

ness for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR H.R. 11589 TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business on Tuesday next, the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 727, H.R. 11589, to authorize the foreign sale of certain passenger vessels, and that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until H.R. 11589 has been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANTICIPATION OF CLOSED SESSION ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, following the disposition of H.R. 11589 on Tuesday it is anticipated that the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) will make a motion that the Senate go into closed session.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and this very well may be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be authorized to file committee reports until 5 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR McGEE TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY TO SUBMIT AN AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) may have until 5 p.m. today to submit his amendment—dealing with the restoration of funds authorized by USIA—for printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for Monday is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. After the two assistant leaders have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 3526. The pending question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), to restore the full authorization for the USIA. There is a time agreement on that amendment limiting debate not to exceed 4 hours. The agreement also provides that no amendment to the amendment may be offered.

I would judge that the rollcall vote on the adoption of that amendment will not occur before 1:30 p.m.

Upon disposition of that amendment, the Senate will then temporarily lay aside the unfinished business on Monday, and will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14582, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes. There is a time limitation for debate on that bill of 3 hours, and a time

limitation on any amendment, debatable motion, or appeal of 30 minutes. At least one rollcall vote thereon can be expected.

On Tuesday, for the further information of Senators, the Senate will take up the bill to authorize the foreign sale of certain passenger vessels, H.R. 11589. There is a time agreement allotting 2 hours for debate on the bill, 1 hour on any amendment in the first degree, and one-half hour on any amendment to an amendment, debatable motion, or appeal. A rollcall vote or rollcall votes are anticipated thereon.

Following the disposition of the ship sales bill on Tuesday, a closed session will occur, the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) having indicated to the joint leadership that it is his intention to move for a closed session during the day. If that motion is seconded, as presumably it will be, the Senate will go into closed session. There could be rollcall votes during that closed session. And Senators are therefore alerted to that possibility.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 11:30 a.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1972, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1972:

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Lael J. Abbott, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending John J. McCamley, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 17, 1972.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named staff noncommissioned officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law: William D. Rusinak

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, April 28, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The just shall live by his faith.—Habakkuk 2: 4.

Creator and Ruler of the world, the Father of all people, we pray for our beloved country—that she may be established upon moral virtues and religious faith, that all ill will, injustice, and selfish greed may be swept away by Thy spirit and that honor, justice, and working for the good of all may flourish among us.

During these days inspire us with the assurance that Thou art with us and with that confidence may we learn to love, to forgive, and to have greater faith in Thee and in our country.

Bless Thou the fellowship we enjoy together this day.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. 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.

GENERAL PHILLIPS OF WYOMING

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Wyoming citizens were pleased to notice yesterday the announcement that Defense Secretary Laird has named Air Force Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips to become the Director of the National Security Agency effective August 1. Sam Phillips, the former director of the Apollo lunar program when American astronauts first set foot on the moon, is now the commander of the Air Force space and missile systems organization.

He is a native of Wyoming, and his efforts as a young man to educate himself, to pull himself up by his own bootstraps to the career of national leadership he enjoys today, is legendary in

Wyoming. It was my good fortune to know him as a fellow student at the University of Wyoming in the years prior to World War II. He exemplifies the finest traditions in American citizenship, and we in Wyoming are proud to recognize his latest advancement in the service of his Nation.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION CONTINUES AT HIGH LEVEL

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, private housing starts remained at an unusually high level in March. The Commerce Department reports that private housing starts totaled nearly 2.4 million units at a seasonally adjusted annual rate. While this is somewhat below the extraordinary rate of housing starts in February, March homebuilding activity was still exceptionally high compared to the historical record. During the 1960's, for example, private housing starts never reached even the 1.6-million-unit level for any month.

Monthly statistics tend to bounce around a great deal, and a more reliable indication of underlying trends can be found in quarterly data. Housing starts averaged 2.5 million units for the first 3 months of this year, 35 percent above the first quarter of 1971, and 12 percent above the fourth quarter. This healthy rate of advance helps fuel our growing economic expansion and provide new housing for the Nation's families.

Other figures suggest that the rate of housing construction will remain high. New housing permits totaled nearly 2 million in March, about the same as the unusually high average for the previous 6 months. And there is evidence that mortgage rates are holding steady. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board announced that interest rates on conventional new home mortgage loans in March averaged less than 7.4 percent, significantly below the nearly 7.7-percent rate of 6 months earlier.

The surge in homebuilding added \$4.6 billion to the growth of the GNP during the first quarter. The signs are that this sector will continue to play an important role in our economic expansion.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Tuesday, March 28, 1972, the Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of the House of Representatives.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The SPEAKER. On behalf of the Chair and of the Chamber, I consider it

a high honor and a distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here for this occasion. We all pause to welcome them. This is a bipartisan affair, and in that spirit the Chair is going to recognize the floor leaders of both parties.

The Chair now recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Speaker and with the distinguished minority leader in welcoming back so many of our former colleagues.

As I look about and see the faces of so many old friends, I feel as if we have never really been separated, and in many ways that is quite true, Mr. Speaker. Only one who has served in this body or in the other body shares the fraternity that we share. Together we have sought to serve our country and together we have sought, as best we could, to resolve the problems of our times.

So in truth and in fact, all of you are still a part of us—and soon all of us here will join you.

The Honorable Sam Rayburn, one of the great Speakers of this House, liked to say, and I have heard him say it so many times, that to serve here just for one term was the greatest honor that the people could confer on a citizen of this country.

All of you have had that great honor and that great distinction. I am pleased to see that you have joined together in an association and a group that has a permanent secretary in order to give continuity to that service even after you have ceased to be a Member.

I am informed that the members of your association now number almost 500 which, of course, indicates the great bipartisan interest that exists in this endeavor. I am told that one of your founding members has gotten so enthusiastic that he had had to withdraw as the cochairman here today because he wants to come back, not as an alumnus, but as an active Member of this body. Of course, I wish him well.

So again let me join with the Speaker of the House and with the minority leader in saying—this is your day and you take over and we will enjoy meeting with you and listening to you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished minority leader, Hon. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored, as you are and the distinguished majority leader to welcome all of the former Members back on their second anniversary as an organization at a function of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader and I, along with all of our contemporary Members, have the opportunity to make speeches and express our views on the floor of the House almost daily when the House of Representatives is in session. Too, we want to hear from you.

Therefore, it might be wise for me to

follow a practice that we still have, and which you had, and that is to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

But, I would feel remiss if I asked that permission without making one or two personal observations.

We still have, as we have had in the past, differences that are expressed on the floor of the House, some partisan and some within each party. But those things happened when you were here, and I suspect that they will probably happen after we will have left.

But the thing that impresses me today, as it impressed all of you, is that the friendships you make here both within your own party and with others across the aisle are the best friendships—at least that I have ever made in my lifetime.

There is a certain depth in those friendships that go on and on and on, and for good reason: They are made after long association in struggling with problems that are of great import to the country. Those friendships, in my opinion, are a significant factor in making the House the greatest legislative body in the history of the world.

I often say, and I think you would understand it better than most groups that listen, this body is the people's House. All of you, as all of us still here, were elected. Nobody is appointed. The fact that we have to go back to put our record on the line once every 2 years and seek the support of our people makes us far more responsive to the legitimate demands and viewpoints of a certain portion of the Nation's population.

All of you were proud at the time you served here. We are proud to have you back, because your contributions over the years were substantial and significant. But we think the fact that you are back as alumni indicates your continuing interest in the problems of our country, problems that you worked on that still need your help.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, I welcome all of you, and we look forward to seeing you in 1973 on your third anniversary visit to the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now call the roll of former Members of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk called the roll of former Members of the Congress and the following former Members answered to their names:

O. K. Armstrong, Missouri.
Laurie Battle, Alabama.
Marion T. Bennett, Missouri.
John W. Boehne, Jr., Indiana.
Frances P. Bolton, Ohio.
J. Floyd Breeding, Kansas.
Charles B. Brownson, Indiana.
Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania.
Joseph Carrigg, Pennsylvania.
Joseph Casey, Massachusetts.
J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado.
Victor Christgau, Minnesota.
Jeffrey Cohelan, California.
Albert M. Cole, Kansas.
Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina.
Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania.
Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts.

Vincent J. Dellay, New Jersey.
 Leonard Farbstein, New York.
 Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania.
 Homer Ferguson, Michigan.
 Phil Ferguson, Oklahoma.
 Paul A. Fino, New York.
 John R. Foley, Maryland.
 Harlan Hagen, California.
 John R. Hansen, Iowa.
 Ralph R. Harding, Idaho.
 Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia.
 Ralph Harvey, Indiana.
 Patrick J. Hillings, California.
 Earl Hogan, Indiana.
 Evan Howell, Illinois.
 DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland.
 Edouard V. Izac, California.
 W. Pat Jennings, Virginia.
 August E. Johansen, Michigan.
 Lester R. Johnson, Wisconsin.
 Marvin Jones, Texas.
 Walter H. Judd, Minnesota.
 Edna F. Kelly, New York.
 Frank Kowalski, Connecticut.
 Theodore R. Kupferman, New York.
 Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin.
 Clifford G. McIntyre, Maine.
 Hervey G. Machen, Maryland.
 D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida.
 Edwin H. May, Jr., Connecticut.
 George Meader, Michigan.
 Walter H. Moeller, Ohio.
 A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma.
 Abraham J. Multer, New York.
 Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey.
 Howard W. Pollock, Alaska.
 Stanley A. Prokop, Pennsylvania.
 Robert Ramspeck, Georgia.
 Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama.
 John M. Robison, Jr., Kentucky.
 Byron Rogers, Colorado.
 Walter E. Rogers, Texas.
 Harold M. Ryan, Michigan.
 Byron N. Scott, California.
 Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.
 Lynn E. Stalbaum, Wisconsin.
 Maurice H. Thatcher, Kentucky.
 Clark W. Thompson, Texas.
 James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania.
 George M. Wallhauser, New Jersey.
 Fred Wampler, Indiana.
 John Bell Williams, Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that 68 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

The Chair is going to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Judd) and the Chair would like, when Mr. Judd takes the floor, to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Jones) to take the gavel.

Mr. JONES occupied the chair.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, we deeply appreciate the courtesy of the Speaker in calling a recess today in a special session of the House on a Friday for the purpose of honoring the Former Members of Congress by receiving us in this Chamber. I am sure every member of the Former Members of Congress wishes me to express for him personally our appreciation of your kind remarks, along with the words of welcome from the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HALE BOGGS, and the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. Speaker, you have certainly gone beyond the call of duty in inviting to the Chair Judge Marvin Jones, who will later be introduced for some comments by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr.

Ramspeck, who will be shuttling back and forth with me as we introduce the Representatives of the various Congresses.

First let me explain why I as the vice president of Former Members of Congress, am here today instead of the president and founder of the organization, the Honorable Brooks Hays.

