

As she said, "I went through the alleys and byways to clean up for the military and, believe me, I saw a lot."

Prior to and during World War II, Mrs. McLean organized a group of 100 women who

would meet at the First United Baptist Church and make clothing for military families.

For 20 years, this highly respected lady covered disasters for Red Cross by herself

until 1966 when the new disaster group was founded.

Mrs. McLean summed it up very appropriately by saying, "I'd be lost if I gave up my work, it's in my blood."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 12, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Jack P. Lowndes, president, Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, and pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.—Psalms 90: 12.

We join in prayer together.

O God, You have given to those here the great responsibility of making laws for our Nation. We are thankful for their willingness to accept this place of service for their fellow men.

Help all of us to remember that people are always more important than things and men are always more important than machines.

Give to them, we pray, wisdom in mind, clearness in thinking, truth in speaking, and love in the heart so that what they do will unite us and not divide us. May they put loyalty to what is right above loyalty to any other interest so that at the end of the day they will have the respect of a grateful nation and "Well done" from Thee.

This I pray in the name of Jesus who walked among people as one who served. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1972 as "National Arbor Day";

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; and

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1972 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1943. An act to provide for the mandatory inspection of rabbits slaughtered for human food, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the first Sunday in June of each year as "National Shut-In Day"; and

S.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the last full calendar week in May of 1972 as "Clean Waters for America Week."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-689, appointed Mr. TUNNEY to attend, on the part of the Senate, the North Atlantic Assembly.

THE LATE HONORABLE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, just a few short days ago, last Sunday afternoon, funeral services were held in New York City for a great man. I refer of course to our late colleague, the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell. Much has been said and much will continue to be said about Adam, but I would like to say at this point that he was without a doubt the ablest person who ever ran for public office in his part of New York City. I knew Adam well since I came to the House of Representatives in June 1944 and he came in January of 1945 and over the years we became very good friends. Adam was a proud man—proud of his blackness and proud of his ability and, when you were with him, you could not help but share in his pride. He led and fought for equality long before the fight was popular or even close to success.

He was above all things a man. He was, too, an excellent Congressman and his record as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor will stand for many, many years as his monument. He led the fight for, and produced, legislation increasing minimum wages, guaranteeing equal pay for women, manpower development and training, and care for the aging. Through the committee he brought forth a host of laws improving all phases of education—from elementary schools to colleges and vocational training. Adam Powell was a fighter all his life and we shall not see his like again for many a year. Mr. Speaker, I wish that all my colleagues could have been in New York last Sunday afternoon. They would have seen just how many, many people this man affected and how he was loved in Harlem. It was a sad but deeply moving experience. To his family and many friends I offer my sincere condolence in their great loss.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 922) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 922

Resolved, That during the remainder of the Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on

Foreign Affairs shall be composed of thirty-nine members.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 117) asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res. 117

Whereas in the congestion and the complexities, the tensions and frustrations of today's life, the need for outdoor recreation—the opportunity to "get away from it all"—has become of crucial importance, and

Whereas there are few pursuits providing a better chance for healthy exercise, peaceful solitude, and appreciation of the great outdoors than hunting and fishing, and

Whereas this is evident in the fact that more than fifteen million hunting licenses and twenty-four million fishing licenses were issued in 1970, and

Whereas the purchase of these licenses brought nearly \$200,000,000 into State and local government treasuries, and

Whereas this income provides a rich source of funds for fish and wildlife conservation and management and for the salvation, preservation, and propagation of vanishing species, and

Whereas hunters and anglers traditionally have led in the effort to preserve our natural resources, and

Whereas outdoor sportsmen also have led in the promotion of proper respect for private as well as public property, of courtesy in the field and forest, and in boating and firearm safety programs, and

Whereas there is no present national recognition of the many and worthwhile contributions of the American hunter and angler: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States declare the fourth Saturday of each September as "National Hunting and Fishing Day" to provide that deserved national recognition, to recognize the esthetic, health, and recreational virtues of hunting and fishing, to dramatize the continued need for gun and boat safety, and to rededicate ourselves to the conservation and respectful use of our wildlife and natural resources.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2 strike the entire preamble.

On page 2, line 4, strike the phrase "each September" and insert in lieu thereof "September 1972".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House is acting today on the National Hunting and Fishing Day resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." This special recognition will honor more than 50 million hunters and fishermen for their contributions to conservation and outdoor recreation.

It is indeed time that the Congress recognize the services of the sportsman in the wise use of our natural resources and for their participation in and encouragement of healthful recreation.

Americans get away from the asphalt jungles, from the jangling of the telephone, from the pressures of the daily struggle in rural areas and in cities by going to the countryside "out with nature." Some play golf, some hike in the forests and parks, some bird watch, and increasing hundreds of thousands each year go hunting and fishing. There are few recreations which provide a better opportunity to get exercise which all citizens need, to find solitude, to breathe some of the little remaining fresh air, and to forget daily cares than hunting and fishing.

For the privilege of hunting and fishing, the participants pay nearly \$200 million each year for licenses, tags, permits, and stamps. This income provides a rich source of funds for fish and wildlife conservation and management. Many of the activities being undertaken today to protect wildlife threatened with extinction and to reestablish breeds and strains who are losing their battle for survival have come from hunting and fishing license funds.

It has been found that the true hunters and fishermen are vitally interested in the preservation of our wildlife. They are leaders in local and national efforts to rebuild the Everglades, to stop wanton destruction of threatened breeds of wildlife, to insure that pollution of our waters does not wipe out our fishlife.

In addition, responsible hunters and fishermen are among the leaders of those who promote safety in hunting and fishing. Many of the hunting and fishing safety laws in this country have been developed, brought to the attention of the legislatures, and eventually passed into law at the behest of those who are our hunters and fishermen.

It is time to give some national recognition to the responsible hunters and fishermen of the country by proposing that the President of the United States set aside the fourth Saturday of each September to recognize this form of recreation and sport in our country. At the same time, we can use this day to assure that we rededicate our Nation to the ade-

quate protection of the land and water wildlife of the Nation, and to promote again and redouble our efforts to see that hunting and fishing recreation is carried on at the highest level of safety for those who participate.

Legislation has already been approved by the Senate for this purpose and I am pleased that over 50 Members of the House have cosponsored my bill, House Joint Resolution 798. The Senate bill, Senate Joint Resolution 117, was introduced by Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE and cosponsored by 37 other Senators.

A great national movement is already underway to celebrate the fourth Saturday of September—September 23—as National Hunting and Fishing Day. Forty national groups representing wildlife enthusiasts, environmentalists, sportsmen, service clubs, labor organizations, foresters, and recreationalists are working to see that September 23 is a meaningful day.

A steering committee to conduct national activities on September 23 has been set up. It is headed by Mr. Thomas L. Kimball, executive vice president of the National Wildlife Federation, and Mr. Raymond C. Hubley, executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America. Mr. Charles Dickey, conservation director of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, who has worked long and diligently on this resolution is acting as secretary of the national effort.

The Governors of 23 States proclaimed State hunting and fishing days during 1971 and indications are that there will be at least 45 States to do so in 1972. Many activities occurred around the country in September of last year even though no national recognition had been given to the celebration at that time.

The enormous and spontaneous support that has been given to National Hunting and Fishing Day clearly indicates that this kind of recognition of those who participate in the sports of hunting and fishing is due.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that I am pleased the House is moving ahead today to provide this recognition.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the House Judiciary Committee has approved Senate Joint Resolution 117 calling upon the President to proclaim the fourth Saturday of September as "National Hunting and Fishing Day."

Speaking from experience, I know there is nothing quite as refreshing as getting into the great outdoors to hunt or fish. With the pressures of our society weighing heavily on us, the opportunity to get closer to nature by sitting on a stream bank or fishing in a lake provides a welcome change of pace. This interest of mine is shared by at least 24 million other Americans who purchased fishing licenses in 1970.

I also enjoy getting into the fields and woods to hunt game birds and animals. This sport is also shared by at least 15 million other Americans. The hunting and fishing avocation actually adds about \$4 billion to the economy annually so it contributes to the economic well-being of the country as well as to the psychological benefit of the individual participants.

I am happy that all levels of Government have recognized the need to provide

more recreational opportunities for our citizens and hope the passage of this resolution will draw attention to the importance of hunting and fishing to the American way of life.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, each year over 15 million Americans enjoy hunting while over 24 million participate in the sport of fishing. Because of these pursuits, these men and women have perhaps the deepest appreciation of all for the outdoors, wildlife, and life in general. As we strive to discover how to improve the quality of life, it is important to note the significant role hunting and fishing play in this quest. It is for these reasons that I have cosponsored and today will vote for legislation asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September, "National Hunting and Fishing Day".

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of September 1972 'National Hunting and Fishing Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TO PAY TRIBUTE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ON LAW DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 169) to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 169

Whereas the first day of May of each year was designated as Law Day, U.S.A. and was set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and in reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America; and of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life: Be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the celebration of Law Day, May 1, 1972, special emphasis be given by a grateful people to the law enforcement officers of the United States of America for their unflinching and devoted service in helping to preserve the domestic tranquility and guaranteeing to the individual his rights under the law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 1 strike the entire preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ARTHRITIS MONTH

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1029) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1029

Whereas arthritis and rheumatic diseases are the Nation's number one crippling diseases affecting seventeen million Americans of all ages, causing limitations in their usual activities and great suffering;

Whereas arthritis and rheumatic diseases are second only to heart disease as the most widespread chronic illnesses in the United States today;

Whereas the annual cost of arthritis and rheumatic diseases to Americans is estimated to exceed \$3,500,000,000 annually in lost wages, medical and disability payments, and taxes lost to the Federal Government;

Whereas advances in research and treatment show promise of significant breakthrough leading to a better understanding of and cure for these diseases;

Whereas the month of May is the period during which the Arthritis Foundation conducts its annual fundraising campaign to support its efforts in arthritis research and treatment; and

Whereas the most common form of arthritis strikes mainly older Americans and the White House Conference on Aging has been meeting during the week of November 29, 1971, to focus attention on the problem of this important group of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation (1) designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month", (2) inviting the Governors of the several States to issue proclamations for like purposes, and (3) urging the people of the United States, and educa-

tional, philanthropic, scientific, medical, and health care professions and organizations to provide the necessary assistance and resources to discover the causes and cures of arthritis and rheumatic diseases and to alleviate the suffering of persons struck by these diseases.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2 strike the entire preamble.

On page 2, line 4 strike the word "annually".

On page 2, line 5 strike the phrase "in each year" and insert in lieu thereof the phrase "of 1972".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the following distinguished colleagues should be considered cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 1029, which authorizes the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month":

Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. MALLARY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF.

I would also like to point out that I have twice introduced this measure and was joined by 48 colleagues in sponsorship. Those who joined me on House Joint Resolution 1145 are:

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BELL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. COTTER.

Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. HARRINGTON.

Those who joined me in sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 1146 are:

Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LENT, Mr. LINK, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. McCURE, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. MELCHER.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. POBELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Because of public apathy, chronic diseases have by tradition been given little priority by Federal health agencies, although they affect more Americans than do the acute diseases. It is apparent that we Americans prefer to react to crises, rather than to continuing need for improved health care. Thus, the aging, the chronically ill, and the handicapped become second-class citizens—shunted aside with token Federal support.

In a chronic disease, such as arthritis with which over 17 million Americans are afflicted—one in every four families—there is no crises point, no time at which the progress of the disease can be dramatically reversed and the patient returned to a state of normalcy. The chronic disease comes to stay, often forever.

Yet, as a nation, we have not begun to give near adequate recognition to the serious proportions of arthritis. It is time that national recognition be given to such a major health problem. But coupled with that recognition, we need substantive legislation and increased funding to cause a national massive effort to forcefully attack this present and future hazard to national good health.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending resolution, which is similar to my bill—House Joint Resolution 1150—authorizing a Presidential proclamation designating the month of May as "National Arthritis Month."

The subject of this measure is a chronic disease, arthritis, to which too little attention has been paid. It is conservatively estimated that more than 17 million Americans are afflicted with the painful and crippling disease.

Enactment of this resolution, of course, is not going to bring any cure. But it will bring the disease to national attention and, hopefully, give needed encouragement and support to scientific efforts to find effective treatment and a cure.

Mr. Speaker, the broad support for this measure in the House is heartening and we can only hope that it reflects a proper recognition of a chronic illness that warrants greater attention at all levels of government and medical science.

I urge passage of the pending resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May of 1972 as 'National Arthritis Month'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE MYRON V. GEORGE

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to advise this House of the death on April 11, 1972, of Myron Virgil George, a Representative from Kansas in the 81st through 86th Congresses. Mr. George, a

native of Erie, Kans., had lived most of his life in Labette County in southeastern Kansas. He died in Parsons in his 72d year following a lengthy illness.

Myron George was my friend—a valued friend and political counselor to me but more importantly—a friend to all who asked his help. He represented in this body the old Third District in Kansas and I could ask no more for myself than to achieve as good a record of representation as did he.

A graduate of Labette County High School he enlisted at 17 for World War I service. Upon his discharge 2 years later he became a newspaper owner and publisher of the paper at Edna, Kans., for the next 17 years. It was here that he made his mark as a knowledgeable and honorable man, a trusted friend, a hard-working devotee in the Republican political vineyard. It was here that he acquired that commonsense knowledge that stood him in such good stead in place of the formal education earlier denied him.

When a fellow Kansas newspaper editor, the late Herbert A. Meyer died while a Member of the 81st Congress, Mr. George resigned his position as executive director of the Kansas State Highway Commission to run both for the unexpired term and the full term in the 82d Congress. He won handily and thereafter was reelected to the next three Congresses. He ran unsuccessfully for the 86th Congress and thereafter returned home to Parsons where he became engaged in construction and transportation operations.

During his service in Congress Mr. George was an important member of the Committee on Public Works and the fact that southeastern Kansas today is among the top districts in the number of flood control projects is a monument to Myron George. He was also a high-ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am sure that a number of my colleagues will recall Mr. George's service here.

Mr. George's wife, the former Hazel Eplee of Parsons, and two sons and a daughter survive him. One son, formerly on the medical staff at Walter Reed Hospital, now practices in Wichita. His second son, a veteran of service in the Air Force, now resides in the State of Washington. He is an official with the State highway commission. His married daughter lives in Kansas City.

A funeral service will be held tomorrow in Altamont, the longtime home of his parents where his father published the Altamont Journal and where he learned the printer's trade as a boy. Myron George was of that vanishing breed of sturdy, self-reliant midwesterners. His friends mourn his passing and Mrs. Skubitz and I join with that legion of them in extending my deepest and sincerest condolences to Mrs. George and their three children.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Kansas (Mr. Skubitz) in expressing my deep sorrow

over the passing of a distinguished Kansan and former Member of this House Myron V. George. Mrs. Shriver and I convey our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. George and her fine family over their great loss.

Myron George served with distinction in the House from 1950 to 1959. He was a valuable member of the Public Works and Banking and Currency Committees. He was a newspaper publisher in Kansas and also contributed significantly to highway development in our State through his services as executive secretary of the Kansas Highway Commission.

Our Nation and the State of Kansas are beneficiaries of the outstanding public service of Myron George. He will be missed by all of us.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKUBITZ. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I knew Myron George. He served with me in the Congress in the early days of my career here. He was an outstanding, effective, and dedicated Member of the House of Representatives.

All of the fine things that the gentleman from Kansas has said about him are 100 percent true.

All of us are saddened by the passing of Myron George.

I extend my sincere condolences to his family.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

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

I concur in the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Kansas and his colleagues from Kansas as well as those of the distinguished minority leader.

It so happens that I served as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, working with a similar Committee on Public Works, in drafting the very far-reaching interstate highway legislation. Our former colleague from Kansas, Myron George, was most helpful and most instrumental in bringing about the passage of that very significant and monumental legislation.

Myron George was hard working, dedicated, and loved by his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my sincere sorrow to his family in his passing.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 13025 AND H.R. 13752, UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on two bills, H.R. 13752, to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; and H.R. 13025, to amend

the act of May 19, 1948, with respect to the use of real property for wildlife conservation purposes.

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

There was no objection.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 917 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 917

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13336) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 917 provides for consideration of H.R. 13336, which, as reported by our Committee on Foreign Affairs, would extend the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, after which the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

H.R. 13336 would authorize \$22 million to fund the operations of the Agency for a 2-year period. The bill contains no allocation to specific years. However, the Agency has programed \$10 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$10.5 million for fiscal year 1974. The remaining \$1.5 million would cover salary increases authorized by Public Law 91-656.

In comparison, the appropriation for fiscal year 1971 was \$8.64 million and for fiscal year 1972 it was \$9 million.

It is noteworthy that, except for the authorization of funds, the bill makes no change in the existing authority of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

As its name signifies, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency plays an indispensable role in U.S. arms control efforts. The Agency provides recommendations and policy assessments on arms control to the President, the Secretary of State, and other officials of the executive branch.

For example, it has been deeply involved in the current strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—between the United States and the Soviet Union to reduce the risk of accidental nuclear war. The direct telephone communication between Washington and Moscow, the so-called "hot line," was installed through the efforts of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Another area of significant Agency involvement has been the Geneva-based conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which recently produced two important international agreements—one, banning the emplacement of nuclear weapons in the seabed, and the other, prohibiting biological methods of warfare.

It is evident that with the increased proliferation of nuclear weapons, an effective Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is of paramount importance, if not indispensable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 917 in order that H.R. 13336 may be considered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13336 is to authorize \$22 million to fund the operations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 2 years.

Except for this authorization, no change is made in the existing authority of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Of the \$22 million to be authorized, the Agency has programed \$10 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$10,500,000 for fiscal year 1974, with the remaining \$1,500,000 to cover salary increases authorized by Public Law 91-656. The appropriation for fiscal year 1971 was \$8,645,000 and for 1972, \$9 million.

The increase in funding is required because of three factors: First, inflation; second, increased personnel costs; and third, increased responsibilities. For example, U.S. costs from the SALT talks, unlike previous arms control conferences are being funded entirely out of the Agency budget.

The report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs contains no minority views or departmental letters.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13336) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13336, with Mr. FLOWERS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us this afternoon is H.R. 13336 which authorizes \$22 million to finance the operations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for a 2-year period.

This bill makes no change in the existing law governing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It provides only an authorization of appropriations.

Although the legislation does not provide a specific breakdown by year, the Agency has budgeted \$10,560,000 for fiscal year 1973 and \$11,440,000 for fiscal year 1974.

That amount is \$4.5 million more than was authorized for the preceding 2-year period. A more detailed breakdown of these figures may be found on page 2 of the committee report.

Although the Agency is asking for an increase in its appropriation, the committee believes the request is amply justified by the very important and difficult responsibilities which the Agency currently has.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created by the Congress in 1961 to provide advice and assistance to the President and other officials of the executive branch on arms control matters.

The major efforts of the Agency are centered on the formulation of arms control policies, the coordination and direction of international arms control initiatives, and the planning and management of the negotiations of arms control agreements.

Since it was established the Agency has had three distinct phases of development:

The first phase was from 1962 until 1969. During that period the emphasis was on research into arms control and the Agency's authorization averaged about \$10 million annually.

The second phase was from 1969 to 1971 and marked a transitional period. During this period the need for research slackened while the Agency prepared for, and began engaging in, substantial arms control negotiations.

As a result, the Agency actually reduced its spending by \$1 million annually and eliminated some 19 positions in the Agency.

Today the Agency has entered into its third and most important phase—one of active negotiations on a variety of arms control issues. To carry out its work effectively it now has need of additional funds and additional personnel.

The Agency has provided the committee with a detailed breakdown of how the additional 4.5 million will be spent during the forthcoming 2-year period.

The effect of mandatory pay acts will consume \$2.1 million. Other wage and price increases will account for \$300,000,

and the dollar revaluation abroad for \$200,000.

New positions in the Agency—10 to be created in fiscal year 1973 and 10 more in fiscal year 1974—will cost an additional \$500,000. Finally, external research and field testing related to ongoing Agency negotiations is budgeted for \$1.4 million of the increase.

In considering this increased authorization, it should be recognized that it is only \$1 million more annually than Congress provided the Agency in 1964—when the dollar was worth about one-third more than it is today.

In terms of constant dollars, then, we are actually being asked to provide less money for the Agency than we did 8 years ago.

Moreover, in that same 8-year period, the amount of the Agency's funds which go for personnel costs has increased considerably from 33 percent of its budget to almost one-half—largely as the result of congressionally enacted pay increases for Federal employees.

As a final justification of the increase, it should be noted that the cost of arms control negotiations, which in the past was usually funded from the budget of the Department of State, now is being charged to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The cost of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks alone has meant an extraordinary expense of more than \$1 million annually to the Agency.

The same important responsibilities which have required increased funding for the Agency also have made necessary the increase in personnel. According to a breakdown on those new positions provided to the committee, they are all directly involved with the negotiations in progress or in prospect.

At this point let me review briefly the forums in which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is active, and the positive achievements which have resulted in the past few months.

At the SALT negotiations with the Soviet Union—currently in session in Helsinki, Finland—two initial agreements were reached last summer. One increases the reliability of the Washington-Moscow "hot line" communications and the other pertains to measures agreed by both sides to reduce the possibilities of accidental war.

Even more important, the present negotiations may result in an agreement on ABM's and some controls on offensive weapons which would be ready for President Nixon to sign during his trip to Moscow in May.

At the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which meets in Geneva, two recent international arms control agreements were developed during the past 2 years. One places a ban on the emplacement of weapons in the seabed; the other prohibits biological methods of warfare.

Among other arms control developments in which the Agency played an important role were U.S. ratification of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America—which makes the area the world's first "nuclear free zone"—and agreements which have been reached in Vienna on nuclear safe-

guards under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Prospects are for continued international negotiations in the arms control field. Even if an initial SALT agreement is reached, there is certain to be a second phase of the talks in which attempts will be made for more comprehensive limitations on strategic weapons systems.

Moreover, in coming months the United States and its NATO allies could begin negotiations with the Soviet bloc on mutual and balance force reductions—MBFR—in Europe—an effort in which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would play a key role.

In monetary terms, this Agency is not expensive. The cost of running it for 1 year is roughly the cost of a single modern fighter aircraft.

More important, funds allocated to this Agency are an investment. If, for example, the SALT negotiations should be successful, billions of dollars may be saved through the limitations on antiballistic-missile systems.

As it carries out its important responsibilities, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency deserves the strong support of the Congress.

I, therefore, urge approval of full funding for the Agency as authorized in H.R. 13336.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the full committee Dr. MORGAN, has already explained the purpose of this bill and gives some background on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I, too, rise in support of the bill. It was approved unanimously by our committee. This agency has been in operation now for some 10 years, and its work has been of great significance to our country.

The bill would authorize a very modest amount, \$22 million, to finance the operation of the agency for the fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The money would be spent at the rate of \$10 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$10.5 million for fiscal year 1974. The remainder will be used to cover mandatory salary increases authorized by Congress.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency under its Director, Gerard Smith, is performing a vital and sensitive role.

In my opinion, both Mr. Smith and his distinguished predecessor as Director, William Foster, have been men of experience and exceptional ability. These two men have made very substantial contributions to the achievements of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

As our chairman has pointed out, the strategic arms limitation talks already have resulted in two new agreements, one to improve direct communication between the heads of the Soviet Government and the American Government by use of satellite communications, and the other to exchange certain information to reduce the risk of accidental nuclear war. The agency is also responsible for the preparation and conduct of the U.S. effort in the Geneva disarmament talks.

In fact, last Monday the Biological Weapons Convention signed by 74 nations here in Washington came out of that Geneva Conference.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that first phase agreements on offensive and defensive strategic weapons will be reached this spring at the strategic arms limitation talks currently underway in Helsinki.

The agency's work will not, of course, end with the first phase agreements, if they are achieved. Rather, its work will increase as the agency carries out further negotiations looking toward more comprehensive limitations on strategic weapons systems.

If the modest investment called for in this legislation can halt or even slow the costly arms race, it will have been one of the best investments this Congress could make.

I should like to compliment Director Smith and his staff on the effective manner in which they are carrying out their difficult task, and I urge the support of the Members for this legislation.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. It has been my privilege to be present for a number of briefings by Ambassador Smith and his staff, both here and in Washington and in Vienna, in connection with the SALT talks. I have also attended some discussions with our NATO Ambassador, who, at that time, was Mr. Robert Ellsworth. The impression I have from these briefings is that Ambassador Smith and his staff have done an exceptional job in keeping our NATO allies informed as to the trends and progress of the SALT talks. They have made sure that our allies are kept closely associated with us in these most delicate negotiations.

It is my impression also from attending some of the international conferences that our allies feel comfortable about the leadership we are providing in these disarmament discussions. I think this is a great tribute to Mr. Smith.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, in the past at least there has been some criticism from some sources—including myself—of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's tendency to emphasize in-house research on the subject of its cognizance, rather than to contract with outside universities and other agencies for such research. I see that the external research item has gone up about a half million dollars in 1974, that is estimated, but in 1973 it does not seem to have gone up any over what it was in 1972.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think there is a modest increase for 1973, and an additional increase in 1974. I do not happen to have the committee report before me, but I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a modest increase, but I want to say to

the gentleman from California that I remember his position a few years ago. Research has been drastically cut back. The modest increase for 1973 and 1974 in the in-house costs are all directly related to the SALT negotiations.

Mr. HOSMER. I see. So it is not going into other items?

Mr. MORGAN. No. I am sure most of the objectionable research, the kind that the gentleman opposed years ago, has been eliminated.

Mr. HOSMER. Does the gentleman anticipate that after November of this year, it will be necessary to support any more expenditures on SALT, or will we be continuing this negotiation in that regard?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would think there would be certainly some need for continued expenditure, because the second round of the SALT talks will have started about that time.

Mr. HOSMER. I was thinking of it in the context of the President's visit to Moscow and the possibility of arriving at some conclusions about arms limitations at that time.

Mr. MORGAN. There is a long road to go after the President's visit to Moscow. That only takes care of a preliminary agreement on offensive weapons.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would agree with my chairman that it is perhaps too early to speculate as to what may come out of the Moscow talks, if they take place, and I hope they do. I hope there will be an opportunity for further discussion with the Soviets with respect to strategic weapons, if first-phase agreements are reached next month.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

If the gentleman will yield further, I was wondering if there was before the committee any evidence that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is very actively engaged in the preparation of some kind of a complete and total nuclear test ban treaty—or is this particular subject in abeyance at the moment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. To my knowledge this subject is in abeyance.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHMITZ. At the bottom of page 3 of the committee report it says:

U.S. costs from the SALT negotiations, unlike previous arms control conferences, are being funded entirely out of the Agency's budget.

Does that mean that the Soviets are not paying any share of the cost of the SALT talks?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course it does not. I might say to the gentleman, we are talking about our share of the cost of the conference. It is a question of where the money comes from to pay for our share of the cost of the conference.

Mr. SCHMITZ. The Soviets are paying?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I can assure the gentleman that the Soviets pay their share of the cost of the conference.

Mr. SCHMITZ. What percentage do they pay? Is it 50 percent?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not happen to have a budget on how much the

Soviets are paying on anything, let alone the SALT talks. That is not our worry. We have no financial responsibility for their contribution.

Mr. SCHMITZ. The report says, "unlike previous arms control conferences." How does this differ from previous conferences?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MORGAN. It used to be that the State Department paid for its costs of such negotiations. Now it is included in the budget of this agency.

Mr. SCHMITZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13336, which provides an authorization of \$22 million to operate the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for the next 2 years.

As an original cosponsor of the legislation which created the Agency, I have followed its activities closely since it was created in 1961.

In my judgment, on the basis of cost-effectiveness, no agency of the Government has a more distinguished record of achievement during the past decade than this one.

Among the international agreements to control arms which it has been instrumental in formulating, and gaining approval for, are:

The ban on the use of nuclear weapons in outer space;

The partial test ban treaty, limiting signatories to underground nuclear weapons tests and ending widespread, harmful, atmospheric testing;

The ban on the use of biological methods of warfare;

The prohibition against the use of the seabeds as a location for the fixing of nuclear weapons;

The designation of Latin America as a "nuclear free zone"—prohibiting the importation of nuclear weapons there;

An agreement with the Soviets on upgrading the "hot line" between Moscow and Washington; and

A United States-Soviet agreement on diminishing the chances for accidental war involving weapons of mass destruction.

These and many other accomplishments have been made with a budget which has averaged about \$10 million annually and a staff which has never exceeded 268 persons.

Past efforts, however, are overshadowed by the importance of the principal negotiation in which the Agency is now involved.

That negotiation is, of course, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—SALT—now being carried on with the Soviet Union.

If an agreement can be reached at SALT, and there appears to be a reasonable prospect for that, a significant step toward curbing the arms race will have been taken and the world will, for that reason, be in somewhat less peril of a nuclear holocaust.

Moreover, if an agreement results in a curb on antiballistic missile systems, the ultimate savings to the American taxpayers would pay the cost of operating this Agency many hundreds of times over.

By the end of next month—possibly before this bill has been enacted—a SALT agreement may be reached and signed by the President.

If such an agreement does result, much of the credit must go to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; its director and our chief spokesman at SALT, the Honorable Gerard Smith; and his highly qualified team of negotiators.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been privileged to preside at no less than nine meetings over the past 3 years at which members of the committee were briefed by Mr. Smith and his associates on the SALT talks.

It is my understanding that other House and Senate committees also have been abreast of developments during the talks.

At a time when the foreign policy interests and objectives of the executive and legislative branches seem so often to be in conflict, the quality of cooperation which ACDA has exhibited in dealing with the Congress is extraordinary.

It is my belief that Agency officials have been utterly candid in providing continuing information to the members of our committee on developments at SALT. On our part, there have been no "leaks" which could have been very damaging in such sensitive negotiations and which sometimes have made executive branch officials reluctant to provide members of Congress with detailed information on important security matters.

In short, the relationship between the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the relevant committees of Congress deserves study and emulation as a model of the cooperation between the branches of Government which is required for effective national security policies.

As a direct result of the close consultation provided to Congress through its committees during the current negotiations, I believe, ultimate congressional endorsement of a SALT agreement has been significantly facilitated.

That, however, must be left to the future. Right now we in Congress have an opportunity to express our endorsement of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, its past accomplishments, and its present work.

We can make such an endorsement by approving the amount of money which the Agency has requested for its operations over the next 2 years—an amount which the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after due deliberation, has approved unanimously.

Therefore, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 13336, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, disarmament has been declared to be high on this Nation's agenda for over two decades, and many of us have been working for the control of arms for even longer. Once again, the Congress, through its vote in support of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has a chance to emphasize the importance we attach to that goal and, at the same time, to ex-

press our dissatisfaction with the progress achieved thus far.

ACDA has been in existence for more than 10 years, and it has some modest agreements to its credit. But, as we all know, it has not come close to bringing the arms race to a halt. There are more arms in the hands of more countries, and more spending on new arms, than ever before. We are even further behind in our quest than we were when ACDA was created.

