

the remarks of the Senators aforementioned, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

**ORDER TO LAY BEFORE THE SENATE H.R. 1 AT AN HOUR TOMORROW TO BE DETERMINED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER**

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the close of routine business on tomorrow, the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 1, and that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and remain in a temporarily laid aside status until an hour during the day to be determined by the distinguished majority leader or his designee.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe that takes care of the various requests.

**PROGRAM**

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

The Senate will convene at 9 a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed the time indicated and in the order stated:

Senator WEICKER, for 15 minutes.  
 Senator WILLIAMS, for 10 minutes.  
 Senator CHURCH, for 10 minutes.

Senator EAGLETON, for 10 minutes.  
 Senator KENNEDY, for 10 minutes.  
 Senator HUMPHREY, for 15 minutes.  
 Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, for 10 minutes.

Senator SCOTT, for 10 minutes.  
 There will then be routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1, with the unfinished business, S. 3970, being temporarily laid aside and remaining in a temporarily laid aside status until an hour during the day to be determined by the distinguished majority leader.

Yea-and-nay votes may occur on amendments to H.R. 1. Tabling motions will, of course, be in order.

Conference reports, being privileged matters, can be called up and yea-and-nay votes could occur thereon.

**ADJOURNMENT TO 9 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 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 10:07 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 1972, at 9 a.m.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 3, 1972:

**IN THE ARMY**

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

*To be lieutenant general*

Lt. Gen. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., xxx-xx-x...  
 xxx-... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).  
 Lt. Gen. Charles William Eifler, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 xxx-... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).  
 Lt. Gen. John Macnair Wright, Jr., xxx-xxx...  
 xxx-... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).  
 Lt. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, xxx-...  
 xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 3, 1972:

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

Kenneth Franzheim II, of Texas, now serving as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, to Western Samoa, and to Fiji, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Tonga.

**IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE**

Diplomatic and Foreign Service nominations beginning Karl E. Sommerlatte, to be a Foreign Service Officer of class 2, and ending Paul B. Sullivan, Jr., to be a Consular Officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 19, 1972.

**U.S. CIRCUIT COURTS**

Frederick Pierce Lively, of Kentucky, to be a U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 3, 1972**

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
 Rev. Edgar E. Ferrell, Jr., First Baptist Church, Black Mountain, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we lift our hearts in gratitude for another day that brings opportunity to praise Thy name before men. We bow in earnest and sincere prayer to thank Thee for Thy blessing that we have known, as individuals and as a nation. We are grateful for the spiritual uplift that is ours as we rely upon Thee each day.

We recognize our shortcomings as we stand before Thee, that we are not always what we should be. We have neglected Thee; we have trusted in our own wisdom and strength; we have disobeyed Thy laws. For this we ask Thy forgiveness.

We remember the past as we look to the future, and we pray for Thy help to be able to build wisely upon the solid foundations of those who have gone before us. May that which we would claim for ourselves always be in subjection to Thy law, and may we seek in all things the righteousness of God that will exalt a nation.

In Thy holy name 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.

**MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT**

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 26, 1972:

H.R. 6503. An act for the relief of Capt. Claire E. Brou;

H.R. 7701. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands located outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in New Mexico.

H.R. 10702. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Fort Belknap Indian Community;

H.R. 13025. An act to amend the act of

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

H.R. 14896. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers, and for other purposes related to expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs;

H.R. 15495. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15577. An act to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges, and for other purposes.

On September 29, 1972:

H.R. 2185. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians;

H.R. 2589. An act to amend section 1869 of title 28, United States Code, with respect

to the information required by a juror qualification form;

H.R. 6204. An act for the relief of John S. Attinello;

H.R. 6575. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma," approved October 31, 1967 (81 Stat. 337);

H.R. 7616. An act to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard;

H.R. 9032. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Havasupai Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 91, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9135. An act to amend the act of August 19, 1964, to remove the limitation on the maximum number of members of the board of trustees of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden;

H.R. 10436. An act to provide with respect to the inheritance of interests in restricted or trust land within the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12207. An act to authorize a program for the development of tuna and other latent fisheries resources in the Central, Western, and South Pacific Ocean;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Walter Eduard Koenig;

H.R. 14974. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the compensation of the Federal representatives on the Southern and Western Interstate Nuclear Board;

H.R. 15865. An act for the relief of Richard L. Krzyzanowski; and

H.J. Res. 1303. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

On September 30, 1972:

H.J. Res. 1227. Joint resolution approval and authorization for the President of the United States to accept an Interim Agreement Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms; and

H.J. Res. 1304. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 1, 1972, as "National Heritage Day."

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 10857. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain national forest lands within the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in the State of New Mexico for certain private lands within the Piedra Lumbre Grant, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15883) entitled "An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for expanded protection of foreign officials, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 166) entitled "An act to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the

Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1852) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Gateway National Recreation Area in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. HANSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 667. An act to designate certain lands in the Lassen Volcanic National Park in California as wilderness;

S. 3203. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to extend under certain circumstances the expiration date specified in a power of attorney executed by a member of the Armed Forces who is missing in action or held as a prisoner of war;

S. 3959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain potential water resource developments; and

S.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to provide grants for Allen J. Ellender fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers to participate in a Washington public affairs program.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

#### MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).



Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MARGARIDA ALDORA CORREIA DOS REIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6504) for the relief of Margarida Aldora Correia dos Reis.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over with prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### EMILIA RUFFOLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10142) for the relief of Emilia Ruffolo.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### DONALD P. LARIVIERE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8952) for the relief of Donald P. Lariviere.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11045) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

#### ARLINE LOADER AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 341) for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

#### FREDI ROBERT DREILICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2725) for the relief of Fredi Robert Dreilich.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### DENNIS YIANTOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 65) for the relief of Dennis Yiantos.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MRS. GAVINA A. PALACAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4646) for the relief of Mrs. Gavina A. Palacay.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANKA KOSANOVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1777) for the relief of Anka Kosanovic.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### RESCUE MISSION ALLIANCE OF SYRACUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10552) for the relief of the Rescue Mission Alliance of Syracuse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10552

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

sum of \$5,935.28 to the Rescue Mission Alliance of Syracuse, Syracuse, New York, in full settlement of its claims against the United States for expenses and costs incurred in connection with preparations for new quarters and facilities in compliance with official notifications by the Government that its property was to be acquired for a United States postal facility. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FIRST LIEUTENANT THOMAS J. TREMBA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11749) for the relief of 1st Lt. Thomas J. Tremba, U.S. Army.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### JORGE ORTUZAR-VARAS AND MARIA PABLA DE ORTUZAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14128) for the relief of Jorge Ortuzar-Varas and Maria Pabla de Ortuzar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14128

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jorge Ortuzar-Varas and Maria Pabla de Ortuzar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct two numbers from the total number of immigrant admissions authorized pursuant to the provisions of section 21(e) of the Act of October 3, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN P. WOODSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10638) for the relief of John P. Woodson, his heirs, successors in interest or assigns.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot reserve the right to object.

Mr. HALL. We do not have the material and information available on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement is out of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

**AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL RESERVED MINERAL INTERESTS TO THOMAS A. BUSIO, RECORD OWNER OF SURFACE THEREOF**

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the fact that Calendar No. 204 has not been on the calendar for the 7 days required, that it may nevertheless be called.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the gentleman's request, I wonder if we could see a copy of the bill and the report. Are copies available?

Mr. LANDRUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. None of the official objectors have had an opportunity to see the report, inasmuch as it would ordinarily not be considered eligible, and therefore was understandably not distributed by the document room. This gives us a dilemma.

Although I appreciate the gentleman's request and am anxious to cooperate with him, I must determine, not only from the standpoint of the official objectors but also from that of an interested Member, if this involves any cost to the Federal Government, including the donation of land at other than fair market value.

Mr. LANDRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. LANDRUM. It involves absolutely no cost to the Federal Government, but, on the other hand, provides that all costs shall be borne by the purchaser and deposited with the Department of the Interior in advance of any consummation of the transaction. The Secretary of the Interior has made findings on several occasions that there are no minerals, and it is of the utmost importance in the getting title to the lands where considerable development is taking place outside of metropolitan Atlanta.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will say that the gentleman did contact me personally about this bill and made a similar statement.

May I ask further if there are any unfavorable departmental reports or if there is any area in which it does not meet the House's agreed to criteria of objection?

Mr. LANDRUM. None whatever, I can assure my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman, my friend from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. May I direct a question to the gentleman from Georgia?

Is the gentleman from Georgia saying to us that the Secretary of the Interior does not object to this?

I would like to have the assurance of the gentleman that the Secretary of the Interior does not object to this transaction.

Mr. LANDRUM. That assurance is gladly given, because it has been provided by a statement from him and the Department of the Interior and the chairman of the committee and the Department of the Interior has prepared the committee amendment.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALL. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10556) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land in Georgia to Thomas A. Busio, the record owner of the surface thereof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10556

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, sell, and quitclaim all mineral interests of the United States in and to the property situated in the State of Georgia and described in section 2 of this Act to Thomas A. Busio, the record owner of the surface thereof.

Sec. 2. The property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land lying or being in the Hog Mountain District, Militia District, Gwinnett County, Georgia, in Georgia Tenant Security Project of Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, bounded on the north by lands now or formerly owned by one Humphries; on the east by lands now or formerly owned by Josh White; on the south by land now or formerly owned by G. W. Thomas; on the west by lands owned and developed by the government and designated as Unit Numbered 86, of Georgia Farm Tenant Security Project and being Unit 87, Georgia Farm Tenant Security Project, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a two-inch pipe with brass cap, being a common corner of a tract hereafter described, of lands owned and developed by the government and designated as Unit Numbered 86, of Georgia Farm Tenant Security Project and being the northwest property line of lands now owned or formerly owned by G. W. Thomas; thence running north 25 degrees 23 minutes and 17 seconds west, 305.70 feet; thence north 54 degrees 49 minutes and 17 seconds west, 677.10 feet; thence north 33 degrees 59 minutes and 47 seconds west, 363.60 feet; thence north 11 degrees, 37 minutes west 1178.20 feet; thence north 26 degrees 56 minutes and 58 seconds east, 391.70 feet; thence north 59 degrees 28 minutes and 28 seconds east, 590.40 feet; thence south 19 degrees, 2 minutes 2 seconds east, 1813.59 feet; thence north 59 degrees 23 minutes and 7 seconds east, 1446.72 feet; thence south 35 degrees 49 minutes and 8 seconds east, 330.44 feet to the center line of

a dirt road; thence leaving said road and running south 45 degrees and 35 minutes and 13 seconds west, 2205.96 feet to the point of beginning. Except, however, that portion thereof lying within the right of way of State Highway Numbered 13. Said excepted portion containing 1.960 acres. The net acreage of this tract is 65.299 acres, more or less.

Sec. 3. In the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines that any land described in section 2 of this Act is not prospectively valuable for minerals, he shall convey the reserved mineral interests to the record owner of the surface rights referred to in the first section of this Act upon the payment of a sum of \$200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance; otherwise, the mineral interests shall be sold to such record owner of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum equal to \$200 plus the fair market value of the mineral interests as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

Sec. 4. Proceeds from any sale made under this Act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "directed" insert "in accordance with section 4 of this Act."

Page 3, line 13 through Page 4, line 3, strike out all of Sections 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary shall require the deposit of a sum of money which he deems sufficient to cover estimated administrative costs of this Act. If conveyance is not made pursuant to this Act, and the administrative costs exceed the deposit, the Secretary shall bill the applicant for the outstanding amount, but if the amount of the deposit exceeds the actual administrative costs, the Secretary shall refund the excess.

"Sec. 4. No conveyance shall be made unless application for conveyance is filed with the Secretary within six months of the date of approval of this Act and unless within the time specified by him payment is made to the Secretary of (1) administrative costs of the conveyance and (2) the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed. The amount of the payment required shall be the difference between the amount deposited and the full amount required to be paid under this section. If the amount deposited exceeds the full amount required to be paid, the applicant shall be given a credit or refund for the excess.

"Sec. 5. The term 'administrative costs' as used in this Act, includes, but is not limited to, all costs of (1) conducting such exploratory programs as the Secretary of the Interior deems necessary to determine the character of the mineral deposits in the land, (2) evaluating the data obtained under the exploratory programs to determine the fair market value of the mineral rights to be conveyed, and (3) preparing and issuing the instrument of conveyance.

"Sec. 6. Moneys paid to the Secretary for administrative costs shall be paid to the agency which rendered the service, and deposited to the appropriation then current. Moneys paid for the minerals or mineral interests conveyed shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.



# REPORT ON SALARIES UNDER ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am submitting the accompanying report on salaries of officers and employees of organizations funded under the Economic Opportunity Act as required by Section 610-1(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. The report was prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity and covers the fiscal year that ended on June 30, 1972.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 3, 1972.

## PEANUT DAY ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, as I hope all the Members know by now, today is Peanut Day on Capitol Hill, and whether you call them "goobers," "ground peas," or "peanuts," they are delicious by any name.

As I have previously advised the Members, in the dining room today we are giving away peanut soup, peanut pie, and cookbooks setting out a thousand ways in which to prepare peanuts.

This is fun, and it is interesting, but it has a very serious note, too, because peanuts account for some \$56 million of income in my district and in the State of Alabama, and they account for more than twice as much in Georgia. Peanuts are produced throughout the Southeast; Virginia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas also produce large quantities of peanuts.

In each of the cloakrooms there are also peanuts. This is a delicacy, and if the Members are not familiar with boiled peanuts, this is a golden opportunity you should not miss.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that by eating more peanuts the Members will have more spring in their step, more twinkle in their eyes, whiter teeth, better bones, and curlier hair, and they will find that sundown will come later in life.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 635, AMENDING THE MINING AND MINERALS POLICY ACT OF 1970

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 635) amending the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1491)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the Bill (S. 635) to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

That the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1876) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 3. In recognition of the fact that the prosperity and future welfare of the Nation is dependent in a large measure on the sound exploration, extraction, processing, and development of its nonrenewable mineral resources, the Congress declares that the purpose of sections 4 to 18 of this Act is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for and/or supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, exploration, extraction, processing, development, production, and the training of mineral engineers and scientists in the fields of mining, mineral resources, and technology.