Let me read from the FMC bylaws, article 6(d):

All membership rights shall be automatically suspended for any Member who becomes a candidate for election to the United States Senate or House of Representatives, and any such Member who is elected shall have his membership automatically terminated.

That is the reason the gentleman, formerly from Arkansas, and now from North Carolina, Mr. Hays, is not here. He became a candidate 2 months ago for election to the House, and therefore his membership in FMC is suspended.

As vice president, I am charged under our bylaws with exercising the functions of the president when he is not present.

Incidentally, I may mention that there are six other members of our organization whose membership is also suspended because they are running for the House or the Senate.

I do not believe anything needs to be said today about the purposes of this organization. Mr. Hays and I discussed those here last year. It was felt, first of all, that the close friendships established during our years in these bodies were precious and it was too bad to let them drop and not to maintain the fellowship and warm personal relations developed here.

A second reason for forming FMC, I believe, was a feeling that we as former Members, after we had left the Congress, had not done all we might for the benefit of our country. Our bylaws state that this organization, Former Members of Congress, Inc., can take no action on any political issue, and no officer or member can use this body or his membership therein for or against any political issue before our country, for or against any legislation before the House or the Senate or any State legislature, or for promotion of, opposition to, any candidacy, his own or any other.

To be useful, this organization must be totally bipartisan—or more important, nonpartisan. We are now only Americans no matter how divided we were by the aisle when we were sitting as Members of the Congress.

I would like to emphasize again what was brought up in our annual business meeting this morning, that this organization as such is not trying to influence the conduct of affairs in the U.S. Government, whether by the legislative, the judicial or the executive branch. We do believe, however, that there are some situations, especially in our own colleges and universities, and in our hometowns, in which we might perhaps be useful, when called upon, to help people understand better than they do the decisionmaking and legislative processes

that have made this House what we believe, as the gentleman from Michigan so well said, is the greatest legislative body in the world, along with the U.S. Senate. We are dedicated to this country and this Congress and we hope that we can be useful, whenever opportunity arises, to make such experiences as we have had available, not so much to the Congress as to the people of our country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I report on our membership? A total of exactly 400 former Members of Congress have joined and paid dues. That is a little more than half of all the former Members of both Houses we have been able to locate. I may add that we did not get many new members this last year because 1971, an odd-numbered year, is not one in which there are many active Members who become eligible for membership in our organization of former Members.

We do not wish anyone any bad luck in the elections coming up this even-numbered year. But in addition to the some 35 Members of the House and the Senate who have announced they are not going to run again, and who will be eligible after next January 3, for our organization, there may be some who are retired for other than voluntary reasons by next January. I assure you they will be more than welcome to join us in Former Members of Congress, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 years, we have lost 17 former Members by death. I should like to read their names and honor them by inclusion in the record of this meeting.

John G. Alexander, Minnesota;

Earl H. Beshlin, Pennsylvania.

You will recall that Mr. Beshlin was with us last year, over 100 years of age. He came to the Congress with you in 1917, Judge Jones. He said he was elected as a Democrat Prohibitionist. Unfortunately, in the last year he has passed on.

The others are:

C. W. "Runt" Bishop, Illinois;

Robert B. Chipfield, Illinois;

William O. Cowger, Kentucky;

Frank P. Graham, North Carolina;

Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky;

Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa;

Edgar W. Hiestand, California;

George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama;

Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota;

John Esten Miles, New Mexico;

B. J. Monkiewicz, Connecticut;

Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota;

Charles E. Swanson, Iowa;

James W. Trimble, Arkansas;

Sinclair Weeks, Massachusetts.

In our business meeting this morning we had a memorial service in their honor.

Now, I should like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Ramspeck, senior Democrat member of the FMC board of directors, for whatever remarks he may wish to make, and then we will introduce the representatives of the various Congresses here represented.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Thank you, Mr. Judd.

Mr. Speaker, I have never forgotten my first term as a Member of this House

and, therefore, I am not going to make any speech.

The SPEAKER. Will the distinguished gentleman from Georgia suspend until the Chair can call to the chair the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Bolton)?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I shall be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

(Thereupon, Mrs. Bolton assumed the chair.)

Mr. RAMSPECK. During the first term which I served in 1929 and 1930, I was sitting back in the cloakroom having a sandwich one day when some Member was out here in the well of the House making a ripsnorting speech. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Taylor), who had been here a long time, remarked to those of us sitting there and said, "That young fellow may regret that speech." He said, "When I first came here 20 years ago, I made a lot of speeches and I cannot think of a one of them I would give a nickel for, but there are some in that permanent RECORD I would give \$1,000 to get out."

Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to present to this group here today for 1-minute speeches and to tell you what they want to say, the Representatives on the Democratic side, beginning with the senior Representative here who entered the Congress in the 65th Congress.

He was a most distinguished and illustrious Member of this House, a man who in my opinion during the early days of the depression did as much, if not more, than any other leader of the House to alleviate some of the difficulties of that depression.

Madam Speaker, I now call upon the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Marvin Jones of the 65th Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield just temporarily?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. I think it was understood, was it not, that these first two distinguished Members, the oldest in terms of beginning their service and in terms of years, were to have a little more liberty under the 1-minute rule?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, Dr. Judd.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Madam Speaker, the distinguished majority and minority floor leaders, and ladies and gentleman of the Congress, I do not feel quite that old, but I suppose that I entered Congress before about half of you discovered America. It is rather difficult to win an argument with the calendar.

Madam Speaker, it gives me infinite and inexpressible pleasure to have the privilege of again addressing this distinguished body which I have always regarded as the greatest legislative body, and along with the Senate, the greatest Congress, in all the world. I have been, as all Members have been jealous of the prerogatives of this body.

On behalf of the entire organization of ex-Members I want to thank the officials of this House for their generous courtesy in allowing us to blow off a little steam.

As a matter of fact, we are about the best emissaries the Congress has in all parts of the United States. In all parts of the country that there are many people who do not realize that of the 3 million people who work for the U.S. Government, only 537 are elected by the people. I have told that fact many times. This number includes 100 Senators, 435 Members of the House, the President and the Vice President. They are the only ones that the people have a right to call to account in the House every 2 years, and in the Senate every 6 years, but in fact approximately one-third of the Senate every 2 years. If some group is seeking a selfish advantage or seeking some favorite legislation and can persuade the public to lose their faith in their chosen representatives by accusing Congress of dragging its feet, they have it made.

Liberty is one of the priceless possessions any people can have. We talk about giving people liberty, but we cannot give them liberty. We may give them an opportunity for liberty, but if they have not equipped themselves to keep it, they will not be able to keep it; they will lose it overnight.

That is ABC.

The Members of Congress are in the limelight always. They are subject to attack. When I first fell from grace and got into politics, I found out things about myself that I had never even suspected. Still men and women will still brave its dangers. In their willingness to do so rests the hope of the retention of representative government.

I believe a majority of the Members of the Congress, or a great many of them, at least, are lawyers, and most of them have read Blackstone, or know about Blackstone, and they will remember that in the early days when the king could do no wrong and was a dictator, they had what they called the wager of battle. If two people had a civil suit each one of them would select someone to do their fighting for them, usually on horseback. The man who won that fight, either using lances or swords, won the lawsuit for his principal. But slowly and gradually, like the rising of the sun, people began to realize that there was a question of right or wrong involved, and that the question of who won the physical contest left wholly untouched the question of who was right.

Then they began to realize that they must have laws and courts, so that a suit might be determined not by physical contest, but on the question of right and justice.

I wonder when the nations of the world are going to discover that principle?

It may be a long way off but when we reach the point that the people of the world are willing to take that course, it will be by the art of persuasion and agreement, rather than contest.

Liberty and law are as intimately linked as the law of supply and demand. You cannot have one without the other. For instance, we talk about stopping colonialism, but I believe that some of the former colonies go into dictatorships

almost as soon as they are turned loose. They break up into tribal wars.

Courage, education, industry, and faith are the priceless ingredients of liberty, or the preservation of liberty anywhere, any time and any place.

How can a man protect his rights if he does not understand them, and how can he understand them without a knowledge of the past and the present? One must search the musty pages of history to find the secret of a nation's greatness, or the cause of a nation's fall.

You will recall that Thomas Jefferson said one time that nearly anybody can stand adversity, but that he could not say that much for prosperity. And I hope that the young people, who are going to take over pretty soon, and their distant tread can now be heard—sometimes I think it is not very far distant—will understand this. Each generation has the advantage of the accomplishments and should do better than the previous generation. A pygmy standing on the shoulders of a giant can see farther than the giant ever saw. I should be disappointed if they do not do better.

I happen to think they are going to do better. I have visited campuses all over the United States. I have been sitting on the U.S. court of appeals for the last several years, all over the United States, because the courts are behind, and they like to have extra help. I have been able to visit these campuses, and I have found that a great majority of the young people want to do something. I hope that none of them will get the idea, however, that governments are organized to make things easier for them. Life should be an adventure filled with the priceless thrill of work and accomplishment.

I think we are living in the most wonderful period in the world's history.

We are going through—from one epoch into another—on a sort of blind express. I do not know what is over there, or what is coming. But I do know this. We are not going back—we do not go back. We are under the pressure of change and a great many people are accepting the doctrine that Congress is dragging its feet. Selfish interests are trying to take away the prerogatives of the Congress; and those people who have a purpose to serve in making anything like a rubber stamp out of the Congress, or in abusing the means of propaganda.

Then some dictator then—that is the first step for a dictatorship and the loss of liberty.

Now we are going through a process of change. Old forms are being discarded. New discoveries are being found. The earth, the sea and the sky are filled with hidden secrets planted by the Creator as a challenge to the human race. There is no limit to human accomplishment. We have only scratched the surface.

I do not get a chance to express myself very often in a body like this—so I thank you for your generous attention and I want to assure you that I shall continue, as will all of the other members of this organization, to be the emissary of the Congress, and to tell the public again

that Congress should never be asked to pass hurried, ill-considered legislation—they should have a chance to conduct a full hearing and hear both sides. Poor legislation is worse than no legislation.

I believe in the U.S. Government, her history, her institutions, and her people. Knowing the glories of her past I have implicit faith in her people. Old forms are being discarded as they are outgrown. Truth, unfettered by out-worn creeds and dogmas are knocking at the portals of humanity. I hope that the best of the past will be blended with the best of the new in a course of continued growth and progress.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to call to the chair the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Kelly).

The Chair recognizes Dr. Judd.

Mrs. KELLY occupied the Chair.

Mr. JUDD, Madam Speaker, it is my privilege now to introduce one who I believe is the oldest man in years who has ever addressed this body, Maurice H. Thatcher, former Congressman from Kentucky from 1923 to 1933.

Prior to that he had been Governor of the Panama Canal Zone 1910–13, and had always been very active in matters concerning the Panama Canal and its well-being.