The Congress must give ACDA, and the cause it represents its full support, and all of the terribly modest budget it has requested. We certainly should not be thinking in terms of reducing the paltry authorization contained in this bill. But we must recognize that more money is needed. The Agency must become an advocate for peace and arms reduction within the councils of Government. Until now, it has been a weak voice, pushing marginal steps while the arms race rushes on.

It has settled for a partial nuclear test ban, while this country continues testing at an unprecedented rate. Now that there have been great advances in detection technology in the past few years, ACDA should be leading the drive within the Government for a full ban on nuclear testing.

It has settled for limited proposals for a standstill agreement on missile launchers, while condoning the installation of MIRV warheads on all our ICBM's. It should be leading the drive for a complete halt in the expansion of strategic weapons arsenals, both through voluntary limitations on our own missile expenditures and through agreements with the Soviet Union.

It has settled for a limitation on biological warfare, while accepting the use of equally deadly chemical weapons by ourselves and others. It should be leading the drive for a total ban on all chemical and biological warfare.

It has settled for a bystander's role in the making of American military policy regarding both the procurement of weapons and their use on the battlefield. It should be leading the drive within the Government for reduced expenditure on wasteful, destructive weapons and, most important of all, for an end to American participation in the war in Vietnam. For too long, this has been looked on as somehow peripheral to the question of arms control, while this country uses the heaviest weapons in its arsenal to destroy a people that offers no threat to us.

ACDA must become a more forceful voice on all of these issues, advocating a return to sanity in this country's war-making capacity. But, realistically, it will not do this unless those of us outside the executive branch—in the Congress and among the American people—speak out for a cutback in our spending on weapons and a halt in our attacks on other peoples. It is about time that this really became an era of negotiation, and that our country turned from its policy of military pressure and armed might to one of international cooperation and the limitation of arms.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of H.R. 13336, the amendment to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, extending the authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. As most of my colleagues are aware, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established by an act of Congress in 1961. This action was taken because it was believed that the question of arms control was far too important to be relegated to a small office in the State Department.

Since the creation of the Agency, we have seen real progress in halting the spread of nuclear weapons. In 1963 a treaty was signed which banned the testing of nuclear weapons everywhere except underground. In 1967 a treaty was signed which prohibited the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. In 1970 the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which was signed in 1968, went into force. Its purpose is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers. In 1971 a treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and the ocean floor was signed. It is expected to come into force in the near future.

In November 1969, the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union began in Helsinki. These negotiations have been characterized by the President as "one of the most momentous negotiations ever entrusted to an American delegation." The seventh round of these talks began on March 28 at Helsinki and it is hoped that in the near future agreement may be reached on a treaty limiting antiballistic missile systems and on other measures constraining strategic offensive systems. The SALT delegation is ably chaired by the Director of the Agency, Ambassador Gerard Smith. If these agreements can be reached, the result will be to enhance U.S. security and greatly improve the prospects for peace in the world.

The Agency is responsible for the Washington preparations as well as for the conduct of the U.S. effort at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. It was in this forum that many of the arms control agreements that I have mentioned were negotiated. This week another major step toward controlling arms was taken when the Biological Weapons Convention was signed in Washington, London, and Moscow. This Convention, which was negotiated last year at Geneva, prohibits the possession and acquisition of these terrible weapons. The Agency deserves a great deal of credit for this success.

On February 29 the Geneva Conference opened its 1972 session. Arms control measures being discussed at Geneva this year include a chemical weapons ban and a ban on underground nuclear weapons testing.

I wish to take this opportunity to wish the Agency well in its endeavors, as I believe they are among the most important of those in which the U.S. Government is involved. I believe the comparatively very small sum that is being requested to advance our national security by negotiating arms control agreements is more than amply justified.

Mr. Chairman, I support this new 2-year authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one of the original sponsors of legislation which resulted in the creation, in 1961, of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I most earnestly urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly approve H.R. 13336, which provides an authorization of \$22 million to operate the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for the next 2 years. Such action taken today will stand as proof that this House and our country is dedicated to the vital goal of maintaining peace in this world through arms control and disarmament.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has now been in existence for 10 years and there can be little doubt that in a world burdened with increasing tension and constant uncertainty, it has moved vigorously forward in pursuing peace for our world. I believe that we ought to recognize that this agency, with limited funding, has made a most valuable contribution toward achieving the peace that we all desire.

Today, we ask that this agency be provided with \$22 million to continue in its task of seeking ways and means to lessen the risk of nuclear war, to halt the continued spread of nuclear weapons and bring an end to the costly burden of massive armaments. Could there be a more important objective for the civilized world?

The task that faces the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is an ominous one. Their responsibility is great. Our provision of \$22 million could easily prove to be one of the most prudent investments in the history of Government. Therefore, for the progress and security of all Americans and all mankind everywhere, now and in the future, I hope this bill will be given the resounding approval of the House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 49(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2589(a)), is amended by inserting immediately after "\$17,500,000", the following: ", and for the two fiscal years 1973 and 1974, the sum of \$22,000,000."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 1, line 7, strike out "\$22,000,000" and insert "\$18,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to maintaining an organization to discuss disarmament and control of weapons, but for the life of me I cannot understand the \$4 million increase that is proposed in this bill. As a matter of fact, I believe the figure I would leave is too much. All I am trying to do is effect a reasonable saving in this bill for, the Lord knows, the people of this coun-

try need a few savings in the authorizing and appropriation bills that are to come before Congress this year.

This setup started out some years ago in the White House with an annual appropriation of something around \$1 million, that maintained a few people available at the White House to discuss arms control and disarmament when some nation wanted to talk about it. I reiterate that was done at a cost of \$1 million or less a year.

Now this thing has burgeoned into a request for \$22 million, and practically all of the money is spent for salaries and personnel and apparently on entertainment or costs of upkeep of the agency in Switzerland.

Moreover, it is a strange contradiction that we should be spending millions each year to talk about disarmament when this Government is peddling around the world each year some \$2 billion worth of arms. I am unable to relate this business of helping arm the world and still spending, as in this bill, a requested \$22 million to give lip-service to disarmament.

So my amendment is simply a small attempt to save a few dollars in behalf of the taxpayers of this country. If we do not start to save a few million dollars here and there we are never going to save billions and we are never going to do anything about the national debt and the \$22 billion a year interest that is being paid on the Federal debt alone. I do not know of a better place to save a few million dollars than here to bring this into conformance with what was spent in the current fiscal year.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I am inclined to support the gentleman in his amendment. We all know it is not quantity of effort in these areas that produces results; it is the quality of the effort. The increases reflected in the current bill are largely those that have to do with quantity items. It is just more money for the pay of people, and so forth. It seems to me a lean type of operation in this particular area would far greater serve the interests of the Nation than otherwise, because, after all, disarmament is not like producing something that comes out by the inch or the yard.

This is something that has to do with the whole attitude as between one or more nations and other nations. It seems to me we can get along just as well in this area on the money we have had in the past as we can in expanding it. Therefore, I would hope that the gentleman's amendment carries.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the observations of the gentleman from California and once again emphasize that this \$22 million will be spent on salaries, entertainment, and other expenses that go with sumptuous living in Switzerland and elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, this Agency was given \$9 million to spend in the present fiscal year. Now it wants \$22 million for the next 2 fiscal years or an increase of \$2 million in each of the next 2 years. My amendment would bring it back to \$9

million per year which would mean a saving of \$4 million.

There is no record of accomplishment that warrants even the \$9 million that was expended last year. In view of the financial situation that confronts the Nation, I am trying to provide a modest saving. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a very small organization; it operates on a limited budget of about \$10 million a year; it has a very small staff. Since 1961, I know of no Government agency that has done more considering the amount of money available to it than the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

We are facing some very important negotiations that are now going on in Helsinki. These are very important to everybody in the world. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency provides the technical back up for these very complex negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, even a cut of \$4 million which has been offered in the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa will interfere with this operation. There is not any question about it. This budget is justified; it contains no unwarranted expenditures. I have studied the committee budget and examined it with care.

I should make clear that \$2.1 million of this \$4.5 million is put aside solely for the pay raises voted by this body for Government employees. We should not apply this kind of a cut only to this Agency. Why not apply it to all Federal employees, including Members of Congress? We have given everyone a pay raise.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I shall yield to the gentleman from Iowa in a moment.

The other reason as to why we should not cut this budget is the fact that we are in an inflationary period. The devaluation of the dollar has increased the overseas expenditures of this Agency. Only one-half million dollars of the \$4.5 million requested here actually is going to be paid out on salaries. In this most crucial year, with the inflationary period in which we live, there is not going to be too much money available. All of this expense is going to be tied directly to the important negotiations that are now going on. So, Mr. Chairman, I would think this is no Agency where this kind of a cut is less justified.

The gentleman from Iowa is a very valuable member of our committee, but I do not believe that this kind of economy is justified here. This is an Agency that really produces. I feel that every dollar spent here is a dollar that is going to bring a real return to this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, let us postpone until tomorrow and the next tomorrow and still another tomorrow just a little economy in an organization that certainly can stand some economy?

Does not the gentleman think that they can reduce the expenditures of this organization in order to take care of the \$4 million? If not, we are in a hopeless situation in this country.

Mr. MORGAN. The cost of this Agency for 1 year is about the same as what it takes to produce one jetplane. We are supplying jetplanes to other countries to assist in our own defense. Yet, here, we cannot spend \$10 million, the cost of one jetplane, to help to bring peace to the world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that I am not in favor of giving jetplanes to countries all around the world. Moreover, I thought we were supposed to be joining in disarmament, not arming the world.

Mr. MORGAN. I am just comparing the cost of this Agency to some of the other wasteful expenditures in Government. I feel that this is one place where we should stand fast against any cuts.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The gentleman from California in advocating support of the amendment says that this is an Agency where quality is important. Of course, it is. We have put employees in the Agency and they are entitled to the mandatory pay increases, which accounts for a large part of the very modest increase that is being asked for in this bill. I think it would be foolish for us to take it out of the skins or the hides, in my opinion, of the qualified employees.

There are underway very delicate SALT talks, so-called, in Helsinki which have increased the financial demands on the Agency and which are expected to continue to increase the demands. However, the overall amount is very modest. I would hope we would not take a \$4 million cut.

I disagree with the chairman in suggesting that this is a small amount. It could be a very substantial amount for an agency of this kind but, in my opinion, in this case it is not.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa.

I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Does the gentleman suppose that the addition of this \$4 million that you are now arguing is needed will reduce the incidence of Russian tanks in South Vietnam? This is supposed to be a disarmament activity. Will this help reduce the number of tanks now being used against our men in South Vietnam? I am referring to the "so called progress" we are told is being made in the SALT talks.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman is familiar with the history of the agency he must realize that it has not focused on conventional weapons. The SALT talks deal only with nuclear weapons systems.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am familiar with that point. But the gentleman is talking about 4 million additional dollars that is supposed to be used for peace, and more personnel that are trying to achieve peaceful settlements with the Russians. Yet the Russians are now sending tanks into South Vietnam. How will this \$4 million help in the reduction of arms that are being used in situations like that? Whether the weapons are conventional or advanced type weapons makes little difference to the American or South Vietnam soldier on the battlefield.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to repeat to the gentleman that never that I know of since the start of the Agency in 1961 have we reached the stage where we have had serious negotiations concerning conventional weapons. Most of the weapons that have been discussed are advanced type weapons that threaten the destruction of the world.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I understand that. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania was just saying that this \$4 million was tremendously necessary because it was going to help in all of our "peace" activities through this agency. But I see no direct results from these SALT talks on really reducing the Russian involvement around the world in their very aggressive military activities. I just wonder if this \$4 million is going to be used for any competent personnel to really secure some results.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the gentleman not feel that there have been any results from the disarmament talks since 1961?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I have not seen any really tangible results.

Mr. MORGAN. What about the non-proliferation treaty?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I have not seen any positive results from that treaty. It appears to me that the Russians have accelerated their armament programs. Maybe the gentleman from Pennsylvania can illuminate me on that.

Mr. MORGAN. What about the nuclear-free zone in Latin America? The gentleman realizes how close it is to us, and that this may contribute to the safety for this continent.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I do not really see, as I have stated before, that there have been any meaningful results that have come out of this Agency. I am just as much in favor of the search for a genuine peace. But I do not see that the expenditures that we have made so far in this agency—and I am not being critical of the personnel in this Agency because I am sure that they are trying hard to achieve peace—that we have had any really tangible results that we can really talk about on the basis of expenditures we have made. And why we really need to add another \$4 million to this Agency to achieve it through the discussions the chairman is talking about. I favor Mr. Gross' amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, how would the gentleman from California characterize the signing in Washington last Monday of a treaty covering the use of biological warfare weapons? Does the gentleman not consider that that is a

desirable document because this Agency was able to develop a basis for an agreement with the Soviet Union on this subject?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am sure if the Russians would abide by the treaty that it would be, but on the basis of our previous experience we do not know whether they will actually abide by the treaty.

So, as I say, I do not know of any real progress that has been made. Can you furnish proof of such process?

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask this question: Is there any reason why the State Department with its in-house expertise could not have negotiated the same kind of a treaty? If not, what are we maintaining the State Department for, and all their experts over there?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Maybe the gentleman from New Jersey would be able to respond to that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the answer is obvious. I would think the gentleman, who is on the committee, would understand that the specific responsibility of this agency is to concern itself with and be responsible for arms control agreements where they have been reached, and that it would be inappropriate for the State Department, if it did have the expertise, to come up with that kind of an approach. I think that the justification for the agency is pretty well established. I think the gentleman from California himself is recognizing that it has already accomplished a great step if the Soviet Union keeps their obligation.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Assuming that they do.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Progress has been made, I think the record will show, where agreements have been reached concerning the Soviet Union. Certainly progress has been made. And we can hope for more of the same, and perhaps more significant agreements if we only continue to fund this agency on an adequate basis. I think it would be foolhardy in the extreme to argue that, because the war is in a difficult phase and the Soviet Union is still furnishing arms to North Vietnam, that this agency does not have a major, sensitive, and important role to play.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a blind assumption here of the truth of a myth and that is that these types of disarmament treaties improve the prospects for peace.

We are talking about \$22 million—people say, is it not worth spending \$22 million for peace? George Washington said that one of the most efficacious means of preserving peace is to let it be known that you are always prepared for war.

A while back, just a few months ago, a book was published which did not get the publicity it deserved. It was a book called "The Treaty Trap" by Lawrence W. Beilenson.

The author of "The Treaty Trap" covered a span of approximately 300 years in this book. Studying various nations throughout this 300-year period, he found the truth about negotiations and treaties to be the exact opposite of what people are led to believe.

He found that those nations which depended upon peace through strength have had peace.

You know, John Jay, one of our first diplomats said:

I would not give a farthing for any parchment security whatever. They have never signified anything since the world began, when any prince or state, of either side, found it convenient to break them.

Parchment security lasts only so long as nobody tears it up.

These types of treaties are putting us to sleep. We are told: Do not worry about war because of a paper treaty, even when it is exactly the type we know from past experience leads to war.

I favor the gentleman's amendment, but I will vote against the bill even if the amendment passes because I do not think we should be spending even as much as a farthing on parchment security.

Because you get war when your enemies believe that when they attack you, they will win.

You have peace when your enemies know that if they attack, they are going to get clobbered. It is as simple as that.

This is the kind of treaty that just puts us to sleep and that makes it more likely that we are going to have a war.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The Disarmament Agency has not been very effective when you think in terms of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and when you think in terms of the explosion of the 60-megaton bomb.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Do not think that the President going to Peking now will preserve peace in Southeast Asia. What happened within 2 weeks after he left there? That war is bigger than it has ever been.

It is not just the war in Southeast Asia as Beilenson showed in his study of a period of 300 years, documenting the fact that paper treaties have led to war. So let us not assume that we are spending \$22 million on peace. We are going on a false assumption that cannot be proved from history.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think the key question is—how this money is being so spent on what might be just a piece of paper.

But it is just like a man at the race-track and betting a few dollars on a long shot.

To keep up your defenses and what we are doing on the defense budget and investing \$22 million in a possibly effective means of keeping peace, as a return on our investment.

Mr. SCHMITZ. One of the proudest boasts of this administration and previous administrations is that they have

"reordered our priorities." We are robbing defense Peter to pay Socialist Paul. We have been deemphasizing defense all through the past 15 years. The proportion of Federal expenditures going to defense has dropped from about 60 percent roughly to 30 percent, while the Socialist side, the human resources side, has gone up roughly from 20 percent to 40 percent.

We brag that we now are spending more on butter than on guns, and that we are not putting this \$22 million into more guns.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman should not be putting the entire thrust of his argument on the administration and the Members, our good friends on the other side of the aisle, who reorder the priorities with consultation with this body.

So it is not just the President who should share some of the blame that the gentleman mentions.

Mr. SCHMITZ. The gripe I have with the present administration is that it has not changed from the previous administration's policy on disarmament.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the other side of the aisle—we are trying to save them from themselves and their spend-thrift ways.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The question was raised as to what this Agency has accomplished. The gentleman from California should be fully aware that this Agency does not spend the moneys authorized for unilateral disarmament.

Mr. SCHMITZ. But that has been the effect; has it not?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It has not been.

Certainly, the gentleman is aware that this agency helped frame a ban on nuclear explosions in outer space, and that it helped accomplish the partial Test Ban Treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(At the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. SCHMITZ was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. This agency has, as I said, helped negotiate a partial test ban treaty: a nuclear test ban treaty to restrict testing, particularly atmospheric testing. I am sure the gentleman, being an environmentalist from California, is in favor of that particular feature of our effort.

Mr. SCHMITZ. We did not need a treaty to do that, because we can stop our own testing wherever we want, but we have no reason to believe that the Soviets would honor such a treaty. They have broken treaties with more than 50 nations. After all, Lenin said: "Promises are like piecrusts—made to be broken." So why should we now assume that they are going to carry out their side of the bargain?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There is no evidence that any arms control treaties we have

negotiated with the Russians have been violated or broken.

Mr. SCHMITZ. How do we know? They will not allow on-site inspection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There are sufficient inspection methods to make it very clear whether there are violations. May I further—

Mr. SCHMITZ. If I had such faith, I would not be taking the stand that I am.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman agree that it is worthwhile to negotiate a treaty to ban biological warfare?

Mr. SCHMITZ. I will stand on the statement of John Jay that a paper treaty will last just as long as either side refrains from tearing it up.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield further, I see no hope for mankind in arrangements that depend only on the theory the gentleman refers to. We must work to keep our sophisticated weapons from annihilating the world.

Mr. SCHMITZ. It does not take two to make a fight; it takes only one. If one does not want to fight, he only gets clobbered sooner. History shows that the Communists have not abided by their treaties, so what is the use of making treaties with them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not go quite as far as my colleague from California in his suspicion and derogation of the principle of international cooperation and treaties. As a matter of fact, we have found from our historical experience in the United States that we cannot simply depend upon our own brute strength alone for the safety of the Nation. We have woven a network of treaties—NATO, SEATO, and a number of other international arrangements into which we have combined our forces with those of other nations and, as a consequence, in many respects multiplied our safety.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Is it not true that the treaties the gentleman has mentioned are treaties with friends? I was talking about making treaties with enemies.

Mr. HOSMER. I am getting to that next. In many areas we find that people who have nothing in common and are totally antagonistic have for one reason or another signed a treaty. For example, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed a treaty just a few months before apparent harmony was all broken up by a gigantic attack by Germany on Russia. In that particular case there was no mutual self-interest amongst those two countries for keeping the arrangement. The only mutual self-interest they had was in trying to fool the rest of the world as to what their true intentions were at the particular moment they entered the sham arrangement.

But there are other and different circumstances wherein antagonists may make commitments to each other which are beneficial to each and reasonably stable in duration.

The reason we establish such things as this Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is for the very purpose of exploring areas in which there could possibly exist some mutual self-interest in forgoing a resort to some kinds of armaments, or some kinds of explosive tactics, or some particular kinds of violence that have not been formally inhibited before. Where, when and if you find that there exists such an area of mutual self-interest, then even nations which are in a generally antagonist posture can profit by making an agreement about the specific subject. Moreover, they can expect such an agreement to be kept for so long as the self-interest remains reasonably mutual. That does not mean you can go away and indefinitely forget about it. You must keep your eyes and ears open for change. As a matter of fact you should limit your participation in these mutual, self-interest-type treaties to areas where you dependently have the capability to monitor such changes by nonintrusive type of inspections that is the only way you can make sure that the other side still retains an interest in keeping the treaty and that you can have any real confidence that it is being kept.

In the case of the Outer Space Treaty that particular principle of monitorability was forgotten. In an effort to get a treaty for a treaty's sake we entered into a ban on weapons in outer space without any actual mechanics of making certain that the people who signed that treaty would be keeping the treaty. In that kind of a treaty realism dictates little, if any, confidence.

In certain strategic nuclear areas, by way of contrast, we can foresee certain kinds of limitations which appear both beneficial and monitorable. For instance, in the case of large-scale strategic nuclear weapons systems, at some point quantitative limitations become mutually desirable. At the same time, nonintrusive means of inspection are now available to the great nations which make it fairly certain that any breach of the limitations would be rather quickly discovered by each sides' own, independent national inspection capabilities. That is an area into which we can safely go, because the treaty would be limited to specifically defined armaments concerning which there is an obvious financial benefit to both sides to limit, there is minimal security risk in doing so, and mutual self-interest and be assured each side, by nonintrusive means, can make certain the other side is not violating the limitation.

Now insofar as the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is concerned, and insofar as it tends to that kind of knitting, and insofar as it does not expend an unreasonable amount of money in doing so—I, personally, think we can wisely make some more than token investment. I think we probably appropriated little more money in the last 2 years than was necessary. I think that if we scale back for the next 2 years to what the gentleman from Iowa suggests, then we will have sized it about properly. For that reason I urge support for his amendment.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) which would reduce this authorization by \$4 million. Specifically, I will address myself to the point that this amendment is offered to save the taxpayers' money.

In my opinion, the development of sound arms control policies and measures actually results in significant net savings to the American people. For example, the termination of our biological and toxin offensive weapons programs brings a saving in the neighborhood of \$8 million a year. This is nearly 80 percent of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's annual budget.

Even more important than this specific saving is the effect arms control measures will have on future military budgets. In this respect, I would point out that as a result of the Outer Space Treaty and the Seabed Arms Control Treaty, it will not be necessary to research, develop, or procure weapons of mass destruction to be placed in outer space or on the seabed. Further, if an ABM limitation agreement can be achieved at the strategic arms limitation talks, expenditures of staggering magnitude will be saved. As we all know, the estimated cost of a "thick" ABM system ranges from \$50 to \$400 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the authorization request for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be supported. It will not only advance the cause of peace and our national security but it also will be extremely economical in the long run. Therefore, I urge the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were—ayes 11, noes 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOWERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13336) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, pursuant to House Resolution 917, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 349, nays 20, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—349

Abbitt Dulski Long, Md.
Abourezk Duncan Lujan
Abzug du Pont McCloskey
Adams Eckhardt McClure
Addabbo Edmondson
Anderson, Edwards, Ala. McCollister
Calif. Edwards, Calif. McCulloch
Anderson, Ellberg McDade
Tenn. Erlenborn McDonald,
Andrews, Ala. Esch Mich.
Andrews, Evans, Colo. McEwen
N. Dak. Evins, Tenn. McFall
Annunzio Fascell McKevitt
Archer Findley McKinney
Arends Fish Madden
Ashley Fisher Mahon
Aspinall Flood Mallory
Baker Flowers Mathis, Ga.
Barrett Foley Matsunaga
Begich Ford, Gerald R. Mayne
Belcher Forsythe Mazzoli
Bell Fountain Meeds
Bennett Fraser Melcher
Bergland Frelinghuysen Metcalfe
Betts Frenzel Michel
Biaggi Frey Mikva
Biester Fulton Miller, Ohio
Blanton Fuqua Mills, Ark.
Blatnik Garmatz Mills, Md.
Boggs Gaydos Minish
Boland Glaimo Mink
Bolling Gibbons Minshall
Bow Goldwater Mitchell
Brademas Gonzalez Mizell
Brasco Goodling Mollohan
Bray Grasso Monagan
Brinkley Gray Montgomery
Brooks Green, Oreg. Moorhead
Brotzman Green, Pa. Morgan
Brown, Mich. Grover Morse
Brown, Ohio Gubser Mosher
Broyhill, N.C. Gude Moss
Broyhill, Va. Hagan Murphy, Ill.
Buchanan Hamilton Myers
Burke, Fla. Hammer Natcher
Burke, Mass. Schmidt Nedzi
Burleson, Tex. Hanley Nelsen
Burlison, Mo. Hanna Nichols
Burton Hansen, Idaho Nix
Byrnes, Wis. Hansen, Wash. Obey
Byron Harrington O'Hara
Cabell Harsha O'Konski
Camp Harvey Passman
Carey, N.Y. Hastings Patten
Carlson Hathaway Pepper
Carter Hawkins Perkins
Casey, Tex. Hays Peyser
Cederberg Heckler, W. Va. Pickle
Celler Heckler, Mass. Pike
Chamberlain Heinz Pirnie
Chappell Helstoski Poage
Chisholm Henderson Podell
Clancy Hicks, Mass. Poff
Clausen, Hills Powell
Don H. Hillis Preyer, N.C.
Clay Hogan Price, Ill.
Cleveland Hollifield Quile
Collins, Ill. Horton Quillen
Collins, Tex. Hosmer Randall
Colmer Howard Rangel
Conable Hungate Rees
Conte Hunt Reid
Conyers Hutchinson Reuss
Cotter Ichord Rhodes
Coughlin Jacobs Riegle
Culver Jarman Roberts
Curlin Johnson, Calif. Robinson, Va.
Daniel, Va. Johnson, Pa. Robinson, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J. Jonas Rodino
Danielson Jones, Tenn. Roe
Davis, Ga. Karth Rogers
Davis, Wis. Kastenmeyer Roncallo
de la Garza Kazen Rooney, N.Y.
Delaney Keating Rooney, Pa.
Dellenback Keith Rosenthal
Dellums Kemp Rostenkowski
Denholm King Roush
Dennis Kluczynski Roy
Dent Koch Roybal
Derwinski Kyl Runnels
Devine Kyros Ruppe
Dickinson Landgrebe Ruth
Diggs Landrum Ryan
Dingell Latta St Germain
Donohue Lennon Sandman
Dow Lent Sarbanes
Downing Link Saylor
Drinan Lloyd Scherle

Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Stanton,
J. William
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tierman
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Wampler
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—20

Ashbrook Haley
Baring Hall
Blackburn Hull
Clawson, Del. Jones, N.C.
Flynt Martin
Griffin Price, Tex.
Gross Rarick

NOT VOTING—64

Abernethy Galifianakis Pelly
Alexander Gallagher Pettis
Anderson, Ill. Gettys Pryor, Ark.
Aspin Griffiths Pucinski
Badillo Halpern Purcell
Bevill Hébert Rallsback
Bingham Jones, Ala. Satterfield
Broomfield Kee Scheuer
Byrne, Pa. Kuykendall Sikes
Caffery Leggett Spence
Carney Long, La. Stanton,
Clark McCormack James V.
Collier McKay Stokes
Corman McMillan Stubblefield
Crane Macdonald, Stuckey
Davis, S.C. Mass. Sullivan
Dorn Mailliard Symington
Dowdy Mann Waldie
Dwyer Mathias, Calif. Ware
Edwards, La. Miller, Calif. Wilson,
Eshleman Murphy, N.Y. Charles H.
Ford, O'Neill Zlon
William D. Patman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Carney with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Ware.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Zlon.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Scheuer.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Caffery.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. McCormack.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 13336) just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION ASKED FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House a bill that would extend for 1 year the existing Federal programs in the field of higher education at current levels of authorization. As the membership is well aware, a conference between the Senate and the House is presently meeting to resolve the differences in the versions of the extensive higher education bills passed earlier by the two bodies.

My move to introduce a simple 1-year extension of existing programs, comes not through any change of opinion about the merits of many of the constructive changes offered in the House bill—nor, for that matter, a number of useful reforms offered by the Senate. Rather it is an expression of my deep discouragement over some developments in the conference, and my concern that those in the Nation who work in the varied fields of postsecondary education have a reliable basis on which to develop their program plans for next year. College and university presidents, administrators and finance officers simply must be allowed reasonable time to organize next year's efforts and to let students know what will and what will not be available in regard not only to course offerings, but in the way of Federal financial assistance.

I must report to my colleagues in the House that, in my opinion, the prospect of a higher education bill emerging from the present conference that would be acceptable to a majority of House Members is a darkening prospect. In regard to a number of major items on which the House expressed its position by wide majorities on recorded votes, the House conferees are expected to forthrightly defend that House position within the conference. That is the rule of the House. That rule is binding upon conferees sent to represent the House, rather than their own preferences and predilections. While compromise is the essence of conference under our system, compromise does not take in the notion of giving away programs supported in the House by decisive majority vote prior to the conference dialog. And clearly, the House in its recorded votes and its work on the higher education measure did not contemplate the gutting or phasing out of existing programs that have worked extremely well.

This 1-year extension is introduced today so it can be assigned to subcommittee and we can begin work immediately. If worse comes to worse and there

is no compromise between the House and Senate that the House can live with, then it becomes necessary for the House to pass this simple 1-year extension as quickly as possible.

This, I suggest, is preferable to the abandonment of programs of proven effectiveness that have meant so much to colleges and students.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing a letter to the chairman of the Democratic caucus with suggested changes in the rules governing any conference committee. It seems to me very important that the House look carefully at congressional reform in this vital part of the legislative process.

I am also inserting the text of the 1-year extension bill which I am introducing:

H.R.—

A bill to continue for an additional year at current levels the authorization of appropriations for carrying out higher education programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for carrying out the programs for which appropriations are authorized by the provisions of law listed in subsection (b), an amount for each such program equal to the amount authorized to be appropriated for such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, under such provisions of law.

(b) The provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) sections 101, 201, 221, 231, 301(b), 401(b), 408(e), 433(c), 441(b), 451(a), 451(b), 502(f), 504(b), 511(b), 518(b), 528, 532, 543, 555, 601(b), 601(c), 802, 925, 1002(a), and 1103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

(2) sections 101(b), 105(b), 201, and 303 (c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1964,

(3) sections 201, 301 (first sentence), 301 (second sentence), and 601(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958,

(4) section 105(a) of the International Education Act of 1966.

SEC. 2. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the total principal amount of new loans made, and installments paid pursuant to lines of credit, to students covered by Federal loan insurance under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall not exceed the limit applicable for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(b) The number of fellowships the Commissioner of Education is authorized to award under title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, shall be the same as the number he was authorized to award during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

SEC. 3. (a) All programs with respect to which funds are authorized to be appropriated by the first section and the provisions of law referred to in section 2 shall continue to be carried out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, notwithstanding any provisions therein providing that they will expire prior to such date.

(b) Section 404 of the General Education Provisions Act shall not be applicable with respect to the authorization of appropriations provided in this Act.

