—Public Law 91-452.

In his message, the President asked for a broad general witness immunity law, to enable the Government to obtain the testimony of recalcitrant witnesses, especially in organized crime cases. Title II of the act contains such a provision. The act, in title V, also authorizes the Attorney General to provide facilities to protect witnesses who fear to testify due to intimidation.

The President also asked for legislation making it a Federal crime to participate in a large-scale illegal gambling business, or to obstruct the enforcement of State or local criminal laws with the intent to facilitate an illegal gambling business. Title VIII of the act enacted these measures.

The organized crime message asked for the enactment of the new procedural remedies contained in S. 30, the proposed Organized Crime Control Act of 1969. All of the procedural provisions of that original bill were approved by the Congress and are contained in the new law.

President Nixon asked for the development of legislation to prevent the infiltration of organized crime into fields of legitimate business, and to apply the theories underlying our antitrust laws as weapons in this effort. Title IX of the act provides these measures.

The President asked for the enactment of the wagering tax amendments, to reinstate the tax on wagers as an organized crime measure. This measure, H.R. 322, was passed by this body on December 22, 1970, and is on the Senate Calendar.

#### DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

When the President proposed his 10-step plan for combating drug abuse on July 14, 1969, he selected as the No. 1 item new statutory tools. He indicated that the Attorney General would forward to Congress a comprehensive proposal to improve and update the inadequate and outmoded drug control laws then in existence. He also revealed that the Attorney General would submit an interim measure to close a gap in the Marihuana

Tax Act which, because of a Supreme Court decision, made Federal prosecutions for marihuana possession impossible.

While the interim proposal never was enacted, the comprehensive revision did take place in a manner fully acceptable to the administration. The Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970—Public Law 91-513—which became law on October 26, 1970, contains the requested modernization in the form of streamlined drug control procedures, more rational penalties, and more effective law enforcement tools. It also obviated the need for any interim changes in the Marihuana Tax Act by eliminating the power to tax the basis for drug control legislation, relying instead on the power to regulate interstate commerce. In enacting this measure, the Congress also added increased authorizations for funding in the areas of education and treatment.

Although the legislative course followed by this comprehensive drug control act was an arduous one, and many frustrations were encountered along the way by all parties involved, the major reforms it brings to the law should enable the administration to take the appropriate steps to control this serious national problem.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME

Shortly after taking office, President Nixon made a statement calling for major revisions of the criminal justice system in the District of Columbia. In response to that call the Department of Justice submitted a package of legislation to the Congress on July 11, 1969. This package was signed into law as the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970—Public Law 91-358. Among the many revisions this law makes in the District of Columbia criminal justice system are:

Creation of a new Superior Court of the District of Columbia which will have jurisdiction over all local civil and criminal matters over which the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Tax Court, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia now have jurisdiction;

Designation of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals as the highest court of the District of Columbia;

Revision and codification of the criminal procedure code;

Revision of the juvenile procedure code to state clearly the rights of juveniles and their parents in all types of juvenile proceedings;

Authorization to judges to consider danger of a criminal defendant in setting pretrial release conditions and to detain certain dangerous defendants up to 60 days prior to trial after a hearing with procedural safeguards—legislation to accomplish this purpose in the entire Federal court system was introduced in the House July 14, 1969 as H.R. 12806, and hearings were held, but no further action was taken;

Expansion of the functions of the District of Columbia Bail Agency to include supervision of criminal defendants released prior to trial; and

Expansion of the District of Columbia Legal Air Agency into a full-fledged Public Defender Service capable of representing up to 60 percent of the criminal defendants unable to afford adequate representation and assisting in the preparation of defenses for the remaining 40 percent of these defendants.

#### OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL

Early in 1970, the administration submitted legislation to strengthen the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which was established by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This agency is the focal point of the Federal effort to reduce crime on a nationwide basis. The Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970, which is awaiting the President's signature is the amended version of that legislation and incorporates all of the major features of the original bill.

The act makes specific provision for the improvement of correctional programs throughout the country. Federal assistance in funding and planning support will enable many of our States and units of local government to achieve greatly needed improvements in the treatment of offenders. We know that this aspect of our battle against crime cannot be overemphasized when one considers the current recidivism rate. Renovation of programs as corrections facilities should result in a sharp reduction in that rate.