He said he is a little shaky in his legs and I asked him if he wanted to sit down while he addressed us and he said—"No, sir, I will stand up."

I assure you he is not shaky in his mind. We are all honored that we have the chance today to honor this very great man who has never lost one bit of his interest in our country and in the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher.

Mr. THATCHER, Madam Speaker and former Members of the House, and any present Members, if they are present of the House and of the Senate, I am very glad indeed that I have been granted this day to be with you.

This Chamber of the House of Representatives is the heartbeat of the United States. The House of Representatives is the heartbeat of America. I suppose that the most fruitful years of my life were perhaps spent in the Congress.

I suppose you can hear me. I am reminded in that connection of a story down in my part of the world, Kentucky, about a man in his cups who attended a free lecture one night in a certain city, and the lecturer was talking about the advance of science. He had a weak voice and could not be heard. He did not know much about the subject that he was presenting.

The man attending the lecture took a seat in the rear and he tried to listen. He could not hear except the mumbling of the speaker. He got up and pointed a shaking finger at the speaker, and cried out, "Louder and funnier."

The well of the House recalls to me many interesting experiences. Naturally. I served 10 years here. I remember that on one occasion Congressman Eslick, of Tennessee—I think he was from Columbia, which is a sort of garden spot in Tennessee—came to the well to speak. He had heart trouble. We were good friends. I thought he ought not to try

to speak. I came down and took a seat near him. He was speaking on behalf of the bonus, which was a vital question at that time. He sat right over there somewhere, and I sat in the front row near him because I knew he was suffering with this affliction. He rose to speak, and I remember his words. He was picturing the plight of certain soldiers who came back to wife and family without any resources.

He said, "We will now turn from this sordid picture." And with those words he fell. I sprang to ease him down, and when he fell he was dead. Dr. Calver, House physician, came in and pronounced him dead.

I remember so many scenes that transpired here. It is a great experience to serve in the Congress of the United States.

I have been for a great many years the only surviving Member of the Commission of Seven on the Isthmus and the Canal Zone. I was the civilian member and the Civil Governor of the Canal Zone and in charge of civil affairs. I was able to bring to bear much of my experience in Panama in legislation on behalf of the canal and the Canal Zone and the employees there. After I left Congress, I was still interested in Panama Canal projects and the affairs of the Isthmus.

I was the author in Congress of the bill which became legislation that provided for the establishment of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory under the supervision of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine Inc., with the power to establish a laboratory in Panama City for research touching the cause and prevention of tropical diseases. That bill was an enabling act carrying an original appropriation or authorization of \$50,000 annually. Now it is a million dollars. It is the greatest institution in the world of its character. I served as its vice president for 40 years or more, all without compensation, and throughout that time I have served as general counsel, and I am now general counsel and honorary president of the Institute, which supervises the work of the laboratory.

So my various experiences in the past always served me in the House when I was a Member of this distinguished body.

I prepared just a short statement here which I will read, and then it can go into the Record for whatever purpose it may be able to serve.

My service of 10 years—5 terms—1923–33, was in an era far different from that which now prevails. That period was one of comparative peace. This is an age of violence. Man is now utilizing the fruits of science for evil purposes.

Mankind must learn that the divine intent is that progress shall be marked with beneficence, rather than evil; that his potential for good is far greater than is his potential for evil; that his mission in life is evolutionary rather than revolutionary; that peace is better than war; that peace and calm are conducive to true and realistic progress. He also must come to the complete realization that however much delayed, destiny wills that the moral values will finally obtain;

and that he must labor to apply with ever-increasing force, the lessons of the past. Mirth and music mitigate somewhat the tragedies of life and death.

The moral principle is the greatest gift of heaven to man. It comprehends the spiritual values. Morality is simply what is best for all concerned.

Faith is reasoned hope. If hope endures, faith endures, and reason.

The trait of reason must dominate and control all human life. All lesser animals live only by instinct.

Thanks to the laws of mathematics, men have visited the moon, a miracle of miracles. On yesterday I saw on the TV color set the splashdown of Apollo 16 in the appointed place in the Pacific Seas thousands of miles away. If the laws of mathematics are eternal and unchanging, so are the moral laws, and whosoever defies them will perish in weakness and infamy.

What is true of individual human beings is true of nations. Righteousness exalteth a nation. Extreme partisanship must be shunned. What is best for the country must be the guide and slogan if we are to survive.

Washington fully understood the perils of unrestrained partisanship and gravely warned against its practice. He was objective, cautious, and sought in all his labors for the cause he espoused to be wise and just.

Since I left congressional service it seems to me that the human race has deteriorated. It has been my hope that science may change the mortal direction. I repeat my observation, that what is best is moral and what is not best is immoral. Evil is the misuse of that which is good.

All of which is trite, yet must be as everlastingly repetitive as the multiplication table.

It has been suggested here and now that I read a verse written by me the other day, and I accept this suggestion and close accordingly. This is a verse I wrote.

I have always been interested in national parks and national monuments. I was the author in the Congress of the legislation that made the Mammoth Cave Region into a national park, the Mammoth Cave National Park.

This is a sonnet about the Statue of Liberty, which here is personified in speech:

STATUE OF LIBERTY (NEW YORK HARBOR)

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

In awe I stand—gift of a sister nation—

To this land of hope and opportunity.

I bear a giant torch in approbation

Of what the people are; I symbolize the free.

Aliens from other portions of the Planet,

Troop hither, under law, from near and far.

The urge involved—there's naught to ease or ban it!

The migrants find the inward-swinging gates ajar.

They seek the solace of these pleasant regions,

And wish to share each and every blessing

With the native born. They are the ardent legions;

And soon all worths they find and are possessing.

The dregs are barred—not those of science, art;
The productive poor, and the pure in heart!

APRIL 12, 1972.

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Laird) to take the gavel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Laird). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Judd).

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I hope you have not developed militaristic tendencies in your present position, but from now on, if we go much over the 1-minute rule, you are authorized to apply the rules of the House.

I would like to introduce at this time a Representative of the 71st Congress, the Honorable Victor Christgau, of my own State of Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Mr. Speaker, former Members of Congress, and Members of Congress. The 71st Congress was elected during the campaign of 1928, and some of you will recall that was between the then Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover and the Governor of the State of New York, Al Smith.

One of the underlying issues during that campaign was farm relief legislation, but underlying that great controversy was also the subject of prohibition, which did not quite surface during the 1928 campaign but did during the next presidential election.

Both presidential candidates, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smith, promised farm relief legislation. President Hoover shortly after he was inaugurated called the Congress into a special farm relief session on April 15, 1929. Two of the issues that came up in connection with farm relief legislation were the revision of the tariff and the adoption of an Agricultural Marketing Act. The Congress adopted both of those provisions.

The Agricultural Marketing Act turned out to be ineffective to meet the depression situation in agriculture at that time. Some of you will recall that during 1929 in the industrial sector there was great prosperity but in the farm sector there was a depression.

One of the issues during that Congress was whether or not the Agricultural Marketing Act should contain a provision for surplus control. The Hon. Marvin Jones of Texas at that time was the leader on the Democratic side on the Committee on Agriculture, and he offered the debenture plan as a method of meeting the surplus farm problem. The Hoover administration, however, opposed it, and it was not enacted. The Senate adopted it by one vote, but it was defeated in the conference committee.

The Agricultural Marketing Act failed to meet the needs of agriculture and I think largely on the basis that nothing was done to take care of the surplus farm producers, which Congressman Jones was trying to meet with the debenture plan.

After the Agricultural Marketing Act was passed by the House early in the 1929 special session they took up the matter of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. That likewise became an ineffective law. I took a trip to Europe shortly after the

House passed that bill and visited a number of countries of Europe and found that there was a tremendous reaction against the United States taking that action in connection with the raising of tariffs. For example, when I went to Holland the people there said, "If you do not buy our tulips"—and we had placed a tariff on them—"we will not buy your automobiles." In Belgium the slogan was, "Patriots ride in Belgian cars" as part of the propaganda against the proposed tariff.

Because the tariff was blamed by the Democrats at that time as being partly responsible for aggravating the depression, it became a great issue in the next campaign.

You may recall that the Hoover administration was defeated by Gov. Franklin Roosevelt of New York.

So, the 71st Congress on the two great issues that were brought before it was unable to meet the problems of the day.

Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Members of the 71st Congress who was associated with one of the great issues that later was brought before the Congress, namely legislation to control abuses in the labor field, and I refer to Mr. Fred Hartley of New Jersey who was one of the younger Members of the 71st Congress. As you know, he later on became chairman of the Committee on Labor and was the coauthor of the Taft-Hartley law which was one of the attempts made by Congress at that time to meet some of the problems of labor.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege to be here today and I thank you for this privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAIRD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Ramspeck).

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call on the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Phil Ferguson, representing the 72d Congress, for a short statement.

Mr. PHIL FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, the reason that I look so much younger than these other people is the fact that I was one of the youngest Members on the Democratic side when I was elected. I had a little word of advice. The Speaker told me when I opposed the Townsend plan, I would not be in Congress long. Sure enough, he was right. I just served 3 terms.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other observation. When I was in Congress the Army was then still plugging for more appropriations for the horse cavalry. I think today the infantry is in about the same situation as the cavalry was then. I speak rather knowledgeably about the infantry. I was a marine in World War II, a foot soldier, and the infantry did the fighting then just as it does now, but it is out of date.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that we have all of the sophisticated weapons available, including the knowledge of outerspace, protecting us at this time and not depend on the old conventional methods of warfare.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from Georgia proceeds, the Chair would like to pass the gavel to a former dis-

tinguished chairman under whom the chair served for many years.

Will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Cooley) please come forward?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOLEY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Ramspeck).

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the 73d Congress will be represented by another Texan, the great State from whence a great many fine Members of this body have come.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Clark W. Thompson).

Mr. CLARK W. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been given my instructions, and I want to tell the rest of you this, by none other than the Speaker pro tem right now. I have just been reading the instructions to the cochairmen right here and I take note that the words, "Stick to the 1 minute" have been underlined three times.

So, Mr. Speaker, I shall abide by those instructions and merely bring the greetings of the 73d Congress to all of you and tell you what a great privilege it is to be back here. Further, I wish to express the hope that each succeeding meeting for a long time will see us all here again.

Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure who is going to speak for the 74th Congress. Mr. Sterling Cole and Mr. Byron Scott were named. Mr. Cole was here; however, I do not see him at this moment, and also Mr. Scott is not here. How about Joe Casey? I have Joe Casey down on the list of the 72d Congress. Is that right?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we will just have to proceed from the 74th Congress to the 75th Congress. So, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Ramspeck) to announce the speaker for the 75th Congress.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and honor to introduce as the speaker for the 75th Congress the distinguished gentleman from California, (Mr. Izac).