HEARINGS ON PREPAID LEGAL SERVICES PLANS FOR WORKERS

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and ex-

tend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to my colleagues that the special Subcommittee on Labor will hold hearings on April 20, 26, and May 16 on H.R. 13938, a bill which I hope will encourage the growth of pre-paid legal services plans for workers.

H.R. 13938 will remove a legal obstacle to the negotiation by labor and management of jointly administered legal services plans, by permitting employer contributions to trust funds established to finance such plans.

Section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act prohibits all payments by employers to employee representatives for purposes other than those specifically expected in that section. This section was enacted to prevent bribery, extortion, and other corrupt practices, and to protect the beneficiaries of lawful employer-supported funds. Section 302(c) contains seven exceptions to this general prohibition, and thus permits employer contributions to trust funds to finance medical care programs, retirement pension plans, apprenticeship programs, and other specific programs.

This bill would add an eighth exception to section 302(c)—jointly administered trust funds for the purpose of defraying the costs of legal services—and thus legalize such jointly administered programs.

MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS NEED HELP TO MEET THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with several of my colleagues in sponsoring a bill to help middle-class parents meet the cost of their children's education.

The cost of college has become a nightmare for middle-class parents. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates a more than 50-percent increase of college costs through 1977. A college education already costs more than \$15,000 at a typical private college in the East.

In the city of New York, parents fear the eventual disappearance of free tuition at the City University. The State University of New York has already adopted a policy of matching private college cost increases.

The very rich, of course, will always be able to pay. Ninety-four percent of the total financial needs of low-income students are covered by current Federal programs.

The middle-class parent stands alone—faced with the difficulty of paying these college costs. Not all of them can pay those costs any more. As a result, an increasingly large number of middle-class children will be deprived of a college education.

This bill, the Higher Education Funding Act, is not a handout to the middle-class—they do not want that. The plan

is designed to encourage self-financing by the parents of students. The bill would just permit parent-taxpayers to deduct from their gross taxable income, the money they contribute, over a number of years, to a special fund they have established for their children's college education.

The idea embodied here is similar to the Keogh Act which permits self-employed persons to set aside annually, tax-deductible funds for future retirement purposes. This idea has been effective in helping people develop retirement funds and should work for college financing.

Moreover, unlike other college financing plans, this is a low-cost program and will allow maximum individual freedom in the selection of colleges. Most proposals have been defeated because of the many billions of dollars they required. Now, I and many of my colleagues feel the benefits of those plans would outweigh the costs. But we are not a majority and action is needed now. If we wait for full tuition subsidies, parents will get no help at all. This program would not make such a large dent on the Federal budget, but would be a large help to the home of many families.

This is an important piece of legislation which deserves serious consideration from the Ways and Means Committee. This bill is not only supported by many of our colleagues in the House and Senate, but is recommended by the Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities as well.

The Higher Education Funding Act is not the perfect be-all and end-all solution to all the needs of higher education. On the other hand, the Higher Education Act, which is now languishing in conference committee, would take care of many institutional needs in higher education, but it ignores the needs of the parents of college youngsters. My bill would meet those needs in a quick, realistic way. Mr. Speaker, the most important argument for this bill is that for very little cost, it will help the forgotten families of America—middle-class families—who by sending their children to college and paying dearly for that education, show a great hope in America. We should encourage that hope by passing this bill.

THE PRICE OF MEAT TO THE CONSUMER NOT THE RESULT OF THE PRICE PAID TO THE PRODUCER—HEARINGS SHOW LIVESTOCK PRICES INADEQUATE

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, on which I have the honor to be ranking minority member, has just completed its first 2 days of hearings on beef prices. The testimony heard thus far not only shows that livestock producers are not profiting unreasonably from the absence of controls on agricultural products but that present livestock prices are in fact inadequate to give farmers a fair return

and insure adequate future supplies of meat.

With the exception of a very brief interval last February cattle prices have been continuously lower than they were 20 years ago. During the same 20-year period, farm production expenses have doubled, farm debt has quintupled, per capita disposal income has increased 2.3 times and general wage rates 2.4 times. But the farmer is getting a lower price for cattle than he did 20 years ago even in today's greatly depreciated dollars. Two farmers from northwest Iowa, Frank Buryanek from Hawarden and Ed Ladd from Rock Rapids, testified that there is no future in livestock production at present prices and so few young farmers are entering this essential field that there is real danger that our Nation will eventually face a serious meat shortage. Mr. Speaker, the record in these hearings has already conclusively established that controls on livestock prices are unnecessary, unwise, and definitely not in the national interest.

We have also in these hearings been able to expose grossly unfair and false advertising tactics on the part of the Giant Food Store chain which has misled the American public into thinking that farmers not chainstores are exploiting lack of controls to earn excessive profits. The undisputed evidence developed at these hearings is that wholesale prices on beef, that is, the price paid by Giant, had been declining for 18 straight days prior to March 21. Nevertheless Giant ran an ad in Washington papers on March 31 stating meat prices were high and strongly suggesting this was caused by lack of controls on exorbitant livestock prices. "Why are they so high? It begins at the source. Livestock prices are not controlled. Prices from our suppliers have skyrocketed." This at a time when Giant was failing to pass substantial reductions in its own costs on to its customers in lower retail prices. And at a time when chainstores on the average had increased their margin on choice beef 4½ cents a pound from November to February, according to Don Pearlberg, Director of Economics for the USDA.

Mr. Speaker, I gave the witness, Clarence G. Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains, every opportunity to express his organization's disapproval of this false and misleading Giant ad but he failed to do so. He admitted the association makes no effort to require truth in advertising, or maintain standards of honesty among its members. He indicated he and the association would be content to leave protection of the public up to law enforcement officers, assuming they would act if any law were actually violated. Thus did the spokesman for the food chainstores wash the industry's hands of any responsibility for Giant's false and fraudulent accusations against the Nation's livestock producers. The National Association of Food Chains' shocking indifference to a proved deception of the consuming public by one of its members indicates stronger legislation is needed to insure truth in advertising to protect consumers and others injured by false advertising as our livestock farmers have been injured by this outrageous Giant ad.

I am confident that members of our subcommittee on both sides of the aisle will want to consider such legislation when the hearings are completed.

RIISING FOOD PRICES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I testified before the Price Commission on the high cost of food and the failure of the Nixon administration's "stabilization" program to curb it.

The President claims that he is trying to stop inflation, but he has left unregulated the entire area of raw agricultural products, an area in which great price fluctuations are commonplace. I realize that he needs the farm vote if he is to be reelected in November, but he needs the urban vote too. He is not going to get it if he persists in limiting working people's wages while the cost of their food climbs higher and higher.

As I suggested to the Price Commission, agricultural prices must be placed under price controls if economic stabilization is to be at all fair. In addition, since the President is not interested in enforcing even existing price regulations, we should enact legislation to pay the attorney's fees of consumers who successfully sue violators, plus a nominal reward for their work in enforcing the law. Finally, the administration should investigate the practices and profit margins of food processors, whose remarkable ability to drastically reduce the price of beef on one day's notice makes one wonder how wide their profit margins are.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my statement before the Price Commission in the RECORD at this point:

BELLA S. ABZUG: TESTIMONY BEFORE THE PRICE COMMISSION ON RISING FOOD PRICES

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Price Commission, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you to discuss the desperate and ever-worsening plight of the American consumer, a plight that has grown to alarming proportions during the past few months.

This tragic situation had its genesis long ago, when we began to commit tens of billions of dollars and tens of thousands of men to an illegal and immoral war in Southeast Asia. The war has continued, and with it the myth of our economic security has dissolved. When the President instituted his wage-price freeze, a program to control the wages of our American labor force while interest, dividends and profits went untouched, our true economic outlook became all too clear. Workers' wages were frozen or severely limited, while the big businesses, including large supermarkets, were asked to fix prices "voluntarily" during the economic "stabilization" period.

The result? An effective wage freeze, while prices, especially food prices, have continued to increase.

President Nixon's inability to create an effective price control machinery in our supermarkets is understood clearly when we read in the New York Times that food prices have climbed to an annual increase rate of 22.4 percent. Such family staple products as milk, sugar, potatoes and coffee have increased in most Manhattan supermarkets between 3 and 17 percent. Celery is up a record 26 percent since September, and spare ribs are up 23 percent in the same period.

People in my district are desperate. Many

elderly and handicapped individuals, and working people too, have given up meat and fresh fruit. Some pick through canned goods hoping to find damaged or label-less cans that can be purchased at a discount. I think that this commission should come up to New York to hear first hand about the situation there, and I invite you to come into my district and to hear witnesses to the almost extortionate quality of food prices there.

While it is unclear whether the overall price scale in large supermarkets has risen, there has definitely been a marked increase in individual items which are essential to the normal American family household.

What is the cause of the dramatic rise in the prices of certain food items, a rise which has reached such an exorbitant level that many American shoppers simply cannot afford essential food for their families?

The answer is twofold. For quite some time, farmers' associations and retail food store owners have disagreed vehemently over which group is to blame for the unreasonable food prices to which consumers are being subjected. The farmers claim that the middlemen, the retail supermarkets, have increased their profits substantially through inflationary and unjustified price increases. The farmers reason that since the retailers reaped large profits during past periods of falling prices for raw agricultural products, they should now be required to absorb at least some of the increases in prices today.

It should be noted here that the Nixon administration has wholeheartedly agreed with the farmer, laying the blame for food price increases on the middleman. Secretary Connally met with supermarket chain owners and convinced them to lower beef prices, but just how long these reductions will remain effective is yet to be seen.

The supermarkets, on the other hand, have pointed at increased farm prices as the major reason for price increases on certain food items. They have pointed to the blatant favoritism shown the farmers by the administration through its institution of higher farm price support levels and its exemption from price guidelines of raw agricultural products.

Mr. Nixon is putting the entire blame for food increases on the middleman because he needs the farm vote in this election year. In fact, Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz has expressed joy at the food price hikes and is pushing for still higher and bigger subsidies in hopes of buying farm votes at the expense of the consumer.

But we should not be deluded, however, into thinking that the increase in farm prices alone has caused the large price increases in our stores, for the supermarkets themselves have flagrantly violated the price freeze and price controls.

Many large supermarkets in Manhattan, for example, failed or refused to list their base prices until subjected to considerable pressure from "Operation Price Watch" of District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

On September 15, 1971, one month after the beginning of the freeze, 98 out of 102 supermarkets checked in Manhattan had failed to list their base prices. By October 11, nearly a month later, half the stores had still not posted their lists.

The very fact that meat prices dropped immediately after Secretary Connally met with the supermarket owners showed that there exists an unduly wide profit margin in at least some food items.

The one thing that is crystal clear here is that the consumer is the real loser. It is apparent that both the farmers and the middlemen are to blame for the food price increase. Department of Agriculture, in a report issued earlier this year, stated that the price of meat per pound has increased 9½ cents over the past few months; of this increase, 4.8 cents was due to the increase in farm

prices and 4.5 cents was due to the increase in the profit margins of retail supermarkets.

President Nixon must decide whether he is interested in halting the food price spiral, thus relieving millions of Americans of a burden which is overtaxing their budgets, or whether he is interested in gaining the favor of farmers for re-election purposes. If he wants to help the millions who feel the pinch of this inflation, he must institute some or all of the following actions at once:

1. Place agricultural products under price controls. If the economic stabilization program is to stop or significantly slow the inflationary spiral, it cannot leave so large and volatile an area unregulated;

2. Request and press for legislation which would pay attorney's fees, plus a minimum bonus recovery of at least \$100, to consumers who successfully sue retailers and wholesalers who violate economic stabilization regulations;

3. Request and press for legislation which would provide that any citizen who provides information which leads to a criminal conviction and fine for violators of price regulations receive half of the fine as a bounty;

4. Reduce inflationary farm prices support levels;

5. Stop pressure for increased price supports for dairy and grain products;

6. Investigate the practices and profit margins of food processors and retailers. Specifically, the administration should check whether the suddenly reduced retail price for beef this month correlates with changes in the wholesale price of beef at and immediately preceding this time.

In addition, this Commission must open up its procedures to the public. Information submitted by companies seeking price increases is kept secret, with consumers not being permitted to see it or to take part in the decision-making process. Also, there is no public disclosure of violations which the Commission finds to have taken place; consequently, although over 20,000 violations have been found, consumers have practically no information to guide or support them in seeking the millions of dollars in refunds to which they are entitled.

I think that the situation with regard to food prices is a perfect example of the failure of economic stabilization in the hands of a business-oriented Republican administration. If we are to have controls at all—and I am inclined to believe that we should not—then either you on the Price Commission must see that they are fairly administered or we in Congress must step in and write legislation which narrowly limits your discretion.

THE LATE HONORABLE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be granted 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of the late Honorable Adam Clayton Powell.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, to the people of my community, Harlem, Adam Clayton Powell was a giant, a man who showed us how to keep the faith. For all of Harlem, April 4 represents a day of personal tragedy since a close friend has passed on.

To many people outside our community, Adam was a puzzle, a man who played the white man's game and beat him at it. He played the seniority game, and won. Some Members of Congress rose to pinnacles of power, to chairmanships of important committees, simply because they were able to muster overwhelming majorities at the polls, election after election. For decades they blocked legislation which would have aided black Americans and poor Americans by pretending that seniority was only slightly less holy than the principles enumerated in the Ten Commandments. Adam represented the brilliant urban answer to those who blocked the road of social change, for he could do everything they could, from rolling out the pork barrel to living it up on congressional junkets.

Adam Clayton Powell will be recorded in the history books of our children and grandchildren as a legislative giant. In the quest for social justice, he had no equal. He was an apostle and uncompromising champion of racial justice and equal opportunity.

It was Adam Clayton Powell who was an early leader in the fight for civil rights. He worked to outlaw racial discrimination in the Armed Forces, in housing, in public accommodations, and in housing. He labored to create a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission and to ban the poll tax designed to bar the black citizen and the disadvantaged citizen from the ballot box.

It was Adam Clayton Powell who had the courage to seek a full-scale investigation into discrimination in Federal facilities in 1947 and to urge the cutoff of Federal funds to States and school districts which maintained segregated educational systems.

It was Adam Clayton Powell who brought the first senior citizens apartment house built under the Community Facilities Act to Harlem. Job training programs, cooperative housing facilities, and Small Business Administration projects all came to Harlem as a result of his leadership and commitment to the community.

As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Adam did more to help the children of America, the unemployed, the handicapped, and the downtrodden than any other legislator in the history of our country. As former President Lyndon B. Johnson wrote to Adam on March 18, 1966:

The fifth anniversary of your Chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee reflects a brilliant record of accomplishment.

It represents the successful reporting to the Congress of forty-nine pieces of bedrock legislation. And the passage of every one of these bills attests to your ability to get things done.

Even now, these laws, which you so effectively guided through the House, are finding abundant reward in the lives of our people.

Only with progressive leadership could so much have been accomplished by one Committee in so short a time. I speak for the millions of Americans who benefit from these laws when I say that I am truly grateful.

The Powell record is unmatched. Vocational education programs, an increased

minimum wage, school construction funds, and occupational safety legislation were enacted under his direction. The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act, and the Older Americans Act of 1965 all bear Adam's imprint. It was Adam Clayton Powell who made the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities realities. It was Adam who guided the landmark war on poverty legislation through the tortuous halls of Congress.

His 26-year career in politics altered the course of history. But, despite the legislative power he wielded, he did not believe that the law is automatically sacred.

He once remarked:

When the law of man and custom conflicts with the law of God, defy the law of man.

And defy the law of man and of custom he did. He sounded the death knell of unquestioning black subservience to the rules of an elitist society. As a result, he found himself expelled from the House of Representatives on March 1, 1967, the victim of a double standard which ignored the wrongdoings of white Members and preyed on the wrongdoings of a black Member. On January 16, 1967, shortly before Adam was excluded from this Chamber and long before he was vindicated by the Supreme Court, I made my maiden speech to the New York State Assembly. I told my colleagues on that day:

Our Congressman was arrogant and made apologies to no one outside of his community. Somehow the people felt that he was doing what they could not do and saying what they were afraid to say.

The people of Harlem found themselves without a spokesman in Congress and they, too, were victims of this double standard.

Until the darkness of death engulfed him, Adam Clayton Powell maintained his robust faith in the ability of black Americans to overcome the repression brought forth by a sick and often misguided society. Despite his epic struggles, obstacles, and frustrations, he always kept the faith. And he was able to impart that faith to others. Adam doggedly believed that he—and now the rest of us—could push America forward and eradicate the cancer of racism.

We shall miss him.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my distinguished colleague from Manhattan, the successor in this House of the late Adam Clayton Powell, in paying tribute to the memory of Congressman Powell, whom I knew for many years as a colleague in the Congress and more important, as a friend.

Adam Clayton Powell knew well the multifaceted problems, concerns, and needs of his 18th Congressional district, and he understood how important it was to make those concerns and needs under-

stood in the Congress of the United States.

While chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he provided effective and sound leadership toward the legislative goals of both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He was very proud of the fact that over 50 major bills were passed during his chairmanship, including the Economic Opportunities Act which created the war on poverty.

As chairman of the committee, he made it possible for junior members of the committee to have their names attached to landmark legislation. When the administration would send proposed legislation to his committee, instead of introducing it in his own name—the usual practice for a committee chairman—frequently he would invite a less senior member to introduce it. That was characteristic of him.

Adam Clayton Powell's dedication to equality and justice was already well established before he came to Washington. He had been at the forefront of the struggle against discrimination in private industry in the city of New York.

He entered politics in 1941 as the first black leader to run for and win a New York City Council seat.

To describe his career as controversial is an understatement. Anyone who felt as strongly about life as he did was not apt to move through it without causing waves. He was often in the eye of the storm.

It has been said that he "gaily defied convention." If that is so, it was because he made it clear that he was not going to take a back seat or enter by the side door.

He had an uncompromising disdain for all kinds of hypocrisy.

In 1944 the people of his district sent him to Washington as their elected Representative, and the streets, homes, and stores of Harlem knew his face, knew his voice, and will remember him as their champion who did battle on behalf of a neglected minority. And his energies were devoted to the advancement of human rights and dignity.

The legislation that he fought so long and so hard to see enacted remains as a memorial of his consummate skills as a practical politician—in the best sense of that honorable but often misused term.

Adam is gone, but the major social legislation of two administrations belongs to the Nation—the war on poverty, aid to education, laws dealing with juvenile delinquency, vocational rehabilitation, the school lunch program, library service, and a host of measures designed to end discrimination and to bring about the full dignity and recognition so long denied black people.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this time to pay tribute to one who, for all the controversy which swirled about him, nevertheless did valiant battle for the disenfranchised, dispossessed and disadvantaged whose needs this Nation has yet to fulfill.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his comments.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well for taking this time of the House to commemorate the memory of one who, despite the odds against him, rose to heights aspired to by all men.

While Adam Clayton Powell was a controversial public figure, criticized by most, he did serve a purpose while he was here among us. He did call to the attention not only of Americans but also of the world the fact that here in the United States there existed a social situation which begged to be corrected.

The most delightful manner in which Adam Clayton Powell pursued his purpose in life will be long remembered. He was the one and only and personified the inimitable.

I had the personal experience of greeting him in Hawaii and spending some time with him there. Even in Hawaii he attracted public attention to the degree that no one else could have.

One of the things that I remember most about Adam Clayton Powell is that he took me as being one of "the group." So he said, but whenever I voted against one of his so-called Powell amendments he would come up to me and say, "SPARKY, you look all right but your prejudice is showing," knowing full well that even as a civil rights advocate I would have voted as I did.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the one other thing for which Adam Clayton Powell will be remembered is the style which he employed in the well of the House. I do not think we have had anyone who could spontaneously and with so much color to his speech, gain so much attention even when he was talking about little things. He had a flair for public speaking. We certainly miss the Adam Clayton Powell type of oratory here in the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman in the well (Mr. RANGEL), and other Members of the House in extending deepest sympathies to the widow of Adam Clayton Powell, and to his family, and to wish for them that God may grant them the courage and comfort to face the future without Adam.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Adam Powell was a friend of mine. He was a great committee chairman. He was a friend of humanity and of the poor and the dispossessed.

For a variety of reasons, Chairman Powell and I, who knew each other before I was fortunate enough to be elected to the House, were good friends. I was personally heartsick when the Democratic caucus decided to remove Chairman Powell as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I was outraged when my colleagues, contrary to the clear language of the U.S. Constitution, refused to seat Mr. Powell, despite the fact that he was elected by his constituents from his district in New York.

At this juncture I would like to say that our distinguished colleague in the well, the gentleman from New York (Mr.

RANGEL) has filled the place of our departed colleague with courage, with an equal commitment to the poor and with all of the restless and determined energy to eliminate the social and racial injustices that abound in this land, as did our good friend, Adam Clayton Powell.

No one could ever speak for Adam. I certainly cannot purport to do so. But I affirm, as one friend who knew and loved him, that if the gentleman from New York had to be replaced, if he could no longer serve as my colleague, I can think of no one with whom it is more comfortable to fight side by side, than the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

During the effort to inflict damage on the image of our dear friend I had placed into the RECORD the enormous accomplishments that resulted from the chairmanship of Adam Clayton Powell.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, if I may, I would ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point those accomplishments.

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

There was no objection.

(The material referred to follows.)

Mr. BURTON. On August 30, 1966, I made the following remarks which appear in the RECORD of that day:

CHAIRMAN POWELL OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was most disappointed and shocked to hear one of our colleagues attack the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Congressman Powell's constituents have reelected him by margins exceeded by virtually no other Member of this House.

His effective efforts as the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and the great benefits which the legislative production of that committee has brought to this country speak for themselves.

I think the Members will be interested in some of the concrete achievements of Chairman Powell's already distinguished legislative and political career.

On June 25 of this year, the Negro newspaper publishers of America voted to give Chairman Powell 1 of the 10 Russwurm Awards for 1966. The other nine honorees included Pope Paul VI; Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson; Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey; Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach; Andrew Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Asa T. Spaulding, president of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Willie Mays, San Francisco outfielder; John H. Johnson, publisher and editor of Ebony, Jet, and Negro Digest; and Gov. Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky.

Earlier this year on March 18, President Johnson wrote Chairman Powell a letter congratulating him on his outstanding 5-year record as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

The President's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, March 18, 1966.

HON. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR ADAM: The fifth anniversary of your Chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee reflects a brilliant record of accomplishment.

It represents the successful reporting to the Congress of forty-nine pieces of bedrock legislation. And the passage of every one of these bills attests to your ability to get things done.

Even now, these laws, which you so effectively guided through the House, are finding abundant reward in the lives of our people.

The poverty program is rapidly paving new pathways to progress for those whom the economic vitality of this land had previously bypassed.

The education measures are being translated into fuller opportunity for all our citizens to develop their God-given talents to their fullest potential.

Minimum wage, long a guarantee of a fair return for an honest day's work, has been increased and greatly extended.

And the problems of juvenile delinquency are being met and curtailed by positive and determined action.

Only with progressive leadership could so much have been accomplished by one Committee in so short a time. I speak for the millions of Americans who benefit from these laws when I say that I am truly grateful.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

On the fifth anniversary of Representative Powell's chairmanship, his office released a background summary of his political career and the list of 52 laws in the various fields of education and labor which were shepherded through his committee. That background summary follows:

THE LEGISLATION RECORD OF REPRESENTATIVE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Congressman Powell was first elected to the 79th Congress on November 7, 1944, from Harlem, which is now the 18th Congressional District of New York State.

He became Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives in January 1961.

This year—1966—Rep. Adam Clayton Powell celebrates the completion of his fifth year as Chairman.

In the five years of his Chairmanship, Congressman Powell has successfully guided to passage 52 major laws from his Committee. He has never had a bill from his Committee defeated once it reached the floor of the House of Representatives.

In those five years, some of the most important legislation in the history of this country and the United States Congress has been passed: Increasing the Minimum Wage, The War on Poverty, Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education, Barring Discrimination in Salaries paid to Women for the same work performed by Men, Manpower Development and Training for more Jobs, Anti-Juvenile Delinquency, Vocational Rehabilitation, School Lunch Program, Library Services.

Following is the record of the 52 laws which were passed in the first five years of Congressman Powell's Chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee:

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Public Law 87-22: Amending Vocational Education laws to include and help practical nurse training programs.

Public Law 87-30: Increasing the coverage of Minimum Wage legislation to include retail clerks; also increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25.

Public Law 87-87: Increased Benefits for Longshoremen and Harbor Workers.

Public Law 87-137: Provides for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Public Law 87-262: Establishes a teaching hospital for Howard University; transfers Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University.

Public Law 87-274: The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenders Control Act.

Public Law 87-276: Providing for the training of teachers of the deaf and handicapped children.

Public Law 87-294: Education of the Blind.

Public Law 87-300: Study of health and safety conditions in metal mines.

Public Law 87-344: Extension of the laws providing funds for school construction and maintenance in Federally impacted areas.

Public Law 87-339: Amending the Federal Employee's Compensation Act.

Public Law 87-400: Amending the National Defense Education Act regarding student loans.

Public Law 87-415: The Manpower Development and Training Act, to make more jobs available.

Public Law 87-420: Amending the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Public Law 87-581: The Work Hours Act of 1962, establishing standards for pay and work of laborers and mechanics.

Public Law 87-715: Educational and training films of the deaf.

Public Law 87-729: Amending the Manpower Development and Training Act regarding railroad unemployment insurance.

Public Law 87-823: Liberalizing formula under National School Lunch Act.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Public Law 88-38: Equal pay for equal work.

Public Law 88-204: Higher Education Academic Facilities Act.

Public Law 88-210: Improving the quality of vocational education, providing for its expansion and strengthening.

Public Law 88-214: Amending the Manpower and Development Training Act.

Public Law 88-269: Increasing Federal Assistance for public libraries.

Public Law 88-321: President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Public Law 88-349: Amending the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Public Law 88-368: Amending the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending it for 2 more years.

Public Law 88-444: National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Public Law 88-458: The War on Poverty.

Public Law 88-508: Amending the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Public Law 88-579: National Council on the Arts.

Public Law 88-582: Registration of contractors of migrant workers.

Public Law 88-665: Amending and extending the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Public Law 89-10: Improving elementary and secondary educational opportunities.

Public Law 89-15: Amending the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Public Law 89-36: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Public Law 89-69: Amending the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

Public Law 89-73: The Older Americans Act of 1965.

Public Law 89-77: Amending Public Law 815, providing for school construction in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Public Law 89-125: Amending the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

Public Law 89-178: Providing for analysis of manpower shortage in correctional rehabilitation.

Public Law 89-209: National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Public Law 89-216: Bonding Provisions of Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

Public Law 89-253: Expanding the War on Poverty.

Public Law 89-258: Expansion of loan service of educational media for the deaf.

Public Law 89-286: Labor standards for persons employed by Federal contractors.

Public Law 89-287: Financial assistance for students attending trade, technical,

business and other vocational schools, after secondary education.

Public Law 89-313: Providing for assistance in construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by major disaster.

Public Law 89-329: Strengthening the educational resources of our colleges and universities; and to financially assist such students.

Public Law 89-333: Amending the vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Public Law 89-376: Federal Coal Mine Safety.

Public Law 89-488: Amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Public Law 89-511: Library Services and Construction Act Amendments.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to keep my many colleagues here on the floor listening to me much longer, but it is important to me that I do not in any perfunctory way participate in this special order dealing with one of the giants in the history of the U.S. Congress and one whose last few years on earth, I know, will not be permitted by the historians to mar the noble and tremendous record of production of our distinguished former colleague, Adam Clayton Powell.

My wife and I shall miss Adam. We shall miss him for the joy he brought to his friends over the years. We shall miss him for his concern for little people of all colors and hues and we shall miss him even more because in the last few years of his life on earth, we were robbed of the opportunity to share more often his company.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I did not serve in the Congress when Adam Clayton Powell was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I know of his reputation in that capacity and the laws which were passed by this Congress as the result of his leadership. I do not intend, therefore, to talk about something I know only by way of reputation. I would rather confine my remarks to something I know of on a personal basis.

I first met Adam Clayton Powell when I was elected as a Democratic district leader in 1963 to the New York County executive committee. He was also a democratic district leader at that time and I remember very well the first occasion when we met. It was shortly after my election, but he had been district leader for many years. When he came into the room it did not make any difference who was there or what was taking place, Adam Clayton Powell without uttering a word became the center of attention. There was a magnetism about him that defies description.

When I came to Congress in 1969 one of the first votes I cast—indeed, I think it was the first vote I cast, immediately after the election of the Speaker of the House, was to seat Adam Clayton Powell. Notwithstanding the years of tribulation that had taken place as a result of his not being seated and the toll of the illness that he was then suffering from—he walked into the House with that same magnetism that I had first seen in 1963 and in the interim years

when we served as district leaders in New York County. I remember vividly how the Members who had been here for so many years came over and crowded around him to wish him well.

There are very few people who have this quality. But there are very few people who merely by their presence are accorded leadership position wherever they are. It is an amazing sight to behold. Every people can point with pride to men and women of leadership, whether they are Italians, Jewish, Irish, Slavic, Hispanic—whatever ethnic group we may be talking about. And the blacks in this country will always be able to look back and say, "There was a prince among princes," because that is exactly what he was.

And I do not think we have to forget the fact that he was under attack and at times deserving of criticism, but as was said 2,000 years ago, "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone." So many other people did what he did and were not punished. But I think the criticism of Adam Clayton Powell must pale when compared with the great good that he did. And as has been pointed out by others who have spoken today, particularly by the gentleman in the well, my good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the legislation which he left is an inheritance, not just for blacks, not just for Puerto Ricans, not just for the depressed nonwhites in this country, but for all of the oppressed of every color, creed, or national origin.

He was leading the battle for all of us in this special area of lifting up the oppressed, of dealing with those problems that those who have no defenders face every day, and he was a defender of the poor without regard to color, unsurpassed over the years.

This Congress and the Congresses to come will look back on Adam Clayton Powell's role in the many Congresses in which he served with pride, and say, "There was a man among men that all of us can revere," and know that the Congress will always be the poorer for having been bereft of the leadership he could have given in this Congress, and that which we are now denied because of his death.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the distinguished Democrat from New York.

Mr. REID. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Adam Powell was a friend of mine during the entire time we served together in the House and, indeed, we worked together prior to that in establishing the first store-front office of what was then called the State Commission Against Discrimination. Adam well understood that a State office way downtown, open only in the daytime, did not meet the needs of people, many of whom could only talk to Government representatives to secure their rights, and he understood the importance of a store-front State office.

I had the privilege in the House of serving with him for a number of years and on his Committee on Education and Labor. Indeed, I believe he was the first gentleman after my swearing-in, or even

before that, to cross over the aisle and welcome me to this body.

Throughout his leadership and chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee Adam Powell brought a sense of urgency and direction to the national agenda. It is a matter of record, now historical record, that under his chairmanship more important legislation in the field of education (such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), in the field of arts, in the field of anti-poverty—such as the Office of Economic Opportunity Act—and in many respects in the field of labor law were passed by his committee and then the Congress. In my judgment, most of these bills are landmark legislation. They will vitally affect the future of our country for years to come.