"Sec. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior sums adequate to provide for each participating State \$200,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$300,000 for fiscal year 1974, and \$400,000 for each fiscal year thereafter, to assist the participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a competent and qualified mining and mineral resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency (hereinafter referred to as 'institute') at one college or university in that State, which college or university shall be the State tax-supported school of mines or a State tax-supported college or university which has or hereafter establishes an administrative unit such as a school or department wherein education and research are being carried out in the minerals engineering field: *Provided*, That (1) such moneys when appropriated shall be made available to match, on a dollar for dollar basis, non-Federal funds which shall be at least equal to the Federal share to support the institute; (2) if there is more than one such college or university in a State, funds under this Act shall, in the absence of a designation to the contrary by act of the legislature of the State, be paid to the one such college or university designated by the Governor of the State, to receive the same subject to the Secretary's determination that such college or university has, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work under this Act; (3) two or more States may cooperate in the designation of a single interstate or regional institute, in which event the sums assignable to all of the cooperating States shall be paid to such institute; and (4) a designated college or university may, as authorized by appropriate State authority, arrange with other colleges and universities within the State to participate in the work of the institute.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such institute to plan and conduct and/or arrange for a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated to conduct competent research, investigations, demonstrations, and experiments on mineral resource problems having industry-wide application, of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to mining and mineral resources and to provide for the training of mineral engineers and scientists through such research, investigations, demonstrations, and experiments. Such research, investigations, demonstrations, experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, exploration; extraction; processing; development; production of mineral resources; mining and mineral technology; supply and demand for minerals; conservation and best use of available supplies of minerals; the economic, legal, social engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of mining, mineral resources, and mineral reclama-

tion, having due regard to the interrelation on the natural environment, the varying conditions and needs of the respective States, to mining and mineral resource research projects being conducted by agencies of the Federal and State governments, and others, and to avoid any undue displacement of mineral engineers and scientists elsewhere engaged in mining and mineral resources research.

"Sec. 5. (a) There is further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 1973, and the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter, the sum of \$5,000,000 annually, which shall remain available until expended. Such moneys when appropriated shall be made available to institutes to meet the necessary expenses of specific mineral research and demonstration projects of industrywide application, which could not otherwise be undertaken, including the expenses of planning and coordinating regional mining and mineral resources research projects by two or more institutes.

(b) Each application for a grant pursuant to subsection (2) of this section shall, among other things, state the nature of the project to be undertaken, the period during which it will be pursued, the qualifications of the personnel who will direct and conduct it, the estimated cost, the importance of the project to the Nation, region, or State concerned, and its relation to other known research projects theretofore pursued or being pursued, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for the training of mining and mineral engineers and scientists, and the extent of participation by nongovernmental sources in the project. No grant shall be made under said subsection (a) except for a project approved by the Secretary of the Interior and all grants shall be made upon the basis of merit of the project, the need for the knowledge which it is expected to produce when completed, and the opportunity it provides for the training of individuals as mineral engineers and scientists.

"Sec. 6. Sums available to institutes under the terms of sections 4 and 5 of this Act shall be paid at such times and in such amounts during each fiscal year as determined by the Secretary, and upon vouchers approved by him. Each institute shall set forth its plan to provide for the training of individuals as mineral engineers and scientists under a curriculum appropriate to the field of mineral resources and mineral engineering and related fields; set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes of this title, and in no case supplant such funds; have an officer appointed by its governing authority who shall receive and account for all funds paid under the provisions of this Act and shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the 1st day of September of each year, on work accomplished and the status of projects underway, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary. If any of the money received by the authorized receiving officer of any institute under the provisions of this Act shall by any action or contingency be found by the Secretary to have been improperly diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State concerned and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be allotted or paid to any institute of such State.

"Sec. 7. Moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, in addition to being available for expenses for research, investigations, experiments, and training conducted under authority of this Act, shall also be available for printing and publishing the results thereof

and for administrative planning and direction. The institutes are hereby authorized and encouraged to plan and conduct programs under this Act in cooperation with each other and with such other agencies and individuals as may contribute to the solution of the mining and mineral resources problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act and, after full consultation with other interested Federal agencies, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its provisions. The Secretary shall require a showing that institutes designated to receive funds have, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work. The Secretary shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, participate in coordinating research initiated under this Act by the institutes, indicate to them such lines of inquiry as to him seem most important, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation by and between the institutes and between them and other research organizations, the United States Department of the Interior, and other Federal establishments.

On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain whether the requirements of section 6 have been met as to each State.

The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and work of the institutes in all States under the provisions of this Act. The Secretary's report shall indicate whether any portion of an appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

"Sec. 9. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relationship existing between any of the colleges or universities under whose direction an institute is established and the government of the State in which it is located, and nothing in this Act shall in any way be construed to authorize Federal control or direction of education at any college or university.

"Sec. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1973, increasing \$2,000,000 annually for five years, and continuing at \$20,000,000 annually thereafter, from which the Secretary may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions; private foundations or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of mining and mineral resources problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied. The Secretary shall, insofar as it is practicable, utilize the facilities of institutes designated in section 4 of this Act to perform such special research, authorized by this section, and shall select the institutes for the performance of such special research on the basis of the qualifications of the personnel who will conduct and direct it, the nature of the facilities available in relation to the particular needs of the research project, special geographic, geologic, or climatic conditions within the immediate vicinity of the institute in relation to any special requirements of the research project, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for training individuals as mineral engineers and scientists. The Secretary may designate and utilize such portions of the funds authorized

to be appropriated by this section as he deems appropriate for the purpose of providing scholarships, graduate fellowships, and postdoctoral fellowships.

"Sec. 11. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain the continuing advice and cooperation of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned with mining and mineral resources of State and local governments, and of private institutions and individuals to assure that the programs authorized in this Act will supplement and not duplicate established mining and minerals research programs, to stimulate research in otherwise neglected areas, and to contribute to a comprehensive, nationwide program of mining and minerals research. The Secretary shall make generally available information and reports on projects completed, in progress, or planned under the provisions of this Act, in addition to any direct publication of information by the institutes themselves.

"Sec. 12. Nothing in this Act is intended to give or shall be construed as giving the Secretary of the Interior any authority or surveillance over mining and mineral resources research conducted by any other agency of the Federal Government, or as repealing, superseding, or diminishing existing authorities or responsibilities of any agency of the Federal Government to plan and conduct, contract for, or assist in research in its area of responsibility and concern with mining and mineral resources.

"Sec. 13. Contracts or other arrangements for mining and minerals resources research work authorized under this Act with an institute, educational institution, or non-profit organization may be undertaken without regard to the provisions of section 3684 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, advance payments of initial expense are necessary to facilitate such work.

"Sec. 14. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exception and limitation as the Secretary may determine, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this section shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any rights which that owner may have under that patent.

"Sec. 15. There shall be established, in such agency and location as the President determines to be desirable, a center for cataloging current and projected scientific research in all fields of mining and mineral resources. Each Federal agency doing mining and mineral resources research shall cooperate by providing the cataloging center with information on work underway or scheduled by it. The cataloging center shall classify and maintain for general use a catalog of mining and mineral resources research and investigation projects in progress or scheduled by all Federal agencies and by such non-Federal agencies of government, colleges, universities, private institutions, firms, and individuals as voluntarily may make such information available.

"Sec. 16. The President shall, by such means as he deems appropriate, clarify agency responsibility for Federal mining and mineral resources research and provide for inter-agency coordination of such research, including the research authorized by this Act. Such coordination shall include (a) continuing review of the adequacy of the Government-wide program in mining and mineral re-

sources research, (b) identification and elimination of duplication and overlap between two or more agency programs, (c) identification of technical needs in various mining and mineral resources research categories, (d) recommendations with respect to allocation of technical effort among the Federal agencies, (e) review of technical manpower needs and findings concerning management policies to improve the quality of the Government-wide research effort, and (f) actions to facilitate interagency communication at management levels.

"Sec. 17. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Mining and Minerals Resources Research composed of—

(1) the Director, Bureau of Mines, or his delegate, with his consent;

(2) the Director of the National Science Foundation, or his delegate, with his consent;

(3) the President, National Academy of Sciences, or his delegate, with his consent;

(4) the President, National Academy of Engineering, or his delegate, with his consent;

(5) the Director, United States Geological Survey, or his delegate, with his consent; and

(6) not more than four other persons who are knowledgeable in the fields of mining and mineral resources research.

(b) The Secretary shall designate the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall consult with, and make recommendations to, the Secretary of the Interior on all matters involving or relating to mining and mineral resources research. The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with, and consider recommendations of, such Committee in the conduct of mining and mineral resources research and the making of any grant under this Act.

(c) Advisory Committee members, other than officers or employees of Federal, State, or local governments, shall be, for each day (including travel time) during which they are performing Committee business entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the appropriate Secretary but not in excess of the maximum rate of pay for grade GS-18 as provided in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and shall, notwithstanding the limitations of sections 5703 and 5704 of title 5 of the United States Code, be fully reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and related expenses.

"Sec. 18. As used in sections 4 to 17, the term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

And the House agrees to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
ED EDMONDSON,  
WALTER S. BARING,  
JOHN P. Saylor,  
PHILIP E. RUPPE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
FRANK E. MOSS,  
GORDON ALLOTT,  
LEN B. JORDAN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 635) to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, submit the joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying Conference Report.

The objectives and purposes of both the Senate passed bill and the House amendment are to provide a more adequate national program of mining and minerals re-



sources research through the establishment of research centers throughout the United States, and to promote the training of mining and mineral engineers, scientists and technicians by providing matching grants and other financial assistance. The differences between the Senate passed bill and the House amendment were mainly differences in legislative drafting and the program format.

The language agreed upon by the Managers is substantially the language of the House amendment with the differences agreed upon as follows:

(1) The Senate passed bill established this research and training program as an amendment to the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. The language of the House amendment initiates the program as a separate statutory enactment supplementing the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. The Conference Committee resolved this difference by the House receding from its position; whereupon, the Conference Committee recommended the adoption of the language of the House amendment as an amendment to the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970.

The Conference Committee is cognizant that the functions assigned to the Secretary of the Interior by the Mining and Minerals Policy Act have been delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources. The Conference Committee recommends that the program authorized by this legislation should also be administered by the Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources. The Conference Committee recognizes that between now and the year 2000, United States consumption of primary minerals is expected to increase fourfold. The nation is currently ill prepared to meet this challenge unless we direct our efforts toward providing the unprecedented quantities of minerals basic to our society and national security by advancing our domestic mineral technology and manpower. The Conferees believe that administration of this research and training program by the Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources will best achieve the objectives sought by having the research and training directed toward the solution of the most pressing problems facing the minerals industry by the people most closely associated with the manner and needs to resolve these problems.

(2) The second difference involved designating the eligible college or university within a State to participate in this program.

The Conference Committee adopted the language of the House amendment with a clarifying amendment to provide that the college or university within a State eligible to participate in this program shall be in the following priority: The State tax-supported school of mines, or the State tax-supported college or university which has or hereafter establishes an administrative unit such as a school or department wherein education and research are being conducted in the minerals engineering fields.

The Conference Committee adopted a clarifying amendment to the House amendment to provide that States which do not have a school of mines or a college or university with a school or department conducting education and research in the mineral engineering fields will have the opportunity to participate in the program by establishing such a school or administrative unit, and concurred in the understanding that "tax-supported" means assisted or maintained by State taxes, including the appropriation of State funds for construction, maintenance, and operation of such schools.

(3) The third difference between the Senate passed bill and the House amendment involved the authorization of appropriations. The Senate passed bill authorized appropriations for this program at a level of \$12,100,000 in the first year to \$23,750,000 in the fifth year; whereas, the House amendment authorized Federal expenditures of \$40,500,000 for the first year to \$48,500,000 in the

fifth year and \$45,500,000 annually thereafter.

The Conference Committee recommends the appropriation authorizations contained in the House amendment with an amendment reducing the annual sustaining grant to each participating State institute to \$200,000 in the first year, \$300,000 in the second year, and \$400,000 in the third year and subsequent years. The effect of this amendment was to reduce the estimated federal expenditures for the program by \$30.6 million in the first three years and \$5.1 million annually thereafter. The Conferees agreed to a program appropriation authorization of \$25.2 million in the first year, increasing to \$43.4 million in the fifth year, and \$40.4 million annually thereafter.

(4) The Conference Committee also recommended the language of the House amendment with an amendment in two other instances on minor differences between the Senate passed bill and the House amendment. The first instance involved the Secretary's discretionary authority to utilize appropriated funds for scholarships and fellowships. The Conference Committee merely changed the source of funding for this discretionary authority from the annual sustaining grant appropriation authorization to the appropriation authorization for additional research. The second instance concerned the Advisory Board. The Conferees adopted the language of the House amendment with an amendment to limit membership on the Advisory Board to nine and added the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
ED EDMONDSON,  
WALTER S. BARING,  
JOHN P. SAYLOR,  
PHILIP E. RUPPE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
FRANK E. MOSS,  
GORDON ALLOTT,  
LEN B. JORDAN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 399]

Abourezk  
Alexander  
Annunzio  
Badillo  
Baring  
Bell  
Bevill  
Boggs  
Brooks  
Cabell  
Celler  
Chisholm  
Clark  
Clay  
Conover  
Culver  
Davis, S.C.  
Dellums  
Diggs  
Dowdy  
Dwyer  
Edmondson  
Esch

Evans, Colo.  
Gallagher  
Gialmo  
Gibbons  
Green, Oreg.  
Gross  
Hagan  
Halpern  
Hungate  
Jonas  
Keith  
Lujan  
McClure  
McCormack  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McMillan  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nichols  
Patman  
Peyser

Powell  
Price, Tex.  
Purcell  
Reid  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rosenthal  
Roybal  
Runnels  
Scheuer  
Schmitz  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Sikes  
Springer  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Waggonner  
Wiggins  
Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further pro-

ceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

#### DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL BICENTENNIAL CIVIC CENTER ACT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16645) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16645, with Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GROVER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

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

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, for more than 100 years, there has been a crying need for a large facility in the Nation's Capital to house millions of Americans and foreign visitors who come to Washington; there has been a crying need to do something to revitalize the inner core city of our Nation's Capital.

The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives is privileged to bring for your consideration today legislation that we believe is designed to help raise up the social and economic well-being of our Nation's Capital. It is a bill that is designed to allow us to provide the Nation's Capital with a facility to make us a good host for our bicentennial activities within a short 4 years and to help memorialize a great President, the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower, a World War II hero, a great general, and a great two-term President.