#### EXPLOSIVE LEGISLATION

Following the President's statement of March 25, 1970, on bombings and bomb threats, the administration sent to the Congress two measures designed to help deal with this menace: a bill to broaden the scope of and increase the penalties under existing Federal law which prohibits the transport of explosives across State lines for illegal purposes; and a bill to make explosive materials less accessible to criminal elements by regulating the importation, manufacture, sale, and storage of explosives.

After the antibombing bill was amended, as later requested by the President, to cover campus bombings, both measures were added to the Organized Crime Control Act, and enacted as title XI of that act.

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT AMENDMENTS

While not the subject of an initial message by the President, the administration nevertheless endorsed and urged the passage of a proposal to amend the Criminal Justice Act of 1964. That act was originally enacted to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.

The proposed amendment recognized the limited nature of the original act and took into account the judicial broadening of the right to counsel since 1964. The President urged the passage of this proposal, as well as other bills dealing with crime, in his message to Congress of September 11, 1970. The measure was enacted and became Public Law 91-447 on October 14, 1970. This was a truly significant step in insuring adequate representation for criminal defendants who are indigent, a step which improved the quality of criminal jus-

tice in America. The new law broadens the applicability of the act to situations not originally covered, such as parole revocation hearings, habeas corpus proceedings, and other collateral actions affecting the rights of criminal defendants. It also permits more adequate compensation of court appointed counsel and provides for the establishment of public defender organizations in those districts where the volume of criminal cases is heavy.

#### CRIMINAL APPEALS ACT

On October 29, 1969, the Congress received from the Justice Department a proposal which would amend the Criminal Appeals Act to permit the Government to appeal all adverse decisions in criminal cases which are not judgments of acquittal. It also was designed to facilitate appeals by the Government by permitting more appeals to be taken to a court of appeals rather than directly to the Supreme Court. This proposal subsequently was enacted as title III of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 now awaiting Presidential approval.

#### FOREIGN DIGNITARY PROTECTION

Information regarding abuses to some of our national symbols led the administration to propose legislation providing increased protection for the great seal of the United States and the Presidential and Vice Presidential seals against misrepresentative use and commercial exploitation. This proposal passed the House and then, in the Senate, was amended to include another administration proposal authorizing the Secret Service to protect visiting foreign dignitaries. This amendment was agreed to by the House and cleared for the President on December 21 and will be signed into law shortly.

#### FEDERAL YOUTH CORRECTIONS ACT

In March 1970, the Department of Justice submitted a proposal to facilitate the procedures for consideration of youthful offenders by the U.S. Board of Parole by permitting hearings before hearing examiners. This measure was enacted into law on July 17, 1970 as Public Law 91-339.

#### OBSCENITY LEGISLATION

In May of 1969, the President called upon the Congress to enact three measures in response to the stringent objections of citizens concerned about the caliber of the material being delivered to their homes. Hundreds of thousands of letters have been received by executive agencies and Members of Congress protesting the unsolicited delivery of salacious materials to persons who do not want to receive them and who are offended by their blatant appeals.

Yet, two of the President's proposals—H.R. 11031 and H.R. 11032—have not been enacted. These measures—to protect children from materials which may be harmful to them and to proscribe unsolicited salacious advertisements—have long awaited congressional approval. This approval has been withheld in spite of the fact that nearly 300 bills on this subject have been introduced in this Congress.

One of the administration's bills, and an important one, was enacted, as an amendment to the Postal Reorganization Act. This measure will allow postal pa-

trons to reject all sexually oriented advertisements by filing such a request with their postmasters. This is an important step, but it is not an adequate solution to the total problem.

#### SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT

In September 1969, the administration proposed to increase from \$50,000 to \$500,000 the maximum fine which may be imposed for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

At the time the present fine schedule was enacted, the maximum fine was reasonable. Presently, however, it is hardly a deterrent to corporate violations of the antitrust laws. Unfortunately, the Congress has failed to enact this legislation.

#### CONCLUSION

This summary reflects a record of accomplishment in which I am honored to have played a minor role. At a period in our history when concern with crime and criminal justice has reached an all-time high among the general population, I believe the 91st Congress as well as the administration will be remembered for the forthright and progressive legislative steps it has taken to provide criminal legislation to meet one of the chief concerns of the Nation. While the full effects of these laws may not be felt for some time, it is safe to say that in this legislative area, we have outdone any other Congress in history with the measures we have enacted.