If the full impact of this legislation has not been felt, it has been due primarily to war and to the fact that many of the authorizations have not been fully met by adequate funding.

But Adam Powell brought something else to this House. It was not just a question of leadership nor a question of vision.

He brought courage to this House. I remember the days when he would fight for civil rights legislation when very few others would do it, either with his clarity or with his sense of urgency. I remember when he not only showed courage and was not cowed by convention nor intimidated by precedents, but he also had a very real sense of humor—a sense of humor about himself and about his country. I remember when sometimes members of the committee or others were, perhaps, indulging a little excessively in the 5-minute rule, Adam with a very definite sense of humor would right the balance and bring order back to the committee and point the direction forward again. These are qualities badly missed, the quality of a genuine sense of humor with a genuine sense of purpose in back of it.

At the time when most of us were voting to try to keep Adam seated and during the debate on exclusion, I said at that time I thought the action of this House was unconstitutional, and I think the record ultimately will show that the first action to exclude was not wholly constitutional. But be that as it may, there are many who have pointed to differences of opinion with Adam, areas where there were disagreements—and there is no question there were areas for genuine disagreement—nonetheless anyone who served in this House knows Mr. Powell brought a magnetism, a sense of purpose, and a sense of vision to the business of this body.

In my judgment, he, during his lifetime, made a difference in the United States. Many of those who followed after him—whether it was Dr. Martin Luther King or Ralph Abernathy or Jesse Jackson, as well as others who have fought for the same goals—in no small measure owed both the opportunity and the effectiveness of their campaigns to the earlier trek that Adam Clayton Powell had made in this body and in international conferences overseas and in conferences throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentle-

man in the well for taking this time and for his representation as he occupies the seat of Adam Clayton Powell. The gentleman has been a great credit in that position.

I also would like to recall very briefly the moving funeral service of the Abyssinian Baptist Church in New York. I think those of us who were privileged to be there felt the relevance that Adam Clayton Powell had to all Americans who felt the deep affection for him in New York and in his Harlem constituency. Above all I feel that here was a man who was unafraid, and who was willing to challenge the future and to virtually boldly move this country forward to meet needs that had been deferred for two centuries. Whatever the criticism and however serious it may have been of Adam Clayton Powell's life, nothing can detract from his record of leadership in passing legislation of fundamental and lasting benefit to the American people.

Finally, on behalf of myself and Mrs. Reid and others. I would like to extend our deep sympathy, in which all Members of the House I am sure join, to Adam Clayton Powell's family and say how deeply we will miss him.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as the senior black Member of Congress, I delivered the following remarks on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus at the funeral of the late Adam Clayton Powell.

Only a tiny handful of men have influenced the implacable forces of our time. To this small circle, Adam Clayton Powell truly belongs. For this we pay him homage today.

No one shares in this memorial with a greater sense of historical perspective than the Congressional Black Caucus and the members of the New York congressional delegation, who are here headed by the distinguished dean of the House, EMANUEL CELLER.

We know how much Adam was loved, feared, and hated, as were few of his contemporaries. We know he leaves a legacy of solid legislative achievement to rebuke his detractors and benefit for generations to come the poor and disinherited, whose champion he was through decades when he had few to join him in the battles that he waged.

We know he was one of the principal architects of black political empowerment in this Nation and that growing ranks of black elected officials, North and South, who now assert their newfound strength and independence, are laying down a broad highway along the trail Adam Powell blazed.

It was his audacious genius to be well ahead of his time. From his base at Abyssinian Baptist Church far back in depression days, he was marching and leading boycotts for bread and butter, economic and social gains. Before he and others marshaled the forces which translated the marching feet of the black nonviolent revolution of the sixties into historic civil rights legislation, Adam Powell had for years been stubbornly attaching the antidiscrimination amendments which bore his name to the business-as-usual legislation of his colleagues.

No one demonstrated better than this white knight that black is not just a color but a state of mind and no one demonstrated better to our younger rebels that age does not limit one's capacity for relevance.

As chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, he laid the groundwork for the empowerment of the poor, the unskilled, and the youth of this Nation by brilliantly piloting to passage landmark antipoverty, manpower, and education statutes.

While our own National Government hesitated and opposed, he had the courage and the foresight to set out on his own at the Bandung Conference in 1955 to forge the links of friendship and common concern among the black, brown, and yellow people of the world.

The envious and mediocre men, who moved to strip him of his power did not in the final analysis win, for they could not deprive him of his zest for life, of his burning intellect and wit and compassion, which made the Congress a smaller place without him. Most of all, they could not take from him the love which he earned from the black and oppressed people of his time, who always reserved in their hearts a special place for Adam.

If any man has drunk of life and given even more freely than he received, that man was Adam Powell. In his abundant life he earned his rest and those of us who knew him, who worked and fought by his side, cannot even now think of him as dead, except in the words of the Prophet, who might have been speaking of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. when he said of death:

Only when you drink from the river of silence shall you indeed sing. And when you have reached the mountain top, then you shall begin to climb. And when the earth shall claim your limbs, then you shall truly dance.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our former colleague, Adam Clayton Powell, was a time of sincere mourning for literally millions of Americans who respected the courage and leadership ability of the former Harlem Representative. I had the opportunity to witness this man's ability and charisma first hand in this Chamber. I also witnessed as an honorary pallbearer the outpouring of public grief and admiration as thousands of New Yorkers lined the street corners of Harlem this past Sunday. That crowd which gathered Sunday, and again on Monday, at Seventh Avenue and 125th Street in New York City remembered the battles which Adam Powell waged in the Congress and throughout this Nation for a better life, not only for black people but for all Americans.

The landmarks in Adam Powell's congressional career which we remember today include civil rights legislation and the successful fight for Federal aid to education, increase in minimum wage and manpower retraining to name just a few. We accept aid to education today as a basic Federal program but 10 years ago the very mention of such a program evoked bitter debate. It was the leadership of Congressman Powell as Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee

which decided that debate and established as a national priority the improvement of our educational system and manpower resources.

I hope that history will record the highlights of Congressman Powell's career in a light which will reveal the true importance of his contributions to the changing of America's priorities and not as Mark Antony proclaimed:

The evil that men do lives after them, the good is often interred with their bones.

Adam Clayton Powell was one of the great leaders in the fight for equality for all and I join my colleagues in expressing sorrow to his family at his passing.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Adam Clayton Powell has passed away, leaving a void that no one will really be able to fill. In his life, more than a few criticisms were leveled at him. Yet when the balance sheet is totaled, he emerges as an outstanding legislator of great ability who played a major role in constructing the educational system of this country.

Today, millions of American children, including uncounted numbers from underprivileged families, have a better chance at a decent education because of his efforts. The structure of Federal aid to education was in large part put together by a few people, prominent among whom was Adam Clayton Powell.

His congressional career was marked by single-minded devotion to a series of progressive causes which for many years had searched in vain for champions on the Federal level. His concern for the dispossessed knew no boundaries, and his championship of his own people was a constant concern.

There will be those who would choose to ignore his contributions. There will be others who will choose to ignore his shortcomings. And, there will be yet others who will look at both, understanding the man, and praising a life that was far more constructive than most people are able to lead.

His monument will be found in the millions of Americans who will grow into adulthood with a better chance for a decent life. More than this, no one can ask.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express in words the feelings I hold for our former colleague, Adam Clayton Powell. I served under his chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee during the great 89th Congress. During that Congress Chairman Powell directed the enactment of such historic legislation as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965 which has led to great progress in our efforts to fight poverty in this country; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which represented a giant step forward in improving the educational quality of our schools; the Higher Education Act of 1965 which recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government toward financing education beyond the high school level. This legislation has made it possible for millions of young people to attain a college degree which would not otherwise have been possible for them; the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965 which erased much of the discrimination in hiring practices across the Nation. These are just a few

of the major bills which came from Chairman Powell's committee during his tenure as chairman. I was proud to have served under him on the committee and to have played a part in the enactment of this landmark legislation. As a freshman Congressman I learned a great deal from Adam Clayton Powell and for his assistance and guidance during those early years in my congressional career I shall be forever grateful.

Congressman Powell was remarkable in many ways. His constituency was grateful to him for his efforts in their behalf and reelected him to Congress several times despite the personal problems he was experiencing. To them he was a good Congressman; to me he was an admired committee chairman and a man whose efforts have made for him a place in our history.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Adam Clayton Powell, who died last week, was one of the first to show black Americans—by his example—that they had a vital role to play in the Nation's political system. That demonstration was a singular achievement.

As Harlem's unquestioned political leader for more than 2 decades, he served a constituency far broader than the congressional district he officially represented.

Rising to a powerful role in Congress as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, he piloted into law a wide range of measures broadening opportunities in civil rights, employment, and education.

During the many years I served in this House together with Adam Clayton Powell, I witnessed the zeal with which he pursued justice and fair treatment for all people. I mourn his passing.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of Adam Clayton Powell signifies more than the passing of a fine human being. It signifies the end of a phenomenon in American politics. It is a loss suffered not only by the people of Harlem whom he represented so long and so well, but a loss to the millions of Americans who benefited by his achievements here in the Congress.

Many of the Federal programs in existence today which provide services to the poor, the unemployed, the handicapped and the undereducated are tributes to Adam's dedication.

Sadly, perhaps, he will be remembered by the majority of Americans more for the things he did than for the person he was. An ordained minister, a newspaper publisher, cofounder of the National Negro Congress, a fine Congressman for 25 years, an influential committee chairman—the list goes on and on. But those of us who had the privilege to serve with him for many years here in the House of Representatives knew him as a man—a man of deep conviction and great personal drive. Adam was an electric individual who had the knack for doing things with a flourish, but yet doing them well.

As one Member of Congress who got to know him well and came to admire him both as a Congressman and as an individual, I am deeply saddened by his death. While he leaves many landmarks

behind him in the fields of civil rights, labor, and education, he leaves also a great void for those of us who shared many of those years—both happy and troubled—with him.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the death of Adam Clayton Powell, our former colleague, and my former Chairman on the House Education and Labor Committee.

I had the honor to be appointed to the Education and Labor Committee shortly after I came to the Congress in January 1965. Mr. Powell was serving as chairman at that time. I quickly learned that he was a knowledgeable, effective, and cooperative chairman.

As a new member, I found him unfailingly helpful, always willing to take the time to explain the complexities of the legislative process. Under his guidance during the 89th Congress, the Education and Labor Committee produced an inordinate share of the great outpouring of progressive legislation that marked the 89th Congress.

It was due in large measure to Mr. Powell that the 89th Congress was dubbed "The Education Congress" by former President Johnson. It was during this period that we produced the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Economic Opportunity Act.

These important bills were made possible by Mr. Powell's excellent working relationship with the chairman of his subcommittees and the members of his committee.

This Nation and its people will benefit for years to come from the results of these and other legislative accomplishments which were drafted, refined and finally enacted under Mr. Powell's guiding hand.

I will always consider it a privilege to have served my committee "apprenticeship" under Adam Clayton Powell. I extend my sincere condolences to his family and his wide circle of friends.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Adam Clayton Powell was truly a great American and a great member of this House. As an editorial in today's Washington Post so aptly noted:

When he walked in Harlem, people turned their heads and when he worked on the Hill, the legislation came rolling forth.

He served here for 26 years, and for 6 of them was Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. As a member and a chairman, he was responsible for many of the significant programs of the last 20 years. He rose in the legislative power structure without being co-opted, and even at the height of his power, he never stopped speaking out and fighting on behalf of the oppressed.

He broke a lot of the "rules" here in the House, but his record on producing legislation—and that is what really counts—was nothing short of incredible. His committee was the source of a flood of major and progressive legislation, including the \$1.25 Minimum Wage Law, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offender Control Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Equal

Pay for Equal Work for Women Act, the Economic Opportunities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Last Sunday, I was privileged to attend the funeral services for Adam. They were held at the Abyssinian Baptist Church in Harlem, whose minister he was for 40 years, and the outpouring of thousands of people there proves that his memory will not be forgotten.

They don't often make them like Adam Powell, and we will miss him.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when no thought was given to civil rights for black Americans, and the doors of most public facilities in even the Nation's Capital were closed to nonwhites, Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., arrived in Washington as the Congressman from the Nation's largest black ghetto, Harlem.

By the time his 26 years in Congress and his 63 years of life had ended, he had pioneered what we now call the civil rights movement, both in Congress and in the streets of his beloved Harlem.

In the course of a lifetime that was full enough for three men, "Chairman Adam" achieved the status of a king in the heart of black America.

As chairman of the powerful House Education and Labor Committee from 1961 to 1967, he skillfully piloted a record-breaking 60 pieces of major progressive social legislation through Congress. These bills, once regarded as impossible dreams when Powell began introducing them in the 1940's and 1950's, are now the bulwark of the Federal Government's and the courts' battle against a wide array of injustices ranging from poverty to discrimination.

Part of this list of monumental legislative achievements are the mainstays of the war on poverty. They include the Economic Opportunity Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act, only yesterday reaffirmed by this body.

Others include the Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Offender Control Act, increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25, Equal Pay for Equal Work for Women, the Vocational, Elementary and Secondary and Higher Education Acts; and the Administration on Aging to name a few.

Even though Adam's flamboyant style drew much criticism from within and outside Congress, he also drew much praise for the incisive, yet sensitive way he handled the business of the Nation that came before his committee.

His mental ability and legislative skill never ceased to amaze me. At times, when he seemed bigger than life and above the battle, I knew it was because he fought with no thought of the wounds. He had known and fought the very knights that had championed slavery a century before, but was still able to think and act in the interest of the Nation in the Halls of Congress.

But it is the personal loss of a friend and close colleague that I feel most deeply, just as I am sure it is the loss of Adam the personal man that now grieves his family and friends most. My friendship with him was starred with many separate encounters, each of which further filled me with a deep respect for his dig-

nity, strength of mind and will, as well as the overwhelming sensitivity to his constituents needs that he possessed and used to guide him through the political and procedural maze of both the House and New York politics.

Knowing the man Adam Clayton Powell has been a privilege and a cherished experience. For not often in a lifetime does one meet a legend, an undying part of both black and American history who, long after he has passed from this life, will be remembered as one of the handful of men who left a positive mark on America in a way that cannot be ignored.

A strong man of great integrity, he earned the acclaim of presidents and poverty-ridden ghetto folks alike. I feel proud to have called him my friend.

For just as no segment of the Nation went untouched by the prowess of this giant of a legislator, no one in Harlem went unaffected by his efforts there, both before and after his coming to Washington.

He carried picket signs and led marches against some of Harlem's and New York City's most powerful institutions and businesses to force them, often successfully, to stop their racist discrimination against black people—his people. But he did it at a time when it had rarely been done before and was not only unpopular, but dangerous.

His election from Harlem in 1941 as New York City's first black city councilman challenged the Tammany Hall political machine, making him the first black man, and one of the few persons of any race, to do so successfully up to that time.

The courage and determination he showed in that situation—with an all-white city council intent on frustrating his efforts for his people and on sending him back to Harlem permanently—should go down in history as a milestone in black political participation in a white-controlled system.

As pastor of Harlem's Abyssinian Baptist Church, the Rev. Dr. Powell—a title he earned but never used—delivered sermons that told a story of a people struggling for freedom. His life was a gloriously important part of a successful chapter in that struggle.

Adam came to Washington not only as the Congressman from the 18th Congressional District of New York, but one of the few Congressmen representing black America. He ably represented the millions of blacks who were unable to get out from under the generations of oppression that face much of black America even today.

His special place in black America could be seen in his mail, ever-flowing in from blacks across the country. Adam offered this segment of America hope and cheer, for most of them had little chance of being allowed to elect a Congressman of their own. Indeed, many black Americans still find themselves in this position.

Some of his mail was addressed to the White House. Perhaps this was aptly so, for it was Adam Powell, more so than any other black national figure, who came closest to being the President of the black United States.

But as the Rev. Gardner Taylor of New York said during funeral services for Adam in Adam's city last Sunday, the only thing wrong with Adam Powell was America. Adam, like few others before him, was able to make America a little more right in his time.

My deepest prayers and condolences go out to his family and close friends who have suffered the immeasurable loss of this man. I feel certain that many of my colleagues join me in saying that we in Congress and all America will miss his voice in these troubled times.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to take part in today's special order in honor of the late Adam Clayton Powell. I commend our colleague (Mr. RANGEL) for taking this time and join with him and our other colleagues in recognizing the many and unique accomplishments of Adam Powell.

I want to take exception to a recent newspaper editorial which maintained that Adam Clayton Powell left no great heritage or accomplishment, in contrast with the late Martin Luther King, Jr. That assertion was both wrong and unfortunate in its approach. With the tensions and divisions in our society what they are today, this is no time to be playing off the memory of one black leader against that of another.

And let there be no doubt that Adam Clayton Powell was a black leader. As much as anyone, he worked tirelessly to foster black pride and a spirit of achievement among his people. He was an immensely popular figure throughout the Nation and with good cause.

I have had the privilege to serve on the House Committee on Education and Labor—the committee Adam Clayton Powell chaired—for more than a year now. There has not been one hearing, one markup session, one caucus—in which the achievements of this committee under his direction and leadership were not very much before us. Whether it be in the area of education, or manpower training, or minimum wage legislation, the solid accomplishments of Adam Clayton Powell cannot be denied. And when we experience difficulties in moving legislation along, we realize even more how important his leadership qualities were.

This Nation owes a tremendous debt to Adam Clayton Powell—and I do not mean just the black community. The historic bills that moved through his committee—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, minimum wage bills, and many others—all strengthened opportunity for all Americans. They benefited the young and the old, the blacks and Spanish-speaking minorities in our core cities as well as the forgotten poor of the rural areas; the college student as well as the steelworker.

When our words today are long forgotten, those historic bills will stand as a living memorial to Adam Clayton Powell.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of New York.

Former Congressman Powell, although a controversial figure throughout most of his career, he was instrumental in ushering through the Congress several legislative measures of national significance. As the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he managed to have the following major legislation reported out of his committee and enacted into law. Public Law 87-30, increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25; 87-274, The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offender Control Act; 87-415, The Manpower Development and Training Act; 88-38, Equal Pay for Equal Work for Women; 88-204, The College Facilities Act; 88-210, Vocational Education; 88-452, The Economic Opportunities Act; 89-10, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act; 89-73, Administration of the Aging; 89-209, The National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities; and 89-329, The Higher Education Act of 1965. This is indeed an incredibly impressive legislative record which deserves the praise of the Members of this body and the millions of Americans who benefited from these laws.

In recognition of former Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, the President of the Borough of Manhattan, Percy E. Sutton, declared April 9, 1972, as a Day of Memorial for the legislator. Mr. Sutton urged all 1,600,000 residents of the Borough to mourn the loss of this influential American.

Mr. Speaker, in reflecting upon the loss of our former colleague, Adam Clayton Powell, we should remember that he was responsible for bettering the living conditions of millions of working people throughout America as well as lifting the level of education and literacy for millions of schoolchildren across the land. This legacy will remain a monument to Adam Clayton Powell for generations yet unborn.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, any Member who served with the late Adam Clayton Powell in the Congress would, I believe, attest to his ability, energy, and legislative effectiveness.

Adam Powell has been properly eulogized for his role in the development of black political consciousness and for the political battles that he fought on behalf of his constituents. He should also be remembered by all of us as a very effective legislator, an outstanding debater, and a strong committee chairman.

In our system of government, a Member of the House very properly gives special attention to the views and needs of his constituents. He is their voice in Government and their intermediary with the frustrating bureaucracy at all levels of the executive branch. In this traditional role as a spokesman for and Representative of his constituents, Adam Clayton Powell was a truly effective Representative. I know that his memory will long be cherished by his constituents who remember the personal attention and service that he rendered to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Adam Clayton Powell's distinguished successor, CHARLES RANGEL, alerted the Members of the House to the special order held this afternoon so that we might par-

ticipate in this tribute to our late former colleague.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for taking out this special order and providing all of us with this opportunity to eulogize a great leader. I join with my colleagues in expressing a deep sense of personal loss occasioned by the passing of Adam Clayton Powell. We knew him as Adam, a fierce and unrelenting fighter for equality. For over 20 years, his eloquent voice was the lone but powerful voice for black people on the national scene.

He had style and dignity. He commanded the respect of both friends and opponents. He was an eloquent preacher, a committed and powerful legislator, and a great man and a good friend.

Mr. Speaker, Adam Clayton Powell's legislative record serves to show us what can be accomplished by an exceptionally able and dedicated Member of Congress. As Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, he steered 55 pieces of civil rights and social reform legislation through the House. President Johnson recognized and commended him for his effective leadership of the committee as this Nation began to commit itself to a war on poverty.

Adam's record may never be matched, but our work remains to be done. We must continue his efforts to bring about equality for all men.

Mr. Speaker, Adam Clayton Powell took pride in being a member of the original Congressional Black Caucus. At that time there were only 9 black Members of the House. It was the first time in the history of the Congress that 9 black Members had occupied seats in the House simultaneously. We were equally proud to put our shoulders next to his for we realized how long he had at one time fought the fight alone.

He was sensitive, articulate, intelligent, and totally committed to the eradication of the injustices which confront black and other minority people.

Mr. Speaker, the America which I grew up in was full of racial hatred, segregation, and discrimination directed toward black people. As a young man, I became determined that someday I would be able to fight to eliminate these oppressive and cancerous conditions from our society. At the age I decided upon this course of action, I looked for a black leader whom I could derive inspiration from. Mr. Speaker, there was no Congressional Black Caucus to inspire me. There was one lone black man in the U.S. Congress. That man was Adam Clayton Powell, a fierce and unrelenting fighter for his people. A man who dared to take on the white establishment with all of its bigotry, racism, and prejudice. The establishment never forgave him. Adam paid a horrendous price for his dedication to the principle that he would accept nothing less than total equality for himself and his people. I admired Adam. I am privileged to have served with one of my heroes: I am a little better man for having known him. History in its own inevitable way will assign him a position of martyrdom. Adam Clayton

Powell is one of the few men in history who became a legend in his own lifetime. Adam, you may be assured that we who loved, respected and admired you—and we who benefited so much from your leadership—will always be mindful of your last admonition to us—Keep the Faith, Baby.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago in this Chamber I rose to pay tribute to Adam Clayton Powell and to plead for his seat in this body as a duly elected Representative of the people of Harlem. My plea was rejected and Adam Powell was temporarily excluded from this House that he had served so long and, for the most part, so well. Today we come to mourn his death.

Adam Powell was a gifted man, a brilliant man, with a magnetic personality and sparkling wit. It was my privilege to serve as his colleague and to know him well. He used his gifts but wasted them, too. He seemed to thrive on controversy and he lived in high style—a symbol to his people of a black man who had “made it” in a white man’s world.

But Adam Powell never forgot his people. He served as a trailblazer not only to blacks who looked to him for leadership but to all the poor and downtrodden who benefited so substantially from his remarkable legislative accomplishments. Amidst all the controversy, the facet of his congressional career tends to be overlooked. I think it fitting that we call attention to it now so as not to forget the real legacy of Adam Clayton Powell.

As one of the first black chairmen of a congressional committee, Adam Powell led the way in establishing legislative landmarks for education, unemployment, the poor, and the handicapped. His vigorous advocacy produced a higher minimum wage, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools and colleges, the poverty program, a National Arts Foundation. Not the least, of course, was the role he played in bringing about passage of the very important civil rights bills of the 1960’s.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Adam Powell made his mark on this House and on his country. He will be remembered as much more than a mere footnote in history.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, I want to stress his important contributions to the enactment of progressive legislation beneficial to countless numbers of American citizens.

As chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Adam Clayton Powell was responsible for fashioning into law increased minimum wages, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offender Control Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, equal pay for equal work for women, the College Facilities Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Economic Opportunities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Administration on Aging Act, the National Foundation for Arts and Humanities Act, and the Higher Education Act.

Few men in Congress could point to such a distinguished legislative record. Chairman Powell was not content to

serve as a passive legislator. His flamboyance and energy were directed toward the development of responsible legislation.

Adam Clayton Powell was an articulate and forceful voice for his people. It is indeed appropriate that he is honored today for his legislative service, particularly for his work as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee.

I was in the uniform of an enlisted man in the U.S. Army when I first met Adam Clayton Powell. I was on a weekend pass visiting my home in East St. Louis in October 1944. Adam was in East St. Louis that weekend making a speech in my behalf as a candidate for Congress. He was himself a candidate for Congress. We were both elected in November of 1944 and we entered the 79th Congress together in January 1945.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a dear friend and a great man with the passing of Adam Clayton Powell. His death is a deprivation for all Americans who feel as he did that equality, regardless of race, must be more than a slogan. He championed the cause of blacks in America at a time when their spokesmen were few, and unmuted voices, among them, even fewer.

As a chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee he fought long and hard for the type of legislation that would bring a large measure of progress to a nation that urgently required change. He was understandably proud of the fact that his leadership helped to pass more than 50 major bills during the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, including the legislation for the war on poverty, statutory landmarks of which we are told he was especially proud.

I knew Adam over the span of many years, and I came to appreciate his dedication to a cause and his ability to mobilize public opinion to support that in which he so strongly believed.

He had a very special kind of rapport with the people of his district, a special kind of appeal which was evident whether he spoke to a mass crowd of admirers in the streets of Harlem, or from the pulpit of his Abyssinian Baptist Church.

Scripture tells us that Adam was created as the first man—and for the tens of thousands of people of his district Adam Clayton Powell became in both deed and word their “first man.” He will be deeply missed by others throughout the Nation, as well.

Mr. O’NEILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest orators in the House of Representatives, Adam Clayton Powell, has just died.

I wish to join my colleagues in the House and the hundreds of thousands of Americans across the country who mourn the passing of Harlem’s unquestioned political leader for more than two decades. One of two black Representatives in the House for years, he was a symbol of achievement, confidence, and defiance for many black Americans.

A skilled politician, Adam Clayton Powell was a man of flamboyant style and legislative brilliance.

I will remember Representative Powell as one of the most productive chairmen of a major congressional committee. More than 60 pieces of major legislation were passed under the aegis of his powerful committee, the House Education and Labor Committee. These included measures covering minimum wages, manpower development and training, antipoverty, and juvenile delinquency. Many of his early “Powell amendments” which sought to deny Federal funds to discriminatory projects are now the laws of the land.

Adam Clayton Powell’s constituents in Harlem will remember him as a man of justice, a leader in the fight for equal job opportunities and better housing for his people. His colleagues in the House of Representatives will remember his superb legislative achievements in the issues of social justice and equality.

Mrs. O’Neill joins me in expressing our condolences to the bereaved family of Adam Clayton Powell.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to join my colleagues in this special order to pay tribute to our former colleague and past Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, of New York.

I am certain that when history makes its judgment on Dr. Powell, he will fare most favorably. Nearly 50 programs of major degree in education, better labor standards, and aid to the poor and elderly became law as a result of his efforts and leadership. He presided over the passage of minimum wage increases, the war on poverty, manpower training programs, aid to colleges and libraries and, most significantly, the 1965 breakthrough on Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

As one who worked with Adam Powell, I learned in the committee and on the floor of his gifts as well as his problems. Particularly, I learned of his overriding love and devotion to the work of Congress.

He valued his friendship in this body and respected his colleagues to a high degree. It was because of that that he labored with such determination to regain his seat and was eventually upheld in that determination and perseverance by the highest court in this land.

Now he has gone before the Creator of us all in the highest tribunal which he faces, and that judgment, of course, is the one which will override all others. I trust and I hope that the God he loved and served will remember his zeal for the poor, for children, for equality, and against injustice. Whether you were one who agreed with Adam and admired him, as I did, or one who opposed him on matters when you felt he had to be opposed, I think we can all agree on this: For the life he led and the work he did and the way he served Harlem and New York, I think he deserves the respect of our colleagues all over the land at this time. But over all I think he said it best himself when he evaluated his own contribution to his work in public service by saying, “No matter how you look at what I did, I paid my dues.”

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body owe Adam Powell great respect for his leadership and service for 26 years.

THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF CARDINAL JOSEPH MINDSZENTY, PRIMATE OF THE HUNGARIAN ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROBERTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today it is indeed an honor for me to speak about a man whom all freedom-loving peoples over the world admire as a proud symbol for patriotism, religion, freedom, and human rights. He is a man, who in our world of compromises, lies, and half-truths, has steadfastly refused to exchange truth for security, justice for individual or group interest, integrity of character for questionable compromises in the name of "progress."

As his predecessor in England, Thomas Beckett, he is a man who would not bargain away the right of individual conscience, the privileges of his church in order to survive under a Godless regime. Such a regime, despite any economic reforms and palliatives in the political sphere, still prevents freedom of religious instructions, forbids a Catholic press or any youth organizations, and pressures the Vatican to agree to the appointment of the most notorious collaborators to three of the four bishoprics in Hungary in the last few months.

But Cardinal Mindszenty is not just a man of integrity and an uncompromising fighter for the freedom of religion and individual conscience against the totalitarianism of Communist ideology.

He is also a teacher of his people who revere him despite his enforced exile since October 1971 and already during his stay in prison and isolation in the U.S. Embassy. His sermons during the 3 years after the war before his arrest, his recent pastoral letter, show him as a man to whom religious truths, the commands of Christian morality, are not only the leading polestar but a condition sine qua non, if social justice and individual freedom are going to be implemented in our crisis-plagued world. I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the Record after my remarks the English translation of his last Pastoral Letter of Advent 1971 written in Vienna for Hungarian Catholics in Hungary and throughout the world.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not only an example of courage and integrity he is also a man of ecumenic spirit. Long before Vatican II, he attracted Protestants and Jews to himself, becoming a symbol not only of Catholic faith, but also of all Christians and God-fearing people against dialectical materialism, and atheistic communism. People relate to me that his sermons, and even devotions, were often attended by non-Catholics, in order to show solidarity for the fighter for human rights, democracy, and morality.

A good friend of mine, Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, Secretary of International Relations of the American Hungarian Federation, Troy State University, visited the cardinal in Vienna on March 26. He reports that the cardinal is in good health physically and mentally, and did not lose either the profundity of his thinking,

or his wit. To him he described our world as going through a period of spiritual and moral fog where truths could no longer be easily pinpointed. He added:

If we can only disperse some of the fog of moral errors and remind the peoples of the world of the truth, we already have accomplished an important task in our life.

Today, I would like to contribute my humble share to the admonition of the great cardinal by reminding my colleagues and the American people of his great example and that despite political compromises which might become necessary as a result of the changing international balances of power, we understand his message that there can be no compromise for any God-fearing people with the ideology of atheistic communism. We promise, in congratulating the cardinal, that we will not fall into the temptation of our times to regard eternal truths and the self-evident truths of our Declaration of Independence from a viewpoint of moral and political relativism. Rather, we will pay the price for freedom, eternal vigilance and loyalty to the principles of the Constitution, based on our Judeo-Christian heritage, in the same spirit in which the cardinal keeps his allegiance to his nation and church now in the enforced exile in Vienna. May God give him health and many fortunate returns.

FROM THE PRIMATE OF HUNGARY

My Reverend Brothers, dear Faithful, and fellow Hungarians!