The legislation before you, Mr. Chairman, would also name 29 Federal buildings throughout the country after deceased and retiring Members of both bodies of the Congress.

The legislation also would extend for a

2-year period authorization for official use of the office space in Boston, Mass., which is being used by our beloved and former Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for a number of years, people have advocated that a civic center be built in downtown Washington, D.C., with taxpayer funds from throughout the country. Your Committee on Public Works rejected that proposal and we bring to you today legislation that we believe is fiscally responsible. It upholds that great American tradition of people paying for facilities who use them.

The bill before you would allow the government of the District of Columbia to engage a private entrepreneur to put up approximately \$65 million to construct this facility and to pay back the cost through the revenues generated from the facility.

The only taxpayer money involved in this legislation would be a maximum of \$14 million, an amount that would be spread over an 8-year period, to help us in getting this facility ready for our bicentennial in 1976.

The facility you see here on this sketch is the new civic center in Los Angeles, Calif. In the first year of operation, this facility in Los Angeles generated \$90 million of new money for downtown Los Angeles.

We are having today over 20 million visitors coming to the Nation's Capital.

We know that this proposed facility will provide thousands of new jobs; we know that this proposed facility will, in fact, generate several hundred million dollars a year in much-needed revenue for the District of Columbia.

Now, while we are on the subject of revenue, I would like to point out that this year alone the Congress increased the appropriations to the District of Columbia by more than \$70 million as a Federal payment in lieu of taxes. That is a 36-percent increase in 1 year.

Why did we have to do this? Because the needs of the District of Columbia are growing as they require additional money for teachers, for pay increases in the salaries of firemen and policemen and additional capital improvements. If they do not collect that money locally, they have to call on the taxpayers of Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, and all of the other States.

We believe, after looking at this project for more than 4 years, that this will generate from \$100 million to \$300 million a year additional funds in the District of Columbia and thereby allow the District to be more self-sustaining and lower the Federal payment to the District. So you can see that the \$14 million maximum which would be authorized in this legislation is infinitesimal compared to the millions of dollars that this is going to generate in new taxes for the District of Columbia.

However, Mr. Chairman, far more important than dollars, this will allow our Nation's Capital to be the Capital that it should be.

This is the only city in the entire United States with 50,000 or more population that does not have a civic center, a place for people to meet and to con-

gregate and conduct business and to show their commercial wares, their ingenuity and know-how.

In addition to that, will it not be embarrassing if we in 4 short years are asking millions of Americans, millions of foreign visitors, to come to our great Nation's Capital only to find no place to house them and only to find that we do not have a facility where we can have the 50 States come together with exhibits and show what a great nation we are and how far we have come in 200 years.

Yes, we have deliberated long and hard to bring forth this proposal that is sound fiscally. This legislation was written with the expertise of the Office of Management and Budget and with the expertise of the President and his great staff and with the expertise of Mayor Washington, who is doing an outstanding job as Mayor of the District, and with a unanimous vote of the City Council, both Democrats and Republicans, and, yes, with the concurrence of the National Capital Planning Commission and, I am happy to say, with the concurrence of 85 percent of the land owners in Mount Vernon Square where this facility will be located.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, we have 55 cosponsors, Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. So it is truly a bipartisan measure to memorialize a great President and 29 distinguished Members who are retiring or are deceased Members of this and the other body.

Mr. Chairman, we feel this is meritorious legislation that should be passed.

Before I sit down I would like to tell you that we have good news today on another front. Over on my right you will notice the sketch of the proposed National Visitors Center at Union Station. We passed legislation in this body 4 years ago to allow private enterprise to put up \$16 million to renovate the existing Union Station and to build a parking facility there and to provide informational services for the millions of schoolchildren and adults coming here each year. Because of the bankruptcy of the Penn Central Railroad this project has been on the shelf for more than 2 years. I am pleased to announce today that the B. & O. and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads have bought out all of the interest in Union Station from Penn Central. The bankruptcy court and the judge have finalized all of the orders and all of the \$16 million required is now in the bank. Next week we will be advertising for construction bids to build a \$11 million parking facility immediately behind Union Station, over the tracks; a new modern compact rail station in the ground level of the parking garage with escalators running to the trains, two movie theaters on the inside of the station, cafeterias and restaurants, and all of those facilities required to make this a great National Visitors Center without one red cent of taxpayers' funds.

Three and a half million dollars will be paid yearly by the National Park Service. We will get all the revenue from the parking, and all the revenue from the sale of food and other goods and services which will far more than pay the \$3.5 million rent. At the end of the 25-

year period the taxpayers of this Nation will own the Union Station, the parking facilities, and the entire National Visitors Center without putting out one dime. I mention that today, as we discuss the proposed Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center because, you will notice, they are separated by some eight blocks, and we will have all of the various modes of travel coming into the Union Station. We will have helicopter service from the roof of the building, as you can see in the picture, and we will have parking facilities. We will also have two subway stops in the basement, a new compact railroad train station, and we will have eight lanes of surface traffic. So, regardless of how our constituents come into town, they will all funnel into the visitors center. There they can see films depicting the history of Washington and as well they will see scenes flashed on the screen of places of interest to visit in the Washington area. Every 5 minutes we will have 80 passenger buses taking people up around the Capitol and around the Mall, and over to Arlington and down to Mount Vernon, and various other places of interest.

How does that tie in with the proposed Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center?

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

When this facility is completed we can have organizations such as the National Education Association that is now bypassing Washington completely because there is no place where they can seat or feed 10,000 people. And then when they do come into town, instead of having to find a place here on the Hill to park so they can come and see their Congressmen, they can go down to the Visitors' Center, park their automobiles, and take a bus up here so that they can stop by and say "hello."

Then we will have shuttle service going directly over to the Eisenhower Center. These will tie these two facilities together, and our constituents will be able to see our faces instead of our backs.

By having the visitors' center open, and, incidentally, that is expected to be completed in less than 24 months, and we will have the other facility completed in less than 4 years, these will both be open at the time of the rush of people here in the bicentennial year of 1976. So if we can pass this bill today then we will have all of these facilities in place, one of them without costing one red cent of the taxpayers' money, and the other will not require one cent for at least 4 years. And then the \$14 million will be spread over an additional several years. So do not let anyone take the well of the House today and tell you that this is going to cost any money now, because we are not spending one red cent of the taxpayers' money in this center until after 1976. It will be built with private funds. It will take almost 4 years to build it. And then with the revenues we receive the day the doors open we will start generating enough money to pay off the debt at about \$5 million per year including interest.



We are providing funds of no more than \$14 million until the project gets moving under its own momentum.

Many people are saying that the Kennedy Stadium has been a boondoggle, and that we should not engage in another boondoggle. Others say that the Kennedy Center has been a boondoggle, but I want to point out to you, my friends, that the RFK Stadium is a one-use facility, and that is for sports. I am sure that my colleagues would not expect us to use this great hall if it did not have a roof on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to lay this argument to rest. We know, that this center will be used all year long. The circus can play there a month out of the year. We can have the ice capades, the horse show, the automobile show, the boat show, and many other things that your constituents and, yes, your own families, will not now attend out at the Armory or at the Colosseum. Additionally, we can have four or five different functions going on simultaneously. We can have all the inaugural balls under one roof. And during the bicentennial activities we can have all of the 50 States come in and show their exhibits.

This is a sound plan. It has been well thought out. It is supported by President Nixon, and the Mayor. It is supported unanimously by the Council and by every single agency of the District government.

Consequently, I hope that we can pass this bill unanimously. It has already passed the other body without one dissenting vote. Let us pass it today so that we can all be proud of our Nation's Capital.

In closing, let me personally thank the President, Mayor Walter Washington, Chairman John Nevius of the District of Columbia City Council, Delegate WALTER FAUNTROY, and the 55 other colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their great contributions and support in behalf of this historic proposal.

Thank you.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this pending legislation.

At the outset I should like to convey my thanks and appreciation, and the thanks and appreciation of all of the citizens of the metropolitan area of Washington to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) for his interest and concern in the welfare of our Nation's Capital. All of us know that it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that the Nation's Capital is properly operated and maintained. But when any individual Member of this Congress puts forth the additional interest and concern and the tireless effort that has been put forth by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) I think he should have that recognition and the appreciation and that appreciation expressed of the people of this area.

Mr. Chairman, the Convention Cen-

ter portion of this bill will actually accomplish four main objectives.

First of all it will beef up the economy of the Nation's Capital which is in need of some stimulation.

Second, it would provide a meeting-place for the many hundreds of potential conventions that would like to meet and convene here in the Nation's Capital.

Third, it would provide a proper facility for the commemoration of the bicentennial of this country here in Washington in 1976.

And lastly it would provide a proper and fitting and useful memorial to one of the great presidents of our beloved Nation, General Eisenhower.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) the total cost—the maximum cost of this facility to the Federal Government will not exceed and cannot exceed \$14 million. The total cost of the facility would be approximately \$65 million. Now I imagine that that would be the principal if not the only objection to the approval of this facility that may be expressed. I think that is a proper question for any of our colleagues to ask regarding this legislation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 400]

Abourezk	Evans, Colo.	Nichols
Annuzio	Flowers	Patman
Archer	Gallagher	Peyster
Ashley	Gialmo	Pike
Baring	Gibbons	Pucinski
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Purcell
Bevill	Gross	Quile
Biaggi	Hagan	Rallsback
Blanton	Hansen, Wash.	Reid
Boggs	Heinz	Rooney, N.Y.
Bow	Horton	Runnels
Burton	Hungate	Ruth
Clark	Lujan	St Germain
Clay	McClure	Scheuer
Conover	McCormack	Schmitz
Conyers	McDonald,	Schwengel
Culver	Mich.	Sikes
Davis, S.C.	McKevitt	Springer
Derwinski	Michel	Staggers
Diggs	Mink	Steiger, Ariz.
Dingell	Mitchell	Thompson, Ga.
Dowdy	Mollohan	Wilson,
Dwyer	Montgomery	Charles H.
Edmondson	Murphy, N.Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 16645, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 361 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) is recognized for the balance of his time, 2½ minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the quorum call I was pointing out that the maximum Federal cost to the Eisenhower Convention

Center project would be a total of \$14 million. And I realize that this could be the principal, if not the only objection that any of our colleagues could really have to the construction of this Center.

I can appreciate that, but if you stop to think of it, \$14 million is minor when you consider all of the other projects we have authorized all over this country and all over the world, for that matter. And it is a minor amount as far as our interest and our investment in the Nation's Capital is concerned.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, yielding to me. First I want to thank him for his great support of this Center over the years. He has been more than a cosponsor. He has been a guiding light. Is it not true that no money would be required from the Federal Government for the first 4 years?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his observation, and that is also what I wanted to emphasize, that this would be in the long run the maximum and the total amount that could be expended by the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement, then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot be indifferent so far as the economy and the welfare of the Nation's Capital is concerned. I think every one of us is interested in having an attractive and comfortable place for our constituents and for the millions of tourists who visit Washington each year.

We cannot permit the economy of the Nation's Capital to run down, because if we do then we will have to pick up the tab as there is nobody else to pick up the deficit in the cost of the operation of the Nation's Capital. We already have to underwrite the budget to provide operating expenditures for this city every year, whether we like it or not.

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in 1952, when I first came to the Congress, the Federal payments for the District of Columbia were \$20 million, and that consisted of about 20 percent of the operating budget of this city. Today, 20 years later, this year, this fiscal year, the Federal payment is \$190 million, or approximately 43 percent of the operating budget. This is a direct payment.

In addition to that, there are several hundred millions of dollars additionally that are being paid into the District government in order to have sufficient funds to operate this city each year. Incidentally, this increase in the cost of the Federal payment was not caused by inflation alone. The ratio of the Federal cost to the operation of this city has been

greater over the period of 20 years than the increase in the economy, as well as the increase of the cost of living here in the Nation's Capital.

What we have had here, and what we have seen during the past 20 years, has been a decay of the inner city. Businesses were moving to the suburbs, and potential businesses were refusing to come to the Nation's Capital.

So what you get down to, Mr. Chairman, and what we need to do, and what this bill does in part, is to help to stop that trend, to reverse the trend, and to slow down the consistent increase in the Federal payment that we will have to make each year. The fact of the matter is that we will have an additional increase in the Federal payment that will be necessary to pay for the pending increase in the teachers' salaries, and there are other proposals that will be coming forth in the next Congress.

So, as I say, the main purpose of this bill and the main objective of this bill would be to reduce—and I repeat—to reduce the necessity of a larger Federal payment in the years to come.

This is an investment in this city. It is not a guarantee, that it is going to be 100 percent perfect. But we have to do something.

This facility would produce a large amount of income for downtown Washington that we need to stimulate the economy and revitalize the business community. It would produce at least \$112 million a year in additional revenues for this city, which will produce a minimum of \$6 million in additional taxes. This means \$6 million less of Federal payment in the years to come, even using these minimal figures—and these are minimal estimates that we have come up with as a result of years and years of study and years and years of planning. We have maximum assurance possible that this facility when constructed will be what is necessary to revitalize and stimulate the economy of downtown Washington in addition to producing the thousands and thousands of additional jobs as referred to by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY). It has the support of every level of government from the President, the administration, the Bureau of Management and Budget, the District of Columbia, and every segment of industry here in the Nation's Capital. You might say—well, let the community build the Center—but we are the community and there is no one else to turn to in order to get the help and the cooperation in doing the job.

In offering my views on what should be a fitting memorial to one of our greatest Americans, I do so with deep humility, for it is extremely difficult to find words eloquent enough to express my admiration for our late President.

I served under him in war, and, along with millions of other American men, I had more than one occasion to depend on his wisdom and leadership as commander of our forces fighting Nazi Germany. Then, as one who came to Congress when he was first elected President of the United States, I again had many opportunities to rely on that wisdom and leadership.

The example of strength and resolution which always radiated from this great but modest man must not be lost to this Nation. I am proud, therefore, to be a cosponsor of legislation which will erect in his memory not just an edifice of stone and steel, but a living, useful and needed memorial, to be used for conventions, trade shows, inaugurations, and other civic, national, and international events important not only to the residents of the District of Columbia but to all the people who visit the Capital of the greatest Nation on earth.

Construction of the Eisenhower Center now will make it possible for the District of Columbia to accommodate the millions of Americans and foreign visitors who are expected to visit here during the 1976 bicentennial. Its completion by that year is essential if the Nation's Capital is to be the focal point, as it should be, of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of our country.