This is not to say, however, that we may rest on our laurels. Our work is not done. As our methods in detection and prevention of crime improve, the criminal element grows ever more resourceful and devious. There are still more effective measures left to be conceived, drafted, and enacted.

Not the least among these are corrections reform and new, more imaginative techniques of prisoner rehabilitation.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 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. In 1969 Americans owned twice as many clothesdryers and three times as many dishwashers as they did in 1960.

#### MAIL ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most Members of the House are familiar with the effort by the National League of Families to gather 100 tons of mail on behalf of our American prisoners of war and send it to the North Vietnamese delegation at the Paris peace conference. This effort has been highly successful and today at 12:30 represent-

atives of the National League of Families—three brothers of servicemen now being held captive, also Lt. Bob Frishman, former American POW—will be on the Capitol steps to gain the signatures of Members of Congress for this humanitarian effort.

The growing voice of worldwide public opinion has had a definite effect on the North Vietnamese. The last few weeks have witnessed an increased amount of news about our POW's. My visit on December 22 and December 23 with officials of the North Vietnamese Embassy in Vientiane, Laos, proved beyond a doubt that world opinion does influence the North Vietnamese.

I can think of no better way to close the 91st Congress than for each Member to evidence his concern for our POW's by joining with me in signing the petition of the American League of Families.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POFF, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALES, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BRADEMAs to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. RHODES) to follow the remarks of Mr. ALBERT today in paying tribute to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Mr. DORN, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, today, for 15 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, today, for 15 minutes, and to include extraneous matter.

### 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. 370. 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;

H.R. 6562. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to beer, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7626. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, sirups, and molasses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15628. An act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15728. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16199. An act to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to accelerate the collection of estate and gift taxes, to continue excise taxes on passenger automobiles and communications services; and for other purposes;

H.R. 17068. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for aircraft manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under temporary importation bond, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide floor stock refunds in the case of cement mixers.

H.R. 17917. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period of qualification of certain union-negotiated pension plans;

H.R. 17984. An act to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969;

H.R. 17988. An act to amend section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow aircraft to be leased for temporary use outside the United States without a recapture of the investment credit;

H.R. 18549. An act to amend sections 902 (b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 10 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 10-percent test is met;

H.R. 18693. An act to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the treatment of certain losses sustained by reason of the confiscation of property by the government of Cuba;

H.R. 19113. An act to provide for the free entry of a 61-note cast bell carillon and a 42-note subsidiary cast bell carillon for the use of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.;

H.R. 19172. An act 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;

H.R. 19242. An act to amend section 278 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend its application from citrus groves to almond groves;

H.R. 19369. An act to amend section 165(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities;

H.R. 19391. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions;

H.R. 19470. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the nursing service requirement and certain other requirements which an institution must meet in order to qualify as a hospital thereunder so as to make such requirements more realistic insofar as they apply to smaller institutions;

H.R. 19562. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain statutory mergers;

H.R. 19567. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968;

H.R. 19627. An act to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income;

H.R. 19670. An act to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until the close of December 31, 1973;

H.R. 19686. An act to amend section 387 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 19774. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in certain areas a spouse will be relieved of liability arising from a joint income tax return;

H.R. 19790. An act relating to the income tax treatment of certain sales of real property by a corporation;

H.R. 19881. An act relating to consolidated returns of life insurance companies and for other purposes;

H.R. 19915. An act to extend the temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement recipients in determining their needs for public assistance; and

H.J. Res. 1421. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On December 31, 1970:

H.R. 10482. An act to provide for the establishment of the Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

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;

H.R. 13000. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16199. An act to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to accelerate the collection of estate and gift taxes, to continue excise taxes on passenger automobiles and communications services; and for other purposes;

H.R. 17867. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18515. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18582. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended; and

H.R. 19953. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to provide financial assistance to certain railroads in order to preserve essential rail services, and for other purposes.

On January 2, 1971:

H.R. 370. 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;

H.R. 6562. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to beer, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7626. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, sirups, and molasses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 15628. An act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15728. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17068. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for aircraft manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under temporary importation bond, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide floor stock refunds in the case of cement mixers;

H.R. 17917. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period of qualification of certain union-negotiated pension plans;

### SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect for our beloved and distinguished Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 799, the Chair declares the second session of the 91st Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 799, the House adjourned sine die.