I am speaking to you after a long and compulsory silence. My words at first are those of gratitude to the Divine Providence which has preserved me amid my many sufferings. I owe a debt of gratitude to all those who, at least spiritually, shared with me the burden of the cross, and who tried to understand the meaning of my fate in the spirit of the Gospel, and supported me with their prayers. At this time, I cannot forget those few who accepted the sufferings in the service of the same ideals, and which has ended or will end in so many cases only by a redeeming death.

If one accepts one's misfortunes in accordance with the Divine will, the faithful man really makes whole through his body the sacrifice of Christ and his body serves the welfare of the Church (Col. 1, 24). Our redemption was born of suffering and we believe that the sacrifices accepted for the sake of Christ were not even secularly in vain. We have crossed the threshold of prison and the temporary frontier that destroys human life with faith and hope in God. What would be a more timely topic than this unbreakable, always young and new, redeeming hope which forms a pillar both of our supernatural and our decent, serious secular life as well?

The liturgy of the Church also speaks to us of hope: we are celebrating advent and the new year. The words of the prophets shall ring in our ears: "The heavens shall give praise and the earth shall give thanks . . . before the Lord Who has come . . ." (Ps. 95, 11-13) "Tell those of little faith: Do not fear! God himself is coming to bring you redemption." (Is. 35, 4, 7) Refer to the Divine promise and talk about His plans and nourish in the people of God the hope in the coming of Messiah. In the fullness of time his hope has been fulfilled and Lord Jesus himself gave "testimony of the truth." (1 Tim. 6, 13), From Him we learned to pray: "Thy Kingdom come." From Him we borrowed the words and parables of hope: of the yeast which is hidden in the flour

but changes it into dough, of the tiniest seed which grows into the mightiest tree. These parables speak of future times. The kingdom of God does not arrive in a moment, the Christian must pray and work for its coming.

The historical appearance of the Lord, the Gospel, and the Church itself, i.e., the community of those "who see in Jesus Christ the author of redemption and the basis for unity and just peace." (Const. lumen gentium, Cap. II, n. 9) are not only historical facts and beings. They are also continuous programs, tasks, but simultaneously also sources of strength. For the Church as the "community of faith, hope and love" (Const. lumen gentium, Cap. I, n. 8) is also both in its external appearances and effects a revelation of the faith permeating its members, of the hope giving life to the faithful, and of the love which binds them together.

Among my correspondence in Rome before arriving to Vienna, there was a Hungarian letter that arrived from northern Italy. Its sender describes that she was born in Nagy-kikinda after World War I. While a small child, she was adopted as one of nine Hungarian orphans by an intelligent, educated Hungarian woman, and became a sister. Educated by her, the sister came as a refugee to the West and knocked on the door of this nunnery.

There has been nobody for decades to whom she could talk Hungarian. In October 1971 she also heard the news: the Hungarian primate is in Rome. She felt that somehow she still belongs to him. She sat down and wrote a two page letter in Hungarian. She apologized but this had been her first Hungarian letter in decades. Her highest order superior wrote an understanding accompanying Italian letter to it. All Hungarian relationships were missing from the life of this dear sister. Her fate was most unfortunate even among the emigres; it is really surprising that she had been able to write in Hungarian at all. In contrast, it is a fortune that the majority of the refugees still has contact to the large and the small Hungarian community: the family. The nation lives in its language. The family is the great anchor of our hope, it does not let the mother tongue to fall silent. If we cannot leave any other inheritance to our children, we should at least bequeath to them the language of our ancestors. Of course, the knowledge of the language of the nation which has adopted them is praiseworthy, but there is nothing more depressing in the life of the parents than the lost language of their country in their children.

Another strength and obligation remains the Hungarian-language mass on Sundays and holidays, and the Hungarian-language sermon. If the Church, understanding the need of souls, permitted the Hungarian language as the language of the Holy Mass at home and abroad, it would be painful if those given this grace amid a world crisis and loss of their country would not appreciate and value it. And we cannot miss the sermon St. Paul teaches that faith comes from hearing, from the hearing of the words of Christ (Romans 10, 17).

In order to give our children a Christian education, it is absolutely necessary to listen to the sermon on Sundays and holidays. (It is true that) in order to achieve the 1456 victory at Nádorfehérvár (Belgrad) St. John Capistrano, although he did not speak Hungarian, could successfully enthrone the Hungarian crusaders so much that they forced the (troops of the) Turkish Empire extending to three continents to run for their life. His sanctity and the (military) genius of his friend Hunyadi, were adequate for the task. But not even the most proficient foreign-tongue orator can compete with the sermon in the mother tongue. Count Albert Apponyi, despite his worldwide renown, often listened

attentively to sermon of the new chaplain celebrating his first mass. Those who miss the sermon cannot fulfill the obligations as fathers, mothers and educators. In the present disintegrating world their children will be like lone, unsupported leaves blown by the wind. Abroad we cannot afford to give to our children and their souls less than what we have received from our caring parents. The right to the mother tongue is the most natural human and individual right.

In addition, every family should have a Hungarian-language New Testament, and every family should subscribe to the monthly of Hungarian Catholic refugees, *Eletünk* (our Life). Our other Christian brethren are also taking care of their own.

I want to emphasize strongly for my priests visit the families, despite their manifold duties. Without it, even at home, there never has been or will be a serious and adequate fulfillment of pastoral duties. This is even more true abroad.

Charity which finds expression in deeds is absolutely necessary toward those in need. How can we expect help from foreigners if affluent Hungarians are indifferent toward those in misery among their fellow countrymen.

St. Paul teaches: "We are kept alive by hope." Our example in regard to mercy is the homeless Tobias, and Jesus has said and promised: "Happy are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy." (Matth. 5, 7).

I am sending my blessing to you, my Reverend Brothers, dear Faithful, to those at home, to those detached (from Hungary) and to those scattered over five continents. Vienna, Pazmaneum
Advent 1971

JÓZSEF MINDSZENTY, M.P.,
Archbishop of Gran, Primate of Hungary.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in congratulating the cardinal-primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church, Joseph Mindszenty, who celebrated his 80th birthday on March 29.

Cardinal Mindszenty has been a source of inspiration, solace, and hope for all of us, regardless of our religious denomination, for the past two and a half decades. His historic fight for individual and religious freedom during the late 1940's in Hungary established the cardinal's place for all time in the hall of fame of heroes of the Hungarian people. His sufferings, both physical and mental, during his long imprisonment aroused the sympathy of the entire world and illustrated the courage of this steadfast man. His years in prison and in semi-isolation in the U.S. Embassy proved that the vicissitude of loneliness could not break a spirit engaged so actively in the cause of human freedom and dignity.

Now, in his exile, Cardinal Mindszenty is active again. He is finishing his memoirs which will be published next year, and he has started a new book on the history of his country. He has issued a pastoral letter to Hungarians everywhere in the world, and I am proud to join his well wishers from many nations in wishing him Godspeed in his religious and intellectual endeavors and many happy returns.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop of Gran—Esztergom—and Primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church has celebrated his 80th birthday in Vienna.

He moved there last October after spending a few weeks in Rome, receiving honors and a very warm welcome from Pope Paul VI. He is still in good health and is mentally extremely alert. He is finishing the final editing of his memoirs and is working on a second book concerning Hungarian history.

All of us know the life and record of this courageous Cardinal who has been a living testimony to his faith, church and his fatherland. He steadfastly opposed the limitation and suppression of individual and human rights and the usurpation of church and personal liberties by an all-powerful dictatorial state regardless whether this state was exercising its illegal powers under the guise of fascism or communism. His pastoral letters in the 1940's, his sermons and personal example constituted the most outstanding record for the defense of true democracy and human dignity in a Hungary which was already then under Soviet occupation and upon which was foisted a Stalinist regime alien to the temperament and desires of the Hungarian people.

His sufferings which include the use of will-paralyzing drugs and 45 days of straight interrogation, a life sentence for crimes which he had not committed intentionally, his liberation during the 1956 Hungarian fight for freedom and his moderate radio speech to his people the day before Soviet tanks crushed the fight for freedom are all part of historical record which had transformed him into more than just a great prelate of the Catholic Church. To Hungarians everywhere regardless of their denomination or political views, he has become the martyr for their nation, and for traditional moral concepts and human rights. But even beyond the frontiers of his nation, Cardinal Mindszenty remains an example for all of us in their uncompromising belief in democracy and human dignity amid the many dangers that beset democracy today.

Therefore, we salute him on his birthday and wish him Godspeed and a fruitful work in his remaining years and many happy returns. May I also express the hope that the present Hungarian Government will finally realize the real greatness and honorable motives of the Cardinal and quash his sentence so that he may live his life in retirement in his beloved native country where for the last 22 years he was either a prisoner or an isolated refugee at the U.S. Embassy.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, among the more than three and a half billion people alive in the world today, few have attained the kind of fame that causes the Congress of the United States to commemorate their birthday. Fewer still have achieved eminence by representing the aspiration of the anonymous billions of human beings whose birth, life and death go unremarked by posterity.

Stefan Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, celebrated his 80th birthday recently, still in exile from his people as he has been for 16 years. By most pragmatic standards, the last decade and a half of his life has been a failure, a futile, quixotic gesture of protest in a lost cause. Yet we, as representatives of the

American people, honor him today, paying tribute not only to the man's own bravery and tenacity, but to the indomitable spirit of the nameless millions he represents. The cardinal's perseverance in the cause of religious freedom has come to symbolize the inner faith which flourishes behind the Iron Curtain despite a generation of official repression. In honoring him, we honor all who cherish his name as the rallying cry of the persecuted, and all who live their lives in silent emulation of his ideals.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION OF VOICE OF AMERICA, RADIO FREE EUROPE, AND USIA LIBRARIES ABROAD IN INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL EFFORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 574—my bill to instruct the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and the U.S. Information Service Libraries abroad to exhibit and broadcast information on the effects of heroin addiction to those countries which are known to produce, process, and traffic in opium.

To illustrate the need for this legislation, I would point out that the average poppy farmer in such a country as Turkey has no idea whatsoever of the death, crime, and human misery caused by the heroin which is ultimately derived from his production.

This lack of information is further reinforced by the fact that Turkey has no domestic heroin problem itself, and has for centuries been growing poppy as a staple product—to be used for everything from baking bread and pressing oil from the seeds, eating the leaves as salad greens, using the stalks for firewood and animal fodder, and prescribing small quantities of the gum as painkilling medication.

Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed children as young as 6 busy hoeing, weeding, and cultivating the flourishing late spring crop during the course of my 11-nation study mission last year—a survey which resulted in the publication, by the House Foreign Affairs Committee of my report entitled "The International Narcotics Trade and Its Relation to the United States."

We have, for years, overlooked an excellent means of supporting bilateral and multilateral drug control efforts. The Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and the U.S. Information Service Libraries in foreign countries would repre-

sent most appropriate vehicles for impressing those countries implicated in the illicit narcotics traffic with the catastrophic effects of heroin addiction. Even those countries which only produce or process opium are in danger of developing a serious heroin addiction problem at any time. Iran, which succeeded only temporarily in its efforts to clamp down on drug use and traffic, is a case in point.

We can expect little success in crop substitution and law enforcement policies in opium-producing nations, unless the farmers and local government officials in those countries are aware of the devastating effects of heroin, not just in the United States, but in all sections of the world.

MISINFORMATION ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS SURVEY AFFECTING RICHLAND AND ASHLAND COUNTIES IS CORRECTED

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a great amount of the controversy surrounding the Lake Erie and Cleveland-Akron Area Regional Waste Water Management Study is based on misinformation. I recognize that some of this comes because of political oratory which can be discounted, but a considerable amount of the misunderstanding is based on newspaper reports.

First of all, when the first Corps of Engineers report on this feasibility study was made available in July 1971, both Congressman JACK BETTS and I immediately objected to the concept of making Richland and Ashland Counties any leached. Although the use of Richland and Ashland County farmland was only a part of that feasibility study, it was obvious that this was not one of the alternatives which should be pursued in our comprehensive effort to attack the water pollution problem. We consulted with the Public Works Committee and our own Ohio member on that committee, Representative WILLIAM HARSHA, of Portsmouth. Through the cooperation of the Public Works Committee and especially Congressman HARSHA, H.R. 11896 now contains a specific provision which should set many of the fears of those in Richland and Ashland Counties at rest. Misinformation had led many to believe a plan would be foisted on them without any recourse and although this was not possible, the bill as passed contained a clear statement of congressional intent to allay all of these fears.

When I received the endorsement of the Mansfield News Journal in my very first campaign for Congress, it was based in large nature on the belief of that paper that the representative in Washington should work to pierce the bureaucratic maze which even then was engulfing us, rather than perpetuate it and further spread its tentacles over the taxpayers. I feel I have been consistent through the years on this point and have fought bureaucracy rather than furthered its goals. I say this because I am well aware that a feasibility report in 1971 can lead

to an accomplished fact 2, 5, or 10 years later. At the same time, there are two points to bear in mind.

First, in probing areas where difficult and hard solutions lie ahead, few if any answers are known or obvious at this point. It is impossible to mount an attack in an area such as pollution and in advance know what actions will be advocated. I completely support the concept that all alternatives should be explored which is far different from saying that any and all recommendations made would be either accepted or supported. At this point, the Corps of Engineers is merely coming forward with alternative plans as a part of a solution to a difficult problem.

Second, the Corps of Engineers is not like most of the "creeping" bureaucracy here in Washington. They are professional, open and direct, as well as non-political. They do their job efficiently and to the letter of the law. You may recall that in 1964 I indicated that the bureaucrats in Health, Education, and Welfare would work to implement, step by step, forced busing to achieve racial balance even though at that time they insisted they would not. A far greater danger is presented by the "creeping" bureaucrats who talk one way and implement, step by step, programs which are the result of their own social views. On the basis of my experience, this is not a problem with the Corps of Engineers. There has never been a sneak attack from them.

I would point out that there have been hundreds of feasibility studies in thousands of areas. For example, for years there was a feasibility study regarding the proposal to link Lake Erie with the Ohio River by means of a canal. I did not oppose this study but I opposed 100 percent any recommendation that such a canal be built. The corps has studied many subjects where final recommendations did not result in a project.

In discussing the Corps of Engineer's alternative plan which calls for the use of lands in Ashland and Richland Counties in the Cleveland-Akron proposal, they indicated that further detailed investigation of potential sites will concentrate in areas near Cleveland and Akron. They have merely stated at this point that Ashland and Richland Counties have not been eliminated from consideration. I believe the Congress will feel, as I do, that sites nearer those cities would reduce pumping costs and thus would be more desirable if this plan ever is finally recommended.

In the legislation before us last month, Representative HARSHA and the Public Works Committee added a safeguard for the people of our area. Although I have indicated that the Corps of Engineers is not to be treated like other bureaucratic agencies, many felt one loophole did remain.

That was the very remote possibility that the project could be implemented as a pilot project without congressional approval. I did not believe the proposal could legally be rushed through as a pilot project but this language makes sure. Through the good work of the committee, on page 231 of the bill in section 108 (d) (1), it specifically states that the

Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is—

Directed to design and develop the Demonstration Waste Water Management program for the Rehabilitation and Environmental Repair of Lake Erie. Prior to initiation of detailed engineering and design, the program, along with the specific recommendations of the chief of engineers and recommendations for its financing, shall be submitted to the Congress for statutory approval.

This means that any proposal would be treated as a straight public works project. In other words, it would require authorization and then specific funding. At all stages, there is opportunity for hearings and amendments.

This is not to say that the Mansfield News Journal and the citizens of Richland and Ashland Counties should not be alarmed at this point. It is, however, to report that there are very definite safeguards which will present us with a proper opportunity and forum to block this radical proposal if it becomes a part of their final plan.

Colonel Hansen, district engineer in Buffalo, informed me that their current study is scheduled for completion in February 1973. The Corps of Engineers has properly studied alternatives and options as directed by Congress. Nine original alternatives were considered. Congressional intent clearly urged the corps to consider total land disposal systems rather than the traditional sewage systems which dump effluents in our waters. Of the nine original alternatives studied, three basic alternatives were reported by the Corps of Engineers to be most promising, one of them including the regional waste water system which would dump in our area.

In the current stage of the Corps of Engineer's survey, they are now studying alternate land disposal sites in addition to the Richland-Ashland area. It is very clear that pumping sites near the cities would reduce costs and be more desirable if this particular approach is to be advocated and, as stated earlier, it is merely one of three proposals currently being considered by the corps.

The first determination I made in studying the situation was whether or not the project could be fully implemented as a pilot project without congressional approval. The answer to this was "no." Congressional intent was nonetheless made clear in the bill as stated above. Second, and of equal importance, the total limit of the authority of the Corps of Engineers is to submit the completed plan to the State of Ohio for its consideration and approval. So we have a second safeguard which has been overlooked. The State of Ohio will have authority to say "yes" or "no" to any project which is ultimately advocated by the Corps of Engineers in our area.

Thus, any suggestion that doomsday is around the corner or that our interests have not been adequately protected is not borne out in the facts. Congressman BETTS and I have received fine cooperation from the committee and from the Corps of Engineers. When the Corps presents its ultimate report, you can be assured that I would vigorously oppose it if it were to advocate the unnecessary

expensive and undesired long-distance pumping of sewage into our area. At the same time, there is no reasonable way anyone can oppose the study of all the alternatives available.

Let me give you a similar example. Suppose the Mansfield News Journal were to advocate that an overall, comprehensive program be developed for the downtown area in Mansfield to combine the objectives of beautification, renovation, housing, parking, Federal, county, and municipal office buildings, parks, and improved commercial and office space. A commission is set up and it begins its study. Word gets out that one of the nine feasibility suggestions—just suggestions at this point, no final plan or agreed course of action—included a proposal to raze the area which now includes the Mansfield News Journal plant.

At this point, before the commission can even make its final recommendations, the newspaper calls for an abolishment of the commission, an abandonment of its study and that no report of any kind be finalized.

I think the paper would be subject to criticism that it really did not want to solve the problem. Yet, that newspaper is in effect, suggesting that JACK BETTS and I take the same course of action because one of the possible consequences of a badly needed comprehensive study might be that our area could adversely be affected if many contingencies were all resolved against us. If, repeat if, these Ashland-Richland farm use proposals were to be embodied in the Corps of Engineers' final report. If, repeat if, that report were authorized by the Congress and in subsequent action, if, repeat if, the State of Ohio approved this land use and finally, if, repeat if, Congress funded the request, the project could be implemented.

Part of the misunderstanding regarding my position was caused by the News Journal front page story on Thursday March 30. A reporter correctly stated that an amendment I supported affirms the House's intentions that spray irrigation disposal systems be seriously explored as a tool for cleaning up the Nation's waters. This is precisely the position of the House over the past several years. No one is positive what should be done, we have specifically asked that alternative system be surveyed and in some cases pilot projects have been implemented. What is wrong with that? Yet the paper jumps from that solid statement of fact to an illusory conclusion, totally improper, that I was in effect further encouraging the Government to dump treated sewage in Richland and Ashland counties. This is totally untrue.

What did the Vander Jagt amendment say? Simply that we asked the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to encourage the development in areas of resources management systems the recycling of pollutants into resources, thereby producing income rather than just incurring operating costs. The amendment itself reads as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANDER JAGT

MR. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANDER JAGT: Page 241, between lines 23 and 24 insert the following:

"(d) The Administrator shall encourage waste treatment management which results in the construction of revenue producing facilities providing for—

"(1) the recycling of potential sewage pollutants through the production of agriculture, silviculture or aquaculture products, or any combination thereof;

"(2) the confined and contained disposal of pollutants not recycled;

"(3) the reclamation of wastewater; and

"(4) the ultimate disposal of sludge in a manner that will not result in environmental hazards.

"(e) The Administrator shall encourage waste treatment management which results in integrating facilities for sewage treatment and recycling with facilities to treat, dispose of or utilize other industrial and municipal wastes, including but not limited to solid waste and waste heat and thermal discharges. Such integrated facilities shall be designed and operated to produce revenues in excess of capital and operation and maintenance costs and such revenues shall be used by the designated regional management agency to aid in financing other environmental improvement programs.

"(f) The Administrator shall encourage waste treatment management which combines 'open space' and recreational considerations with such management.

Page 241, line 24, strike "(d)" and insert "(g)".

That this concept is being considered in the Lake Erie area is true but it does not follow we are promoting the dumping of waste in Ashland and Richland counties. This is a nationwide problem and the current studies are progressing in many different areas, not just ours. The overall concept and principle is sound. Implementation in Richland and Ashland counties would not be.

The question has also been raised whether or not the Lake Erie proposals would be "legal" under the 1909 Treaty with Canada. That treaty provided that any action which would change the level of the Great Lakes must be agreed upon mutually. The impact of the Corps proposals on the lake level is being studied. It may be subject to agreement. The proposal itself certainly is not illegal. Currently, waste treatment in the Chicago area results in dumping Lake Michigan water in the Mississippi River which takes water from one watershed to another. There is little doubt that Canada will have something to say about any Lake Erie proposal. The State of Ohio will also have something to say. The Congress will have something to say. This again indicates a failure of those raising objections to recognize the difference between a proposal in its early stages and a completed, comprehensive program enacted into law and funded. Many hurdles are ahead but it would be erroneous, in my opinion, to suggest the project is not legal in this, the survey stage.

I do not believe that problems are solved by engaging in press release wars and have taken all of those steps which, I think, are necessary and responsible to give our area proper representation on this controversial issue. One of the few virtues, I feel, I have is that, as a Congressman, I have never worried about criticism or whether or not actions, I be-

lieve to be correct, are generally understood.

However, this whole controversy does have a rather interesting irony. After doing all of this in achieving an absolute safeguard against any "sneak attack" on our area, I still determined that I would vote against the entire measure on final passage so the record would be clear. As such, I was one of only 14 to vote against the bill. It passed, 380 to 14. The bill had some other bad features, but on the whole, it was a giant step forward in the overall problem of combating water pollution. In effect, I could say that I am one of the only Members of Congress on record in opposition to the proposal, and this would be accurate, but, as I pointed out, it is a far more complex situation than that.

At the same time, it is interesting that, despite my nay vote on the overall bill of more than 200 pages, it is being charged that I have promoted the scheme, at worst, or have not given diligent representation to the Richland-Ashland area's interest, at best. I think the record clearly discloses that neither of these charges are accurate.

VETERANS ASSISTANCE DAY AND JOBS FOR VETERANS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional Easter recess, I had the opportunity to participate in one of the most rewarding experiences ever since becoming a Member of Congress. The event to which I refer was a combined Veterans Assistance Day and jobs for veterans program in Meridian, Miss., on Tuesday, April 4. I had the honor of serving as chairman of the event which benefited veterans and their dependents in a nine-county area of east central Mississippi. The program also drew veterans from west central Alabama. I will be quick to point out that the success of the Meridian Veterans Assistance Day resulted not from my chairmanship, but from the hard work and dedicated efforts of officials at the veterans center in Jackson, Miss. These men and women, plus representatives from the Mississippi Employment Security Commission, U.S. Department of Labor, Civil Service Commission, and the Armed Forces all worked as a team for one of the most successful veterans assistance days ever held in the United States. We had a total of 787 veterans and/or dependents register and conducted a total of 2,186 interviews into such benefits as GI loans, education benefits, medical care, and employment. The most rewarding aspect of the program was the fact we were able to place over 200 veterans in jobs and expect to place another 100 within a few weeks. My colleagues might also be interested to know that 93 certificates of eligibility for GI loans were issued on the spot.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to two Veterans Assistance Officers stationed at the Jackson, Miss., VA

Center. They are Ken McDonald and Claude Guice. These two men spent many long and hard hours working out all the details that contributed to the outstanding success of the Meridian Veterans Assistance Day. Without their knowledge, experience, and dedication to bettering the lives of our veterans and their dependents, the program would not have been a success.

Mr. Speaker, other organizations which are deserving of our thanks are the Meridian Chapter of the American Red Cross, members of the Knights of Columbus in Meridian, the Meridian VFW Chapter, the news media, plus many more.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following information which shows statistically the success of the Meridian Veterans Assistance Day:

VETERANS ASSISTANCE DAY, MERIDIAN,
MISSISSIPPI, APRIL 4, 1972

Number veterans and/or dependents attending	787
Total interviews	2,186
Breakdown of type interviews:	
Education and On-The-Job Training	441
Compensation and Pension	381
Medical-Dental-Outpatient	186
G. I. Loans	339
Insurance	93
Employment—State	446
Employment—Federal	160
Military	75
Veterans Farm & Home Board	42
Other (Review of Discharge, Social Security, etc.)	23
Interviews per veteran	2.78
93 Certificates of Eligibility for Home Loans were issued.	

THE HIGH PRICE OF FOOD

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege to testify before the Price Commission hearing on the subject of meat and other food prices. This hearing was particularly important because the Price Commission is the quickest instrument for bringing food prices down to a level where they are within the reach of all Americans. The hearing was particularly fitting as well, because the Price Commission is responsible, in a material way, for the high cost of food. My interest in and familiarity with the problem of food prices extend somewhat beyond the fact that I represent a large urban constituency. In 1964, I was appointed by President Johnson to the National Commission of Food Marketing. That Commission examined problems associated with the entire food marketing system—from farmer, to consumer. Last month, as chairman of the House Democratic Study Group's Consumer Task Force, I held 2 days of hearings of the subject of meat prices and the effect on those prices of our meat price import quota policies. Last week, I conducted a shopping survey of 10 supermarkets in my district in Queens, New York and discussed food price problems with shoppers, supermarket officials, store employees and representatives of

the Internal Revenue Service who are responsible for enforcing compliance with phase II price regulations.

The purpose of the Price Commission hearings—the unscrambling of the food price tangle and, hopefully, the implementation of solutions to the problem—represent a task as formidable as it is urgent.

While I possess only a limited knowledge about the complexities of today's food marketing system, I do think that I was able to offer some useful recommendations.

To date, the search for the cause of high food and meat prices has deteriorated into a propaganda contest between competing producer interests. Moreover, this controversy demonstrates that consumers do not stand on an equal footing with producers in addressing market price difficulties—even though they are the principal victims of those difficulties. During the past several weeks, we have heard much from representatives of the farm groups—including the Secretary of Agriculture—from the representatives of the cattlemen, and of course, from the food retailers—but not much at all from representatives of the consumer interest.

Thus far, the debate has shed more heat than light on the subject. This is largely because rhetoric of proponents of one point of view or another is filled with statements and restatements of marketplace myths which have been accepted for far too long as reality. It would be useful, therefore, in considering this vital matter, if the Price Commission rejected forever the following damaging myths:

First. Myth No. 1 involves the assertion most frequently made by the Secretary of Agriculture and apologists for the food industry, that the American housewife spends only 15.6 percent of her disposable income on food. This totally fictitious figure, which is predicated on the false assumption that income is distributed equally to all Americans is designed, of course, to dampen consumer anger over rising food costs. It is misleading, at best; and at worst, a mean insult to the millions of Americans who are deeply disturbed about the high cost of food and beef products.

In an effort to expose the meaninglessness of the 15.6 percent figure, I asked the Director for Agricultural Economics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Economics Division of the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress to comment on its validity as a truthful indicator of the amount of money spent for food by the broad spectrum of American families. USDA's Director of Agricultural Economics acknowledged that the 15.6 percent figure "is not an accurate measure for a typical American family . . .". The Economics Division of the Congressional Research Service concluded that the 15.6 percent figure:

Is not an informative figure, representative of the food costs for most Americans to whom food prices are a significant matter.

The percentage might be characteristic of the food and disposable income relationship for a comparatively small number of families with incomes somewhat above

\$20,000, but would not be representative of persons with lower or higher incomes.

To illustrate the nonrepresentative character of the overall percentage figure, the Congressional Research Service calculated that if in 1969 the 10.4 million lowest income families in America had spent only 16.7 percent of their disposable income on food—the fictitious figure for that year—the average family of four could have bought each day—only two loaves of bread, a quart of milk and not quite a full can of fruit juice.

The Congressional Research Service, using Department of Labor Statistics for food expenditures as a percentage of urban family budgets in the spring of 1970, estimated that families earning approximately \$6,300 a year would spend about 30.5 percent of their disposable income on food; families earning around \$9,000 a year, 27.2 percent on food; and urban families with an annual income of around \$12,700 would spend approximately 24.5 percent of their disposable income for food purchases.

Although the percentage of disposable income spent on food purchases may have declined modestly since the spring of 1970—the decline, if any, would be less than one-half of 1 percent—it can still be seen that the 15.6-percent figure we have heard so much of recently, is nothing less than a fraud on the consuming public. Even the Director of Agricultural Economics of the USDA estimates that the real percentage of disposable income spent on food for a median family—\$5,554—was 20 percent or more.

It is my hope, of course, that after today the 15.6 percent figure will disappear from the debate on food prices and will be replaced by a figure which has more meaning and relevancy for the millions of American families who now find that they cannot afford a decent diet.

Second. Myth No. 2 involves the distortion inherent in the assertion that the price of raw food products are up only 9 percent over 20 years ago; or, in the case of beef, that cattle prices have merely reached the level that existed in 1951. This 20-year figure—which, to the uninitiated, sounds like an offhand, almost accidental standard of measurement—is utilized time and time again by representatives of producer groups to justify the present level of livestock and retail beef costs.

If there be any validity to the arguments that farm meat prices today are not high; that the 5- to 6-percent increase in farmers gross income is reasonable; that prices received by farmers for food are not inflationary; and, that food still remains one of the most reasonable buys available then, proof beyond the "20 years ago" standard is necessary.

The fact is, of course, that the Korean war was being fought 20 years ago in 1951 and 1952. It is also a fact that livestock and retail beef prices were atypically high during that period. For example, the Consumer Price Index for meat in 1951 and 1952 averaged 90.6 cents per pound. During the subsequent 5-year period from 1953-57, meat averaged only 82.4 cents per pound. Additionally, the average price of choice steers per hun-

dredweight at Omaha in 1951-52 was \$33.64. During the subsequent 5 years, the price averaged about \$10 per hundredweight less, at \$23.

Third, Myth No. 3 may be the most damaging and, certainly, the most ironic of all. It is that the economic stabilization program is designed to keep food prices down to the 2.5-percent increase level established for the economy as a whole. This is because the Price Commission's phase II policy permits packers, processors, and retailers to pass along to consumers not only actual dollars and cents invoice cost increases but markup percentages as well. The ability of packers, processors, and retailers to maintain their markups in the face of nonexistent or disallowed increases in overhead costs, adds, dramatically, to the cost of food and particularly, meats to consumers.

Using an example furnished by the Price Commission itself in a booklet entitled, "Price Controls and You", this is the way it works: if the invoice cost of a can of peas is \$1 and the retailer sells the peas for \$1.10, his markup is 10 percent. If the invoice cost to the retailer increases to \$1.20, the retailer may apply his 10 percent markup to his new cost and sell the peas for \$1.32. While the actual cost to the retailer increases only 20 cents, the consumer's cost goes up 22 cents. Although there may be justification for the maintenance of markup during a relatively inflation-free period, it seems to me inexcusable to permit it on all food products at this time.