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from California proceeds, the Chair wishes to pass the gavel to his old friend, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Harvey).

Mr. HARVEY occupied the chair.

Mr. EDOUARD IZAC. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and my former colleagues, I can think of many things, of course, that happened during the 75th Congress, but there is one humorous occurrence that I believe you would all like to hear about.

We were elected, as you will remember, in November of 1936, and we came down here to Washington in 1937, and there was no patronage, and everybody looked at everybody else, and said, "What, no patronage?" Because practically all of us had brought at least one friend from the home district, hoping to give him some kind of an appointment down here, either as a policeman, or to run an elevator, or something of that kind.

Well, as it happened, we had a chairman, and I presume they have the same kind of setup today, and this chairman announced to all of us, we new Members, "Unfortunately, there are no patronage jobs available."

As a matter of fact, we found out later he had seven of his own. But that did not help us any.

Fortunately, they did, later on, recognize the man I brought with me from San Diego, and he was put in the document room, and there he served with distinction for over 30 years, and he has just recently been retired.

So, when you come down to Washington for the first time do not always look for patronage.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARVEY of Indiana). The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Judd).

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have the great honor of introducing as the representative of the 76th Congress, the Honorable Frances P. Bolton of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Before the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Bolton) proceeds, the Chair would like now to pass the gavel to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, one of our former great colleagues, Mike Monroney.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, former Members of the House, and those very good people who have stayed around to greet us, I first want to say one thing: And that is that just before we began this session two of my Ohio members had to leave, one was Senator Bricker, and the other was Bill Hess, great friends of all of us, but I wanted to have them have the credit of this meeting, and of having come for the business meeting this morning.

It is wonderful to be here, is it not? And it is wonderful to stand in this Chamber again. However, I have often heard my family say, "Well, mother, just remember that a few words will do a great deal more than a great many." So I am not going to say very much, and I am sure that that will be a great relief to all of you.

But the fact is that I think as a whole we former Members are not appreciating quite what our value can be to our country. I hope very much as we meet annually, and certainly under the very fine leadership first of the great Brooks Hays, and now of Walter Judd, that we will really take hold of something which will bring knowledge of what this House does before the country, and what it can do in the minds of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren—and I now have one great-great-child—for many others.

So I hope that as you go home from here that you will take with you a new sense of Washington—mercy, what a lot of new roads and things they have here now—and we are going to be so grand when we drive up here. I could hardly remember my old space in the garage, but I am glad I got it, and I am glad to be here.

You remember coming in here at any time of the day or night, and seeing the Capitol, and that dome? Does it not do

something to you? Well, just be sure it keeps on doing something to you so that you can pass that feeling on to your children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, and so that they can pass it on their great-grandchildren. For it is America.

Thank you.

Mr. JUDD. I now have the privilege of introducing the speaker for the 77th Congress, Hon. J. Edgar Chenoweth of Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, both of the present Congress and those who formerly served in this body, which is so rich in memories, I bring you greetings from the 77th Congress. I am delighted to be here today. Evan Howell, of Illinois, and I are the only former Members here today.

This is an unexpected pleasure. I never thought that I would again have the privilege of addressing the House of Representatives. It is a thrilling experience for me.

I came here on January 3, 1941, in the 77th Congress. I recall Speaker Sam Rayburn stated he had realized the ambition of his life that day when he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives.

One of the first legislative battles of the 77th Congress was a fight between Michigan and Arkansas as to which State was going to lose a seat in the House, after the 1940 census. Michigan prevailed. The debate was most interesting.

Then the first major piece of legislation in the 77th Congress was the lend-lease bill. Do you remember that measure? The argument was made it would keep us out of war.

Then I remember the summer of 1941. President Roosevelt was gone for a time and no one knew where he was. Where was he? Out in the Atlantic with Churchill drawing up the Atlantic Charter.

Then you remember Pearl Harbor in December of that year, and the declarations of war against Japan and Germany. I remember distinctly, I believe it was the day after Christmas of 1941, when Churchill addressed a joint session of the Congress in the Senate Chamber. Many Members had gone home for Christmas, but Mrs. Chenoweth and I were here. I recall one statement he made. He said:

I am happy to report to my people that the United States is now in the war with us.

I remember March 1, 1954, when the Puerto Rico fanatics used the House Chamber for a shooting gallery. The next day I received a call from Colorado. I was asked, "Where were you yesterday—why didn't you get shot and get some publicity." It just happened that I was handling the rule on the Republican side at the time the shooting started, at the request of Leo Allen of Illinois, chairman of the Rules Committee. The bill provided for importation of Mexican labor and was very controversial. Shortly after I took over the shooting started. It sounded like firecrackers. You remember the rest of the story and how five of our colleagues were wounded.

I used to show visitors from Colorado where I was standing and the bullet holes in the table next to me. However, I real-

ized no danger, and fortunately escaped injury.

It is wonderful to be here with you today. There are so many happy memories that come back to me, when I see my old colleagues with whom I served in the House. I concur in the statement that the finest friendships in the world are made right here on the floor of this House. I am delighted to see all of you. I shall cherish happy memories of our service together as long as I live. Thank you very much.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad that we have a representative for the other body to speak for the 78th Congress, which is my own Congress, Senator Homer Ferguson of Michigan.

Mr. Homer Ferguson of Michigan.

Mr. HOMER FERGUSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, former Members of Congress, and Members of the House and Senate in the present session: It is such an honor and privilege to appear in this well today that I am bound to say a few words on this occasion. I will ask the Chair to measure the time of a minute and call me to order, because I am not accustomed to these regulations of 3 or 5 minutes.

My friends, as I was sitting here listening to my good friend, Marvin Jones, I could not help but be deeply impressed by the great speech which he made. If you will carry his thoughts to the public, it will be well worthwhile.

I have had the privilege of serving in the three branches of the Government. The legislative as a U.S. Senator; the executive, as U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines; and both the State and Federal judiciary. In the judiciary, it was our duty to insure to all Americans that great motto carved on the front of the Supreme Court—"Equal Justice Under Law." In the Senate, and equally here in the House of Representatives, it was our duty to make those laws which are to be applied to all citizens equally by the judiciary. And in the executive, it was our duty to see that those laws were thoroughly carried out.

I am happy, as I stand here and look up, to see the inscription, "In God We Trust" still carved above the American flag. It was my privilege to sponsor the Senate bill that inserted in our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, the words under God. I say privilege because those who pledge allegiance to our flag should realize that our Nation exists under God and it is our God-given and inspired right to represent the great people of this country in the Congress.

I thank you again for the privilege of addressing you once more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). The gentleman yields back 15 seconds of his time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to make an announcement. We have 13 more former Members to speak and we have 8 minutes before we are scheduled to board buses to go to the Department of State and the Department of Defense. A word to the wise.

It is now my privilege to introduce from the 79th Congress Hon. Albert M. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a week

of notable returns—Apollo from the moon, Henry Kissinger from Moscow, and another notable return I think will be ignored by the press. I do not think Walter Cronkite will have it on the news tonight. I doubt that Jack Anderson will even disclose it in his column. I am referring to my return to the well of the House.

But more important than that, of course, is that we are here today to honor the Members of Congress, those who have served and those who are now serving. Important indeed is that. But in addition to that, we want to focus the attention of America on this House of Representatives, because we all believe that it provides for the people of America a symbol of freedom.

The significant return today, however, is that of this organization, former Members of Congress.

Today we honor Congress and the men who serve in that great body.

More than honoring, I suggest we may focus the attention of America on this unique people's institution of advocacy, action, and protection.

When all shouts, anger, tears, abuse, and frustrations fade away, the strength and achievements of Congress become the living symbol of our freedom.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce from the 80th Congress the gentleman from New York (Mr. Multer).

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, may I remind those who heard the story, that stories throughout this country do change from time to time, and the story that came from Kentucky to New York is presently told about the same speaker and same gentleman, seated in the rear of the auditorium who called out, as we tell it, "I can't hear you," and a Member in the front row replied, "I can, and I'll change seats with you."

This is one of the nice things about our coming to this rostrum to speak. Anybody can leave without even asking to be excused.

May I plagiarize very briefly the remarks of our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana, (Mr. Boggs) and our minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford) by saying that most of us remember, who served under the great speakership of Sam Rayburn, the gentleman from Texas, his constant repetition of "I love this House." I believe that love is inculcated into every last Member of this House on the day when we take our oath, and it remains with us as long as we live.

Then, too, as pointed out by the minority leader, our organization, if it survives and does anything, will prove that we can disagree but never be disagreeable. The purpose, if nothing else, of our organization will be to prove that this House of Representatives and the Senate, the Congress of the United States, is a living institution to be respected and revered, so that we can go on from strength to strength.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call upon the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. Edna F. Kelly, to represent the 81st Congress.

Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, to speak from the well of the House was a privilege and a great honor. To have the opportunity to speak again in this august body is a greater privilege and honor—and a great responsibility. We must recognize this privilege and let the sitting Members know we pay heed to their responsibilities in these trying days and wish them God's guidance in their efforts to preserve the absolute principles upon which our country is established. I thank them for making this day possible.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce as a Representative of the 82d Congress, Mr. O. K. Armstrong of Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, present Members of this great body, and my colleagues who are former Members. I am sure we all appreciate the honor of being here, as every one of my predecessors at this lectern has said. I consider it a great honor to say this word of appreciation on behalf of the members of the class of 1950, the 82d Congress, and still a most distinguished group.

I am sure all of us since our terms here, whether we served for a short time or long, have been introduced somewhere as "a former Member of the Congress."

I always appreciate the honor, but I feel a little humble about what happened on the first day of my term. My wife and I drove up in our battered car to Washington. The next morning when Congress was to begin, we drove up to the Capitol. Even in that day we had to look for a place to park. I noticed a sign in front of the Capitol which said, "Reserved for Members of Congress." I nudged my companion and said, "That is us." So we drove in as if we owned the place.

I had not any more than turned off the ignition when I heard a voice shouting at me which said, "You cannot park there." I looked out of the car. There was this great big policeman, 8 feet tall, and 4 feet wide. Some Members may remember him. He was shaking his billy club at me, and he said, "You cannot park there!" I said, "Why can I not park here?" He said, "That is reserved for Members of Congress."

I said, "Officer, they just got through electing me out in Missouri." He thought that over for a minute, and then he said, "Well, Mister, please excuse me. You just did not look smart enough to be a Member of Congress!"

That was not the reason I dropped out of Congress after one term. Some Members may remember the inimitable Congressman Dewey Short. In my State in the region I had served, the "other party," as my party called it, in its unwisdom put my district in with that of Dewey Short. I did not want to oppose that veteran, so I dropped out of the race for reelection.

But I have some great memories, as we all do, of our service here. I remember a word of advice I got that first week. I thought, well, I would look in on and talk to the great Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Rayburn. I said:

"I am a freshman Member. Have you a word of advice?" He said, "Mr. Armstrong, I have. Just because you have been elected to Congress, don't think that

all the wisdom of the world resides in you." And I never forgot that.