The Center will also make it possible for the Capital City to host many major national and international conventions each year, activities which will serve to generate jobs for several thousand people and bring an estimated \$112 million annually in new revenue, \$6 million in direct taxes resulting from spending by convention groups.

H.R. 16645 authorizes a maximum of \$14 million for Federal appropriations to the District Government to ease the financial burden on the District budget during the initial years of the project. The Committee on Public Works has made it quite clear that there will be no recommendation for additional funds. The Center is to be built and financed by private developers under a purchase contract backed by the full faith and credit of the District of Columbia government. Under this method of financing, private developers will secure financing and build the facility.

The city will be authorized to use the developers' money to acquire the property. No payments will be due the developers until after the Center is ready for occupancy and revenues are coming into the city, then payments amortizing the developers' investment and providing a reasonable rate of return are made by the city for a maximum of 30 years. Once the developers' investment has been repaid, the city will then own the Center.

The site chosen for the Center by a coordinated study of Federal and local agencies as most advantageous for such a facility, originally covered 25 acres, but has now been reduced to 10 acres to obviate the need to remove the neighboring Chinese community and a group of downtown businesses. The total cost is limited by the legislation to \$65.5 million. Current plans include an exhibition area of 300,000 square feet, and that there will be within the building 31 additional meeting rooms ranging in size from 100 to 3,500 capacity, with the exhibition area itself designed so that it can be easily converted into a large meeting area which would accommodate up to 20,000 or more people.

Mr. Chairman, Washington, D.C., is the only one of this Nation's 24 largest cities without a major civic center. I

doubt if any Member present here today feels that this Nation's Capital does not need or should not have such a center. There may be those who say we should wait until some future date for its construction, but all acknowledge that it should be built. I believe it should be built now, and ready for utilization in 1976. I believe our committee colleagues have chosen the best way to build it, utilizing private funds in a manner patterned after the process authorized by Congress in amendments to the Federal Public Buildings Act, and guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the government of the District of Columbia. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 16645.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I can think of no more fitting endorsement of this legislation than that expressed personally by President Nixon in a recent letter to the Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY, the able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois who has worked so long and so hard to bring the Eisenhower Memorial Center to fruition. The President wrote:

This legislation has my full support, and I urge its early enactment.

The development of the Eisenhower Bicentennial Civic Center will provide new jobs, new economic development, and new life in the downtown area of our Nation's Capital . . . such a development is essential to both the future economic viability of Washington's central core and the city's continued vitality as the seat of the national government. The Center will encourage thousands of citizens from across the nation to visit our city, a factor which takes on special significance as we approach the 1976 Bicentennial in which the Washington metropolitan region will play a major role. Furthermore, . . . the Center would be an active and impressive memorial to former President Eisenhower.

Mr. Chairman, this project also has the support of the overwhelming majority of the citizens who live and work here in our National Capital, as attested by a recent editorial in the Washington Post, which said, in part:

The prospects for revitalizing downtown Washington received a big boost . . . when the Senate, without debate or dissent, approved the bill authorizing construction of the District's long-sought convention center at Mount Vernon Square. If the House concurs . . . the District will have a good chance to complete this vital project before 1976, giving the Nation's Capital not only a major facility for bicentennial functions, but also a permanent catalyst for tourism, business expansion, and the revival of the central city.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 16645—to calling on the American taxpayers to subsidize the construction of a convention center for the city of Washington, D.C.

As one of the authors of the minority views on this project from the Public Works Committee, I want to urge my colleagues to study that dissent closely.



I would like to preface my specific objections with the observation that—especially in the eyes of the taxpayers and voters we represent—this convention center project is altogether too similar to the previous white elephants we in Congress have been bamboozled into paying on; namely, the Kennedy Stadium and the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. As our minority views show, the taxpayers could easily become embroiled in bailing this project out—just as they have had to bail out these other two abortive schemes. And I am personally somewhat tired of apologizing when the Congress of the United States is made to look the fool. We preach fiscal responsibility and concern for the plight of the hard-pressed taxpayer, but then most shamefacedly admit that we have committed the taxpayer to paying for a project whose original sanguine prospects somehow just failed to materialize. What I mean is—and I have pointed this out before in the hearings on this bill—I have little doubt that the backers of this convention center complex themselves believe that all the projections and glowing futurisms are accurate and that they should be given a chance to prove it. I also have little doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the backers of the two aforementioned memorials were equally sincere in their predictions. But, as my colleagues are aware, the taxpayers are picking up the interest tab on the RFK Stadium to the tune of \$831,000 a year—after we had been assured the whole thing would not cost our constituents a dime.

Now, I know that the people of the Fourth District of Kentucky have complained loud and long to me about their Congress saddling them with the burden of these successive fiascos—and I dare say that my colleagues have heard similar complaints. I have total sympathy with those who complain about the profligacy and bumbling of this body with regard to such projects.

My colleague, Mr. GRAY, has circulated a letter from the President dated August 17 of this year in which Mr. Nixon urged the project's importance to the forthcoming bicentennial celebration in Washington. With all due respect—as the minority position makes very clear—the project, even by the most optimistic calculations, would not be completed until after July 4, 1976. This means, of course, that the only contribution this project will make to the already fouled-up bicentennial operation is to foul it up further by clogging traffic and causing noise in the middle of summer around construction in the heart of town.

There are, of course, other sites in the District of Columbia which could be used for this complex—and without the need of displacing families, taxpaying businesses, and churches. The advantages of another site are obvious. Besides not eliminating a badly needed source of tax revenue, we could save the money required to relocate all the families, businesses, and so forth in this presently selected area. But regardless of the site, the project is ill-advised.

Consider another point. And that is, that—granting the validity for a moment the contention that this convention cen-

ter will draw all the conventions its proponents say it will—these conventions will be lured away from other cities—cities some of my colleagues represent—and which count on that revenue just as much as the District of Columbia might. The taxpayers of other cities, Mr. Chairman, well might find themselves in the uncomfortable position of subsidizing their competitor. And I do not want to be in the position of having to explain why I countenanced such a paradox.

I think, in sum, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues can see that the disadvantages of this questionable project far outweigh the illusive advantages which have been urged on us in slick and glittering terms. It is simply not consistent with our professed desire to cooperate in saving the taxpayers' money at this economically trying time to commit the taxpayers so irresponsibly to another such undertaking.

Let me interject, before closing, a point in conjunction with an objection I have had to this project from the very beginning. I have urged that we consider traffic and overall congestion in selecting the site for this enormous complex. A site more accessible, with more and cheaper parking facilities does not seem at all out of line to me. Be that as it may, I wish my colleagues to consider what rush hour traffic will be like around here when we have the additional influx and competition of 20,000 conventioners down at the bottom of the Hill. You think it is bad now.

I believe that each of the aspects I have touched on, plus the questions and objections raised in the minority views, plus the human concerns involved with the people in this proposed area should be more than enough reason for us to reject this proposed Convention Center.

And remember, your opponents may ask why you supported a project which was not going to be let to the "lowest and best" bidder. As a matter of fact—a project on which no bidding is required.

Mr. Chairman, this project has a peculiar aroma.

I urge my colleagues to employ some fiscal, humane, and political perspicacity to this question—and to reject H.R. 16645.

Thank you.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman who is a delegate from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16645 which would, among other things, provide for the construction of a living memorial to the late President Eisenhower in the form of a civic center in the heart of the Nation's Capital. Of the 24 largest cities, Washington, D.C., is alone in being unable to provide adequate facilities for the national and international conventions which contribute substantially to the tax base and to the employment base of every other city.

The Eisenhower Center will help remedy that plight as well as guarantee the continuation of the efforts that will revitalize the downtown area. The Center will serve as the catalyst that will provide the base for the level and quality

of development that has made the area west of 15th Street very successful and very desirable.

We anticipate that the annual yield from the additional conventions will exceed \$50 million per year with a direct benefit to the District of more than \$3 million per year. Without the Center, none of this is possible. More than 3,000 persons will be employed with the Center and more than 2,500 jobs will be created during its construction. Yet, the Federal contribution will be a maximum of \$14 million. That will be used only to the extent that the center requires start-up funds for the first several years. The resultant rejuvenation of the area will bring additional tax benefits as well as employment and housing. There has never been a greater opportunity for this city than the creation of a major facility in the heart of downtown Washington. Unlike the stadium and the opera house, the Eisenhower Center will be right in the heart of the business district. It will serve the tourists and the citizens of the city as they move about in their daily business, as they visit the exhibits, and as they patronize the shops, the stores, and worship in the nearby churches. This center has been planned with the community in mind. It was moved to accommodate the needs of the Chinese community and a thriving business district. It is close to the bus terminals that provide access to all points in the Nation, particularly the eastern seaboard. It is within one block of two METRO stations which will provide access for visitors who are not using automobiles; and, it is near all of the existing hotels as well as those which are being planned.

I am enthusiastic about the Center; just as enthusiastic as everyone else in the city. The Mayor, the board of trade, the city council, RLA, as well as the National Capital Planning Commission have all endorsed the proposal. I join them and urge you to support this most worthwhile project.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the distinguished Delegate from the District of Columbia, is it not his feeling that when this is fully operational it will be generating new jobs and new hotels and that this will be the catalyst for a great deal of such activity and that it would be conceivable we could lower the Federal payment now required to be coming from all 50 States?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am not really that confident on it to answer that, but I am confident it will enable us to expand our capabilities.

Mr. GRAY. I say, is it not conceivable that this could generate additional revenues so that will be possible?

Mr. FAUNTROY. It is conceivable. There is no question it will generate additional revenues in a whole area that has defied development and rejuvenation thus far.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says this new center would enable Washington, D.C. to attract some additional conventions which are not now available to the city. Could he perhaps list some of these major conventions that we cannot now attract?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me I will be glad to answer that.

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, we have a list of 160 major organizations that are now bypassing Washington, D.C. because there are not enough facilities to accommodate 10,000 delegates and up. As an example, we have a letter from the National Education Association. The educators from all over the country would love to come to Washington. In fact they are airlifting their Washington staff all out throughout the country at a cost of a quarter million dollars a year because there is no place they could have their association meet here.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what this means is that Washington, D.C. will be taking a convention away from New York City or from Fort Worth or Los Angeles or some other place and bringing it to Washington.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman had studied conventions as we have in this bill, he would know generally the large organizations do not go to the same city twice. It is usually a musical chairs proposition. There are literally thousands of different conventions being held each year.

What we take in from here would be very, very small indeed from an individual city. The Shriners may meet in Dallas this year, and next year perhaps Chicago or some other place. In addition, we are missing an estimated 25 to 50 international conventions which no city in the country has at present.

We feel that if we have a large facility here, we can get the international groups started in the United States and have a reverse result. They might go to Iowa, Kansas City, Los Angeles next year, if they start. We had the Dulles International Airshow, Expo 72, as a good example. I have talked to a number of exhibitors from France and Great Britain and other places who stated that they would like to come here for international exhibits.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell me whether the air show at Dulles International Airport was a financial success? Did that generate a lot of funds for the Dulles Airport or the United States, or did it cost the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. GRAY. The Dulles Air Show, according to the Secretary, was a fantastic success. It was unfortunately marred with some accidents, but as far as the economics, it far exceeded expectations.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I find certain aspects of this legislation under consideration to be rather humorous, or certainly ironic. I heard Mr. GRAY, the distinguished proponent of this bill, plead for a convention center so that we could bring educators among others down here for education conventions. I have not had any trouble communicating with the educators in my district. Every single time there is a bill or act, 10 or 15 of them seem to show up in my office either here or in the district. I do not think there is any particular need to have a convention center so that we can get more educators down here to speak to themselves and speak to the Members of Congress.

I find another humorous, ironic twist in the bill. For those of you who have not read it, I hope you do so before you vote. Also, I hope you read our dissenting views. Another irony in this bill is that it is being used as a vehicle to pay homage to some of our distinguished Members. I believe the ground rules are—the gentleman from Illinois can correct me if I am wrong—if a Member hangs onto his job for 10 years or more, he is going to get a building named after him.

I notice that one of the beneficiaries in this particular part of the bill, and why it was put in this particular vehicle, I can only surmise, but I find it rather ironic that in this bill we are going to pay homage to Doc HALL. I find it rather ironic that we are loading up the taxpayers with the expense of this bill, and in the same bill paying homage to Doc HALL. Doc is sitting here—as he has done so faithfully as a watchdog of the Treasury. I do not know if he is going to vote for or against this bill—it is going to be most interesting this afternoon to see how the good Doctor does vote on the bill and on the motions which we are going to offer.

I find it ironic to see that we have a great big monstrosity like this in Washington, and in the same bill we memorialize Doc HALL. It is amusing, and I see the Doctor smiling; he, too, appreciates the humor.

I find another thing: Who comes up here and asks to put 10 more acres of cement smack in the heart of the District of Columbia? Of course, officials from the District of Columbia.

They do not want any more of the people getting into this 10 acres of concrete. They will not let us build the Three Sisters Bridge so that people can travel around the District or through the District, but they want 10 acres of cement right in the heart of the District.

Where is the Washington Post? Every time we talk about paving over this Nation with highways, the Washington Post lights up like a Christmas tree. So does the Evening Star. There is outrage if we build highways, but this is the crowning irony. The Public Works Committee is spreading 10 acres of cement and pavement in the heart of the District, and doing it in the names of Doc HALL and General Eisenhower and other fine Congressmen mentioned here, and with the blessing of those who are outraged when we improve highways.

Let us all have a good laugh at this time of the year, because if we laugh at mortal things it is that we may not weep.

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I do not have time to yield to my friend.

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman, because I want to know what he has to say. He is also my chairman.

Mr. HAYS. I want to say that the gentleman's statement about the Washington Post lighting up like a Christmas tree would be more proper if we said it lights up like the red star over the Kremlin.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Hallelujah. I yielded to the right man. I am not going to bore the Members by reading the dissenting views, because I do not have the time to read the dissenting views. I will, of course, ask leave to put them in the RECORD later.

The dissenting views make several points which are very important. I want to echo one that is important; that is, the question of priorities.

We are all talking about priorities. Some of our opponents are going to talk about priorities.

Speaking about the Washington Evening Star, last week they had an editorial on Capital projects for the Capital City, in which they outlined \$900 million worth of unbuild buildings which needed building, such as schools and hospitals, and they pleaded with the Congress to come forth with the money over a period of 10 years to build these buildings.