What significance does this have for the consumer and the price he or she pays for beef? Using the Department of Agriculture's own figures, we can deduce the following:

Each American now consumes approximately 113.3 pounds of beef annually;

The average price of choice beef per pound at retail in February 1971 was \$1.04; in February 1972, it was \$1.16;

The yearly per capita expenditure for choice beef in February 1971 was \$117.52; in February 1972 it was \$131.43. In other words, beef cost an individual \$13.90 more in February 1972 than in February 1971 or 11.8 percent more;

For every penny increase in the cost of live cattle, the retailer receives from the

consumer 3.5 cents. Of this 3.5 cents, 2.25 cents is justified—based on a conversion of live to retail weight—but 1.25 cents is pure profit. That is, 35.7 percent of the 3.5 cents is unjustifiable profit;

Multiplying \$13.90 by 35.7 percent, we find that \$4.96 per person or \$992 million for the Nation as a whole is spent for beef purchases each year because of this margin pass-through allowed by the Price Commission under phase II.

Beef purchases annually cost the American consumer \$1 billion extra if prices continue to rise at the 10 to 12 percent rate and if the phase II guideline on permissible markups in the beef distribution system are continued. It must be remembered that this \$1 billion excess cost is permitted even though increases to cover rising overhead costs are forbidden.

The public and the Price Commission should also be reminded that the \$1 billion excess relates to beef purchases only; undoubtedly, the consumer is being overcharged tens of millions of dollars in other commodity areas because of this permissible margin pass-through.

It is, of course, true that under phase II guidelines, the retailer may not increase prices if it results in an overall rate of profit that is greater than the company's rate of profit for two of the company's last three fiscal years. If the Commission measures overall profit on the basis of "sales" as opposed to "invested capital", then the supermarket chain stores can maintain the rate of profit on sales while increasing the rate of profit on invested capital because of their ability to turn-over stock at a faster rate. Moreover, the enormous problems confronting the Price Commission in other sectors of the economy and the Commission's limited resources, convince me that challenges to a retailer's rate of profit will not be many or successful.

MEAT PRICES TODAY

Although we are all abundantly aware of the high cost of food in general and meat in particular, I think it would be useful to recite some food price statistics to illustrate the plight of the shopper.

Retail choice beef prices per pound in

February were up 3.9 percent over January and 14 percent higher than a year before. Consumers paid 43.1 percent less for beef in 1967 than they do today. Also since 1967, the Consumer Price Index for meat has increased more than 21 points. In 1967, choice beef averaged 80 cents per pound; now it averages around a \$1.15.

While the entire CPI has been rising at an annual rate of 3.7 percent since the beginning of phase II in November 1971, food prices have risen at a 6.2 percent annual rate. Although food comprises only 30 percent of the CPI, it is responsible for 60 percent of the rise in living costs since phase II began. Meat prices, as we all know, have been leading the food charge. In February, soaring food prices raised the Consumer Price Index 0.5 percent over January. Higher prices for food, particularly for food at home, accounted for three-fourths of the total index rise. Food at home rose 1.9 percent over January—the biggest increase for any month in 14 years. Meat and poultry prices at retail rose 4.4 percent.

The Wholesale Price Index in February provided similarly depressing news for food consumer: Livestock prices were up 5.6 percent over January and were 17.4 percent higher than one year earlier. Processed meat, poultry, and fish were up 4.1 percent over January and were 13.3 percent higher than a year earlier.

The Wholesale Price Index for March was greeted by administration officials as good news for housewives—but their optimism is not, in my judgment, convincing or well-founded. While livestock prices were 2.1 percent lower than in February, they were still 19 percent higher than livestock prices a year earlier. This represents a 1½ percent greater annual spread than the yearly spread in February. Processed meats, poultry, and fish were down 2.5 percent under February 1972, but they were 12.8 percent higher than a year earlier.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provided me with the average retail prices and percent changes in prices of selected meat items in New York, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles between February 1971 and February 1972. The results of that survey are found below:

	Prices for February 1971	Prices for February 1972	Percent change from February 1971 to February 1972		Prices for February 1971	Prices for February 1972	Percent change from February 1971 to February 1972
Frankfurters (pound):				Chuck roast (pound):			
New York.....	83.8	90.8	8.2	New York.....	74.9	89.0	18.1
Washington.....	78.8	81.7	3.9	Washington.....	74.5	85.7	15.1
Los Angeles.....	77.7	83.0	5.7	Los Angeles.....	70.4	80.7	15.3
Bologna sausage (8 ounce):				Round steak (pound):			
New York.....	58.2	61.3	8.4	New York.....	158.4	179.3	14.0
Washington.....	52.8	55.9	5.4	Washington.....	136.2	152.3	12.2
Los Angeles.....	54.1	56.7	5.9	Los Angeles.....	116.7	133.6	16.1
Salami sausage (8 ounce):				Sirloin steak (pound):			
New York.....	65.1	68.1	3.4	New York.....	136.9	153.4	11.4
Washington.....	58.5	64.0	9.8	Washington.....	133.9	149.3	11.6
Los Angeles.....	62.9	65.5	4.8	Los Angeles.....	182.9	208.7	14.1
Hamburger (pound):				Veal cutlet (pound):			
New York.....	87.8	97.3	11.3	New York.....	280.5	312.7	14.0
Washington.....	70.3	74.1	5.7	Washington.....	282.2	300.6	7.3
Los Angeles.....	60.2	69.2	15.4	Los Angeles.....	208.0	268.2	21.7

WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?

We might characterize as myth No. 4, the view espoused by some in the administration that the future for meat prices is encouraging. My reading of the

facts in this matter lead me to an opposite conclusion: Food prices and particularly meat prices will continue to rise in 1972 and beyond, at an unacceptable

level. Even the Secretary of Agriculture acknowledged in a recent interview in U.S. News & World Report that—

Over the long pull, fresh meat prices are going to rise.

According to the "National Food Situation, February 1972," published by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture:

Food prices in 1972 may average 4 and 1/2 percent higher than in 1971, up from the 3 percent increase last year (1970-1971) . . . prices of food at home likely will rise close to 4 percent compared with the 2 and 1/2 percent in 1971.

Beef supplies will probably expand at a faster rate later this year and the prices could ease some. However, strong demand will hold the prices at a relatively high level . . .

This last statement would seem to contradict denials by the Secretary of Agriculture that "we are short of beef."

The Director of Agricultural Economics of the USDA in a speech on January 6, 1972, before the Kansas Livestock Association Convention, said:

First, the short run. This year shapes up as being one of the better years for livestock producers. Red meat out-put will likely be about the same as last year.

We expect marketings to be up next summer and fall because the cattle inventory is rising and cattle-feed price relationships generally favor expanded feeding. Usually, when we see sizable increases in beef out-put ahead, we anticipate lower cattle prices. But it looks like any weakness in cattle prices that may develop will be limited . . . the price effects of increased beef out-put in 1972 likely will be offset by the sharp reduction in pork out-put now developing. There probably will be another rapid rise in consumer incomes."

Now let's take a quick look at some of the longer-term aspects of the livestock situation . . . the beef production projected for 1980 would mean a rise of around a third over that produced in 1970. This is a slower rate of increase than from 1960-1970 . . . thus, in the years ahead, the pace of expansion in beef out-put will slow . . .

Price trends in the cattle business will continue irregularly upward even with an increase in production because consumer demand will be up even more.

CAN PHASE II SLOW FOOD PRICE RISES

It is my position, as stated above, that Phase II requirements regarding mark-ups actually encourage unreasonable food prices to consumers. It follows that Phase II has had virtually no salutary effect on rapidly rising food prices. Even the frantic round of jawboning conducted by the Secretary of the Treasury quite recently may not be as totally effective even in the short run as many people believe. In New York City, for example, a price survey of nine beef items disclosed that as of last Friday—April 7, 1972—only one item was priced lower than the preceding month—chuck fillet steak, from a \$1.18 to \$1.56; three were the same price—California chuck roast, chuck pot roast boneless, and ground chuck; while five actually increased in price—boneless shoulder steak from \$1.28 to \$1.39; flank steak from \$1.59 to \$1.65; top sirloin roast boneless from \$1.29 to 1.39 and round roast bottom boneless from 1.29 to 1.39 and round roast bottom boneless from 1.19 to 1.29.

In a major Washington, D.C. area supermarket, a survey conducted for my office by the Virginia Citizens Consumer Council found that of 13 items surveyed on March 25 and April 8, 1972, seven remained the same price, two were actually higher and only four were of lower price.

But let us examine, for a moment, what one of the administration's most involved economists has to say about the effect of Phase I and Phase II on livestock prices. The Director of Agricultural Economics with the Department of Agriculture in a January 6, 1972 speech before the Kansas Livestock Association Convention stated that—

Phase I of the administration's new economic policy, announced in mid-August, had no major effect on livestock prices. Of course, livestock were exempt under the 90 day freeze, but cattle and hog prices could have been indirectly affected by the limitations set on wholesale or retail meat prices. However, the livestock market seemed to move freely at levels near those existing 30 days prior to the freeze.

Shortly after Phase II went into effect in mid-November, the Price Board granted processors of agricultural products permission to pass along increases in costs of their raw materials. Thus, higher prices of slaughter animals could be passed on the wholesalers and retailers. For example, in December, the cattle market rose well above prices paid during the 90 day freeze and the wholesale beef market moved right along with it."

With this flexibility in pricing of agricultural products, we do not expect Phase II to have any appreciable effect on livestock prices in 1972, if pricing policies for meat and livestock are not changed from those now in effect.

Let me say at this point that I am enormously sympathetic with the difficult task that confronts the Price Commission. My own view is that the Commission would do well to ignore both those who are cheerleading for higher livestock prices and those who choose to blame high prices on only one segment of the food marketing system. What is necessary and achievable is an objective evaluation of the reasons for high food prices across-the-board, and the establishment of a broad policy that will enable producers to remain in production at adequate profit levels and which will, at the same time, provide consumers with reasonable meat prices. In my view, it is entirely proper for consumers not to care very much about the profits of producers and middlemen in their quest for reasonable food prices. It is proper, as well, for farmers to relish their new-found prosperity. The point is that Government—in this case, the Price Commission—must develop and implement immediately a policy that will provide relief for consumers; and, in the longer run, that will provide farmers with a fair rate of return on their capital and labor.

I made the following recommendations to the Commission:

First. As an immediate first step, the Price Commission should freeze the price of raw agricultural commodities for 60 days. Thereafter, it should prohibit for an additional 180 days the maintenance markups by packers, processors and retailers. Only actual dollars and cents invoice increases should be permitted passed to consumers during this period. If this policy is successful in dampening food and meat price increases, then consideration should be given at the end of this 8-month period to restoring the permissibility of markup—based increases, but only as to those commodities which are increasing in price at the 2.5-percent annual level.

Incidentally, these alternate policies should be made retroactive to price levels at the beginning of phase II in November 1971.

Second. Simultaneously, the administration should suspend all meat import quotas and without requiring foreign nations to limit their export of beef. It is important to note, in this regard, that the recent 7-percent increase in the importation of beef quotas will only expand the total domestic availability of beef by one-half of 1 percent. In the words of the Secretary of Agriculture, this is not sufficient to cause a "flutter in the market."

Third. Based on my work on the National Commission on Food Marketing, it is my conclusion that there is gross inefficiency and unnecessary cost in the food marketing system beyond the farm gate. This includes inefficiencies in transportation policies—the wasted space in railroad cars because whole carcasses are shipped rather than butchering the animal at central locations close to areas of production—inefficiencies at slaughterhouses, packingplants, and distribution centers. The Department of Agriculture now spends less than one-half million dollars a year out of its \$8 billion budget to research these inefficiencies and improve the food marketing system. Incidentally, the Department spends \$5 million a year or 10 times as much controlling the fire ant in the South.

Fourth. If the Price Commission is sincerely interested, as I believe it is, in providing consumers with information at the point of sale adequate to assist the Government in ferreting out phase II violations, then it must revise drastically the information required in base price books located in supermarkets and other retail establishments. Presently, all that is listed there, with respect to food prices, is the base price cost of a product. But since food retailers are permitted to maintain their markups, and since the percentage the retailer applies to the cost of the product in order to calculate the selling price is missing from the base price book, there is no way possible for the consumer to know whether the current price violates the Price Commission's guidelines. Moreover, during my survey of 10 Queens, New York supermarkets, I found numerous violations of the "retailer's price posting requirements," which specify that a sign be prominently posted in each department indicating the location of the central base price list. I would not urge the enforcement of this requirement until such time as the proper and adequate information is included in the base price books themselves.

The burden on the Price Commission is great, and consumers are becoming increasingly impatient with the administration's economic stabilization program. On April 1, I polled 100,000 of my constituents on their reaction to the President's new economic policy; 96 percent of those responding stated their belief that prices are "still rising at an unacceptable level."

Accordingly, I urged the Commission

to take whatever steps are necessary to reverse the continuing trend toward higher food prices.

NEW YORK TIMES NEWSSTORY ON PANAMA CANAL TREATY NEGOTIATIONS INADEQUATE AND MISLEADING

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 1, 1971, I commented at length on the anti-American, distorted, inaccurate, and misleading propaganda in a newsstory in the New York Times concerning the Panama Canal. Following that exposure, I noticed that a subsequent newsstory in the New York Times by the same writer on the same question was substantially improved in quality, commended him in an address to this House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1972, and issued a press release thereon emphasizing that the dangerous situation arising from the pro-Communist revolutionary government at Panama requires protective action by the United States.

The latest newsstory on the Panama Canal situation in the New York Times was by C. L. Sulzberger in the April 9, 1972, issue of that paper under the condemnatory title of "Removing an Old Blemish." In this article its author displays a knowledge of current treaty negotiations that discloses his access to official sources but fails to show a realistic understanding of the subjects discussed. The story is, therefore, significant not for what it states but for what it fails to present.

The following are some of the highlights of the article:

First. That "quiet negotiations" between Panama and the United States for new canal agreements have progressed to the point where they may be completed before the end of 1972.

Second. That writer Sulzberger condemns President Theodore Roosevelt's action in acquiring the Canal Zone as "unabashedly crude."

Third. That he obviously supports the surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama.

Fourth. That he describes our government as wishing for a "new deal" for Panama and an opportunity to "remove the blemish on its posture of anti-imperialism."

Among the important points that Mr. Sulzberger did not reveal are these:

First. That the United States not only holds full sovereign powers over the Canal Zone but also obtained title to all privately owned land and property in the Zone by purchase from individual property owners.

Second. That in supporting a vast and extravagant sea-level undertaking he failed to show that it is unjustified economically and that this has been admitted even by its proponents and that the advent of thermonuclear warfare had made any type of canal vulnerable to destruction regardless of its design.

Third. That he failed to state that the supravessels for which a sea-level canal is being promoted were constructed for the purpose of avoiding the transit of the Panama Canal and the payment of tolls as it is more economical for them to sail around Cape Horn than to pay tolls.

Fourth. That he ignores the ecological angle in a sea-level undertaking and the danger of infesting the Atlantic Ocean with the poisonous Pacific sea snake and the crown of thorns starfish.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to such propaganda as that presented in the Sulzberger story, I would stress that the Canal Zone and Panama Canal are not a mere piece of real estate and a shopping center type of development suitable for placing on an auction block or an outlying post such as Okinawa but part of the coastline of the United States at the strategic center of the Americas absolutely essential for hemispheric defense. Surrendering its indispensable protective frame of the zone territory to Panama would be about as sensible as opening the White House grounds for commercial development.

In order that the Congress and the Nation at large may have the indicated news story for reading and evaluation, I quote it along with the 1971 memorial to the Congress of the Committee for Continued U.S. Control of the Panama Canal, which is one of the most comprehensive brief summaries of the Panama Canal problem ever prepared.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 9, 1972]

REMOVING AN OLD BLEMISH

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Quiet negotiations between the United States and Panama have now advanced to the point where it is hoped a new agreement governing the famous Atlantic-Pacific canal—and possibly even the right to construct another interoceanic channel—can be reached before the end of this year. Using a period of tranquility in relationships between the two countries, diplomatic representatives appear to see light at the end of a murky tunnel.

The basic accord still governing the Canal dates from 1903 after Teddy Roosevelt's unabashedly crude manipulations carved Panama from Colombia. Although the original understanding was modified three times, the changes were relatively insignificant. The U.S. still pays Panama only \$1,930,000 a year for the waterway itself although Americans living and working in the Canal Zone spend almost a hundred times that much annually.

What irks the Panamanians most is the unarguable fact that, through suzerainty in the Zone, Washington continues to practice the imperialism it officially eschews. Moreover, had tentative new agreements been ratified in 1964, as first foreseen, Panama would today be receiving something like \$25 million yearly in shipping tolls alone. The draft treaties were to regulate the existing cut, another sea-level canal and mutual defense.

Two basic issues have flared since Panama began to feel its rights were being ignored in this new anticolonial age. These are continued existence of the Zone, which clearly infringes on Panamanian sovereignty, and the fact that tolls have never been increased. In recent years, moreover, it has become evident that the vital necessity of the present Canal is self-liquidating because it is too narrow for existing ship designs and too vulnerable to attack.

Contemporary large cargo vessels and modern U.S. aircraft carriers can no longer traverse it. Moreover, the system of locks ad-

justing the difference in water level between the Atlantic and the Pacific makes the Canal an easy target in an age of nuclear-tipped missiles. For both peacetime and emergency wartime reasons it is desirable to construct a new and lockless link between the two oceans which can handle the increased volume of maxi-ship traffic and is also less vulnerable to possible destruction.

In 1970 Washington proposed a joint U.S.-Panama "unified canal system" to continue operating the existing waterway and to excavate another sea-level cut. Other surveys have studied the feasibility of different routes in the East Panamanian province of Darien or just across the frontier in Colombia.

Intermittent negotiations than ran into impasses despite Washington's indication that it was prepared to cede substantial territory from the Zone and accept new legal jurisdictional rules in what remained plus additional commercial concessions. The U.S., however, wishes to insure its right to defend and operate the existing Canal and to decide whether this should be enlarged or a new sea-level cut should be excavated.

To erase the "colonialist" image which has been attached to the United States, there has been agreement in principle to elide from any future treaty a phrase giving the U.S. the right to behave in the Zone in a sovereign manner for a period defined as "in perpetuity." An argument continues over the time period during which Washington would retain military rights of defense and more limited administrative rights.

In March the latest series of talks, which had been taking place in Washington, appeared deadlocked. However, U.S. negotiators were sent to Panama and there appears to be confidence that a new understanding can be reached within a few months.

It is of major importance that this be done at a time when U.S.-Panamanian relationships are not marred by public agitation as in January, 1964. A series of anti-American riots then produced a break of several weeks in diplomatic relations.

Washington wants a new deal and a chance to remove the blemish on its posture of anti-imperialism; but it doesn't want to seem to be doing so under pressure. Panama, on the other hand, wants more money, more legal rights, more territorial jurisdiction and, above all, no more of the humiliating implication that part of its territory can perpetually be ruled by a foreign power. An end to this archaicism is in sight.

PANAMA CANAL: SOVEREIGNTY AND MODERNIZATION—MEMORIAL TO THE CONGRESS (Committee for Continued Control of the Panama Canal, 1971)

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States: The undersigned, who have studied various aspects of interoceanic canal history and problems, wish to express their views:

1) The report of the interoceanic canal inquiry, authorized under Public Law 88-609, headed by Robert B. Anderson, recommending construction of a new canal of so-called sea level design in the Republic of Panama, was submitted to the President on December 1, 1970. The proposed canal, initially estimated to cost \$2,880,000,000 exclusive of the costs of right of way and inevitable indemnity to Panama, would be 10 miles West of the existing Canal. This recommendation, which hinges upon the surrender to Panama by the United States of all sovereign control over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone, has rendered the entire canal situation so acute and confused as to require rigorous clarification.

2) A new angle developed in the course of the sea level inquiry is that the Panamic biota (fauna and flora), on which subject, a symposium of recognized scientists was held on March 4, 1971 at the Smithsonian Institution. That gathering was overwhelmingly op-

posed to any sea level project because of the biological dangers to marine life incident to the removal of the fresh water barrier between the Oceans, now provided by Gatun Lake, including in such dangers the infestation of the Caribbean Sea and Atlantic Ocean with the poisonous yellow-bellied Pacific sea snake (*Pelamis platurus*).

3) The construction by the United States of the Panama Canal (1904-1914) was the greatest industrial enterprise in history. Undertaken as a long-range commitment by the United States, in fulfillment of solemn treaty obligations (Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901) as a "mandate for civilization" in an area notorious as the pest hole of the world and as a land of endemic revolution, endless intrigue and governmental instability (Flood, "Panama: Land of Endemic Revolution . . ." Congressional Record, August 7, 1969, pp. 22845-22848), the task was accomplished in spite of physical and health conditions that seemed insuperable. Its subsequent management and operation on terms of "entire equality" with tolls that are "just and equitable" have won the praise of the world, particularly countries that use the Canal.

4) Full sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone territory and Canal were acquired by treaty grant in perpetuity from Panama (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903). In addition to the indemnity paid by the United States to Panama for the necessary sovereignty and jurisdiction, all privately owned land and property in the Zone were purchased by the United States from individual owners; and Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus before Panama's independence, has recognized the title to the Panama Canal and Railroad as vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States (Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1914-22). The cost of acquiring the Canal Zone, as of March 31, 1964, totalled \$144,568,571, making it the most expensive territorial extension in the history of the United States. Because of the vast protection obligations of the United States, the perpetuity provisions in the 1903 treaty assure that Panama will remain a free and independent country in perpetuity, for these provisions bind the United States as well as Panama.

5) The gross total investment of our country in the Panama Canal enterprise, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1968, was \$6,368,009,000; recoveries during the same period were \$1,849,931,421, making a total net investment by the taxpayers of the United States of more than \$5,000,000,000; which, if converted into 1971 dollars, would be far greater. Except for the grant by Panama of full sovereign powers over the Zone territory, our Government would never have assumed the grave responsibilities involved in the construction of the Canal and its later operation, maintenance, sanitation, protection and defense.

6) In 1939, prior to the start of World War II, the Congress authorized, at a cost not to exceed \$277,000,000, the construction of a third set of locks known as the Third Locks Project, then hailed as "the largest single current engineering work in the world." This Project was suspended in May 1942 because of more urgent war needs, and the total expenditures thereon were \$76,357,405, mostly on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, which are still usable. Fortunately, no excavation was started at Pedro Miguel. The program for the enlargement of Gaillard Cut started in 1959, with correlated channel improvements, was completed in 1970 at a cost of \$95,000,000. These two works together represent an expenditure of more than \$171,000,000 toward the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

7) As the result of canal operations in the crucial period of World War II, there was developed in the Panama Canal organiza-

tion the first comprehensive proposal for the major operational improvement and increase of capacity of the Canal as derived from actual marine experience, known as the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan. This conception included provisions for the following:

(1) Elimination of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel Locks.

(2) Consolidation of all Pacific Locks South of Miraflores.

(3) Raising the Gatun Lake water level to its optimum height (about 92').

(4) Construction of one set of larger locks.

(5) Creation at the Pacific end of the Canal of a summit-level terminal lake anchorage for use as a traffic reservoir to correspond with the layout at the Atlantic end, which would improve marine operations by eliminating lockage surges in Gaillard Cut, mitigate the effect of fog on Canal capacity, reduce transit time, diminish the number of accidents, and simplify the management of the Canal.

8) Competent, experienced engineers have officially reported that all "engineering considerations which are associated with the plan are favorable to it." Moreover, such a solution:

(1) Enables the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished on the Panama Canal, including that on the suspended Third Locks Project.

(2) Avoids the danger of disastrous slides.

(3) Provides the best operational canal practicable of achievement with the certainty of success.

(4) Preserves and increases the existing economy of Panama.

(5) Avoids inevitable Panamanian demands for damages that would be involved in the proposed sea level project.

(6) Averts the danger of a potential biological catastrophe with international repercussions that recognized scientists fear might be caused by constructing a salt water channel between the Oceans.

(7) Can be constructed at "comparatively low cost" without the necessity for negotiating a new canal treaty with Panama.

9) All of these facts are elemental considerations from both U.S. national and international viewpoints and cannot be ignored, especially the diplomatic and treaty aspects. In connection with the latter, it should be noted that the original Third Locks Project, being only a modification of the existing Canal, and wholly within the Canal Zone, did not require a new treaty with Panama. Nor, as previously stated, would the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan require a new treaty. These are paramount factors in the overall equation.

10) In contrast, the persistently advocated and strenuously propagandized Sea-Level Project at Panama, initially estimated in 1970 to cost \$2,880,000,000, exclusive of the costs of the right of way and indemnity to Panama, has long been a "hardy perennial," according to former Governor of the Panama Canal, Jay J. Morrow. It seems that no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such proposal within practicable limits of cost and time is demonstrated, there will always be someone to argue for it; and this, despite the economic, engineering, operational, environmental and navigational superiority of the Terminal Lake solution. Moreover, any sea-level project, whether in the U.S. Canal Zone territory or elsewhere, will require a new treaty or treaties with the countries involved in order to fix the specific conditions for its construction and this would involve a huge indemnity and a greatly increased annuity that would have to be added to the cost of construction and reflected in tolls, or be wholly borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

11) Starting with the 1936-39 Treaty with Panama, there has been a sustained erosion of United States rights, powers and

authority on the Isthmus, culminating in the completion, in 1967, of negotiations for three proposed new canal treaties that would:

(1) Surrender United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama;

(2) Make that weak, technologically primitive and unstable country a senior partner in the management and defense of the Canal;

(3) Ultimately give to Panama not only the existing Canal, but also any new one constructed in Panama to replace it, all without any compensation whatever and all in derogation of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution. This Clause vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the entire Congress (House and Senate) and not in the treaty-making power of our Government (President and Senate)—a Constitutional provision observed in the 1955 Treaty with Panama.

12) It is clear from the conduct of our Panama Canal policy over many years that policy-making elements within the Department of State, in direct violation of the indicated Constitutional provision, have been, and are yet, engaged in efforts which will have the effect of diluting or even repudiating entirely the sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States with respect to the Canal and of dissipating the vast investment of the United States in the Panama Canal project. Such actions would eventually and inevitably permit the domination of this strategic waterway by a potentially hostile power that now indirectly controls the Suez Canal. That canal, under such domination, ceased to operate in 1967 with vast consequences of evil to world trade.

13) Extensive debates in the Congress over the past decade have clarified and narrowed the key canal issues to the following:

(1) Retention by the United States of its undiluted and indispensable sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone territory and Canal as provided by existing treaties;

(2) The major modernization of the existing Panama Canal as provided for in the Terminal Lake Proposal.

Unfortunately, these efforts have been complicated by the agitation of Panamanian extremists, aided and abetted by irresponsible elements in the United States, aiming at ceding to Panama complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone and, eventually, the ownership of the existing Canal and any future canal in the Zone or in Panama that might be built by the United States to replace it.

14) In the 1st Session of the 92nd Congress identical bills were introduced in both House and Senate to provide for the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal by modifying the authorized Third Locks Project to embody the principles of the previously mentioned Terminal Lake solution, which competent authorities consider would supply the best operational canal practicable of achievement, and at least cost without treaty involvement.

15) Starting on January 26, 1971, many Members of Congress have sponsored resolutions expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal enterprise, including the Canal Zone, and not surrender any of its powers to any other nation or to any international organization in derogation of present treaty provisions.

16) The Panama Canal is a priceless asset of the United States, essential for inter-oceanic commerce and Hemispheric security. The recent efforts to wrest its control from the United States trace back to the 1917 Communist Revolution and conform to long

range Soviet policy of gaining domination over key water routes as in Cuba, which flanks the Atlantic approach to the Panama Canal, and as was accomplished in the case of the Suez Canal, which the Soviet Union now wishes opened in connection with its naval buildup in the Eastern Mediterranean and Indian Ocean. Thus, the real issue at Panama, dramatized by the Communist take over of strategically located Cuba and Chile, is not United States control versus Panamanian but United States control versus Soviet control. This is the issue that should be debated in the Congress, especially in the Senate. Panama is a small, weak country occupying a strategic geographical position that is the objective of predatory power, requiring the presence of the United States on the Isthmus in the interest of Hemispheric security and international order.

17) In view of all the foregoing, the undersigned urge prompt action as follows:

(1) Adoption by the House of Representatives of pending Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions and,

(2) Enactment by the Congress of pending measures for the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

To these ends, we respectfully urge that hearings be promptly held on the indicated measures and that Congressional policy thereon be determined for early prosecution of the vital work of modernizing the Panama Canal, now approaching saturation of capacity.

Dr. Karl Brandt, Palo Alto, Calif.: Economist, Hoover Institute, Stanford, Calif., Former Chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Comdr. Homer Brett, Jr., Chevy Chase, Md.: Former Intelligence Officer, Caribbean Area. Hon. Ellis O. Briggs, Hanover, N.H.; U.S. Ambassador retired and Author.

Dr. John C. Briggs, Tampa, Florida: Professor of Biology, University of South Florida, Tampa.

William B. Collier, Santa Barbara, Calif.: Business Executive with Engineering and Naval Experience.

Lt. Gen. Pedro Adel Valle, Annapolis, Maryland: Intelligence Analyst, Former Commanding General, 1st Marine Div.

Herman H. Dinsmore, New York, N.Y.: Former Associate Foreign Editor, *New York Times*, Editorialist.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Alexandria, Va.: Professor of Economics, Georgetown Univ.

Dr. Donald M. Dozer, Santa Barbara, Calif.: Historian, University of Calif., Santa Barbara, Authority on Latin America.

Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, Washington, D.C.: Former Commander-in-Chief, Allied Air Forces, Mediterranean. Analyst and Commentator on National Security Questions.

K. V. Hoffman, Richmond, Va.: Editor and Author.

Dr. Walter D. Jacobs, College Park, Md.: Professor of Government and Politics, University of Maryland.

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, McLean, Va.: Engineer and Author.

Edwin J. B. Lewis, Washington, D.C.: Professor of Accounting, George Washington University; Past President, Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C.

Dr. Leonard B. Loeb, Berkeley, Calif.: Professor of Physics Emeritus, University of California.

William Loeb, Manchester, N.H.: Publisher and Author.

Lt. Col. Matthew P. McKeon, Springfield, Va.: Intelligence Analyst, Editor and Publisher.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Tulsa, Okla.: Consulting geologist; formerly head of Department of Geology, University of Pennsylvania.

Richard B. O'Keefe, Fairfax, Va.: Asst. Professor, George Mason College, University of Virginia, Research Consultant on Panama Canal, The American Legion.

Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, Owings Mills, Md.: Aviation Executive.

V. Adm. T. G. W. Settle, Washington, D.C.: Former Commander, Amphibious Forces, Pacific.

Jon P. Speller, New York, N.Y.: Author and Editor.

Harold Lord Varney, New York, N.Y.: President, Committee on Pan American Policy, New York; Authority on Latin American Policy, Editor.

Capt. Franz O. Willenbacher, Bethesda, Md.: Lawyer and Executive.