H.R. 17984. An act to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969;

H.R. 17988. An act to amend section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow aircraft to be leased for temporary use outside the United States without a recapture of the investment credit;

H.R. 18549. An act to amend sections 902(b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 10 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level corporations in the tax credit structure if the 10-percent test is met;

H.R. 18693. An act to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the treatment of certain losses sustained by reason of the confiscation of property by the Government of Cuba.

H.R. 19113. An act to provide for the free entry of a 61-note cast bell carillon and a

42-note subsidiary cast bell carillon for the use of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

H.R. 19172. An act 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;

H.R. 19242. An act to amend section 278 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend its application from citrus groves to almond groves;

H.R. 19369. An act to amend section 165 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities;

H.R. 19391. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions.

H.R. 19470. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the nursing service requirement and certain other requirements which an institution must meet in order to qualify as a hospital thereunder so as to make such requirements more realistic in so far as they apply to smaller institutions;

H.R. 19562. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain statutory mergers;

H.R. 19567. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968;

H.R. 19627. An act to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income;

H.R. 19670. An act to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until the close of December 31, 1973.

H.R. 19686. An act to amend section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H.R. 19774. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in certain cases a spouse will be relieved of liability arising from a joint income tax return;

H.R. 19790. An act relating to the income tax treatment of certain sales of real property by a corporation;

H.R. 19881. An act relating to consolidated returns of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 19915. An act to extend the temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement recipients in determining their needs for public assistance; and

H.J. Res. 1421. A resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 30, 1970:

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; and

H.R. 19333. An act to provide protection for customers of registered brokers and dealers and members of national securities exchanges.

On December 31, 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. 9681);

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. 6114. An act for the relief of Elmer M. Grade and for other purposes;

H.R. 6400. An act for the relief of Reddick B. Still, Jr., and Richard Carpenter;

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 Kococanus";

H.R. 8933. An act to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the "Jackson lock and dam" on the Tombigbee River, Ala., 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. 12564. 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. Scandon;

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, Washington, in honor of the late Dr. Enoch A. Bryan;

H.R. 14271. An act for the relief of Jack A. Duggins;

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. 15549. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to further the effectiveness of shipments of goods and supplies in

foreign commerce by promoting the welfare of United States merchant seamen through cooperation with the United Seamen's Service, 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. 16199. An act to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to accelerate the collection of estate and gift taxes, to continue excise taxes on passenger automobiles and communications services; and for other purposes;

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 electrode 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. 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. 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. 17867. An act making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18858. An act to change the name of the West Branch Dam and Reservoir, Mazoning River, Ohio, to the Michael J. Kirwan Dam and Reservoir;

H.R. 19401. An act to extend for one additional year the authorization for programs under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act;

H.R. 19436. An act to provide for 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;

H.J. Res. 1162. Joint resolution 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; and

H.J. Res. 1417. Joint resolution extending the dates for transmission to the Congress of the President's Economic Report and of the report of the Joint Economic Committee.

On January 1, 1971:

H.J. Res. 1416. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 92d Congress.

On January 2, 1971:

H.R. 17825. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17853. An act for the relief of Carlo Bianchi & Co., Inc.

H.J. Res. 1421. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On January 5, 1971:

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. 13493. An act to change the name of certain projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River.

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. 17901. An act to improve judicial machinery by providing for the appointment of a circuit executive for each judicial circuit;

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; 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 Grande Croce, of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica, an award conferred by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

On January 8, 1971:

H.R. 10482. An act to authorize the establishment of the Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

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. 10874. An act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the State 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;

H.R. 13000. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, and for other purposes;

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

H.R. 19342. An act to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 19953. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to provide financial assistance to certain railroads in order to preserve essential rail services, and for other purposes.

On January 11, 1971:

H.R. 370. 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;

H.R. 18515. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18582. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended;

H.R. 19113. An act to provide for the free entry of a 61-note cast bell carillon and a 42-note subsidiary cast bell carillon for the use of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.;

H.R. 19590. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 19915. An act to extend the temporary provision for disregarding income of old-age survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement recipients in determining their need for public assistance.