I wrote the Evening Star a letter, and suggested that if they really meant what they said, if they wanted these projects, and wanted the Congress to do them in an orderly manner—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman yield me another minute and a half?

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Time comes tough if one is against this project.

The Washington Evening Star, of course, did not bother to print my letter. It is too bad they did not.

As to the editorial, I will ask leave to have that printed in the RECORD, later with my letter.

The editorial makes the point that the problem of long-term budget priorities must be faced now. Many new and improved facilities around town are badly needed, and some are long overdue. Yet each project should be weighed carefully against other priorities. It would be tragic if this year's decisions make the next decade's budgets so tight and so inflexible that, for instance, tomorrow's children might be denied new teachers for the brand new buildings we build.

I see present on the floor the chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee. He will confirm that there are these unfilled needs.

If we take this money, it is not only \$14 million outright. It is the yearly



maintenance expense that will also have to come out of the District of Columbia budget, over and above what we are going to pay for this glorified convention center for people to come down, to have a good time, to clutter up the streets. We will be denying the people of the District needed facilities, as outlined in the editorial.

Mr. Chairman, by leave hereafter obtained our dissenting views follows as well as the Star editorial and my letter to the Star which has not been published:

#### DISSENTING VIEWS ON H.R. 16645

We oppose those provisions of H.R. 16645 which authorize the construction of a Civic (Convention) Center in the District of Columbia. We do so for the following reasons:

1. *The project is essentially a local business-generating enterprise for which direct or indirect Federal financial participation or guarantees are unwarranted.*

The primary incentive and rationale put forward to justify the construction of a Civic Center is that it will stimulate business in Washington. It will allegedly do so by attracting large conventions to the city which otherwise would go elsewhere for lack of adequate local facilities to handle them.

We agree that the promotion of private business within the District of Columbia is desirable. More people coming to Washington will undoubtedly mean more business for local entrepreneurs—hotel and restaurant owners and other commercial enterprises. And, without a doubt, increased business will produce more jobs in this community (which however, would be reflected in less jobs in those communities throughout the United States which lost such conventions).

But the business and jobs which would be developed are primarily local in nature and import. Whether the Federal Government, through Federal taxes raised nationwide, should become involved in subsidizing the means to create them is questionable. Yet, under the terms of H.R. 16645, Federal credit and tax revenues are decidedly involved. Besides advancing \$14 million of so-called start-up monies to launch the Civic Center when completed (Sec. 4(b)), the full faith and credit of the District is pledged in section 3(e) in the event of a failure or default of the Center to meet its obligations. Thus, if the project, like the illfated RFK stadium, is not a financial success, the District of Columbia will be obligated to indemnify private entrepreneurs and others who put money into the project.

We are mindful that the District generates approximately 70% of its operating revenues through local taxation. But the remainder of its budget is made up of direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury. This financial arrangement, with the Federal Government making a substantial contribution each year to the District, is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. Accordingly, should any additional financial burden be added to the District requiring substantial outlays under the full faith and credit pledge, such sums will predictably have to be paid out of the Federal Treasury. There are simply no surplus District revenues from which such sums could be drawn.

2. *The Civic Center will not contribute measurably to the Nation's bicentennial celebration.*

A secondary argument advanced to justify construction of the Civic Center is that it will play a role in the Nation's upcoming 200th birthday celebration. Proponents apparently believe that the Center will be used in connection with the celebration. If this project had been authorized a year or two ago, there might be some substance to this assertion. Indeed, the prospect of the timely completion of a showplace facility in which bicentennial activities could take place

might help fill the vacuum created by the abdication and withdrawal of other cities around the country from bicentennial connected projects. But sadly, even the most optimistic forecasts indicate that completion of the Civic Center cannot be expected until after July 4, 1976—how much later no one can truly say. Under the circumstances, it would be unrealistic to suppose that the facility could play a meaningful role in the bicentennial.

3. *Cost estimates for construction of the project are open to question.*

If, as is often asserted, the past is prologue, costs for the Civic Center could escalate several fold prior to completion. That is what happened with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Indeed, before the final voucher was submitted on the latter project, costs had escalated four times from \$5 million to something over \$20 million. If history repeats with the Eisenhower Center, the overall cost of the facility could be staggering.

As proposed to the Committee, the project is currently estimated at \$65 million. A four fold increase in the cost of the Civic Center would come to a grand total of \$260 million. Over a thirty year period (at 8% interest) the overall cost of the project could rise from the present estimate of \$135 million, a total substantially exceeding half of billion dollars. Furthermore, if start-up costs underwent a similar escalation, costs would rise an additional \$60 million.

4. *The record of the District of Columbia in managing enterprises of this sort is questionable.*

Illustrative of this point, is the unfortunate record of the RFK Stadium. Original estimates to the Congress for that project ranged between \$5 and \$6 million. It ended up costing over \$20 million. Interest on the bonds issued to cover the cost of construction of the stadium amounted to \$831,000 annually. Yet, the stadium today is not earning enough to cover such interest payments. As a result, although the Congress was solemnly assured at the time it approved the stadium project that it would not cost the American taxpayers a single dime, the Federal Government, because it had pledged its full faith and credit, is now being called upon to pay the Stadium's interest deficit (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 19905, June 7, 1972).

Neither the District of Columbia nor the American taxpayer can afford a repetition of this type of financial fiasco.

5. *The District of Columbia is already the beneficiary of massive Federal assistance for essentially local projects.*

Besides the already mentioned JFK Center for the Performing Arts and the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium, the District of Columbia is the recipient of a long list of Federal projects of primarily local interest and benefit. The job and tax generating Federal facilities scattered throughout the city all come under this heading. Perhaps the piece de resistance of all such projects is the subway system now under construction. Federal authorizations and credit back this massive project to the tune of over \$4 billion dollars. Under the circumstances, the District would seem to have more than its fair share of taxpayer supported facilities. To add yet another essentially local project to this long list seems both unfair and unwarranted.

6. *The purchase contract arrangement authorized by this bill virtually eliminates legislative oversight by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.*

Construction of the Civic Center under the purchase contract arrangement proposed in this bill means that, for all practical purposes, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate will have only minimal say and supervision over this project. This is so under the provisions of the Public Buildings Acts Amendments of 1972 recently ap-

proved by the Congress and signed into law by the President. Without continuous monitoring, a project like the Civic Center could easily get out of hand, as have other similar undertakings in the District. If that happens, Congress would have practically no power of supervision and reform, despite the fact that it will have to indemnify those who stand to lose if such excesses occur. In this connection, it is interesting to note that an amendment in Subcommittee to require that contract be let to the "lowest and best bidder, as determined by the Commissioner," failed.

7. *In view of the huge Federal deficit, and in view of the many other pressing human needs in the District of Columbia and elsewhere around the country, this is a project that should be given a low priority and should not be approved by the Congress at this time.*

For the foregoing reasons, which we regard as good and sufficient, we urge our colleagues concerned with good government and responsible financial management to oppose those provisions of H.R. 16645 authorizing construction of a Civic Center in the District of Columbia.

TENO RONCALIO, Wyoming.

JAMES C. CLEVELAND, New Hampshire.

GENE SNYDER, Kentucky.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 1972]

#### CAPITAL PROJECTS FOR THE CAPITAL CITY

Does your neighborhood need a new school, a clinic, a better playground? What kinds of public facilities will you want in the community by 1980? If you live in the District, this is the time to mull over such questions, for District officials are soliciting public comment right now on a proposed capital improvements program for 1974-79.

The six-year proposal now being circulated adds up to a \$900 million catalog of construction all over town. It includes \$267 million in school replacement and renovation, plus health centers, police and fire stations, the long-discussed new courthouse and new D.C. jail, recreation facilities, sewers, major street and bridge improvements, and such other items as the modernization of the Municipal Fish Wharf. Some projects are already in the works but require more money; about half are totally new. The only fields of city services left out are libraries, now being restudied, and higher education, since the District plans to seek federal grants to build permanent campuses for Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute.

The District is a long way from breaking ground for the new projects. After citizen comment has been assessed and the six-year program has been refined, each project will still have to be approved by the Mayor, the City Council, and of course the Congress before a penny may be committed for the work. Yet right now is the time when community ideas can be most influential, before city agencies get locked into specific sites and schemes.

One question which needs attention is the matter of cost. City residents will not only be using the new schools and streets for a generation or more; they will also be paying for them for at least 30 years, since the District finances its capital improvements through long-term treasury loans which are repaid from local tax revenues. The price tag is not small. This year \$28 million of the District's operating budget is going to pay off capital construction loans. If every project already authorized by Congress is actually built, the debt burden could reach some \$75 million per year by about 1980. And if all of the projects in the new six-year proposal are added to that, the annual claim on the District's treasury could soar to over \$130 million within a decade.

Where would such sums come from? Part

might be gleaned from increases in local revenues, if the city's tax bases expand enough. But much of the annual debt might have to be repaid either by raising taxes or by cutting operating programs. Either approach would be painful. The Congress has already expressed concern about the prospects for such a future budget squeeze, for the District is also faced with large future commitments for employee pensions and other obligations which will have to be met.

The problem of long-term budget priorities should be faced now. Many new and improved facilities around town are badly needed, and some are long overdue. Yet each project should be weighed carefully against other priorities. It would be tragic if this year's decisions make the next decade's budgets so tight and so inflexible that, for instance, tomorrow's children might be denied new teachers because the city is paying off new schools.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1972.

MR. NEWSBOLD NOYES,  
Editor, Washington Evening Star,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial on "Capital Projects for the Capital City," which appeared on Tuesday, September 19, was most interesting. You spoke of the six-year proposal, adding up to \$900 million of needed construction throughout the District. You suggested that the problem of long-term budget priorities should be faced now.

You pointed out that many new and improved facilities are badly needed in Washington, and that some are long overdue. You suggested that each project should be weighed carefully against other priorities. You also pointed out how tragic it would be if decisions now would make the next decade of budgeting so tight that perhaps tomorrow's children would be denied new teachers because the city is paying off new schools.

This editorial was not only interesting, but also probably more timely than you realized when you wrote it. At this very time the Public Works Committee has filed a report on legislation to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia. In dissenting views in which I was joined by two colleagues, Congressman Roncallo of Wyoming and Congressman Snyder of Kentucky, we echoed some of the points made in your editorial. I enclose those dissenting views and hope that you can publish them if space permits.

We conclude in our dissenting views by pointing out that in view of the huge federal deficit, and in view of the many other pressing needs in the District and elsewhere around the country, the proposed civic center should be given a low priority and should not be approved by the Congress at this time.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALLO).

Mr. RONCALLO. Mr. Chairman, one of the highlights of my career here has been service on the Committee on Public Works. I have great respect for the ability and dedication of its chairman; of BOB JONES in pinch-hitting for the chairman; and particularly the chairman of the subcommittee, for which I have such high regard, KEN GRAY, who is the chairman in charge of this legislation. We see teamwork and dedication on that committee, and it is an excellent committee.

It is with a little reluctance that I rise to oppose this legislation unless the amendment to strike the convention center from it is agreed to, which will be offered by my two cosponsors of the

minority views, Mr. CLEVELAND and Mr. SNYDER, later in the afternoon.

I can only say that I know of nothing more monstrous, in my opinion, than to allow this legislation to pass as it is. This was originally put to us, about 2 months ago, as a sports palace for a hockey team, and the convention center. The sports palace was to be financed by free enterprise money, borrowed from some banks, and other lending institutions. The people behind that decided to go out on the beltway, which is the new main street. Pennsylvania Avenue is not the main street any more; the beltway is.

The Beltway is the main street; that is the only street. And what you have in business out there now is a hockey team and all the financial success that counts, and that is not going to be downtown, off of Capitol Hill.

I have often argued for decentralization of our Federal establishment many times. We know how difficult it is to write law in this District of Columbia, and if you are going to compound now the choking traffic situation around here, the congestion in the District, and the deterioration of the legislative way of life by adding yet another 10 or 15 acres of concrete at the bottom of Capitol Hill. I suggest that is going to make it that much more difficult. And I suggest to my colleagues then you had better start thinking about the sixth move of the Capitol of the United States of America. As we know, it went from Boston to New York, then to Philadelphia, to Annapolis, and then here, to get away from the merchant men influence now twisting our tails again, this time to underwrite their palace downtown for conventions.

During this past fiscal year we have spent \$30 billion more than we have taken in. We are a fiscally irresponsible Government that is \$400 million in debt, headquartered in a district whose human needs far transcends in every conceivable way the needs of the people for a Convention Center.

At least if it has to be built, it could be built in a different location, some place where we have places to park, and it could be built in such a way that it would be useful to the people of this community, not just for visiting conventioners.

I am going to ask the Members to remember the summers we have spent here and the difficulties we have gone through in the writing of law. For instance, how many persons have we seen picketing in the last two summers? And I would ask, "How will it be when we are confronted with a Convention Center 10 blocks away?" And further, I would ask, "Is this what the Nation's Capital is supposed to be all about?"

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I wish to bring to your attention a communication that I received that I in good conscience think I should read to the Members.

As you know, 4 or 5 years ago the Congress initially supported and then later additionally supported the Eisenhower College in New York State, and

at that time the Eisenhower family indicated, through Mrs. Eisenhower and others in the family, that the real memorial—and I quote "memorial"—was Eisenhower College as far as the family was concerned.

I have an obligation to read the letter, because it is a letter from Mamie Doud Eisenhower addressed to me, dated September 23, 1972:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: Lauris Norstad has just told me of the urgency of a personal note attesting to mine and the Eisenhower family's verification that Eisenhower College fulfills my husband's wish for a memorial.

Ike had a strong desire to see Eisenhower College given the best of everything and a chance to survive.

Rather than take the time for a full re-statement, I have asked Lauris to send you a copy of my testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. It also includes testimony of Milton and John.

For you personally, I want to offer renewed assurance that anything you can do to assist the college will meet our fondest wishes, as well as carry out everything my husband tried to do in expressing his belief in the college. It pleased him most that generations of students would really make it a living memorial in contrast to a monument of stone.

Sincerely,

MAMIE DOUD EISENHOWER.

I felt obligated to make it crystal-clear that the family, from the point of view of a memorial, wanted support for Eisenhower College more than anything else in tribute to General Eisenhower.

I understand there is a letter in the testimony of the committee from Mrs. Eisenhower stating that the family is not objecting to the use of the name for the civic center. But it also appears to me from this correspondence that the family's desire for a memorial is to have the college and nothing else.