I never forgot one other thing, Mr. Speaker, and that was indelibly impressed upon my mind. I remember a great speech of a great general by the name of Douglas MacArthur. After he had been relieved, unwisely, in my opinion, of his command in the Far East, he came to speak to a joint session of Congress. He said one thing that I wish our President at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and everyone who serves in both the House and the Senate today, could remember at this time of crisis in our history. I heard that great general say: "There is no substitute for victory." He was right. There was no substitute for victory in war and there never will be, when we defend the liberties of humanity.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, to represent the 83d Congress, I call upon the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Matthews), whose friends call him Billy.

Mr. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to represent my colleagues of the 83d Congress; we think, if one would evaluate quality, one of the two best freshmen classes, Mr. Speaker, who ever sat in these hallowed halls.

After leaving Washington, I have gone back to the grass roots of America, and I am teaching at the Santa Fe Junior College in Gainesville, Fla. I want to bring you greetings from the faculty and the student body of that great school.

We have much in common, former Members of Congress and instructors. We both are inclined to know how to live in genteel poverty.

You will recall that sometimes in the cloakrooms we would say that Congress would be a magnificent place in which to serve if you did not have to answer the roll, if you did not have to answer your mail, and if you did not have to run for reelection. Well, teaching would be magnificent and perfect if you did not have to call the roll, grade the papers, and work for tenure.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going back to the grass roots of America to work in the classroom. This week we are studying about the Congress of the United States. I am going to talk about the etiquette of dialog that is so magnificently demonstrated here. I am going to talk about the synthesis that makes possible the merging of 1,000 different views into workable legislation. And I am going to talk about the progress we are making in the solution of problems. So often we just do not get the facts about the progress we are making.

I would challenge myself and you, my beloved colleagues, to do your part in making this country a better place in which to live.

I would challenge my college youth, whom I have the honor of teaching, for the future, and I would plead with them not to use escape mechanisms but to get into the mainstream of American life so that we can all say, after we have done our work, "indeed this is a little bit better country in which to live because of my service."

Thank you.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is supposed to be one more from that Congress in the form of our Defense Secretary, Mr. Laird, but we are a little late and I expect he has had to go. He has already been honored by you, sir, by your inviting him to occupy the chair.

We will move on to the 84th Congress, to August Johansen. I do not see him here now. He was here, but he is gone.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, for the 85th Congress I call on Leonard Farbstain of New York.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I want to say that for me as a Representative of that class it is a great thrill to be back in these hallowed halls, even though we are only former Members of Congress.

I know, for myself, I did not realize how important this body was and the effect and influence this body has upon the commonweal and the general public until after I had left it.

So all I can say is the Members of this House need only carry the flag and great honor will prevail.

For the Class of "85", I want to say our great wish is first to be able to live until we attain that number, and from then on we will worry about the future.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, for the 86th Congress I call upon Mr. Fred Wampler of Indiana.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of this distinguished body: I want to brief my remarks, if I may, and carry you back a few years to Terre Haute, Ind., when a great American came to Terre Haute, Ind., to try to reelect a Congressman who was representing flood control. His concluding remark before combined civic organizations was "There was no issue so complex that it cannot be reconciled through the ingenuity of man." He went back to Texas. This was possibly his last public appearance for the Honorable Speaker Rayburn of the House of Representatives became ill and never returned to Washington.

It is my privilege and honor today to come back to the House bringing you the words of this great American, hoping that we can live the words that he expressed in Terre Haute, Ind., on that day. His message will never be forgotten.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, representing the 87th Congress, I call upon a gentleman from Idaho (Mr. Ralph Harding).

Then we go to the 88th Congress, and I call upon Mr. Harold Ryan of Michigan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, and my colleagues who are former Members of Congress, the alumni Members of the 87th and 88th Congresses are deeply grateful for the opportunity that they did have in serving in this Congress and making their various contributions. We like to think that we did add a little bit to help carry on the great Government of the United States and to help in some way even to make it better as time went on. We are also grateful for the opportunity given us in creating and developing some of the best friendships a person could ever have.

There were many good things that were done in our freshman years which are too numerous to talk about, but at the same time one of the outstanding events which occurred—and I was not on that particular committee—was, under the leadership of our great President then, John F. Kennedy, we attempted to make plans to the moon.

President Kennedy did say at that time that we would be the first country to put a man on the moon, and it was during my freshman year here that appropriations were wisely made by the Committee on Appropriations and given to the Space Committee in order to develop plans so that this dream could actually be realized.

Because of succeeding appropriations and with a tremendous amount of work done by thousands of great Americans and with contributions made by many people, we have witnessed the fact that the United States is the first nation to place a man on the moon.

This will be one of the outstanding memories, of course, in my career.

I, like many others, am grateful for the opportunity to be here once again, because, as someone said, we never knew that we would ever have the chance again to grace this podium.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, representing the 89th Congress, I call upon the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Stalbaum).

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, you know, the 89th had a lot of freshman Members, and just about at this time in the debate someone would move to cut off all further debate at the end of 2 minutes. I feel a little bit that same way today, so I merely want to give my greetings to all of the Members here from the Members of the 89th Congress and extend these greetings to the Former Members of Congress Club. It is a pleasure to be here speaking for all of them, and I hope we have many more of these meetings.

Thank you.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, for the 90th Congress I have the honor to present the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Pollock).

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues, former colleagues and associates in Former Members of Congress, it is wonderful indeed to stand before you in the well where so much history was born, where great men of America before me have stood, and to have the experience of sharing with all of you the opportunity once again to answer the rollcall in these hallowed Chambers of the United States House of Representatives, truly the greatest deliberative body in the world.

I was privileged indeed a few years ago to represent the people of the great State of Alaska as the Congressman for Alaska. In Alaska we have one U.S. Congressman and two U.S. Senators. I always felt I had a doubly difficult and challenging job in representing my Alaskan constituents, for I had to do the work of two Senators—and I loved every minute of it. My friends, our 90th Congress Club does not have many members in Former Members of Congress Inc. We really do not have sufficient vintage yet to have very many members in this

unique organization. I would like to mention, however, one of our distinguished former Members is George Bush, who is now the United States representative to the United Nations in New York, and, of course, Tom Kleppe, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration was in our class. Jim Smith, of Oklahoma, who is the Administrator of the FHA was another. I have had the distinguished privilege of serving under our President as the Deputy Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. And with sadness, I must mention that there is another former Member of the 90th Congress who is no longer with us, and that is my good friend and close colleague, Bill Cowger of Kentucky, who died recently while still a young man. His death was untimely.

One thing more, those of you who will be retiring from Congress this year, voluntarily or otherwise, let me say we will sincerely regret seeing you leave this active role in the service of our great Nation; but know also we welcome you into our ranks. We welcome you into membership in this illustrious and prestigious organization—the Former Members of Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, things change. When I first visited the House Chamber on a hot summer day in the early 1930's, the Speaker was cooled by a small fan on his desk. Spitons were everywhere.

When I came to the House as a Member in the early 1950's, the Chamber was air cooled, one spittoon stood out near Speaker Sam Rayburn's chair. We voted by voice.

Now, I read, the House will vote by push button; will it soon come to pass that people will guide their Representatives in the Congress on pending legislation by some signal?

Would it help the Members of the House and the Senate form a more perfect Congress if citizens could express their wishes on pending legislation via telephone to computer terminals for relay to the Hill?

Thus, guided by an expression of his constituency on legislation, the Member could vote it up or down as the facts allowed.

Feasible? Expensive? Perhaps.

It is estimated the present Congress will spend about \$24 million during the calendar year on franked mail to keep the people informed. Plus an estimated \$4½ million on air mail and special delivery. Twenty-eight million dollars a year to keep the people informed. A small price to pay for freedom.

Between elections, what would it cost to keep the Congress informed of the wishes of our citizens on legislation before it is debated for passage?

Would dial-a-vote via telephone to computer terminals for relay to Congress help it become a more perfect body, if that is possible?

Things do come to pass, do they not?

Mr. JUDD. For those of you who are still active Members of the Congress, and those of you who will be retiring voluntarily, or otherwise, this year, I want to say on behalf of all of us that while we deeply regret the facts of political life that may cause you to be leaving your active service in the U.S. Congress, we will certainly welcome you into our fellowship in Former Members of Congress, should you care to join us.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, a good many former Members wrote or called to express their regrets that they could not attend today's activities, beginning with our two honorary presidents, President Richard Nixon and former President Lyndon B. Johnson, and our honorary chairman, our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack, the latter not only wrote to express his regrets, but also sent a check for support of the organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks the names of these former Members who have sent regrets at not being able to be present in person.

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

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

E. Ross Adair, of Indiana, now U.S. Ambassador to Ethiopia.

George Bush, of Texas, now U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Katherine Byron, of Maryland.

Louis B. Capazzoli, of New York, Associate Justice of Supreme Court of N.Y. Appellate Division.

Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri.

Ed Foreman of New Mexico.

Hadwen C. Fuller of New York.

Angler Goodwin of Massachusetts.

Charles Hoeven of Iowa.

John Davis Lodge, now, U.S. Ambassador to Argentina.

Eugene Keogh of New York.

Donald McGinley of Nebraska.

Catherine Norrell of Arkansas.

M. Blaine Peterson of Utah.

David Potts of New York.

Katherine St. George of New York.

Neil Staebler of Michigan.

Joseph Tydings of Maryland.

Albert Vreeland of New Jersey.

Basli Whitener of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the majority leader, when we go back in the House, will ask unanimous consent on behalf of all former Members attending this session to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are two more items. One is a report of the nominating committee and of the actions taken by the annual meeting of FMC this morning regarding the members elected to the board of directors and the officers for the new year.

Mr. Speaker, for that purpose, I yield to the chairman of the nominating committee, the distinguished former Member from Alabama, Mr. Laurie Battle.

(Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the nominating committee I am the board of the Former Members of Congress as they were elected unanimously this morning. They were all run-

ning, after careful selection, in a manner that all of us would like to have run originally, and that is without opposition.

We have four Members who have graduated from the Board of Directors, the Honorable Brooks Hays, Jed Johnson, Frances Bolton, and James Van Zandt.

Replacing these distinguished former Members will be the Honorable Joseph Barr, Eugene Keogh, Thomas Kuchel, and George Meader. They will serve for 3 years.

In addition, we have former Senator Ralph Yarborough who is running for public office as I understand it and he will be replaced by the Honorable Jeffrey Cohelan who will serve for 1 year.

The Honorable Edna Kelly will not be able to attend the meetings of the board for the coming year so she will be replaced by former Senator Joseph Tydings. He will serve for 2 years.