On January 12, 1971:

H.R. 6562. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to beer, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7626. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, sirups, and molasses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15628. An act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15728. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17068. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for aircraft manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under temporary importation bond, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide floor stock refunds in the case of cement mixers;

H.R. 17917. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period of qualification of certain union-negotiated pension plans;

H.R. 17984. An act to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969;

H.R. 17988. An act to amend section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow aircraft to be leased for temporary use outside the United States without a recapture of the investment credit;

H.R. 18549. An act to amend sections 902 (b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 10 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 10-percent test is met;

H.R. 18693. An act to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the treatment of certain losses sustained by reason of the confiscation of property by the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 19242. An act to amend section 278 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend its application from citrus groves to almond groves;

H.R. 19369. An act to amend section 165(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities;

H.R. 19391. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions;

H.R. 19470. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the nurs-

ing service requirement and certain other requirements which an institution must meet in order to qualify as a hospital thereunder so as to make such requirements more realistic insofar as they apply to smaller institutions;

H.R. 19562. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain statutory mergers;

H.R. 19567. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968;

H.R. 19627. An act to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income.

H.R. 19670. An act to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until the close of December 31, 1973;

H.R. 19686. An act to amend section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 19774. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in certain cases a spouse will be relieved of liability arising from a joint income tax return.

H.R. 19790. An act relating to the income tax treatment of certain sales of real property by a corporation; and

H.R. 19881. An act relating to consolidated returns of life insurance companies, and for other purposes.

On January 13, 1971:

H.R. 19172. An act 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.

On January 18, 1971:

H.R. 4605. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the United States Code to remove the prohibitions against importing, transporting, and mailing in the United States mails articles for preventing conception; and

H.R. 19928. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2657. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the enforcement of title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, for the calendar year 1970, pursuant to section 114 of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2658. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2659. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2660. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on scientific and professional positions established in the Department during 1970, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3104(c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## 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. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. Report on juvenile justice and corrections (Rept. No. 91-1806). Referred to the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. Report on amphetamines, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. Report on heroin and heroin paraphernalia (Rept. No. 91-1808). Referred to the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

659. The SPEAKER presented petition of the Gushikawa City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to removal of poison gas weapons from the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## GENERATION GAP

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has come to my attention one of the finest addresses I have ever had the pleasure to read. This was an address delivered by Dr. Thomas A. McGoldrick, Jr., of Savannah, Ga., at a meeting of physicians at Sea Island, Ga., last fall.

Dr. McGoldrick's speech deals with the so-called "generation gap" that troubles so many of us today. It contains an eloquent message for anyone who has children and who are concerned about young men and women today. It should be especially meaningful to youth.

I bring this fine message to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF DR. THOMAS A. MCGOLDRICK, JR.

(By Dr. Thomas A. McGoldrick, Jr.)

We were to meet at 4:30 that first morning, and it was understood that we would have our talk on the second night.

There was much to be done, the tanks, the nets, the cushions, the ice chest, the lunch.

I had left out an old skivvy shirt of mine but you preferred your leather vest; and I had left out a can of insect repellent.

Sometimes at low water we have clouds of tiny gnats, the "no-see-ems" we call them, that have a way of getting into one's nose and ears, and I was a little apprehensive over what they might do in your shoulder-length hair. But you left it behind.

I told you to select your own tackle, and you chose a heavy casting rod with a large reel. I took my light spinner.

In the first gray of dawn we slipped into a shallow creek and the water was alive with the shrimp we would use for bait. I was amazed at your quick dexterity with an unfamiliar shrimp net. We had a chest full of bait in no time and we talked about ways of handling shrimp and keeping them alive.

We ran down the sound and the morning was early October crystal. The eastern rim of sky was a rosy blaze and the water was blue as the sea.

We turned up a small river with the tide at dead low and anchored off a point of shells. Never had the water looked more fishable. We cast in and no nibble, we talked about depth and the ways to thread shrimp and the color of floats, and nothing.

Then suddenly both our floats were down and I knew we were in the fish. I was leading mine in when you gave a great yank and the hook flew out of the fish's mouth.

I had my fish in the boat and another on the line when you cast in hastily and I looked and saw that your reel was caught in a horrendous back-lash. I finally persuaded you to take my rod while I worked on that back-lash.