In conclusion I fully respect the views of the Eisenhower family and support them, however, I do favor this bill and trust it will pass.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any additional time, but I believe I should set the record straight.

I agree with everything that the distinguished minority leader said about Mrs. Eisenhower. This bill comes with the personal support of the President of the United States after consultation with the Eisenhower family.

I quote a letter dated July of this year from Mrs. Eisenhower:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAY: Thank you for your letter of July the twentieth.

I have no objections at all to your naming the proposed convention center in Washington, D.C. in honor of my beloved husband. It not only would be a tribute to his memory but it would focus attention on our Nation's Capital and, as you say, it would be a useful functional facility that people could enjoy.

With my warm regard and best wishes,

Sincerely,

MAMIE DOUD EISENHOWER.

I know the distinguished minority leader did not want to leave the impression that Mrs. Eisenhower is not fully in accord with what we are attempting to do here today.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I want to set



the record straight about what we are doing here with regard to pollution and traffic congestion in this city.

We are trying to alleviate the traffic congestion existing on the streets of Washington. On any given day now during tourist season you will find 50,000 vehicles on the streets of Washington running up and down the streets and clogging the streets.

If you heard my remarks earlier, you heard me say that we are going out for bids next week on the National Visitors Center, with 2,500 parking places there. We will hook up with the Eisenhower Center with possibly 2,000 or 3,000 parking places there. Every time we fill up one 80-passenger bus at these facilities we eliminate 30 vehicles on the streets of Washington. This is the only way that we will stop pollution and stop traffic congestion; we must get people into public transportation.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I see our very distinguished friend from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) here, who has worked so hard on the Metro system. The stops at this proposed Eisenhower Center, two stops, will be operational by 1976. Many people will want to go from the visitors center to the Eisenhower Center by the Metro.

I want to assure you that we have studied this matter very carefully. The plans we bring to you with an expenditure of no taxpayers' money for the visitors center and with an expenditure of no taxpayers' money for at least 5 years on the Eisenhower Center and no more than \$14 million to be spent over the next 8 years is a very modest amount.

This is the only way that you will get rid of the traffic congestion and the air pollution in this great city. This project is supported by all the radio stations, the Washington Post and the Star News in addition to the business community. They know what is good to eliminate traffic congestion and pollution in Washington. It is this proposal.

Why is every city in the United States building a new civic center? They know that a civic center is the lifeblood of downtown. In Richmond they have built a new civic center and in Newport News and in Ocean City and Los Angeles, Las Vegas, and New York, and many other areas. Why have all of these cities built a civic center? Because they know you have to have people coming downtown and spending their dollars. This is what we want for Washington.

My friends, let me tell you that I have no personal ax to grind, and this is no aggrandizement for KEN GRAY, but during the time that I have served in this Congress 50,000 people have moved from the center of the city and into the suburbs. What happened when we had a proposal for a convention center and sports arena, and everybody got up on the floor and called it a boondoggle, and then what happened? Mr. Abe Pollin is now building an 18,000 seating capacity arena out in the country in Largo, Md., and what could happen is that your families will have to drive out there through all the traffic if they want to see the circus, or if they want to see the boat show, or the auto show, or to see any of the other activities because when he

finishes his arena, he will siphon off all of the activities of downtown Washington with millions of dollars lost in tax revenues.

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and illustrious gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to warn the Members of this House not to expect the same kind of oratory they just listened to.

Mr. Chairman, during his entire retirement, I had the honor and privilege of representing a gentleman who was probably better known and more highly respected the world over than any man in modern history. The only home he could ever call his own is located in the congressional district I serve.

Probably I am the last man in this Congress who should oppose the erection of the Dwight David Eisenhower Civic Center, but I cannot, in good conscience, support another project in this city which will inevitably become another Federal boondoggle.

I was not a Member of this body when the D.C. Stadium was authorized. The record indicates that proponents assured the membership of this body that the project would be self-supporting and Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer would never be required to put 1 dollar into the project. It would be entirely self-supporting. The D.C. Stadium Act passed this House, August 10, 1959, during the 86th Congress.

It is October 3, 1972. We are in the 92d Congress. Information I have indicates not one bond has ever been retired, and a great deal of tax money is required each year to pay the interest on those bonds.

Many who are here today heard countless speeches of the Patrick Henry variety by the proponents of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. We were assured over and over by the gentleman from Illinois and others that not 1 penny of public money would ever go into this project. Construction and maintenance would be done solely from public contributions. The record has refuted those original statements practically every year since the original bill was enacted. We not only poured millions into construction from the public till, but we are now called upon annually for additional millions for maintenance.

Oratory will and has again filled this chamber with meaningless words. The get-something-for-nothing with no cost to anyone group is busy. I assume each of you received a telegram from Mr. John W. Stadler, president, Metropolitan Board of Trade. Listen again to his one sentence: "This center, a District of Columbia project requiring minimal Federal funds, will generate sufficient new business to pay for itself, contrary to experience of the D.C. Stadium and Kennedy Center." Does Mr. Stadler have figures to verify that statement? Most of us here today heard similar language in connection with the Kennedy Center. Are Mr. Stadler and his business associates willing to put their names on legal paper which would assure the Congress this will

not be another D.C. Stadium or Kennedy Center? Businessmen today are looking for good investments that pay reasonable returns. Why do they not assume all the obligations?

The Federal Government is not in any financial position to make speculative loans. Many of us saw the first \$100 billion budget approximately 10 years ago and all were generally agreed it should go no higher. At about the same period, our national debt ceiling was \$186 billion.

Before the 92d Congress adjourns, we will be asked to vote on a resolution saying the expenditures for 1973 may not exceed \$250 billion. Since 1961 the debt ceiling has been raised 17 times. It now stands at \$450 billion. Before adjourning, we will also be asked to raise that figure to \$465 billion.

Is it not about time the Congress shows some sense of fiscal sanity?

Is it not about time to do some real serious belt tightening?

General Eisenhower does not need an additional national memorial. He has built his own memorial in the hearts and minds of men and women the world over.

I personally do not believe we can afford another governmental luxury.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt of the administration's full and unequivocal support of this legislation.

The city of Washington so far as the decay and poverty are concerned is no different from the heart city of any other great metropolitan area in this country. We must renew the economic vitality and viability of the inner city of Washington, as we must of all these other cities.

This civic center will bring revenue and taxes and it will help offset the Federal payment, which is a paramount problem of the Congress. It is estimated that the center will bring a minimum of \$50 million a year into the city. It is vitally needed. Upon completion, the center will create 3,000 new jobs. They too are greatly needed.

Only Washington of 24 of the largest cities in this Nation does not have a civic center.

I urge your support of this legislation. And I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) in particular, for his eloquent and persuasive work on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining.

Mr. Chairman, this project has received intensive study, not just by the Committee on Public Works, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but by experts who were retained by the committee to study it over a period of some 18 months or 2 years.

I am in complete support of the project. I believe the gentleman from Illinois made the most compelling arguments in its favor. The President of the United States endorses it and supports it. Mrs. Eisenhower has endorsed the project. I believe the minority leader supports it. I do support it, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 16645 authorizes the District of Columbia to construct a civic center in the downtown area of Washington, D.C. The purpose of the center is, first, to honor the memory of President Dwight David Eisenhower. Second, to provide a facility that may be used in connection with the 1976 bicentennial during which we may expect to host millions of Americans and foreign visitors. And, third, to provide for the District of Columbia a facility that can be used to enhance the city's major industry, that of tourism, by providing a suitable place for major national and international conventions. Fourth, to revitalize a rapidly deteriorating section of the District of Columbia by creating a new economy and social vitality in the central core of the District. It is anticipated that the activities of the civic center will generate new jobs and new tax revenues for the District, and will generate a badly needed 24-hour population in the heart of the downtown area.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize the full support of President Richard M. Nixon for the construction of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center. President Nixon expressed this support in a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, KENNETH J. GRAY, dated August 17, 1972. At that time, President Nixon urged the early enactment of this measure and expressed his belief that the development of the Center will provide "new jobs, new economic development, and new life in the downtown area of our Nation's Capital." He further expressed his belief that such a development is essential both to the future viability of the central core of Washington and to the continued vitality of the city as the seat of the Nation's Government.

The second portion, sections 5 through 33, provide for naming public buildings in honor of distinguished, dedicated Members of Congress who served the House and have enriched the Nation with their efforts on its behalf. To honor these men, in my opinion, is a fitting and proper thing which would serve to honor the Congress of the United States as well as those whose names are recognized by this legislation.

Section 34 extends for an additional two periods authority for our previous Speaker to maintain his offices and staff.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16645 and urge the Members of this body to vote favorably for it.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support for H.R. 16645, the bill which establishes the Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center. It has been my belief for some time now that our Nation's Capital City deserves and indeed, urgently needs, the proposed civic center. As we all know, in just a few short years we will be celebrating America's 200th anniversary and at the heart of our efforts, certainly, should be a tribute to our great President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I can think of no finer tribute, Mr. Chairman, than that of the Eisenhower Civic Center.

It will, in large measure, serve as a

base and support for much of what we hope to accomplish during and after our bicentennial. There is every reason to believe that the construction of the civic center will result in a revitalization and a new growth for the city of Washington, D.C. It will also bring additional and much needed revenue to the District and will create many additional jobs.

I note with great interest that the President has stated his strong support for this legislation which would authorize the District Government to build this great convention center complex in the downtown area. Despite the fact that he sees this as a local project, he said he would request authorization for a Federal contribution to the center. I further note that H.R. 16645 proposes that the Federal share of carrying out the purposes of the Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center Act shall not exceed \$14 million as a contribution to the District of Columbia.

The return to the people of the District—as well as the people of the whole Nation—will far exceed the cost of the proposed civic center, not only in economic terms but equally important in terms of the human needs that will be met by providing facilities for events of national and international importance.

As Mayor Walter Washington has stated:

We must remember that our city is a city of tourists, a city that belongs to the Nation. Between twenty to twenty-five million people come here to visit their city, and it is altogether fitting and proper that such a facility . . . be considered.

Indeed also, it is altogether fitting and proper to construct such a splendid memorial to our late and great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower—an outstanding American who loved his Nation and served it so well during times of crisis during peace and war.

And it is fitting and proper to look to the future of the District of Columbia, and to the enhancement of the Nation's bicentennial year. I enthusiastically support the efforts to construct the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center, and I urge the favorable consideration of this bill by my colleagues in the House.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am tremendously pleased, and somewhat humbled, to have this opportunity to propose that we honor a great American today by giving his name to the new Federal building in downtown Cleveland, Ohio. The man I refer to is well known to Members of Congress, and his service to this Nation—which he is still rendering—will long be remembered by the people of the United States. It comes as no surprise, Mr. Chairman, I am sure, that the name I am advancing here is that of the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, since 1965 one of the distinguished jurists on the U.S. Court of Appeals at Cincinnati, Ohio. Most of you will remember him as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under two Presidents—Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. I myself remember him primarily as the mayor of Cleveland—the first and only person to have been elected to that exalted office for five consecutive

terms. Others in the Ohio delegation, in this chamber, will remember Judge Celebrezze as the highly effective Ohio State senator from the Cleveland area—in the days before he became mayor. But the people, Mr. Chairman, while remembering Judge Celebrezze for all these offices he has held, are aware of him primarily as an honest and decent human being—as an embodiment of the American dream, because of his humble origins—as statesman whose concern for people has helped to continue the governmental traditions that have made our country the greatest in the world.

I think it is noteworthy, Mr. Chairman, that the man I propose to honor today is not a native of the United States. He was born in Italy and was brought here as a child. He was reared in a poor Cleveland neighborhood, having virtually no material advantages but possessing the kind of headstart that really counts—that being his good fortune in having been born to a family with a high sense of honor and a strong feeling of patriotism for their adopted land.

Most Clevelanders remember Judge Celebrezze's distinguished older brother, the late Frank Celebrezze, who had a distinguished record of public service as the safety director of Cleveland and, later, as a judge of the Municipal Court. With his brother as his mentor, Judge Anthony Celebrezze embarked on a career that has not only enriched the lives of American citizens generally but which also has brought honor to, and instilled pride in, all Americans of Italian descent.

Mr. Chairman, Judge Celebrezze was the first foreign-born mayor of Cleveland. He was the first Italian-American to serve in the Cabinet of a President of the United States. He was the first Italian-American to sit on the U.S. court of appeals.

I will not recount here—I leave that to his biographers—all the achievements of this great American. But it is fitting to note that the Federal building which I trust will bear his name was begun during the time that Judge Celebrezze was mayor of Cleveland, and he did a great deal, as mayor, to lay the foundation for that building. It is also worth noting that he served as HEW Secretary during the time when social and health programs were expanded at a pace unprecedented in the history of the United States. For example, Judge Celebrezze, as Secretary, can justly lay claim to having been instrumental in giving the American people such programs as medicare and Federal aid to education. Many of you sitting here are, of course, aware of this, since Judge Celebrezze personally interceded with many of you to see to it that these programs were enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that, if a poll were taken in Cleveland for this special purpose, the people of that city would, virtually unanimously, themselves propose that the Federal building be named for this great American. They will long remember him for what he has done for Cleveland and the Nation, and I am certain they will want their children and grandchildren to remember him also.



Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this legislation H.R. 16645, to which our distinguished chairman, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, the members of his Public Works Subcommittee, President Nixon, Mayor Washington, and hundreds of dedicated public citizens of the District of Columbia, have devoted so much of their time and energies and their talents.

This measure will not affect the budget for 5 years. In no event will this exceed \$14 million. This project, which is both a tribute to the memory of a beloved President of our country and an economic necessity to the residents of our Nation's Capital, has been studied and restudied for more than 4 years. Every detail of its financing, location, construction and operation has been worked out so far as is humanly possible. It remains only for the Members of this body to let it go forward.

The Washington business community supports this legislation, as do the great majority of the citizens who live and work in the downtown area that will be revitalized and reinvigorated by the presence of this civic center and the millions of visitors who will be attracted to it in the years ahead.

The jobs and the economic activity that will be created by this center in the heart of our Capital City are sorely needed by the people of this community. They look to us for action.