And, saving the best for last, Mr. Speaker, the new president of the Former Members of Congress board of directors is the Honorable Walter Judd and the new vice president is the Honorable Joseph Tydings.

I thank you.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the wives and widows of former Members of Congress had a meeting this morning and decided to organize an auxiliary to FMC. They have been in the gallery during this session. They already have more than 150 charter members. They too, desire to maintain their friendships of yesterday.

In closing, once again I wish to express on behalf of every Member of the FMC, Mr. Speaker, our great appreciation for your courtesy and that of the majority and minority leaders, and of the other Members of the Congress, for giving us this opportunity to be received by you in this historic Chamber.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House for their presence here today.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS AND PERMISSION TO REVISE

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the Record and that all Members and former Members here who spoke and those here during the recess have the privilege of revising their remarks and to include extraneous material therein.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 26, 1972, the House voted approval of the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations in denying the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the right to use the funds provided for in H.R. 14582, to finance the transfer of the Fourth District Home Loan Bank from Greensboro, N.C., to Atlanta, Ga. Following is the exact language of the prohibition:

Provided, That none of the funds made available for administrative or nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board by this Act shall be used to finance the relocation of all or any part of the Federal Home Loan Bank from Greensboro, North Carolina, nor for the supervision, direction or operation of any district bank for the fourth district other than at such location.

Under the limitation of time in effect during the debate on H.R. 14582, there was no opportunity to develop all of the facts which show that the decision of the FHLBB to transfer this bank from Greensboro to Atlanta was hastily made—without prior notice to the member savings and loan associations or to the employees or to the public—and was made in a manner which indicates that the move was ordered without the careful consideration such an important decision deserves.

This decision by the FHLBB seems to have been an arbitrary one. Every reason given originally by the FHLBB to justify the decision has been demolished by the facts developed during two hearings conducted by the Appropriations Committee having jurisdiction over the FHLBB budget. The story of what transpired and the pertinent facts should be recorded so that all Members of Congress and others who read this record may see how a Government agency, charged with the responsibility of supervising the Home Loan Bank system, used its authority in an arbitrary manner and without any real consideration of the consequences of its action. Only Congress can force this Board to follow the rule of reason and I think Congress will take that action when the facts are known.

I am therefore taking this time in order to explain what transpired and to show some of the consequences of this arbitrary decision made by the FHLBB.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Home Loan Bank system is composed of 4,301 savings and loan associations. The country is divided into 12 districts and there is a Federal Home Loan Bank in each district. District 4 is composed of 698 insured associations in Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

The Federal Home Loan Bank for the fourth district has been located in Greensboro, N.C., for the last 22 years. This district leads the entire country in the number of insured associations and in net assets of member associations—\$30.6 billion.

The Greensboro Federal Home Loan Bank is supposed to be run by a 12-man board of directors, eight of whom are selected by the member associations and four are appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. There is one vacancy

on this Board at the present time. The Chairman of the Board is Mr. Clyde Perry of Florida and he is one of the members who was appointed by the FHLBB.

The fourth district of the Federal Home Loan Bank system, with its bank located in Greensboro, has had tremendous growth during the last 5 years as the following facts will show:

During this period the fourth district had the greatest net savings inflow of any of the 12 districts.

During this period the fourth district has led the country in attracting new savings.

During the past 4 years the member associations in the fourth district have closed a higher dollar volume of mortgage loans than any other district except the San Francisco district. However, during 1971 Greensboro moved ahead of San Francisco and led the country in this category.

As of December 8, 1971, home loan bank personnel in Greensboro consisted of the following:

District bank employees.....	73
Examination personnel.....	20
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation personnel.....	5
Total	98

The Federal Home Loan Bank system is supervised by a 3-man Board as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and is composed of the following:

Mr. Preston Martin of California, Chairman;

Mr. Carl Kamp of St. Louis, Mo.;

Mr. T. Hal Clarke of Atlanta, Ga.

On December 8, 1971, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, located here in Washington, adopted resolution No. 71-1304 which stated that "effective immediately" the Fourth District Federal Home Loan Bank, located in Greensboro, N.C., is hereby moved and relocated at the city of Atlanta, Ga. And its name is hereby changed from the Federal Home Loan Bank of Greensboro to the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta.

Resolution No. 71-1304 was adopted by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board without any public notice, without any public hearing, without any prior discussion with the Board of Directors of the Bank, without any notice to the 98 employees, and without giving the 698 member associations, who actually own the Bank, any opportunity to be heard about the proposed transfer of the Bank from Greensboro to Atlanta.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The following sequence of events, I believe, clearly demonstrates that this was an arbitrary, and unreasonable act by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and that in taking this action the Board displayed a lack of sensitivity to the rights of the 98 people employed in Greensboro and a cynical disregard for the views and opinions of the member associations who own the Bank:

On December 5, 1971, Sunday, a Federal Home Loan Bank Board member, Mr. T. Hal Clarke, stopped off in Greensboro on his way to his home in Atlanta for a conference with Mr. Fogarty, who is the president of the Bank but not an

elected Director. On page 9 of the printed hearings, conducted on December 15, 1971, by the Subcommittee on HUD-Space-Science-VA of the House Committee on Appropriations, which subcommittee annually reviews the budget of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as required by the Federal Corporation Control Act, Mr. Clarke made the following statement:

I told him (Mr. Fogarty) the way the Board was thinking. The decision hasn't been made at that point. But after the study made here we had pretty well come to a conclusion. I told him that we wanted him to be the first one to really know the Board's plans.

Mr. Clarke returned to the District of Columbia from Atlanta and on December 8, 1971, Wednesday—3 days after Clarke's conference with Fogarty mentioned above—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board had a meeting here in Washington, which lasted only 15 minutes, during which a number of items of business were disposed of including adopting resolution No. 71-1304 which stated that "effective immediately" the Greensboro bank is moved to Atlanta.

The Greensboro Bank Board of Directors had a regular monthly meeting scheduled to convene in Palm Beach, Fla., on December 10, 1971, Friday—2 days following the meeting of the FHLBB at which resolution No. 71-1304 was adopted. During that bank board meeting in Palm Beach, a resolution was adopted approving the transfer.

One of the directors of the Greensboro Bank Board, Mr. Mel Thompson of North Carolina, said about that ratification meeting in Palm Beach that the transfer was presented to the bank board as an accomplished fact—and that the bank board members felt that they had no alternatives but to approve the action which had already been taken "effective immediately" by the FHLBB here in the District of Columbia.

The fact that the FHLBB ordered the transfer "effective immediately"—2 days before the bank board met in Palm Beach—indicates that the FHLBB was contemptuous of the bank board and only sought its approval after the transfer had been ordered for "window-dressing" and in order to be able to claim that this transfer had been made with the approval of the bank board. To seek approval after the transfer had been ordered was adding insult to injury and, in my judgment, was a shabby tactic unworthy of use by a supervising Federal agency.

The "effective immediately" resolution was adopted by the FHLBB on December 8, 1971, stated that the board had "carefully considered" relocating the bank to Atlanta. However, the minutes of the FHLBB meeting on December 8, 1971, which entire meeting lasted only 15 minutes, disclose no discussion of the proposed move and the minutes of previous meetings are silent on this subject. So there was no discussion of the proposed transfer in any official meeting of the FHLBB. Moreover, although the FHLBB was aware of the fact that the Greensboro Bank Board met regularly each month, there is no

record of this proposed transfer ever having been presented to the bank board for consideration or discussion until after the "effective immediately" resolution had been adopted on December 8, 1971.

Mr. Preston Martin, Chairman of the FHLBB, and Mr. T. Hal Clarke, member of the FHLBB from Atlanta, both testified that the decision to transfer the bank to Atlanta was made after a study had been conducted and it had been determined that the move would promote efficiency and serve the best interests of the 698 member institutions. However, in our hearings on December 15, 1971, the FHLBB board members could not tell the committee:

First. How many of the 98 employees in Greensboro would move to Atlanta or how many would resign rather than move from Greensboro.

Second. How many of the 98 employees in Greensboro own their homes and would have to sell them in order to move to Atlanta.

Third. What it would cost the bank to make the transfer of all its activities to Atlanta.

Fourth. Comparison of the cost of living in Atlanta against Greensboro.

Fifth. What would be done with the brand-new bank-owned building in Greensboro, which cost \$1,736,694.72, and had been occupied less than 2 years.

In view of the inability of the members of the FHLBB to answer any of the foregoing questions at our hearing on December 15, 1971, it is pertinent to inquire what the so-called study consisted of? It would appear that there was very little study made and that the FHLBB arbitrarily decided to force the Greensboro bank to abandon that brand-new building in Greensboro and move the bank to Atlanta without even considering what the transfer would do to 98 employees and without even consulting the member institutions or considering the cost of the transfer.

It would be hard to find an example of a more arbitrary action, or a more cynical display of the use of raw power, by a Federal bureau to force its will upon the owners of a financial institution it had been given the responsibility of supervising.

LACK OF INDUSTRY SUPPORT FOR THE TRANSFER

In resolution No. 71-1304, which was adopted summarily by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board at a meeting here in Washington on December 8, 1971, lasting only 15 minutes, it was stated in the preamble that industry groups—meaning savings and loan associations—continued to express a desire to have the bank relocated. And in a hearing conducted by our subcommittee on this matter on December 15, 1971, it was stated by Mr. Preston Martin, Chairman of the Board, and Mr. T. Hal Clarke, the member of the board from Atlanta, that many industry people had expressed a desire to have this bank transferred and that many individual members of the bank's board of directors had expressed similar wishes.

In a subsequent hearing conducted by our committee on March 13, 1972, it was

again stated that at various meetings around the district many industry people had expressed a desire for this transfer and that it had been discussed with certain members of the Board of Directors of the bank, although it was admitted that these discussions did not occur in any official meeting of the bank board but at conventions and other meetings.

Although asked to identify the industry people with whom the proposed transfer had been discussed, Mr. Clarke was unable to name a single one. In the March 13, 1972, hearing, Mr. Clarke made the following statement:

I could conjure up, I suppose, from my memory some of the individuals (industry people) that I have talked to over the past at the various meetings.

But I repeat that he was unable to identify or name a single industry person who had recommended this transfer or with whom he had even discussed it.

Asked to identify members of the Greensboro Bank Board, other than those from Georgia and Florida, with whom the proposed transfer had been discussed, Mr. Clarke was able to identify only three: Mr. Clyde Perry, who lives in Florida and who was appointed to the Greensboro Bank Board by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; Mr. Forrest Abbott of South Carolina, who was also appointed to the Bank Board by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and Mr. John W. Stadler, member from the District of Columbia.