There are few tests of frustration quite equal to working on a fouled reel while the fish are biting like mad . . .

You were catching fish, good fish, missing some, and after a long time I had you rigged. Finally, we were both back in the water—and the fish were gone . . .

We had a minor mishap a little later when we had changed drops. You turned quickly to cast in another direction and your hook buried in the fleshy part of my upper arm.

You are obviously distressed and wanted to help pull it out, but I showed you that with the barb on these hooks (as on other things) there was no way to retract it.

Fortunately I have always kept in my tackle box a syringe and some Xylocaine and a sterile surgical blade, and after a good bit of clumsy surgery I was able to dig the hook out; there was a fair amount of bleeding and the edges were jagged but I pulled this together with some band-aids.

You were looking gray. I assured you it was not the first time that this had happened.

We sat a long time waiting for high water drops and in the meantime you had taken the top off the motor and were making some adjustments. It was obvious you had considerable proficiency in things mechanical.

At the same time I had misgivings, this was an old motor and it had never failed me, and there is a saying in this part of the country "If your outboard motor's running pretty good, don't start tinkering with it."

The fishing was sometime that afternoon, we caught an occasional school bass on the high water, but we never really got into the fish.

By now afternoon was lengthening and we headed for home; when we came to a point about a mile and a half from the dock my faithful motor suddenly conked, and I knew it had been adjusted too fine.

We coaxed and cajoled, but no motor, and I saw that with the wind and tide still against us we were losing way. We each took an oar and sat shoulder-to-shoulder and started to row.

I watched you row easy and strong, but the boat was heavy in the water and I was beginning to pant, I was after all close to forty years your senior. But I vowed I would stay with you if I collapsed in the boat.

We rowed until I knew I could not pull another stroke, when we finally nudged the floating dock and threw the line around a cleat, and then we both fell forward across the oars.

We were away early the next morning and I noticed that you were wearing my skivvy shirt and that your hair was coated with insect repellent, and in the boat I saw that you had selected one of my light spinning rods.

We commented on none of these things. It was late, near time to head home, when you suddenly said "BIG BITE." I

looked and your float was down but your line was slack, and you said, "He's gone." And I said, "Be careful, sometimes a big fish will swim up your line."

You tightened the slack and suddenly there was a great swirl in the water and your reel sang as the fish headed for deeper water. Four times you brought that fish in and four times he made another run for the river.

Once again you brought him in, this time close to the boat near enough for me to get a glimpse. And I said, "My God, that's a huge stag bass."

The fish was tiring, but he made another run. I wanted to give you advice a dozen times, but I thought no, this was your fish, and anyway, you were handling him beautifully.

I have fished a thousand hours, and I don't think I have ever prayed about a fish before, but I watched that mono-flament line and I found myself praying, "Please God, don't let's lose this fish."

Once again you brought the fish in near the boat and I made a lunge with the net and this time I had him—and suddenly we had fish and net and line flopping all over the boat, and we were both standing, shouting, laughing, crying, pounding each other's chest—and in that moment that's all there was in the world—the sky, the river, that fish and us.

We ate a tremendous supper, fresh fish broiled in lemon sauce, corn and tomatoes from the back garden, homemade ice cream with fresh sliced peaches, and we laughed and talked of nothing but that fish, 14 pounds of stag bass, the largest ever caught in these waters.

We both helped clean up.

It was dark when we walked down to the Bluff and sat in those rickety, wooden easy-chairs.

This was the second night.

The tide had turned and we watched a gentle whisper from the southwest sway in the Spanish moss and started a strumming in the palm fronds. Overhead was a canopy of dusky blue with only a few stars.

We sat a long time, exhausted, sunburned, and I think, both deeply contented. The breeze freshened and we could hear the water lapping at the boat.

The sky had turned a paler blue and now was dusted with a million tiny diamonds.

After a while, I don't know how long it was, you stood up and watched the river, now dark blue with the tide running. Abruptly you turned and said, "Thank you, sir, and good night."

And this had been our talk.

You left sometime during the night; and I was not to hear from you or see you again until June, when by chance I was on campus on the day of your commencement.

You had graduated magna cum laude and you were standing tall in a group of excited friends, all of whom had shoulder-length hair and peace symbols on the sleeves of their gowns.

It was not important, but I noticed that your hair was trim and that you were not wearing a peace symbol.