Mr. Chairman, the plans for the Eisenhower Center call for occupancy by July 4, 1976, when we begin the Bicentennial celebration of these United States. We can meet that deadline. It is essential that we approve H.R. 16645 today.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is vital to the interest of "Our Nation's Capital"—to the residents of the United States who take their time to come to Washington to actually see—to enjoy—the history which belongs to all Americans.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly will vote against H.R. 16645, the Eisenhower Memorial Civic Center. Admittedly, the Center is needed and will be a useful addition to the Federal City.

But, Washington has a pending backlog of \$900 millions for urgently needed facilities now. Colleges, schools, hospitals, prison improvements, court improvements, et cetera, would be placed in a position of second priority by the passage of this bill. I think the civic center should be second priority to these other more urgent needs.

Since Congress has been so reluctant to fund the D.C. Transit System, I do not see why we should be in such a hurry to fund a civic center.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty support of an appropriate memorial in honor of the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States. Although the Eisenhower family does not object to this legislation, which provides for an Eisenhower Convention Center, the family has indicated its preference for a memorial of an educational nature and I have supported legislation to achieve that goal.

I am also in hearty support of those provisions of H.R. 16645 which were added as a committee amendment to name the Cleveland Federal office building

after the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, former mayor of the city of Cleveland, State senator, and distinguished former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and presently serving as a respected jurist on the U.S. court of appeals.

I oppose the provisions of this bill which would require the taxpayers of the United States to commit the spending of \$14 million downpayment on a convention center in the city of Washington, which could eventually cost \$100 million. This project is being vigorously proposed by land speculators, developers, and hotel owners who would reap the bonanza of extra convention business and high profits.

The taxpayers of America are already paying \$1 billion and perhaps an extra billion to build a subway system in the city of Washington, a new multi-million-dollar visitors center, and additional millions to pay off the debt on the District of Columbia Memorial Stadium.

The District of Columbia, with its national shrines, and the tremendous Federal Establishment as the seat of the Government, is already overwhelmed with tourist attractions. There is no real basis for making Washington a convention city at the expense of every other community in America. Something should be left for the other cities of America which build and maintain convention facilities at their own expense and which are struggling for economic survival.

We must reverse the flow of tax dollars to Washington and back to the communities from which these dollars come.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center Act."*

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) it is essential to the social and economic development of the District of Columbia to establish major centers of commercial and economic activity within the city;

(2) such a center of activity would result from the development of a civic center located in the downtown area of the District of Columbia;

(3) a civic center would (A) attract large numbers of visitors to the downtown area and result in increased business activity in the area surrounding the center; (B) enable national organizations to hold their conventions and other meetings in the District of Columbia and thereby encourage citizens from the entire Nation to visit their Capital City; (C) provide a new source of revenue for the District of Columbia as a consequence of its operations and the expanded commercial activities resulting therefrom; and (D) provide expanded employment opportunities for residents of the District of Columbia;

(4) it is fitting that said civic center be established as a memorial to the late President, Dwight D. Eisenhower;

(5) the prompt provision of major convention facilities in the District of Columbia will significantly contribute to the commemoration of the Nation's bicentennial year; and

(6) the powers conferred by this Act are for public uses and purposes for which public powers may be employed, public funds may be expended, and the power of eminent domain and the police power may be exercised, and the granting of such powers is necessary in the public interest.

SEC. 3. The Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), as amended (40 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 18. (a) In order to provide for the District of Columbia facilities for the holding of conventions, exhibitions, meetings, and other social, cultural, and business activities, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia (hereinafter, "Commissioner") is authorized to provide for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of the civic center to be designated as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center on a site in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia within an area bounded by Eighth Street, H Street, Tenth Street, New York Avenue, and K Street.

"(b) (1) Such civic center shall be in accordance with a plan, indicating the design and estimated costs, approved by the Commissioner and the District of Columbia Council, and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission pursuant to section 5 of the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1005) and section 16 of the Act approved June 20, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-428), and reviewed by the Commissioner of Fine Arts to the extent required by section 1 of the Act approved May 16, 1930 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-410).

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5-711), the urban renewal plan, approved pursuant to section 6(b) (2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 5-705(b) (2)), for an urban renewal area in which the civic center is located shall be deemed to be modified by the plan approved pursuant to this subsection and the National Capital Planning Commission shall certify such urban renewal plan, as modified, to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

"(3) In the development of the civic center in accordance with the plan approved pursuant to this subsection, the Commissioner, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may open, extend, widen, or close any street, road, highway, or alley, or part thereof, by the filing of a plat or plats in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia showing such opening, extension, widening, or closing.

"(c) The Commissioner shall acquire by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, all real property necessary to provide for the civic center.

"(d) (1) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into purchase contracts, including negotiated contracts, for the financing, design, construction, and maintenance of the civic center. The Commissioner is further authorized to lease the site described in subsection (a) at a nominal rental for a period of not more than thirty-five years. The payment term of said purchase contracts shall not be more than thirty years from the date of acceptance of the civic center and such purchase contracts shall provide that title to the civic center shall rest in the District of Columbia at or before the expiration of the contract term and upon fulfillment of the terms and conditions stipulated in the purchase contracts. Such terms and conditions shall include provision for the application to the purchase price agreed upon therein of installment payments made thereunder.

"(2) Such purchase contracts shall include such provisions as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall deem to be in the best interest of the District of Columbia and appropriate to secure the performance of the obligations imposed upon the party or parties

that shall enter into such agreement with the Commissioner. The purchase contracts shall provide for payment to be made to—

"(A) amortize the cost of site acquisition, including relocation payments required by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, and such other moneys as may be advanced by the contractors to the District of Columbia;

"(B) amortize the cost of construction of improvements to be constructed;

"(C) provide a reasonable rate of interest on the outstanding principal as determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B) above; and

"(D) reimburse the contractors for the cost of any other obligations required of them under the contract, including (but not limited to) payment of taxes, costs of carrying appropriate insurance, and costs of repair and maintenance if so required of the contractors.

"(3) For the purpose of the purchase contracts provided by this subsection for the erection of the civic center, the Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with any person, copartnership, corporation, or other public or private entity to effectuate any of the purposes of this subsection.

"(e) The full faith and credit of the Government of the District of Columbia is hereby committed to guarantee, upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, the fulfillment of all obligations imposed by the provision of this section.

"(f) (1) The Commissioner is authorized to accept and administer gifts, personal services, securities, or other property of whatever character to aid in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(2) The Commissioner is further authorized to provide for the operation of any or all aspects of the civic center by any department or agency of the Government of the District of Columbia, or may provide for the performance of such operations, including the use or rental of the civic center or its equipment, motor vehicle parking facilities, concessions, and other activities, by contract entered into with any person, copartnership, corporation, or other public or private entity, upon such terms and conditions as may be stipulated in the agreements, and for such purposes may utilize or employ the services of personnel of any agency or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia, with the consent of such agency or instrumentality, upon a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis, and may utilize voluntary or uncompensated personnel."

Sec. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such sums shall remain available for obligation until expended.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation and out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$14 million for a contribution to the District of Columbia as the Federal share of carrying out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 5. The Federal office building and United States courthouse to be constructed in the southwest portion of that block bounded by Mitchell Street, Pryor Street, Central Avenue, and Trinity Avenue, in Atlanta, Georgia, is hereby designated as the "Richard B. Russell Federal Building", in memory of the late Richard Brevard Russell, a distinguished Member of the United States Senate from 1933 to 1971, and any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Richard B. Russell Federal Building".

Sec. 6. The Federal building to be constructed in the block bounded by the west side of New Orleans Avenue north of Main Street, and the east of Jackson Street, in

Hattiesburg, Mississippi, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "William M. Colmer Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "William M. Colmer Federal Building".

Sec. 7. The Federal building to be constructed in the block of West Commerce Street bounded on the west side by Columbus Street and on the east side by James Street in Aberdeen, Mississippi, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Thomas G. Abernethy Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "Thomas G. Abernethy Federal Building".

Sec. 8. The Federal building being constructed in the block bounded by Ninth Street Northwest Tenth Street Northwest, E Street Northwest, and Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building".

Sec. 9. The Federal office building now under construction in the Capital Plaza area of Frankfort Kentucky, is hereby designated as the "John C. Watts Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "John C. Watts Building".

Sec. 10. The Federal building in the block bounded by Second Street Southwest, Third Street Southwest, Cleveland Avenue South, and Dewalt Avenue South, in Canton, Ohio, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Frank T. Bow Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "Frank T. Bow Federal Building".

Sec. 11. The jet propulsion laboratory at 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, California, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "H. Allen Smith Jet Propulsion Laboratory". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such jet propulsion laboratory shall be held to be a reference to the "H. Allen Smith Jet Propulsion Laboratory".

Sec. 12. The Federal building at 1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "George P. Miller Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "George P. Miller Federal Building".

Sec. 13. The United States courthouse and Federal building at 302 Joplin Street, Joplin, Missouri, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Durward G. Hall Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Durward G. Hall Federal Building".

Sec. 14. The United States courthouse and Federal building at 225 Cadman Plaza, Brooklyn, New York, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Emanuel Celler Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Emanuel Celler Federal Building".

Sec. 15. The post office, United States courthouse and Federal building at 401 West Trade Street, Charlotte, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as

the "Charles R. Jonas Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Charles R. Jonas Federal Building".

Sec. 16. The United States courthouse and Federal building at the corner of Princess Street and Water Street, Wilmington, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Alton Lennon Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Alton Lennon Federal Building".

Sec. 17. The post office and Federal building now under construction in the block bounded on the north by East Sixth Street, west by North Diamond Street, south by East Fifth Street, and east by North Adams Street, Mansfield, Ohio, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Jackson E. Betts Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Jackson E. Betts Federal Building".

Sec. 18. The Federal building in the block bounded on the north by Edmond Street, south by Charles Street, west by Eighth Street, and east by Ninth Street, St. Joseph, Missouri, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "William R. Hull Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "William R. Hull Federal Building".

Sec. 19. The United States courthouse and Federal building to be constructed in the block bounded on the north side by Lombard Street, east by Hanover Street, south by Pratt Street, and west by Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Maryland, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Edward A. Garmatz Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Edward A. Garmatz Federal Building".

Sec. 20. The post office and Federal building to be constructed in New Bedford, Massachusetts, under authority of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-313, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Hastings Keith Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Hastings Keith Federal Building".

Sec. 21. The post office and Federal building at 333 West Fourth Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Page Belcher Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Page Belcher Federal Building".

Sec. 22. The Federal building at the corner of Main Street and High Street, Farmville, Virginia, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Watkins M. Abbott Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Watkins M. Abbott Federal Building".

Sec. 23. The Federal building to be constructed in Roanoke, Virginia, under authority of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-313, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Richard H. Poff Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Richard H. Poff Federal Building".

Sec. 24. The post office and Federal office



building at the corner of Lincoln and Central Streets, Essex Junction, Vermont, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Winston Prouty Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Winston Prouty Federal Building".

SEC. 25. The Earth Resources Observation System Facilities Development Foundation at 101 West Ninth Street, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Karl E. Mundt Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Karl E. Mundt Federal Building".

SEC. 26. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare South Building located at 330 C Street Southwest, Washington, District of Columbia, is hereby designated, and shall be known as, the "Mary Switzer Memorial Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Mary Switzer Memorial Building".

SEC. 27. The Federal office building to be constructed in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, on the site bounded by Maine and Academy Streets on the Marrison Parkway, is hereby designated and shall be known as the "Philip J. Philbin Federal Office Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Philip J. Philbin Federal Office Building".

SEC. 28. The post office and Federal office building to be constructed in the block bounded by Grinage Street, Verret Street, Lafayette Street, and High Street in Houma, Louisiana, is hereby designated as the "Allen J. Ellender Post Office and Federal Office Building", in memory of the late Allen J. Ellender. Any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Allen J. Ellender Post Office and Federal Office Building".

SEC. 29. The Federal building at 334 Meeting Street, Charleston, South Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "L. Mendel Rivers Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "L. Mendel Rivers Federal Building".

SEC. 30. The United States courthouse and Federal building at the corner of Avenue A and Seventh Street, Opelika, Alabama, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "George W. Andrews Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "George W. Andrews Federal Building".

SEC. 31. The Federal building to be constructed in Florence, South Carolina, on the site bounded east by Sanborn Street, west of North McQueen Street, and north by West Evans Street, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "John L. McMillan Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "John L. McMillan Federal Building".

SEC. 32. The United States courthouse and Federal building located at 400 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Wayne N. Aspinall Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Wayne N. Aspinall Federal Building".

SEC. 33. The post office, United States courthouse and Federal building at 207 West Main Street, Wilkesboro, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Johnson J. Hayes Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Johnson J. Hayes Building".

SEC. 34. The effective period for each provision relating to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Ninety-first Congress which is contained in H. Res. 1238 Ninety-first Congress, as enacted into permanent law by chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971 (84 Stat. 1989), is hereby extended for an additional two years from the date on which (but for this section) such provision would expire.

SEC. 35. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) Sections 6 and 7, sections 10 through 23, inclusive, sections 25, 31, and 32 shall take effect January 4, 1973.

Mr. GRAY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SNYDER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Page 14, line 12, beginning with line 12, page 14, strike out all language down to and including line 18 on page 20 and renumber the remaining sections.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, of course, gets to the crux of the bill, as I am sure the Members here present are aware—and this would strike out the civic center and leave the rest of the bill, which takes care of all of the name changes of Federal buildings so that those folks who are interested in seeing Federal buildings named for colleagues present and past will not be under any local pressures at home to vote for the bill with the monstrosity of the civic center in it.

I do not blame Mrs. Eisenhower for writing to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) saying that she does not want this to be the Eisenhower memorial and that she wants it to be the college, because I suspect that she knows as well as the rest of us know that this is another one of those white elephants like we have had built and pushed on us here in Congress in years past. It has only been a few months ago that the District of Columbia appropriation bill came up, and colloquy took place then as to what the situation was with regard to the fiscal sanity of the RFK Stadium. In response to questions propounded to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) who was handling the bill, we found that there is an \$831,000 annual interest payment which has to be picked up by the taxpayers of this country, because the first penny of interest has not been paid, and the first bond has not been paid.

Those people who brought the stadium bill to the floor at that time thought it was going to pay, and they told us so. I

do not question their honesty and integrity then, and I do not question the honesty and integrity of those who bring this bill to the floor today. But I say their track record is pretty poor. Their track record is zero when it comes to these projects paying off.

They tell you there is only \$14 million in here to be paid by the taxpayers, but the truth of the matter is that the bonds are guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the District of Columbia, and whatever the District of Columbia does not have when the time comes to run their government, they come down here, and the Congress has to give it to them in the form of a Federal payment.