This record demolishes the argument that this proposed transfer had widespread support throughout the industry and shows conclusively that the subject was never even presented to the Greensboro Bank Board in any official meeting prior to the "effective immediately" resolution adopted December 8, 1971; and it also shows that only informal and casual conversations about the transfer were had with only three members of the Greensboro Bank Board and two out of the three were appointees of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

In this connection it is pertinent to point out that Mr. Clyde Perry, of Florida, who is a member—now Chairman—of the Greensboro Home Loan Bank Board by appointment of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, was one of the bank directors Mr. T. Hal Clarke said he had discussed this move with in advance. Now this same Mr. Perry was chairman of the building committee for the Greensboro Bank building from the initial planning to its completion and dedication in May of 1970. If there was any demand or sentiment from the 4th District Savings and Loan Associations to move the Greensboro bank to Atlanta, pray tell me why Mr. Perry did not voice that demand and sentiment before the new bank building was constructed in Greensboro at a cost of \$1,736,694.72? If the bank was ever going to be moved from Greensboro to Atlanta, prudence would have dictated that the move should have been made before that magnificent new building was constructed in Greensboro.

The predecessor chairman to Mr. Preston Martin of the FHLBB has stated that

there was no pressure or reported sentiment to locate the new building anywhere in the 4th District other than in Greensboro where the bank had been operated for the last 22 years. This plus the fact that Mr. Perry was chairman of the building committee when the new building was constructed in Greensboro, indicates that whatever sentiment exists within the industry to transfer this bank to Atlanta developed after Mr. T. Hal Clarke, who resides in Atlanta, took his place on the three-man Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

If there was indeed widespread demand throughout the industry to abandon the magnificent new building in Greensboro and transfer the bank to Atlanta, and if the Federal Home Loan Bank Board had been even remotely interested in the views of the members of the bank board or the member associations who own the bank, some advance notice would have been given that the Board was contemplating moving the bank so that objections, if any, could have been heard and considered. It would have been an easy matter to present this proposal to the Greensboro Bank Board because that Board met every month and, as I have already indicated, the December meeting had already been set to be held in Palm Beach 2 days following the meeting of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board here in Washington when the "effective immediately" resolution was adopted. This precipitous action causes the question to be raised—why the haste? What made it so necessary to act hastily on December 8, 1971, in the face of the fact that the bank board was to have a meeting 2 days later? If the FHLBB had been interested in obtaining the views of the bank directors, it could easily have waited until after the December 10 meeting of the bank board in Palm Beach and could have sent a representative to that meeting to explain the need for this transfer and to solicit, in advance, the approval and recommendation of the bank board.

These strange circumstances indicate a disposition on the part of the FHLBB to take official action, without any advance notice to anybody, so as to present the bank Board with a fait accompli—as much as to say that this is what we have done: we would like your approval as an afterthought or as window dressing so we can be able to say to critics that the bank Board approved the transfer; but since we have a legal right to do it, we have already moved the bank and you might as well approve it because it will not do any good to object to it now.

I think Mr. Mel Thompson was correct when he stated that the matter was presented to the bank board as a fact that had already been accomplished and that the only alternative then was to approve the action already taken or have a confrontation with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

COST OF THE MOVE

A recital of the following facts will prove conclusively that this move to Atlanta is going to be costly and extravagant:

The bank in Greensboro presently occupies a magnificent building, less than 2 years old, which cost \$1,736,694.72. It is located four blocks from the center of the business district of Greensboro and its accessibility is rated superior from all areas of the city.

It is a two-story office building with a basement. It was constructed to accommodate a third story if and when additional space should be required. The record shows that "the building was also constructed to look like new for 20 years with a minimum of maintenance."

The architects' estimate is that it would cost from \$500,000 to \$550,000 to add a third story. However, the bank officials in Greensboro have obtained an estimate from the construction firm that built the building that it would cost from \$720,000 to \$864,000 to add the third story.

There are 175 parking spaces on the lot upon which the bank sits, thus providing adequate parking for the 98 employees and for 75 additional employees if and when needed.

Although the Federal Home Loan Bank Board members who testified in our original hearing on December 15, 1971, could not at that time tell the committee what it would cost to transfer the bank to Atlanta, for the simple reason that figures on that subject had not been developed although the members testifying stated that careful study had been given before the move had been directed, subsequently the Board provided the committee with supplementary information answering the questions they could not answer in December. Included in the supplementary information provided the committee was an itemized estimate that the out of pocket cost of making the transfer of the bank and personnel to Atlanta would be \$339,768.

If you add the first year's rent for space in Atlanta, which will be \$279,852, it appears that the cost to the bank to move, plus 1 year's rent on the new space in Atlanta, will aggregate \$619,620, or just about what it would cost to add a third floor to the building. And I am speaking so far only about money costs and have not said anything at all about the disruption of the family life of 98 employees who will have to uproot themselves from Greensboro and move to Atlanta or resign. I will discuss the effect of this transfer on employees a little later, but before doing so I wish to point out another incredible act in the sequence of events which transpired.

I have previously stated that the Board members could not answer any questions about what this transfer would cost when we had our first meeting on December 15, 1971, but that subsequently they provided that information. The committee did not receive it until after Congress reconvened in January. We proposed to explore this move again in our regular hearings when the FHLBB was due to appear before subcommittee on March 13, 1972. The supplementary material consisted of a large volume of statistical and other information and it required some time to analyze. Moreover, since our regular meeting was coming up on March 13, the committee did not see any neces-

sity of scheduling a special hearing and planned to go into the subject more thoroughly in our regular hearing on March 13.

A few days before that hearing was scheduled, information came to the committee that the bank was on the verge of signing a lease for office space in Atlanta. I could not believe that the FHLBB would authorize or approve the signing of a lease in the face of our forthcoming hearing and before the committee had an opportunity to discuss the cost of the transfer and the other questions raised about it with the Board. Therefore, during the middle of the week prior to our scheduled hearing on Monday, March 13, 1972, I undertook to reach Mr. Preston Martin, Chairman of the FHLBB, on the telephone to urge him to have the signing of a lease held up until after our hearing on the following Monday, March 13, 1972. I was informed that all members of the FHLBB were out of town so I spoke with Mr. Arthur W. Leibold, Jr., the General Counsel of the FHLBB, and presented my request to him. He told me that he would communicate with the Board members and advise me of their decision later in the day. Late that afternoon Mr. Leibold called me back on the telephone and told me that the Board members held a long-distance telephone conference following which they instructed him to advise me that the Board respectfully declined to follow my suggestion to hold up the signing of a lease in Atlanta.

The committee was later provided with copy of a lease of four floors in an Atlanta office building which purports to have been signed on March 10, 1972. This is a 5-year lease of 44,776 rentable square feet at a rent of \$23,321 a month or \$279,852 per year. The 5-year cost of this space will be \$1,399,260. The attorney for the Greensboro bank wrote a letter to the FHLBB here in Washington, prior to the execution of this lease, inquiring as to the desirability of inserting an escape clause in the lease so that the bank could get out from under it in the event Congress should pass legislation introduced last December to require a plebiscite of the member associations before a home loan bank should be moved. Mr. Leibold responded to that inquiry in a letter dated March 6, 1972, advising the bank's attorney that such an escape clause would not be necessary and that the pending legislation "does not require the lease to contain a provision dealing with that contingency" and advising that the execution of a formal lease could proceed, subject to final approval by the FHLBB.

Here was a suggestion by the bank's attorney that an escape clause should be inserted in the lease in case the bank might be later prevented by law from occupying the space, and we have the spectacle of the Board's General Counsel telling the bank's attorney that an escape clause would not be necessary.

Here we also have the spectacle of the FHLBB declining to hold up the execution of a lease that might cost the bank \$1,400,000 in rent when it already owned a \$1,800,000 building in Greensboro which it was proposed to abandon—re-

fusing to hold up the execution of a lease for 3 days until the already scheduled hearing could be conducted.

Now I ask again why all of this haste? What was the spur that motivated the FHLBB to act so precipitously, and what caused the General Counsel of the Board to recommend against an escape clause?

Can it be that the owners of the space in Atlanta were so anxious to get their space rented at a monthly rental of \$23,321 that they were able to persuade the FHLBB to rush madly ahead to get that lease executed before we could continue our hearings on March 13?

I am informed, although I have not yet been able to verify the information, that the building in Atlanta was completed during the summer of 1971 and that the space finally rented to the bank has been vacant ever since.

BURDEN ON EMPLOYEES

As already indicated, on December 8, 1971, there were 98 personnel, including bank employees, examination staff, and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation employees, in Greensboro. Between the time of the announcement that the bank was being moved and our subsequent hearing on March 13, 1972, 10 of the bank employees had resigned, including a senior vice president. The supplementary information furnished the committee following that original hearing indicates that 47 of the 98 personnel in Greensboro have indicated that they will not move to Atlanta, including 36 bank employees, nine of the examiner staff, and two of the mortgage corporation people. Only 36 of the personnel on board in Greensboro have indicated that they will move to Atlanta, including 27 bank employees, six of the examination staff, and three of the mortgage corporation staff.

This indicates that more than half of the employees and personnel on board in Greensboro have declined to move to Atlanta; and no wonder, because many of them have lived in Greensboro for more than 10 years, own their homes and have their children in school, and have become participating citizens in the community life of Greensboro.

These people who are not going to move will have to be replaced by the bank if it moves to Atlanta and the bank will be handicapped for lack of experienced and trained personnel. One of the reasons advanced by the FHLBB as a reason why they were not concerned over the prospect of finding replacements in Atlanta for those who will not move is that the regional office of the Civil Service Commission is in Atlanta and its facilities could be utilized. But it turns out that one of the estimated cost items of the move is \$12,000 to pay an employment agency in Atlanta to find replacements for personnel who do not move.

But in addition to all this, the supplementary material furnished by the FHLBB shows that this move is going to impose a serious burden on the personnel who do move because of the substantially higher cost of living in Atlanta over Greensboro.

In Atlanta, for example:

Food is higher—103.5 against 93.4;

Housing is higher—115.7 against 99.5; Utilities are higher—99.1 against 96.8; Health care is higher—94.8 against 92.

Only an item called "miscellaneous" is shown to be higher in Greensboro than in Atlanta. The Board does not identify any items that make up "miscellaneous."

But the material furnished by the Board shows, in summary, that the overall composite index for Atlanta is 7-percent higher than for Greensboro.

In addition, there is no parking furnished with the lease in Atlanta whereas there are 175 parking spaces available in Greensboro. So all employees who use automobiles to get to work in Atlanta will have to find a place to park and pay parking fees.

There can be no doubt about the fact that this move, if finally consummated, is going to be a damaging blow financially to the 98 employees now located in Greensboro. It is unconscionable that a Federal bureau would run roughshod in this fashion over the rights of loyal employees and make such an important decision before even considering how expensive the move would be not only to the bank but to the employees, and without giving any consideration to the upheaval this move will cause in the family life of this large number of employees who I think have a right to expect better treatment than this at the hands of a Government bureau.