Dr. Francis G. Wilson, Washington, D.C.: Professor of Political Science Emeritus, University of Illinois; Author and Editor.

Atty. William R. Joyce, Jr., J.D., Washington, D.C., Lawyer.

Institutions are listed for identification purposes only.

EQUITABLE TAX LAWS AND REALISTIC EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS I introduced on March 1, 1972, H.R. 13495 to make our tax laws more equitable and our educational policies more realistic. Some 5 million American children attend private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools. The parents of these children are finding it increasingly difficult to shoulder the financial burden of educating their children in these schools. Rising costs have forced some nonprofit schools to introduce tuition payments for the first time. The same rising costs are forcing schools that have been charging very modest tuition to increase those charges by substantial amounts. The result is the threat of a severe depression in the private educational sector—a depression that would imperil the quality of American education and the freedom of parental choice guaranteed by our Constitution.

H.R. 13495 provides a carefully limited Federal income tax credit to parents for half the tuition they pay for the education of their children in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools. No educational expenses except tuition are eligible for the credit. There is an upper limit of \$400 per child. Taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$25,000 will have their total credit reduced by \$1 of credit for every \$20 of excess income, thus preserving the sound principle of ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13495 will save money for all American taxpayers, at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. It will particularly aid those families—some 2 million families—who are carrying a dual burden for the education of their children. These families are paying taxes for support of the public schools and at the same time paying tuition to send their children to private nonprofit schools. We should recognize their unique claim for tax relief. That is the purpose of my bill.

Mr. Speaker, the cost to the Federal Government for my bill in terms of revenue loss is substantial—some \$500 million—but it is small compared to the value received. Parents of non-public-school children are paying some \$1.4 bil-

lion in tuition alone and this is only a fraction of the actual cost of education in the private sector. When you consider what it would cost to educate these same 5 million children in the public schools at the current national average per pupil cost of \$858, I call my tax credit bill a bargain for the Federal Government.

There are millions of Americans ready, with relatively small help from the Government, to maintain their nonpublic schools. In these days, when we need enormous revenues to meet the social problems that beset our country, the loss of the private investment in education would be a catastrophe. Every non-public-school child that transfers to a public school costs the taxpayer money. Such transfers, especially on a large scale, are most imminent precisely in our major metropolitan areas.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will take no money away from any public school. Indeed, it will save money for all public schools and, in many of our large metropolitan areas, it will help prevent financial disaster. We are all aware of the grave financial crisis facing our State and local governments, a crisis which has given rise to the demand for revenue sharing by the Federal Government. My tax credit bill should be considered as part of the effort by Congress to meet this financial crisis, particularly in the cities. I have introduced H.R. 13495 to provide responsible, constitutional aid to the parents of non-public-school children.

The American educational tradition is a tradition of pluralism and of the primacy of parental choice. Nonpublic schools are not aliens in our midst. They date from the foundation of the Republic and contribute the indispensable element of diversity to our educational culture. They play a vital role in the religious and intellectual life of our country.

The existence of private nonprofit schools is also vital to the preservation of fundamental parental rights in education. Fifty years ago the Supreme Court ruled that "the child is not the mere creature of the State." Parents have a wide sphere of constitutionally guaranteed freedom in directing the education of their children.

Fortunately, the laws that the Supreme Court struck down during the 1920's have disappeared from the American scene. Now, however, some 50 years later, we are faced with the imminent prospect of the steady attrition of non-public schools. This attrition is being caused, not by any lack of parental desire for such schools, but by financial pressures that can and should be alleviated by government.

Some of these financial pressures are directly attributable to government itself. When both taxes and educational costs were low in comparison to what they are today, it was possible for parents to band together, especially with the help of church organizations, and support nonpublic schools on their own. Government, however, has been substantially increasing both the taxes it collects and the amounts it spends on education. The result is to leave less private money available for much higher private educational costs.

We must never forget that education is

not luxury. The welfare of our Nation depends on the education of our children. In recognition of this elementary truth, Government directly subsidizes education in many different ways and provides tax incentive for private investment in education. We need not fear that the Federal Government will abandon its historic neutrality toward parental choice between public and nonpublic schools. Rather, what we have to fear is the certainty that, without tax credit legislation, this neutrality will disappear. The education of children in nonpublic schools is not a private matter. We should promptly extend the help that my tax credit proposal would provide.

Mr. Speaker, I am appending to my remarks a section-by-section analysis of my bill.

The analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 13020

Section 1(a) adds a new section 42 to the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 42(a) provides a credit against the individual income tax for tuition an individual pays to a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school on behalf of any dependent of the taxpayer. The credit does not include books, supplies, fees, and other items.

Section 42(b) limits the credit for any year on behalf of any dependent to 50 percent of the tuition paid up to a maximum credit of \$400. Additionally, the aggregate credit allowable is reduced by one dollar for every \$20 by which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer (or if married, the taxpayer and his spouse) for the taxable year exceeds \$25,000.

Section 42(c)(1) defines tuition as any amount paid for attendance at a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school. Meals, specifically excluded.

Section 42(c)(2) defines private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools as an institution regularly offering education at the elementary or secondary levels that fulfills the requirements of State compulsory education laws. Additionally, the organization must be one described in section 501(c)(3) and 503(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Organizations described in section 501(c)(3) must be organized and operated exclusively for charitable educational purposes with no part of any net earnings inuring to any private shareholder or individual. Under Rev. Rul. 71-447, the Internal Revenue Service has held that such a school must not discriminate as to race on the basis of any of its policies or programs.

Section 503(b)(2) describes an organization that normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly enrolled body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on.

Section 42(c)(3) makes it clear that the credit is inapplicable to education beyond the twelfth grade.

Section 42(d) limits the credit to the amount of taxable income remaining after the application of the other credits allowable against individual income tax (e.g. the foreign tax credit). However, the credit for taxes withheld and certain fuel taxes is applied after the credit for tuition provided by the bill.

Section 42(e) provides the Secretary with regulatory authority.

Section 1(b) corrects section headings.

Section 2 makes the bill effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1971.

PROBLEMS FACING NEW ENGLAND FISHING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of being the speaker at the weekly meeting of the Seafarers Institute luncheon. My subject was one of the great problems facing the New England fishing industry. Recently the New England congressional delegation met with all segments of the industry to discuss their problems and we will shortly be filing legislation to try to lessen their burdens. I am grateful to Hugh O'Rourke of Boston for calling this meeting, and to Phil Conley of the Seafarers for allowing me to be the guest at today's luncheon.

We are very proud of our tradition in New England. Proud of the New England town meeting, the old village squares, the buildings that date back before the American Revolution, and we are very reluctant to let any of that heritage disappear when there are reasons to keep it, and means and methods to preserve it, available to us.

And today I want to tell you of my great concern that one part of that strong heritage may be disappearing. I strongly believe however, that we have at hand several ways of preserving it and making it once again strong and durable.

I refer to the dilemma of the New England fishing industry. It is, of all the Nation's industries, perhaps the most traditional. The art and skill of fishing is passed from one generation to the next and an age-old routine is followed.

Because of the traditional customs and practices of the New England fishing industry, it is being victimized by the "hit and run" character of its foreign competition.

The tradition of fishing that causes the greatest problem for New England fishermen today is that they do not practice overkill. That is, they fish enough to supply the market, yet leave enough to restock the breed of fish for the next season, the next year, and for the next generation.

The ecologists who continue to tell us how all industry is inconsiderate of ecology might be glad to know that New England fishermen have been the most considerate of men in regard to their catch. And they still are. But that leads to great problems for them.

For the fishing industry around New England is a highly competitive one. Foreign vessels fishing near New England's shores outnumber the American fishing boats by more than 3 to 1. And their practices amount nearly to rape of the fishing grounds.

These foreign fleets use fishing methods that are remarkable for the amount of fish they bring in, and appalling for the wholesale slaughter they wreak. One of them is the "pulse" method in which fish are stunned by beams and then simply harvested as if they were so much corn. But, where corn leaves seeds on earth, the fish are completely removed from the sea. All sizes, all varieties, all specimens of fish are pulled up in the foreign nets, never to be seen again in that part of the sea.

American fishermen, New England fishermen do not want that kind of catch.

Both morally and economically, that is a method to be shunned and condemned.

Yet there is little we can do about it as the law is presently constructed. Outside the 12-mile limit, foreign fleets are free to pillage and plunder as they like. And that is wrong.

Why, yes, there are international bodies supposed to control such things. One of them is the U.S. State Department's International Conference on North Atlantic Fisheries, unfortunately, it has gotten bogged down in diplomacy to the point that it cannot protect the fish of the North Atlantic. And in some cases it seems that, for diplomatic reasons of course, it would rather bow to the Russians, the Danes, and the Norwegians than acknowledge the existence of the New England fishermen.

We need to change that. We can declare lobster and scallops "creatures of the shelf." Meaning that they belong to the Continental Shelf over which the United States maintains jurisdiction, and that fishing for lobster and scallop could be strictly watched and controlled by the Coast Guard.

It is a step that we should have taken for the haddock that once swam in such abundance over Georges Bank. We did not and now, in the words of the New England Fisheries Advisory Committee with which I have worked very closely, "The resource is now commercially almost nonexistent." The committee said that while U.S. fishermen "exploited the resource at acceptable levels" it was for years "devastatingly overexploited" by foreign fishermen while the State Department failed to enforce the regulations of the International Conference of North Atlantic Fisheries.

But now the New Englanders are pleading for the protection of lobster and scallop resources from the same overfishing techniques that ruined the haddock schools. We in Congress would have to have a very deaf ear indeed not to hear that plea.

And we in Congress have been distressed, to say the least, to hear of incidents in which the massive fishing fleets of foreign nations have smashed New England's lobster traps and other equipment during their plunder of the sea.

The gear offshore lobsterman must have is expensive, and yet, because of the repeated attacks of foreign fleets, American insurance companies have grown greatly reluctant to insure the New England fishermen. And even when they decide to insure them, the policies they write are oftentimes beyond the economic reach of the New England fisherman.

And New England fishermen traditionally are strongly independent people, and they don't want their fleet to become dependent on the Government. But I think that insurance for the fishermen provides the Government with an opportunity to do something of value without interfering in any way with the operation of the fishing fleet.

By setting up an insurance subsidy for the New England fishermen, the Government could help that fleet maintain its competitive balance by assuring the fleet that payment for damage would be made.

And there is good reason to think that such a subsidy would pay itself back, since a part of the New England catch is exported, thus aiding our balance of payments and our balance of trade. Those are rather impressive credentials for Government help.

And there is another problem of tradition that must be overcome. That is the problem of technology. For devices have become the biggest news in fishing. Not just the pulse device I mentioned earlier, but fish finding sonar and a host of technology currently beyond the financial reach of most fishing boats.

And if these boatowners were to buy and install the new devices they need, the expense of operation could force many of them out of business.

Here again we see the problem that confronted the Nation's merchant marine before passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. The technology needed for a modern fleet was known, but the money was not available. Congress made those funds available through the act. And it will prove to be a wise investment.

I believe that Government must find a similar remedy for investment in the fishing fleet. And the time to do that is now. Perhaps the answer is some form of tax credit to encourage installation of the needed gear, or perhaps some kind of subsidy. The point is, it can and must be done and done soon.

For without some kind of help, both through modern regulation of the fisheries that provide these New Englanders with their livelihood and through assistance to bring about a new era in New England fishing, the fleet must soon die.

And if it were to do that, we would have lost New England's oldest industry, one that began in Gloucester, Mass., in 1623, and if that is lost, America will have been diminished. We cannot let that happen.

We cannot let it happen because the collapse of that American industry would put us completely at the mercy of foreign fleets for the seafood we eat and the fish products that are used in a host of ways by several other industries.

The fishing fleet is an important and integral part of the American maritime industry and we, as a nation, must fight for its continuance and preservation.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ALASKA IN THE BUDGETS OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES

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

MR. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, those Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government which are responsible for lands and natural resources are particularly vital for Alaska. Today, I have testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, and have submitted a supplementary letter, as well. So that other Members, and all Alaskans, might know my own priorities and the needs of Alaska in these budgets, I am inserting these statements in today's Record.

HON. NICK BEGICH, ALASKA—TESTIMONY FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, APRIL 12, 1972

Madame Chairman: In any given year, the budget for the Department of Interior is of vital importance to the State of Alaska. The various agencies of the Interior Department control about two-thirds of Alaska's 375 million acres, and this is a vast responsibility both to the State of Alaska and to the Nation. I value the relationship of Alaska to the Department of Interior, and my remarks here today are in general support of the various budget requests of the agencies of the Department.

What must be specifically noted, however, is that this year and those following are of substantially greater importance than previous years. The passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act (P.L. 92-203) will drastically expand and accelerate the responsibilities of the Department of Interior in Alaska. Thus, the theme of my remarks is that the budget of the Interior Department must insure that the meaning of the Land Claims Act is not lost through inadequate funding.

First, let me direct attention to the Interior Department Supplemental requests for F.Y. 1972. I note, and strongly support, the appropriation of \$12.5 million in this request for "start-up" money for Native Regional Corporations under the Land Claims Act. Similarly, I strongly support the requests of the B.I.A. for \$500,000 for Native enrollment and \$500,000 for assistance in resolving Native land allotment issues stemming from earlier land laws. Also included in the Supplemental request is the total of \$1 million by the B.L.M. to provide 85 new persons to carry out responsibilities under the Land Claims Act. (\$600,000 for Cadastral Survey activities and \$400,000 for the resource management and records program). While this is the sort of additional budgeting which is necessary, I must say that, especially in the case of survey capabilities, I question whether the amount budgeted is enough, and request consideration of an additional amount.

My principal concern with the F.Y. 1972 Supplemental request is the absence of any funding for the Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission created by Section 17 of the Land Claims Act. This Commission has a duty to the State of Alaska, to the Native people of Alaska, and to the public interest of the Nation, and I believe that some fraction of the authorized ceiling of \$1.5 million should be appropriated this year to allow the Commission to begin its activities properly. I note that in recent Senate confirmation hearing, the recently appointed Federal co-chairman of the Commission, Mr. Jack Horton, promised that money would be available, but did not elaborate on the source or amount. I respectfully request that the Committee insure that this promise is fulfilled.

Moving now to the F.Y. 1973 budget requests, I would make the point that this is the first year of a full funding cycle to implement the Land Claims Act. The budget for F.Y. 1973 will be examined by all Alaskans to determine whether or not the Interior Department fully appreciates its role under the legislation and is willing to increase its level of activity.

This expanded role seems to be reflected in the F.Y. 1973 request, based on my preliminary evaluation, which indicates an 18% increase over last year's budget.

Allow me to briefly set out some specific areas of support and concern.

The B.I.A. request contains \$50 million for the Alaska Native Fund, which I strongly support. In examining other aspects of this request, I believe two items are worthy of special mention. First, I believe the amount

budgeted for the construction of school buildings and facilities in Alaska is inadequate given the demonstrated needs. Second, I believe the general level of funding for higher education is inadequate, especially given the substantially higher funding (by \$8 million) for adult-vocational education services.

The B.L.M. request is also vital to Alaska. Again, I note the absence of money for the Joint State-Federal Land Use Planning Commission and request that both the F.Y. 1972 Supplemental and the F.Y. 1973 budget provide part of the \$1.5 million authorized. In addition, I am concerned that the \$3.1 million provided for B.L.M. functions directly related to the Land Claims Act (\$1 million for cadastral survey; \$2.1 million for land management and records) may be inadequate. The problem is not final completion of this task, as much as completing it on a rapid schedule, and as much as \$5 million may be necessary to make F.Y. 1973 truly productive.

Similarly, the budget request for the Geological Survey is important, if Alaska is to begin to move forward after years of inactivity. Although it is difficult to break out the figures for any state, my information is that the overall U.S.G.S. for Alaska is only increased \$70,000 for F.Y. 1973. If this is so, it seems entirely inappropriate in a year in which the Land Claims Act is implemented, in which the Trans-Alaska Pipeline may be approved, and in which mineral exploration in Alaska will certainly increase the need for good survey information.

Regarding the Indian Health Service, I want to compliment the improvements being made, and to request that an additional sum be made available to allow even better delivery of health care in Alaska. Specifically, I request that \$2 million be added to the national budget for contract health care, with \$150,000 being for dental care and \$1,850,000 for medical care. This money can be immediately absorbed in Alaska rural medical and dental care programs alone.

I have two specific points regarding the Forest Service requests, both of which represent important environmental measures. First, I note that research funding in Alaska has been cut by \$35,000 to \$947,000 for F.Y. 1973. I respectfully submit that, under all the circumstances in Alaska, this figure must be raised to \$1.2 million. Second, I note that the figure for forest roads and trails in Alaska has been cut by over \$1 million to only \$2,774,000. Quite frankly, this will result in increased clearcutting of timber, because without adequate road building funds, the new, smaller, clearcutting tracts agreeable to all parties (Forest Service, timber companies, environmentalists) cannot be reached and larger tracts will be cut using existing roads. I respectfully request that this be increased at least to last year's level of \$3,861,000.

Finally, within the limited time available, I want to express strong general support for the F.Y. 1973 requests of the Park Service and to compliment the 1972 program.

I thank the Committee for its time and attention.

CONGRESSMAN NICK BEGICH,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1972.

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: I would like to take this opportunity to specifically highlight the very important need for increasing the research program by the U.S. Forest Service in Alaska.

Alaska is on the threshold of rapid development of her natural resources. The forests, lands, and watersheds of Alaska need to be managed wisely. The research for these re-

newable resources lies mainly with the U.S. Forest Service.

It is my intention today to request an increase of \$550,000 for Forest Service research in Alaska. This amount would provide the first increase in the Forest Service's plans to expand forestry research in Alaska. It would provide necessary research in 1) fire, 2) watershed management, 3) wildlife habitat, 4) salmon spawning habitat, and 5) recreational development in Southeastern Alaska.

FIRE RESEARCH

(\$100,000 Increase Desirable)

Every year forest fires sweep through Interior Alaska destroying thousands of acres of timber and, of course, countless forms of wildlife.

Additional funding could effectively be utilized in FY '73 for fire research to better predict both the beneficial and harmful effects of fire and, hopefully, lead to more efficient fire control strategies.

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

(\$100,000 Increase desirable)

A permafrost environment creates particularly unique problems with regard to water sources. Increased funding could enhance the development of a better understanding of soil-water-land relationships and the man-caused and natural disturbances of ecological systems in a cold-dominated climate.

Increased research would be of considerable value when one considers that Interior Alaska's watersheds produce more than one-third of the fresh water runoff in the United States.

WILDLIFE HABITAT

(\$100,000 increase desirable)

A better understanding is needed of the relationships between big game populations and forest and shrub vegetation. Big game is definitely affected by the amount and availability of the winter food supply. In a great many areas of Alaska, big game is necessary for subsistence.

SALMON SPAWNING HABITAT

(\$150,000 increase desirable)

More attention is needed to better understand the relationship between timber harvesting and protection of salmon spawning streams in Southeastern Alaska. The coastal mountains of Southeastern Alaska where improper logging practice will cast sediment into the streams needs study so as not to reduce the salmon spawning opportunities and the industrial base for the fisheries industry.

There is little question of the inadequacy of Alaska's program of forestry research when you consider the immensity of our 49th State. Your subcommittee's attention to Alaska's need will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

NICK BEGICH.

CAB'S CONSUMER AFFAIRS OFFICE COMPILING ENVIABLE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Air Line Pilot, the magazine of professional flightcrews, has in its March issue a very interesting story written by Jean Earnshaw that deals with passenger gripes. The news article is a detailed account of the Civil Aeronautics Board's Office of Consumer Affairs, the first of its kind in the Federal regulatory system.

Created by CAB Chairman Secor D. Browne, and headed by Jack Yohe, a for-

mer newspaperman from my Pennsylvania congressional district, this Office has established itself for its accomplishments in handling airline passenger problems whenever they arise. Incidentally, the overall airline record for complaints is not bad. About 8,000 complaints were filed with the Board from the more than 150 million persons who used air service in 1971.

A strong advocate of consumers' rights, Mr. Yohe believes, the news article points out:

... the airline passenger has a right to know, in advance, the service he can expect, the cheapest available fare, the restrictions and conditions applicable to the fare, any additional charges he will have to pay for visual and audio entertainment and beverages he may consume. He has the right to be fully apprised, in advance, of the carrier's limit of liability for damaged or lost baggage, and of the alternatives open to him to protect his possessions beyond those liability limits. And the oversold passenger has the right to be fully apprised of the carrier's obligations to him. I believe, if consumer complaints arise at all, the consumer has a right to expect them to be handled with the speed befitting the pace of travel to which the air age has accustomed us.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this news story be printed in the RECORD.

PASSENGER GRIPES

(By Jean Earnshaw)

An airline passenger wrote the Civil Aeronautics Board he had read that a certain airline would carry a piano on one of its flights. "I might be subjected to the piano peckings of a child or the improvisations of a tipsy amateur," he said. "Whoever the artist, I am not paying for transportation to be made a captive audience."

The letter is one of over 8,000 that have come in the last year to Jack Yohe at CAB's new Office of Consumer Affairs. The gripes come from disgruntled passengers, angry about canceled flights, oversold space, lost or damaged baggage, lost cargo, rude personnel and a host of miscellaneous causes.

Yohe hears from that percentage of the 170-million U.S. airline passengers whom the airlines have alienated—the out-for-blood and hardship cases—as well as an occasional crank or crook who is determined to make trouble for the industry. Believing that the men in the cockpit might be interested in what the consumers in the cabin are complaining about, *Air Line Pilot* took a look at the CAB consumer complaint files.

There is the case of the William Delaneys, an elderly couple on a pension. They decided last February to go on an Orient Adventure Tour. They sent \$1,769 to a travel service that handles package tours. In less than two weeks Mrs. Delaney was hospitalized and underwent three operations, including amputation of the toes on her left foot. The Delaneys canceled their trip and asked for a refund. Instead they received two roundtrip airline tickets.

The travel service took the position that the trip should have been canceled 60 days before departure.

"When I heard the agency was using a technicality as an excuse for not paying off, I really started raising a fuss," Yohe recalled. "I called the travel service and told them I was very disturbed about the way they had handled the case."

"All right," the company representative agreed. "We'll pay them back \$1,000."

"The amount is '\$1,017,'" Yohe insisted. "You'd hold us up for \$17?"

"You bet I will," Yohe replied firmly. The additional \$17 arrived by special deliv-

ery messenger while Yohe was talking on the telephone to the Delaneys.

Yohe, a tall man with prematurely gray hair and a quiet manner that belies his record of getting things set straight fast, handles most consumer gripes on the telephone. He feels strongly that writing letters is time consuming and expensive. Because Yohe was for many years CAB director of information, he is on a first-name basis with most airline executives. His calls frequently go directly to the men at the top.

The Juergen Oelsner case hung fire for almost two years before his attorneys wrote to Yohe's office for help. In June 1969, Oelsner shipped \$23,000 of household goods, fully insured, from Quito, Ecuador to Montevideo, Uruguay. The shipment was picked up by one airline in Ecuador and transferred enroute to another for delivery in Uruguay. After he discovered the packages had been damaged and \$12,000 worth of personal belongings were missing, Oelsner was told to contact the second carrier, which he did. Six months later, this carrier wrote the claim should have been filed with the airline that had first accepted his shipment. Almost one year from the date of the shipment, the original carrier replied it was sending the entire file to its insurers in Chicago. Then silence. In March 1971, Oelsner phoned the Chicago firm, which advised it was denying the claim because it had not been filed within 90 days after receipt of goods.

Oelsner's attorneys at this point wrote to Jack Yohe, who contacted the first airline's claims manager. About his conversation with the Chicago adjusters, Yohe says: "They told me they would gather all the facts and consider the claim. I asked them why they had not already done so. I had to go all the way to Lloyds of London to solve this case, which was a tough one. The insurer eventually discounted the \$12,000 claim by 20% because of poor packaging and paid \$8,856, to the satisfaction of the claimant."

The Office of Consumer Affairs, tries to get prompt action on complaints. If a passenger has a valid case, the office is successful in solving his problem. As of Dec. 31, Yohe estimates he had settled close to \$140,000 worth of claims by airline passengers.

Establishment of Yohe's office is the second major consumer-oriented action taken by CAB Chairman Secor D. Browne during his tenure. In 1970 a consumer advisory panel was set up, and Reuben B. Robertson, an associate of Ralph Nader, was named to head the nine-man panel. Early in 1971 the Nader group formed its own Aviation Consumer Action Project. The group has petitioned CAB to suspend Eastern Air Lines conditional reservation fares (the petition was dismissed), to change Trans-World Airlines-Flying Mercury, Inc. group tour practices, to lower United Air Lines fares in California and to change CAB regulations on carrying the physically handicapped in airlines.

The biggest gripes of airline passengers during 1971? Canceled or delayed flights and reservation problems, which accounted for 18% and 17%, respectively of the consumer complaints. Fares, rates and refunds racked up an additional 14% of problems, followed by lost, damaged or delayed baggage (11%), cargo problems (6%), personnel attitude (4%) and inflight service (3%). Under 1% each were caused by service in general, rate discrimination or racial problems. The remaining 20% were attributed to "miscellaneous" causes because they didn't fit into the categories now in use. Examples are complaints regarding smoking in the cabin, showing X-rated movies to children and stewardesses on international flights who cannot speak the language of the passengers.

Of the troubles plaguing airline passengers last year, many were apparently caused because passengers were not aware of airline procedures. People did not understand that the airlines limit baggage liability

to \$500 on domestic flights and \$7.50 per pound on international flights (in spite of the fact it is included in small print on their tickets.) A new CAB rule requires airlines to post this information prominently.

Promotional fares seem to confuse many passengers who don't understand why they can get standby fares from Chicago to the West Coast but cannot get them from Washington to Chicago. When Discover America excursion fares were in existence, people in the Midwest did not understand why they could not take advantage of the almost-50% discount, which applied only to trips 1,500 miles or more from the starting point. The "Take Your Wife Along for \$99 for Four Days" fares to the West Coast have engendered complaints from single women who claim the fares are discriminatory. A brother and sister wrote asking why they couldn't take advantage of this type of family discount.

A hornet's nest of consumer complaints rose with an angry hum last summer when a rash of youth fare discounts to Europe slashed air rates 58-62% New York to London and 66-76% New York to Rome. Middle-aged air passengers complained so bitterly that the Department of Transportation got into the fray saying youth fares are discriminatory. On Sept. 1, CAB ordered a formal investigation to decide the issue. CAB will also determine if international discount fares for persons over 65 are discriminatory to other passengers.

Passengers complain long and loud about lack of flight information. They don't like it when their flights are delayed and they are not told why; or when there is a delay and their messages to waiting family or friends by the airlines get garbled in the transmission or don't arrive at all.

Overselling space accumulates one of the biggest piles of complaints, accounting for almost 10% of the total. Add other reservation problems and the figure jumps to 17%. Take the case of Frank A. Jones who planned and saved for years so he and his wife could take a trip to the Near East. He paid for a ticket on a flight leaving Kennedy Airport at 6:40 p.m. last July 1. Jones later wrote to the airline's customer relations manager in New York: "Our flight did take off July 1 at 6:40 p.m. but without my wife and me. I want to know why. During the long hours of waiting, someone got the information I was bumped to give my seat to Iberian Airline passengers."

The flight was oversold by 53 seats, and 41 more passengers showed up without recorded reservations. The delay was not explained to Jones, he said, and he got little sympathy from the man at the airline office, who told him: "If you don't like being bumped, cancel your trip and stay home."

"The only human being who tried to ease the pain of that bad experience," wrote Jones, "was the captain . . . He apologized for the delay. Delay? An overnight stay!"

When Jones received a check from the airline for \$400 for being bumped and not being rerouted to arrive at his destination within the four hours required by CAB on international flights, he again wrote to Yohe's office: "Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. I feel if it had not been brought to your attention, no one at the airline would have gotten too excited about it. It really restores my faith as a layman to know that someone cares about us, the consumers."

According to John Smith, one of Yohe's staff of 10 that runs the CAB Office of Consumer Affairs on a yearly budget of \$123,000, there is a great difference between the complaints of frequent and occasional air travelers. "The occasional traveler sees things in magnified form," Smith explained. "He complains about 'surly' or 'inattentive' stewardesses and rude ticket agents. He wants to know why he is not served vegetarian, salt-

free or kosher meals or hot dogs. The meal portions are too large or too small. The drinks are too small. (Actually, they are larger than average—a full two ounces, it is the glasses that are small and the bottoms deceptive.) The seats don't work or are cramped, the toilet facilities are inadequate, the air-conditioning is either not working or too cold. He doesn't like it when a Boeing 707 is substituted for a 747."

The professional traveler, on the other hand, will overlook minor problems. He will put up with almost anything except baggage loss or time delays.

Baggage loss, damage and delay problems account for about 11% of the complaints, received. Soft-side luggage is extremely vulnerable to a knife; and it sometimes is either totally lost or arrives damaged with valuable items missing. Passengers apparently still don't realize the carriers cannot be liable for expensive jewelry, cameras, or cash carried in suitcases. One man put \$2,000 cash in a suitcase, and when it was lost asked the carrier to pay. No way!

Many passengers complain about the special attention they feel they require and don't always get. A blind man who had to make connections in Pittsburgh wrote he had called and arranged for one carrier to escort him to the next because he didn't have a seeing-eye dog. The airline didn't provide the help.

A 14-year-old retarded girl who was promised an escort in St. Louis, was never met, said her parents, and was found wandering around the terminal. Unescorted children, they complained, are sometimes left unattended, despite prior arrangements that seem to get lost in the computers.

One of the most sensitive areas of passenger complaints concerns the travel of disabled passengers who may not be able to take care of themselves and evacuate the aircraft alone in an emergency. Under a 1962 airline agreement approved by CAB, passengers who are not able to board and deplane from an aircraft unassisted or move about in an aircraft unassisted must be evaluated by a physician designated by the carrier or be accompanied by an attendant.

An airline that flies paraplegics usually handles this by having its company doctor check out the case with the patient's own doctor. The carrier is not obligated to transport persons who cannot use the standard airline seat in a sitting or reclining position; and it may, at its own discretion, limit the number of handicapped persons carried on a given flight for safety reasons. There seems to be—judging from the complaint files at the CAB—a lack of realization by the public and a lack of communication by the carriers as to what these medical criteria are.

In June, Nader's ACAP filed a formal petition with CAB to change air carrier rules regarding carriage of the handicapped, including stretcher cases. Claiming current airline practices are discriminatory and illegal under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, ACAP asked CAB to change its regulations to require airlines to carry the physically handicapped, either in wheelchairs or stretchers, at no additional fare, attendants at half fare, and to give handicapped passengers all "reasonable" help at no additional cost, with a fine of \$1,000 for each violation.