ACCESSIBILITY TO FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

One of the arguments advanced by the FHLBB to support their decision transferring the Greensboro bank to Atlanta is that Atlanta is the financial center of the South, and that the home loan bank needs to be in the same city with Federal Reserve Banks, Regional offices of the FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency, and regional offices of other Government agencies.

This argument is demolished by the following facts:

During the time the home loan bank has been in Greensboro, it has developed and progressed to the point where it leads all of the 12 district banks in savings inflow, increase in net assets, and number of mortgage loans closed. These facts indicate that the bank has not been handicapped in the past in being located in Greensboro.

Excluding Atlanta, home loan banks are located in only four cities around the country in which there are also Federal Reserve banks and regional offices of the FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency.

Home loan banks are located in seven cities across the country where there are no Federal Reserve banks and no regional offices of the FDIC or Comptroller of the Currency. These cities are: Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Des Moines, Little Rock, Topeka, and Seattle.

I caution Congressmen who represent these named cities to be watchful lest they wake up one morning and discover that the FHLBB, without any notice to the directors of the banks in those cities, and without any notice to the member associations, and without any notice to the bank employees, and without any notice to the public, has arbitrarily

moved the home loan bank to some other city.

CONGRESSMAN RODINO'S PROGRAMS ON HEALTH, CRIME, AND DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of the 92d Congress, I wish to report my activities and accomplishments of the House Judiciary Committee in the areas of health, drug abuse control, and crime prevention.

During my 24 years in Congress I have consistently supported measures to improve the health and welfare of this country. Likewise, the Judiciary Committee, of which I am ranking Democratic member, has approved major drug abuse and crime control legislation—The Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts of 1968. In early 1970, I developed a comprehensive three-pronged attack on the drug abuse problem.

NARCOTICS CONTROL—THE RODINO PLAN

First I introduced legislation to provide for medical supervision and treatment of every known addict. Second, this bill would enable law enforcement officials to conduct vigorous crackdowns on one of the most evil criminals in our society—the narcotics pusher. The third step in my program, which authorizes the President to cut off foreign aid to any country that fails to cooperate in halting international drug traffic, was enacted into law in February. I have emphasized that the problem of drug abuse must be attacked on all levels of government: local, national, and international.

On the local level, I have worked closely with DARE, New Well, and Odyssey House to promote programs for the successful treatment of drug addicts. On the national level, I have stressed for many years the need for providing the necessary funds to declare an all-out war on drug abuse.

As a result of my continuing efforts, the President has finally recognized that drug addiction is a national crisis requiring emergency action by the Congress and the administration. On the international level, I was the Chairman at the last scientific meeting of NATO's North Atlantic Assembly. This Assembly unanimously adopted my resolution to authorize international cooperation in attacking this problem and to provide funds in developing nonaddictive heroin substitutes. Also, as a result of my initiative, a United Nations fund for drug control has been created to study all aspects of this truly international problem.

CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL

One of the primary responsibilities of the Judiciary Committee is to enact legislation for the prevention and control of crime.

In 1965, my committee processed the Law Enforcement Assistance Act to strengthen crime control programs by

providing grants to local and State agencies. In 1971, all LEAA programs for New Jersey totaled \$11,870,000 and over 1,000 students are now enrolled in law enforcement education programs.

In 1968, I was one of the authors of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, which provides funds to State agencies to assist in the prevention of crime. One of the most important programs undertaken as a result of this act was a narcotics education project to warn the youth of this country of the dangers of drug abuse. Furthermore, my Judiciary Committee is planning to hold hearings next month on proposed changes to this act, to provide compensation to policemen and firemen who are injured and to the survivors of those killed in the line of duty.

RODINO'S HEALTH PROPOSALS

In this Congress I have introduced and promoted a number of measures that would significantly improve every citizen's opportunity to receive better health care.

A major proposal is my Health Security Act, to establish a national health insurance system covering all U.S. citizens. It would be financed by a combination of payroll taxes and general revenues. I strongly believe an adequate, comprehensive health insurance system is the next step after enactment of Medicare to assure all our citizens their right to proper health care.

Other measures are not as far reaching, but just as crucial in attacking specific health problems. One would create a national blood bank program to assure a supply of clean, healthy blood to everyone. It is vitally needed to halt the terrible increase in hepatitis and other diseases contracted from blood transfusions. Recently New Jersey's health commissioner warned that the odds are 99 to 1 that New Jersey citizens having blood transfusions will develop hepatitis.

Another of my bills amends the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide expanded aid for kidney disease victims who must rely on kidney machines for survival. I am glad to say it was included in the vocational rehabilitation bill that recently passed the House.

On another front, I have introduced a bill to attack the dreadful spread of venereal disease. Since the early 1960's syphilis and gonorrhea have increased alarmingly. Gonorrhea especially is a problem in Newark, which has the highest rate in the Nation. It is shocking to realize that experts estimate there is a huge "reservoir" of about 800,000 carriers spreading the disease without knowing they have it.

I have also sponsored a bill to authorize use of our maximum resources and efforts to find the cause and prevention for the sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS). The death of babies, occurring for no visible reason, is one of the most tragic problems facing parents. An estimated 10,000 babies die each year for no known reason.

Tuberculosis is still a menace, and unfortunately Newark leads all the country's cities in the rate of new TB cases. Nationally the rate was 18.3 persons for

every 100,000 people—in Newark it is 77 new TB cases. It is shocking that no funds were authorized for TB detection and control programs for this fiscal year, so I have urged the House committee to add money in the new health budget.

Nearing enactment is the sickle cell anemia bill to establish programs for detection and prevention of this blood disease that primarily affects black citizens. Another bill I recently introduced, and which I believe will be brought up soon, is to authorize similar programs for Cooley's Anemia. This is a related blood disease that mainly affects people of Italian and Greek descent, but now has spread to people of many origins because of intermarriage.

Finally, I have just introduced a major bill to launch an all-out attack against diseases of the heart and blood vessels, the lungs and blood, similar to the bill last year that made a national goal to wipe out cancer.

I am committed to the cause of bringing better health care for all Americans—it is literally a matter of life and death.

PROJECT SANGUINE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have called upon the Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, to eliminate Wisconsin as a possible site for Project Sanguine.

It is my belief that Project Sanguine either should not be built at all, or if it is built, should be moved to a location in Texas.

A careful reading of the environmental impact statement recently prepared by the Navy reveals that there would be substantial advantages economically, technically, and environmentally in moving the project to Texas.

Economically, the Navy's own statement indicates, construction costs would be cheaper on a site such as the open, flat, dry land in Texas. The need to build in or near the hills, rivers, streams, and lakes in Wisconsin would only add to the cost of building the project.

Texas' warmer climate would allow quicker and cheaper construction. In addition, a warm climate that is also dry would cut the maintenance costs on the system drastically. A site in northern Wisconsin would be hampered by long, cold winters, slowing construction. The harshness of the weather would further increase the cost of maintaining the system.

Several scientists, most notably, Dr. Alwyn Scott and Dr. Michael McClintock of the University of Wisconsin have raised serious questions about the technical feasibility of Project Sanguine. Among the problems cited by several scientists is the existence of rather wet soil on the Wisconsin site. The wetness of the soil can potentially interfere with the transmittal of Sanguine radio messages. This problem would clearly be solved by a move to Texas where the

land is very dry. Hence, there are technical advantages to a move to Texas.

There also appears to be lower environmental costs in the move to Texas. If built in Wisconsin, Project Sanguine would invariably cause disruption to water resources. The building of Sanguine would entail construction near and possibly under surface water resources. The building of Sanguine may also disrupt groundwater resources throughout northern Wisconsin.

Rather than move Sanguine to Texas, the other possibility that I hope Secretary Laird will consider is not building Project Sanguine at all.

Project Sanguine appears to offer only very marginal increases in the capability of the United States to communicate with its submarines at sea. Yet the economic and environmental costs of Project Sanguine remain unknown.

Already \$50 million has been spent on research and development for the project. In this year's budget, the Navy is requesting an additional \$12 million. The final cost of Project Sanguine is not clear but will surely run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Environmentally, the potential for damage for Project Sanguine is enormous. Water resources, plants, animals, and possibly even human beings could be harmed by long term exposure to a system such as Project Sanguine.

In addition to the economic and environmental considerations, a number of scientists have raised questions of technical feasibility. The Navy has never adequately answered its critics on any of these grounds: economics, environmental and technical feasibility.

Thus, I have requested Secretary Laird to remove Wisconsin from the list of possible sites for Project Sanguine and either move the project to Texas or not build Sanguine at all.

The letter to Secretary Laird follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 28, 1972.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to request that you eliminate Wisconsin as a possible site for Project Sanguine and choose between building in Texas or not building it at all.

A careful study of the latest environmental impact statement reveals economic, technical and even environmental advantages to a site in Texas.

I am still convinced that to build Sanguine would be a mistake. But it is clear to me from the impact statement that Wisconsin should be eliminated as a site for the project and the only sensible choice now is between building it in Texas and not building it at all.

The Navy itself admits in the impact statement that a site in Texas would result in lower construction cost because the site in Texas is flat and dry, not heavily forested like Northern Wisconsin.

In addition, I believe the changes for extensive environmental damage may be reduced by moving Sanguine to the flat, dry plains of Texas. This Texas site will not result in the destruction of vital water resources that would occur in Northern Wisconsin.

In order to build Sanguine in Northern

Wisconsin, it would be necessary to dig around, near, and possibly under the large numbers of rivers, streams and lakes in that area causing disruption of the natural flow of both surface and groundwater.

Careful study of the Navy's impact study also discloses that Texas' warmer climate would permit more rapid construction of the project cutting costs for both the building and maintaining the Sanguine system.

The site in Texas would probably be near large metropolitan areas such as Austin and Dallas-Fort Worth which would reduce transportation and material costs, according to the Navy. The Navy states in the impact statement that location of the system near a metropolitan area would cut costs.

As you may know, several scientists have raised serious questions about the technical feasibility of Project Sanguine. One of the factors that has been cited as a possible technical problem is the relative wet state of the Wisconsin land. The site in Texas by comparison is dry.

While many environmental questions remain unanswered, it is clear that economically and technically it would be wise to construct Sanguine at a lower environmental and economic cost or not build Sanguine at all.

I understand that the site in Texas is under serious consideration and that members of the Texas delegation have been informed about the possibility of Sanguine being built in their state.

I look forward to an early reply from you about whether the site for Project Sanguine would be moved from Wisconsin to Texas or if the Project will not be built at all.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. JONAS, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1914. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize involuntary active duty for Coast Guard reservists for emergency augmentation of regular forces; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. NEDZI: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 55. Joint resolution proposing the erection of a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of the Seabees of the U.S. Navy (Rept. No. 92-1032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11627. A bill to promote competition among motor vehicle manufacturers in the design and production of safe motor vehicles having greater resistance to damage, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 14693. A bill to retain November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H.R. 14694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

381. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.