In an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, the board said it has noted an increased amount of public dissatisfaction with the air carriers' handling of disabled persons and will re-examine the subject. Public comments were filed at the board Dec. 15, 1971. Among them was a strong response from ALPA's Steward & Stewardess Division explaining how a survey of its 15,000 members in 1970 showed a frightening increase in problems related to physically handicapped persons traveling on transport airplanes. The S&S Division said it had given its figures to the

Air Transport Association and asked for a clarification of its rulings. It cited recent emergency evacuation where handicapped persons blocked or prevented egress for other passengers and an accident in England where a stewardess died trying to help a crippled passenger from a burning aircraft. The board is now considering the problem.

CAB Office of Consumer Affairs ombudsman Jack Yohe says he gets very few complaints regarding pilots. There are also few of what CAB calls "efficiency complaints," those regarding operation of the aircraft, such as hard landings. A few passengers have written in to say either that pilots talk too much over the intercom, or don't talk enough. Yohe sometimes gets unsolicited complimentary letters about pilots and stewardesses, which he passes along to the airline. Hopefully, they will end up in the crew members' files.

Very few of the complaints received are concerned with safety. When one does appear, it is referred to FAA. If Yohe's office sees a trend in the way a carrier or travel agency is handling problems, such as oversales or baggage losses, it sends its studies to the board's Bureau of Enforcement, which begins a field investigation.

Yohe agrees with Stuart Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, that U.S. airlines have set a pretty good record for reliability and service. Certainly their \$250-million worth of computer-backed electronic reservation systems, which handled 330-million reservations last year, have set a service standard for other industries to strive for. The majority of airlines also do a good job of handling most customer complaints.

Yet Yohe has strong feelings about an airline passenger's "Bill of Rights." He believes:

"As in any other contractual relationship between the consumer and the provider of the product or service he buys, the airline passenger has a right to know, *in advance*, the service he can expect, the cheapest available fare, the restrictions and conditions applicable to the fare, any additional charges he will have to pay for visual and audio entertainment and beverages he may consume. He has the right to be fully apprised, *in advance*, of the carrier's limit of liability for damaged or lost baggage, and of the alternatives open to him to protect his possessions beyond those liability limits. And the oversold passenger has the right to be fully apprised of the carrier's obligations to him. I believe, if consumer complaints arise at all, the consumer has a right to expect them to be handled with the speed befitting the pace of travel to which the air age has accustomed us."

Yohe added this one-sentence interpretation: "In other words, airline representatives should tell the airline passenger, before he asks, what the fine print says."

Yohe admits his biggest job is catching up on the backlog of complaints. His processing system begins each letter within a few days after it is received, usually within a week of the incident. When he gets additional manpower he will be able to use a new computer system, for which the programming has already been worked out, to analyze complaints by type and airline. The computer readout will indicate trends in complaints.

Because of Yohe's findings during the 12 months he has been the focal point for passengers' gripes, CAB has published three notices of proposed rulemaking: on requiring a standardized airline complaint report form; posting notice of baggage liability (it became a rule Oct. 26), and confirming space reservations (carriers have already begun to comply with this proposed rule). The board has also published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking on carriage of disabled passengers. That's four down, with more to come on subjects like the self-claim baggage

system, cargo damage, delay and loss, failure to remit COD charges and safety and advertising problems with charter operations.

Since the Office of Consumer Affairs was established in December 1970, several airlines have created similar consumer-oriented programs—Pan American, TWA, United (which has upgraded its director of consumer relations) and Eastern Air Lines, to mention a few.

There seems to be a growing awareness in the aviation industry that the nation is entering an era of consumerism and that it will be here for a long time.

If any man can bridge this gap between the demanding public and the airlines he is Jack Yohe. Even CAB's critics have announced confidence in him. Certainly many consumer complaints are unfounded and many are due to lack of information. On the other hand, in the director of consumer affairs, consumers have found an ombudsman who will listen to their problems and help them if he can. The whole air transportation industry may benefit from his efforts.

WASHINGTON POST PLAYS FOOTSYE WITH ITS BIG ADVERTISERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Skubitz), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, as some of my colleagues are aware, I have taken more than a cursory interest in the recent furor over high retail prices of beef. I have cited chapter and verse to prove that it is not the farmer, the beef producer, who has been the beneficiary. Fortunately, in recent days, some of my colleagues, notably in the other body, and Secretary of Agriculture Butz and his staff people, have exposed the real culprit—the middleman and the retailer, primarily the superchains.

Facts demonstrate that retailer margins remained upped while slaughter prices went down. Meanwhile, the superchains with pious advertisements, attributed to their public-loving consumer advisers, urged buyers to eschew meat make better buys in protein-high foods such as cheese, fish, and poultry, on all of which, incidentally, the chain's profit margins were even greater than on beef.

The ultimate in gall, inchutzpah, came when the Giant superchain lifted, with permission, of course, a commendatory editorial from the Washington Post. That editorial made the Giant and its consumer adviser out to be saints, whose primary devotion is the public weal.

I felt that the Post should not be permitted to get away with allowing a major advertiser to use an uninformed and incorrect editorial as grist for that advertiser's mill. After all, the Post is one of those supposedly great newspapers that publicly boasts that its editorial policies are never influenced by its advertisers.

The Post has not yet seen fit to publish my "Letter to the Editor." In a way, I understand why. So that my colleagues will be informed of developments, I ask that the text of my letter to the editor of the Washington Post be herewith printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1972.

The Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Although I resented the thrust of your editorial on April 2, "Making No Bones About It," primarily because it dealt uninformedly and less than factually with a subject on which the editorial writer had obviously the most superficial knowledge, I refrained from comment simply because it was an editorial, an opinion you had a right to air.

But when Giant is permitted to lift it to again purchase a full-page advertisement to present itself as a pious, public-loving, public spirited institution, I must protest. I must protest that the editorial writer fell for the buncombe that superchains like Giant and Safeway and A&P constantly drum up as if they were in business for the benefit of the poor housewife and not for profit.

Why didn't the original Giant ad explain why meat, and particularly beef, "costs too much?" Why did retail meat prices drop in the superchains after, but not until, there had been public outcry and official notice of meat prices by various government officials from President Nixon down?

The fact that slaughter prices fell off sharply didn't affect the price of beef already in the processing line for retail consumption for which the chains had paid the earlier higher price. The fact is that the superchains reduced their profit margins when the heat went on. The fact is that the chains decided that it was prudent public relations to accept the reduced profit margins. The fact is that both your newspaper and its esteemed evening contemporary refused advertisements from an area consumer chain that sought to prove that meat was selling for less when lower profit margins were acceptable.

The superchains saw the opportunity to push other high protein foods on which the profit margins were greater, substantially greater than beef, and your editorial writer fell for the bait, hook, line, and sinker.

That's exactly the clap-trap that the Giant's "consumer adviser" was trying to sell to the housewife. If your editorial writer believes that Giant hired Mrs. Peterson to present sound economic buying advice to Giant customers, or that Mrs. Peterson's buying suggestions are dictated by her's and Giant's concern for the welfare of their customers, he is indeed too naive to be writing editorials.

Mrs. Peterson's suggestions that people "buy less meat" and "buy something else" were not, in short, the *pro bono publico* statements the Post editorial paints them and that Giant now gleefully reprints. Mrs. Peterson and Giant would have been a great deal less disingenuous if they had advertised *mea culpa*.

Of course, cattlemen were quick to cry unfair. Of course, beef prices were at a twenty-year peak, the highest since the Korean war. Is your editorial writer suggesting that farmers and beef producers alone among all American workers and industries should be paid what they were paid twenty years ago; that while labor costs and the Cost of Living Index, and the prices of virtually every commodity a person buys, including the cost of the Post, and indeed the retail cost of beef in those same chain stores, all rose in a range from 26% to more than 100%; that while all this took place the beef producer should be paid the same price he received twenty years ago?

Would it not have been more honest, and at least a bit fairer, in quoting Mrs. Peterson that beef prices were the highest since the Korean war, to also note that fresh vegetables

and fruits were higher than ever before in modern history, that canned fruits and vegetables were the highest in twenty years, that the prices of staples such as cereals, soaps, toilet paper, etc., etc., all reflect the spiraling inflation that we have experienced in the past two decades?

Why single out farmers whose average income in Kansas for 1970, the latest figures available, came to \$4,877? Why doesn't the editorial writer note that level of annual earnings as a pertinent one, and point out that it is less than the average urban welfare recipient receives—a sum, incidentally, for which that Kansas farmer toils at manual labor for 10, 12, and even 14 hours a day. When the Post writes about farmers, it prefers to note the high level of subsidy payments to a few hundred larger corporate landowners.

Some of these facts, I submit, belong in an editorial in a newspaper that prides itself on attempting to be factual and honest and belief-worthy. Again, I'm not nearly as dismayed with the misinformed view of the editorial as I am that the advertising department agreed to prostitute the Post's editorial for the Giant's economic gain.

Sincerely,

JOE SKUBITZ.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD SENDS QUESTIONNAIRE TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, every year I send a questionnaire to all of my constituents in Michigan's Fifth Congressional District. My 1972 questionnaire is about to go out. With the thought that my colleagues may be interested in the questions I am posing to my constituents, I include my 1972 questionnaire at this point in the Record.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
1972.

DEAR FRIEND: The issues of 1972 have become quite clear. Many important questions are still facing the Congress this year. It would be helpful to me if I could have your opinions on those questions.

I must, of course, reserve the right to make my own decisions. I do not think you would want it otherwise. But I value your guidance.

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below. Results of this poll will be reported to you, to the Congress, and to the President.

Sincerely,

JERRY FORD,
Your Congressman.

The attached questionnaire is designed so that husband and wife and young people can express an opinion. Please place your answers in the appropriate boxes, detach the questionnaire at the fold, and return to me as soon as possible. If you want to make some special comment, please write me at the following address: Rep. Gerald R. Ford, Room H-229, U.S. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

If you want direct help with a problem, please contact my district office: 425 Cherry S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502. You may also, on an urgent matter, talk with me or my staff in Washington without charge. Simply call my district office, 456-9607, and the call will be put through to Washington.

JERRY FORD 1972 QUESTIONNAIRE

	His		Hers		18 to 20 year old	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a moratorium on forced busing to achieve racial balance, coupled with special Federal aid to disadvantaged schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you favor Federal legislation to prevent national emergency strikes in transportation (railroads, airlines, shipping and trucking)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you favor diverting some of the highway user taxes to finance urban mass transit systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Do you favor sharing of Federal income tax revenue with the cities and States on a fixed percentage basis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	His		Hers		18 to 20 year old	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
5. In the last 4 years the Soviet Union has increased its strategic missile capability and greatly expanded its naval forces. Do you favor an increase in U.S. military spending to offset this?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Do you favor continuing wage and price controls until inflation is curbed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Do you favor a substantial increase in social security benefits if this means higher social security taxes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	His		Hers		18 to 20 years old	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
8. On health insurance, which do you favor? (A) An improved nationwide private health insurance system, with employers required to pay 65 to 75 percent of the premiums and employees the rest, and with insurance companies placed under Federal regulation and control.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(B) A Federal Government program financed with special payroll taxes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	His		Hers		18 to 20 years old	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
9. On Vietnam, the U.S. Government should: (A) Declare a ceasefire within the nation of Vietnam and immediately withdraw all American military personnel therefrom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(B) Withdraw all American forces from South Vietnam, conditioned on release of U.S. prisoners of war, a ceasefire throughout Indochina and the holding of an internationally supervised presidential election in South Vietnam.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD INTRODUCES A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR THE HOLDING OF A NATIONWIDE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION EVERY 4 YEARS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed constitutional amendment providing for the holding of a nationwide presidential primary election every 4 years.

While this primary election would determine the identity of our presidential candidates, political parties would continue to nominate the vice presidential candidates and to adopt party platforms.

My proposed amendment is identical with one introduced in the Senate March 13 by Senate majority leader MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana and Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican of Vermont.

It calls for a national presidential primary the first Tuesday after the first Monday in August in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and Vice President.

The person receiving the greatest number of votes cast by registered voters of his party affiliation—a plurality of at least 40 percent—would become his party's official candidate for President.

If either of the parties failed to give its highest vote-getter at least 40 percent, a runoff election would be held between the two top vote-getters of the party on the 28th day after the day on which the primary election was held.

Only persons eligible to vote in the primary election could vote in the runoff.

To get on the primary ballot in all the States, a major party candidate would be required to file petitions signed by qualified voters equal to 1 percent of the vote cast in the last election for presidential candidates of his party in each of 17 States.

For candidates of minor parties—which did not have electors on the ballot in 17 States but polled at least 10 percent

of the vote cast nationwide—the requirement would be 1 percent of the total vote cast throughout the Nation in the last election.

Only persons registered by party affiliation could vote in the primary, and there could be no crossovers.

After observing the antics of presidential hopefuls in the various State primaries this year, I feel we should put an end to this chaotic situation by having 1 same-day primary throughout the Nation. Unlike the present primaries, the national primary I proposed would decide something. It would, with a runoff if necessary, give us our presidential candidates.

MASS COMMUNICATION IS AN AREA OF DEEP CONCERN TODAY

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, mass communication and its role in our pluralistic society is an area of deep concern today.

The ability to reach thousands of people at any given moment is both a marvelous technical achievement and an awesome responsibility. By nature mass communication is a one-way channel, and the burden for presenting a broad, balanced viewpoint, whether in hard news, public information, or entertainment, rests squarely with the originating medium.

It is a privilege for me to bring to your attention WFBL radio in Syracuse, N.Y., a radio station which has not only met its responsibility as a major broadcaster, but in fact has been a leading example of a community-oriented mass communicator since its inception in 1922.

On the air only a few hours a day and with only two employees, one of whom, Mr. Charles Phillips, is still with the station, WFBL was the first licensed radio station in central New York in February 1922. From this modest begin-

ning it has grown to a full 24-hour-a-day broadcast operation with 30 employees.

Particularly noteworthy is the recent public service series on the related problems of solid waste disposal and our ecological dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I join with thousands of other central New Yorkers in thanking WFBL on its 50th-year anniversary for half a century of better listening.

A WATCHDOG FOR PRISONERS—THE CORRECTIONAL OMBUDSMAN

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, a man by the name of Robert Landman, Jr. testified before the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee No. 3, of which I am a member. This subcommittee has jurisdiction over corrections, and Mr. Landman is an exoffender. He was also the plaintiff in a landmark prisoners' rights decision handed down last fall by Judge Robert Merhige of the Federal district court in Virginia. I want to quote briefly from Judge Merhige's opinion, because it is very much relevant to one of the basic reforms needed in our Nation's prisons:

Commencing in 1964, Landman embarked upon a career, wellknown to this Court, as a writ-writer. The evidence before the Court is that between that time and the time of his release, on behalf of himself he filed a minimum of 20 suits, and it is estimated that in addition he assisted fellow inmates in approximately 2,000 other petitions.

In short, the Court finds that there was imposed upon Landman over 265 days of solitary confinement and in no instance did he receive even the rudimentary elements of a hearing or opportunity to defend any allegations made against him. The Court is satisfied that Landman's exercise of his right to file petitions with the courts, and his assisting other prisoners in so doing, were the primary reasons for the punishments put upon him.

Robert Landman Jr. served 265 days in solitary confinement merely for exercising a legal right!

On January 11, 1972, another man, Edward L. Morgan, was released from the District of Columbia jail, almost a month after having been acquitted on a robbery charge. Mr. Morgan spent that month in jail because there had been a mix-up in the files, and he was thought—despite his protestations—to be another man.

There are many more stories—many much more gruesome—of repression and mistakes in our prisons, and even violence and murder. One of the major reasons for these stories is the simple fact that prison walls serve as much to keep the public out as they do to keep the prisoners in. The prisoners are a silent minority in this country, except their silence is not one of choice, but of imposed rules and regulations and sometimes abuses.

In part, we are all to blame for this. Society has allowed our prisons to fester, isolated from public scrutiny and even public interest. The shock of Attica produces a brief spasm of outcry, and then silence descends again.

That silence must end. And to achieve this, I am introducing the Correctional Ombudsman Act of 1972. The idea is a straightforward one—to create a permanent public watchdog, with effective powers, to open up our prisons to the public eye and to end the abuses which pervade these institutions.

Prof. Walter Gelhorn of the Columbia University Law School has stated aptly the need for a correctional ombudsman in his book, "When Americans Complain."

Nowhere is the need for external examination of grievance greater than in America's prisons, jails, and other places of detention . . . (The) inmates, many of them ill-adjusted socially and resistant to discipline, live perforce in an authoritarian setting: . . .

The term "ombudsman" may be new to some ears, but in Sweden there has existed such an office since 1809. Since then, numerous other countries have established an official citizen protector, or watchdog, and lately, in this country, such officials have begun to appear.

Thus, today, ombudsmen exist in Finland, Tanzania, New Zealand, Norway, and in four Canadian provinces. In 1967, the Hawaii legislature created the office of ombudsman, and in 1969 Nebraska followed suit. Appointed ombudsmen exist in Oregon and Iowa. Just this past year, a bill to create a prisoners' ombudsman was passed by both house of the California Assembly, but was vetoed by Governor Reagan.

The utility of having a correctional ombudsman is not a one-sided matter, although I think it very clear that given the current state of our correctional institutions, it is the inmate who is in most need of protection. Remediation of prisoners' grievances by an ombudsman would assist correctional administrators by lowering the level of bitterness and hostility which builds up behind bars. I think it significant, for example, that one of the demands presented by the prisoners at Attica was the creation of an ombudsman.

It is clear, of course, that correctional administrators are not going to be quite so sanguine about the advantages of having an ombudsman office looking over their shoulders, and thus the mere enticement of some additional Federal dollars is not going to do the job. Consequently, the Correctional Ombudsman Act provides that no State shall receive Federal funds for corrections under the Law Enforcement Administration Act unless a State ombudsman is established. Thus, my bill does not propose the incentive of dangling a few extra Federal dollars; it mandates the drying up of all Federal funds less the office is established.

Moreover, stringent controls are established by the bill so that a meaningful correctional watchdog is created, and not some mere sham. The State ombudsman must be politically independent. On the staff of the ombudsman office must be at least one attorney, one experienced investigator, one criminologist, one sociologist, and one ex-offender. The makeup of the staff is to reflect the ethnic and racial composition of the prison population, so far as that is constitutionally feasible.

Under the provisions of the Correctional Ombudsman Act, the ombudsman may enter any correctional institution at any time; he can meet with any person or view any documents pertinent to any investigation. He may hold public hearings, and he may establish a permanent office within the confines of any institution.

The correctional ombudsman will have also a variety of remedies available to him. He can work within the administrative structure of the corrections department, seeking changes through administrative remedies. He can report to the State legislature on the need for remedial legislation. He can hold press conferences, and seek public scrutiny thereby; this includes his being able to bring the press into any institution. If the corrections people are resistant, or if there is not time for delay, the ombudsman will be able to issue cease and desist orders to compel immediate action. And finally, the ombudsman can provide legal counsel for prisoners, and he can himself go into court seeking judicial assistance.

In my own State, the names Attica, the Tombs, Rikers' Island all stand as testament to desperate need for massive change in our corrections system. The Correctional Ombudsman Act of 1972 proposes, I believe, a vehicle to speed that change. Equally important, if not more so, it creates a means to end immediately the abuses, the degradation, the deprivation of rights, and the subtle psychological repression, which indeed make our prisons colleges of crime.

AN OMBUDSMAN TO PROTECT THE MENTALLY DISABLED

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Willowbrook State School in New York has now assumed its place on the long list of in-

stitutions of despair and abuse in this country. Willowbrook is the largest institution for the mentally retarded in the world. And indeed, the word "institution"—and all the sterility, grayness, and impersonality which the word implies—is the correct name for this facility. To describe it as a "school" is to abuse the English language.

Were Willowbrook unique in its failings, that would be tragedy enough. That it is not unique is apt testament to the alacrity with which the mentally disabled are shunted aside by society, deprived of care, and decent training; deprived, in sum, of a chance and of hope. In Maryland, for example, there is Rosewood State Hospital, housing some 2,600 patients. When the director of Maryland's State mental retardation administration assumed his post last year, he called Rosewood "one of the worse I have seen." He has also said:

The impersonality of it, the lack of dignity, the homosexuality that I think nobody would deny—we must do better.

Unfortunately, like so many other aspects of our society which have failed and which are victimizing those who cannot protect themselves—the prisons, our ghetto schools, our system of administering the Indian reservations, our migrant camps—public attention is short lived. A furor arises when some new revelation breaks into the news, but soon subsides as the news media turn to other stories. Yet the degradation and the despair continue.

I intend to introduce the Mentally Disabled Protection Act of 1972. It has one major aim—to create a permanent watchdog body which will exercise continuing independent scrutiny of our facilities for the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

The Mentally Disabled Protection Act of 1972 is not an answer for the sore lack of funds which afflicts every mental health facility in this country. That shortage is one which may well be perpetuated so long as the great mass of people can conveniently forget that such facilities exist. But this bill does propose that we will not let the public forget; that there will be constant pressure being exerted—on legislators, on private organizations, on Government, and on the press—to make the scandal of these institutions everyone's responsibility.

Equally, if not more important, the Mentally Disabled Protection Act will provide just what its name states—protection. This bill amends the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to provide that no Federal funds shall be made available under this act unless the State establishes an ombudsman agency which will serve to protect the mentally disabled in institutions within the State.

This concept of an "ombudsman" is not a new one in other countries. Since 1809, Sweden has had such an official—a person who serves as a watchdog or monitor, to protect citizens against adverse governmental action. In the intervening century and a half, several other countries have established such an agency. In this country, Hawaii cre-

ated by statute an ombudsman in 1967; Nebraska did the same in 1969. Ombudsmen have been created administratively in Oregon and Iowa.

It is the ombudsman's function, whether his jurisdiction extends across all governmental activity or is focused just on one aspect of government—such as corrections or treatment of the mentally ill—to act as a check against arbitrary or invidious actions. He has the function of directing an outside, independent, investigatory eye on governmental activity, and he has the resources to then seek a remedy.

The bill which I will introduce—and I have introduced similar legislation to create State ombudsmen for prisons—requires that the ombudsman be politically independent. It also requires that the ombudsman established in the State shall have a staff which includes at least one attorney, one investigator, one psychiatrist, one psychologist, one individual who has had experience working with retarded and mentally ill institutionalized individuals, and one former institutional patient.

The ombudsman office created by the Mentally Disabled Protection Act will have a variety of tools to use to bring about change. The ombudsman will be able to enter any institution at any time, accompanied by press if he chooses, and to interview any patient. He may, if he chooses, establish a permanent office at any or all institutions. He will be able to make recommendations to the Governor and to the State legislature. In addition, he will have the authority to utilize the power of public scrutiny by directly contacting and informing the press as to his findings and recommendations.

The ombudsman will also be able to provide legal counsel for patients who need such assistance. And he will be able to go into court to bring suit against the appropriate State agency if that is required.

These are stiff requirements, and certainly no State health administration is going to welcome this type of protector of the rights of the helpless. Thus, the bill looks to the particular power of the Federal dollar, denying grants to any State which fails to establish such an ombudsman agency.

In 1965, Robert F. Kennedy compared Willowbrook State School to a "snakepit." Tragically, there are many more such snakepits across the land. The Mentally Disabled Protection Act of 1972 is needed to end the horrors which are inflicted upon the helpless and the forgotten.

ACQUISITION AND PROTECTION OF CONGRESSIONAL CEMETERY

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the property known as the Congressional Cemetery, in the District of Columbia, for the administration as a part of the National Capital Park System.

The approximate 30 acres of land at 1801 E Street, Southeast, Washington, D.C. are the last resting place of many of the greats of American history.

The history of the cemetery dates to 1795, when the Maryland Legislature authorized the establishment of Washington Parish. Pursuant to an agreement with the new Christ Church, influential parishioners obtained a 4½-acre trace for a burial site for Senators and Representatives who might pass away while attending Congress. In 1812, the Vestry accepted the cemetery, reserving 100 burial sites for Members of Congress. In 1820, the reservation was extended to include the heads of Departments of the General Government and families. Until the establishment of Arlington National Cemetery, additional sites in the Congressional Cemetery were reserved for Government use. In return, the Government periodically appropriated moneys, labor and material toward upkeep and improvement.

From the time of its establishment until the close of the War Between the States, the remains of three Presidents, at least two Vice Presidents, possibly 75 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives were carried to and interred at Congressional, as well as those of many high-ranking administrative and military officers of the Government.

The three Presidents who died in Washington during this period were William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, and John Quincy Adams, although Adams was a Member of the House at the time of his death in the Capitol, February 23, 1848. The remains of these Presidents and of a number of Senators and Representatives were later removed to home cemeteries, as were those of Dolly Madison, but there still remain in Congressional the remains of 14 Senators and 43 Members of the House of Representatives, including those of Vice President Elbridge Gerry. It is also the last resting place of famed photographer Matthew Brady, the musician and composer, John Philip Sousa, and former Speaker of the House Phillip Barbour.

Congressional Cemetery is owned by Christ Church, Washington Parish, the oldest Episcopal parish in the District of Columbia and is still operated as a cemetery. Although it is listed on the Register of National Historic Places, and so eligible for matching grants for historic preservation under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, I am advised there are no funds available for preservation and restoration of the historic monuments or for replacement of trees and other landscape work which would give the cemetery the beautiful appearance its rich historic heritage deserves.

Proper development, rehabilitation, and interpretation of this unique and hallowed place justifies the singular congressional consideration contemplated by this bill.

The text of H.R. 14339 is as follows:

H.R. 14339

A bill to provide that the historic property known as the Congressional Cemetery may be acquired, protected, and administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of

the park system of the National Capital, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of protecting and interpreting the property consisting of approximately thirty acres at 1801 E Street, Southeast, in Washington, District of Columbia, known as the Congressional Cemetery, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire the same by donation or with donated funds for administration as a part of the park system of the National Capital.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the proper development and operation of the Congressional Cemetery in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Wednesday, April 12, on account of illness.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (at the request of Mr. O'HARA), for today, on account of illness.

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. ROUSSELOT) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 60 minutes, on April 18.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, on April 18.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KEMP), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SKUBITZ, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York to extend his remarks immediately following reading of the Journal today.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.

Mr. LANDGREBE in five instances.

Mr. SPRINGER in five instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY in two instances.

Mr. SANDMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.
 Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. HOSMER.
 Mr. BLACKBURN in two instances.
 Mr. ROUSSELOT.
 Mr. McKEVITT.
 Mr. ZWACH.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. QUILLLEN.
 Mr. ARENDS.
 Mr. KEMP in two instances.
 Mr. SKUBITZ.
 Mr. PRICE of Texas.
 Mr. BROZMAN in two instances.
 Mr. BRAY in two instances.
 Mr. HUNT.
 Mr. BELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. ABOUREZK in five instances.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in 10 instances.
 Mr. FRASER in five instances.
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in 10 instances.
 Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
 Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
 Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
 Mr. RARICK in five instances.
 Mr. ADDABBO.
 Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in five instances.
 Mr. WOLFF.
 Mr. FAUNTROY in five instances.
 Mr. BIAGGI.
 Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.
 Mr. BENNETT.
 Mr. MONAGAN.
 Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.
 Mr. BOGGS.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
 Mr. BRASCO.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.
 Mr. STEPHENS.
 Mr. SYMINGTON.
 Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
 Mr. BEGICH in three instances.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1943. An act to provide for the mandatory inspection of rabbits slaughtered for human food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the first Sunday in June of each year as "National Shut-In Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the last full calendar week in May of 1972 as "Clean Waters for America Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1972, as "National Arbor Day";

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; and

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1972 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3054. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 13, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 92d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C. title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ELIZABETH (Mrs. GEORGE) ANDREWS, Third District of Alabama; CLIFFARD D. CARLSON, 15th District of Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1852. A letter from the Assistant Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a Federal plan for meteorological services and supporting research for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 304 of the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1963; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1853. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the committees which advise and consult with him in carrying out

his functions under the Social Security Act, pursuant to section 1114(f) of the act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5404. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, and for other purposes, without amendment (Report No. 92-980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13089. A bill to provide for acceleration of programs for the planting of trees on national forest lands in need of reforestation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Report No. 92-981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1379. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a volunteers in the national forest program, and for other purposes; with amendments (Report No. 92-982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSENTHAL: Committee on Foreign Affairs: House Concurrent Resolution 471. Concurrent resolution to seek relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews; with an amendment (Report No. 92-983). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. ABZUG:
 H.R. 14323. A bill to raise needed revenues by gearing the income tax more closely to an individual's ability to pay, by broadening the income tax base of individuals and corporations, by integrating the gift and estate taxes, and by otherwise reforming the income, estate, and gift tax provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:
 H.R. 14324. A bill to amend the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for cancellation of student loans for service in mental hospitals and schools for the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:
 H.R. 14325. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that married individuals who file separate returns shall be taxed at the same income tax rate as unmarried individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLUMS:
 H.R. 14327. A bill to establish minimum prisoner and parole standards for prisons in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:
 H.R. 14328. A bill to authorize a program to develop and demonstrate low-cost means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 14329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 14330. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14331. A bill to strengthen and improve the private retirement system by establishing minimum standards for participation in and for vesting of benefits under pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, by allowing deductions to individuals for personal savings for retirement, and by increasing contribution limitations for self-employed individuals and shareholder-employees of electing small business corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 14332. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide maternity care in service facilities for certain members of the uniformed services and their dependents after such members are separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. ICHORD, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 14333. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 14334. A bill Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURTON, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 14335. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for grants to cities for improved street lighting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 14336. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 3, United States Code, to provide for the protection of foreign diplomatic missions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 14337. A bill to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office for the Handicapped to coordinate programs for the handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14338. A bill to provide for the creation of correctional ombudsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14339. A bill to provide that the historic property known as the Congressional Cemetery may be acquired, protected, and administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the park system of the National Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 14340. A bill to limit the authority of the government of the District of Columbia with respect to the levying and collecting of certain taxes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 14341. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the fiscal year 1973 authorizations for project grants for health services development and for project grants and contracts for family planning services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14342. A bill to provide certain benefits for American civilian prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, for Federal employees in a missing status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 14343. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of nonmarriage of certain annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14344. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 14345. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Agricultural Hall of Fame National Cultural Park in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 14346. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to restrict the mailing of chain letters containing statements implying or predicting harm or misfortune to recipients failing to transmit the letters or copies thereof according to instructions therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 1154. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. McKEVITT):

H.J. Res. 1155. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.J. Res. 1156. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.J. Res. 1157. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the first Monday in May as Industry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 1158. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 1159. Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. Con. Res. 577. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of June 18 through June 24, 1972, as "National Children's Theater Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 578. Concurrent resolution relating to the denial of admission to any military service academy of the United States solely on the ground of sex; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

367. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the assignment of public school students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SPRINGER introduced a bill (H.R. 14347) for the relief of Monroe A. Lucas, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, April 12, 1972

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art high and lifted up, Lord of our life and our salvation, come upon us here and throughout this land to be—

Lord of our homes
Lord of our schools
Lord of our churches
Lord of our ballot boxes

Lord of our Government
Lord of our peace tables
Lord of this Chamber.

Enable us to affirm by our lives and our actions that we are a nation "under God."

We pray in the name of our Lord and Master. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MOSS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of