So the truth of the fact is that the Members' taxpayers at home are going to be required to pick up the cost of this boondoggle. Just like the gentleman from Iowa said, there will be some conventions that will come here because of this center, but they are going to be coming from other communities across this Nation who need those conventions just as badly as Washington, D.C., needs them.

Quite frankly, my friends, I am a little bit worried with the District of Columbia having this building. If we have another District-owned building, they might be using it for housing like they put people up in some of the other District of Columbia-owned buildings and stadiums around here in times past when the demonstrations were taking place.

I say to the Members that this civic center needs to be knocked out. It needs to be killed. We rejected this proposition when it came from the District of Columbia Committee a couple of years ago, so they sent it to the Public Works Committee because they have a little bit more muscle than some other folks. That committee can give them some projects.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. The project that the District Committee was considering had a sports arena in it. This is not a sports arena project. That was what was objectionable about the District of Columbia Committee proposal.

Mr. SNYDER. That was the gentleman's opinion as to whether it was objectionable or not. The truth of the matter is that the sports arena was the only thing that determined that to be feasible from the financial standpoint. When you take that out, that makes this an entirely different proposition.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. GRAY. I just called the gentleman's hometown this morning and found out that the Civic Center in Louisville, Ky., had more than 600 events last year. That is an average of two per day.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right. We want to keep them, too, instead of giving them to the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY. It is good for Louisville, but it is not good for the Nation's Capital; is that correct?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not represent Louisville; Congressman MAZZOLI does. But, I say to the gentleman that my respon-

sibility is basically representing the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, and I think that most of the Members here feel that their obligation is to represent their constituents. There may be a few who do not.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Where does the gentleman think this \$70 million increased Federal payment that we dumped into the Capital this year came from?

It came from the Fourth District of Kentucky and the 24th District of Illinois. Next year they want \$3 million more. They want a \$74 million increase over what we gave them last year. It comes from all of the 50 States, the gentleman's taxpayers and mine, and until we build up Washington, D.C., we will have the same problem to face each year. More money from our taxpayers.

Mr. SNYDER. We will put that much more burden on the taxpayers if we build this monstrosity. That is my point.

Mr. GRAY. It is just the other way around.

Mr. SNYDER. As I was saying before I got unwound, we just do not need it. It is just that simple. We have people coming in here. They are disrupting the Government half the time now anyway. If we put this big thing right down at the foot of the hill. The Members do not have enough time to take care of their constituents now because of all of these outsiders parading in their offices and clogging them up and keeping the Members from doing business. It is going to be a whole lot worse when we have this thing.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I came here today wondering what we are talking about in terms of the Nation's Capital. Is it some foreign land we are talking about? Or is it the area of the birthplace of a nation? Is it a Federal city or it is some far off country somewhere? As the Members have spoken here today they seemed to have more concern with the foreign nations than with one of the great cities of the world. This is a city which everybody throughout the world comes to visit and they marvel at our monuments and they marvel at our architecture and they believe it to be one of the classical cities.

I know there may be disruptive forces that come to this Nation's Capital because in a free society all voices can come, disruptive or not, to explain their will and to understand their country and to cherish its principles and, yes, to pay honor to a great American President. I think in paying honor to this great American President we do it by trying to help the people of the Federal city sustain its economy and develop its programs so it can be self-sufficient.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which would strike from this legislation that part of the bill which authorizes the civic center.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point in support of this amendment.

Again the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who spoke so eloquently in support of this bill, pointed out in his colloquy with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) that there was this very successful civic center in Louisville, Ky. This is one of the points we have been trying to make. These civic centers can be successful, but the point is why load up the taxpayers of the United States with a civic center? Why can it not stand on its own feet if it is going to be so successful?

The gentleman spoke about the fact that the sports part of this package, which has now been taken out, will be built outside the District under private auspices. If this remaining part is economically viable, we do not need to come up with this bill and put the bite on the taxpayers. That is really what this argument is all about.

For those Members who have said the time has come to stop spending the taxpayers' money, here is one place where apparently on the record it is not even necessary. Here is the place, here is the time, and here is the way we can do it when we vote by recorded teller vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I know there are many of us who are not worried about spending money in the District but who are worried about the facts of life here. There are many who are worried about the loss of jobs in the District and the necessity of losing a whole population, when we move out large numbers of the Chinese and other citizens who will have to find someplace to live.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Exactly; many acres now occupied by residents will be taken over.

Mr. KYL. Creating new jobs in this civic center for serving banquets, could be taking away jobs from hotels whose banquet rooms today serve conventions.

I assume the District is going to operate this thing. They already have the highest percentage of city workers to population of cities of the United States. It is just the impracticality of this which forces me to disagree with the proposal.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman for his point. It is a well made point in support of the amendment which I support. I hope the committee will adopt it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am intrigued and to some degree mystified by some of the arguments against this civic center.

In most of our major communities throughout the Nation, we have found it desirable to build convention centers. We built one in my community some years ago. There was no argument to the effect that private capital would be able to build that center. I do not suppose that in any of these cities represented here by any of us, private capital has built a convention center. Almost invariably some public money had to be provided in order for the convention cen-

ter to be built, but once it was built, it began to generate income to the community.

I do not think anyone here is going to argue that the city of Washington does not need the generation of some income into the community. I do not see how any of us can sit here and logically argue that we ought not put up any money for the Federal city to have a convention center such as our respective communities have found desirable to build. Nor, since this is the Federal city, can we simply say that if Washington, D.C., needs it, let it build it itself.

If we follow that argument to its logical conclusion, then we are going to have to vote to free Washington from the Federal city status and let it have home rule, or vote to give it to Maryland, or something like that. It is not consistent for us to sit here and refuse to give Washington that kind of status, and at the same time refuse to give it the facilities it needs to build its future.

Mr. JACOBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course.

Mr. JACOBS. I wonder if the gentleman could inform the committee as to whether an environmental impact study has been made.

Mr. WRIGHT. An environmental impact study has been ordered and will be completed before the commencement of construction.

I just want to address myself to another argument that was mentioned, and that is the fact that the district stadium has not been a financial success. I think all of us recognize the truth of that, but that stadium is an entirely different kind of facility than a convention center.

The stadium is an open-air stadium, as all of us know. It has very limited use. It is only for sporting events. Perhaps it has not made money, but throughout the United States the average usage of convention centers is about 700 events annually, which is about two per day. So, I think the convention center might attract sufficient usage to pay for itself.

But the basic question is, does Washington, D.C., need a convention center? If it does, we, as the Federal City Council, ought to take care of it and help provide it for them.

I think it is obvious that it does need one.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, it is not correct that at the time the financial prospectus was made on the stadium, those experts who made that knew what it was going to be used for. When they came in here and said it would pay for itself, they were taking into account the uses for which it would be put.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman is correct. They made a mistake, and I acknowledge that fact. It is like comparing—

Mr. SNYDER. If they made a mistake in computing whether a Greyhound bus was going to pay for itself, and also made a mistake on whether or not a Mack truck down here is going to pay for itself, there is reason to believe they might make a mistake here.

Mr. WRIGHT. I just say to the gentleman, the Kennedy Center on an opera-



tional basis is making money, because it is the kind of facility which provides for multiple uses.

One other thing which I did want to say—

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not inclined to yield further.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not blame the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. This differs considerably from the Kennedy Center and the stadium. We voted for those facilities, and those who live here—I count among us the Members of Congress who live in this area—supported those in order to provide a more enriching, broadening experience for the people of the area.

This is entirely different. This would attract people from all over the world and from our respective cities to come to conventions in Washington, D.C.

I believe that would be a great thing. Every time people come from my district to Washington, D.C., they tell me they are surprised, and pleasantly so, to discover it is not a tawdry or trashy city, as some of them had been told. They are surprised, contrary to what they were told, to find that they really are safe when they go out on the streets of Washington, D.C. I want more people to come here to find that out. I believe more people should come to Washington, D.C. The more who come the better citizens they are. Exposure to the history and traditions of this city gives them a greater appreciation for our country. I think that is the kind of thing we should encourage.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Some allusion was made to dislocating people presently in jobs in the area of the project.

Mr. Chairman, the record of our hearing shows that 85 percent of the property owners of the area approve of this particular program. Some 15 percent of them object. I do not believe we will have a massive dislocation of restaurateurs and business which will not be offset time after time, over and over again by new business in the area of the center.

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

Mr. GROVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have heard this figure about 85 percent of the property owners being in favor of it. How about the people in the buildings, those who may be renting from the property owners. Those are the people the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) and the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO), and I are interested in. How many of those people are in favor of this?

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

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

Mr. GRAY. The 85-percent figure includes the tenants as well as the landlords.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, many of those who are on the floor may not real-

ize exactly what this amendment will do. What it will do is eviscerate the center from the legislation and leave only the memorials to retiring Members.

The very purpose and substance of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is that we are trying not only to do something for this great Capital and this great country but also to do something for the government of the Capital City, to give them the tools for economic self-reliance. If we do not, then we will have a further degrading and decaying city, which will then more and more rely on us, who do not want them to rely on us in the Congress, with a greater burden and financial liability in the years to come.

I am in favor of giving them the tools needed to get out of their economic problems.

We hear on TV some pleas for compassion for people.

Since we talk about dams, we should give a damn. This is not to give a "dam" but to give a "damn." If we give a damn for the District of Columbia, we should vote for this and give them the tools to lift themselves up by their bootstraps, so that some day we can have the kind of home rule for the people of the District of Columbia which is soundly economically self-supporting.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Members for taking so much time. I shall be brief.

I find there is a strange paradox here today. All of the previous speakers who have taken the well in opposition to this proposal—voted last week to spend over \$7 million for the Bicentennial Commission in administrative costs to plan our 200th anniversary. Think of that; over \$7 million.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) and others who have spoken in opposition to this are in favor of giving over \$7 million now, which is absolutely going to inflate the budget, but they are not willing to spread \$14 million over the next 30 years for a job generator and an income generator in this facility.

So I hope that we lay to rest here this afternoon this argument that this is a budget-busting project. Not 1 red cent will be needed on this project for at least 5 years, and possibly none then, and in no event can more than \$14 million be used in the next 30 years for this project. Yet my friends voted to eat up with bureaucratic redtape downtown \$7 million in the next fiscal year to plan our 200th anniversary.

Why are we planning our 200th anniversary? To bring millions of persons into the Nation's Capital. And where are we going to send them? Out to the District of Columbia Armory or the Uline Arena? Out to all the hotels? No. You know what is going to happen; they are not going to stay.

We had a survey made by the National Park Service recently that showed the average visitor who comes to Washington planned to stay a week but actually stayed only an average of 2 days. He cannot find a place to park; he does not

get a welcome; he has no place to sit down and eat a decent meal at the Capitol.

Every single hotel owner in Washington has testified in favor of this project. They are not going to sleep in the Eisenhower Center. They know that when millions of people come to attend conventions, they are going to stay in the Sheraton Park and the Shoreham, and other area motels and hotels. And with the 5-percent tax rate that gives the city millions in new income each year.

It will only cost about \$5 million a year for this facility to get the return of \$200 million to \$300 million. This facility would generate far more than is needed to pay off the mortgage, so we can get the District of Columbia off the backs of our taxpayers.

I would ask my friends to vote the way they want to, but I hope no one votes with the idea that you are going to save money.

You voted last week to give away \$7 million to the bicentennial committee. For what? To plan this bicentennial, and you will have no place to hold it unless this bill passes.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I just wondered, from the gentleman's remark: he said something about the visitors' center. Is that not going to be built?

Mr. GRAY. Yes; it is. The visitors' center on the right of this sketch is a very integral part of the overall plan. It will have the largest parking facility, and will be eight blocks apart, and we will have shuttle service between these points to accommodate those here to attend the conventions, we need them both. We need more parking and less cars on the streets.

Mr. JACOBS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. Is it not logical the parking places could be provided in any case at that site?

Mr. GRAY. The Redevelopment Land Agency plans to tear down all of these buildings. That is why I am a little surprised that my friend from New Hampshire kept talking about displaced persons.

You know what is going to happen if this does not go through. Through the Urban Redevelopment Agency all these buildings and all those tenants are going to be displaced. And by what? Another high-rise office building.

Our committee has definite proof that a large corporation wants to build another office building on that site.

So if you think you are voting against this bill to save the tenants down in Mount Vernon Square, you are just being misled, because that is not so.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. How far will this facility be from the nearest subways?

Mr. GRAY. There will be two stops at the facility itself. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) can tell you it

is planned to have the subway in operation by the time of the bicentennial in 1976 and we will have this facility built by then.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) has said the hearings showed we could not have this facility ready. That is not so. There is not one word of testimony in the hearings from any responsible person to this effect.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACOBS. It has been alleged here the stadium, the Robert Kennedy Memorial Stadium, is not a money loser. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House, I sat in long hours of negotiations with the lessees of that stadium, and I can tell you and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) can tell you that is not accurate.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman misunderstood the gentleman from Texas. He said the Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, in its first year of operation is not losing money.

He acknowledged that the R.F.K. Stadium was losing money.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. But it is a one-use facility compared to a multiuse facility here.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

I might say to the gentleman that one of our friends in the press gallery suggested to me a few minutes ago that this bill should contain a change in the name for the sports stadium and be called the Robert Short Memorial Stadium.

I might say to the committee on that, what do I tell my people back home in Indianapolis? I tell them that if you go to Washington, D.C., you will see some of the problems we are going to have if we do not mend our ways.

But here is a case where the reverse is true. This is somewhat like déjà vu to those of us who pay property taxes in Indianapolis, because, you know, just a few years ago the same glowing accounts were given for the new convention center in Indianapolis. They said that it would bring in more business than they ever dreamed of and it will not cost the taxpayers anything. "Do not worry," they said. Well, this year they will have a \$400,000 deficit and next year it is projected to be \$600,000 deficit. And just guess—

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman knows that he is talking primarily about a sports arena.

Mr. JACOBS. No, no, no. I am talking about the convention center back home in Indianapolis.

Mr. GRAY. We checked with the officials and we did not find a single city in the United States where a convention center was not making money, or at least

breaking even. That is why so many are being built.

Mr. JACOBS. My city, then, this must be something we dreamed up, because the deficit this year is \$400,000 and next year there is \$600,000 projected.

Put yourself in my position. Here we have a convention center back home that is going to make the property tax in Indianapolis begin to look like a property tax up in the Chicago region, because of this deficit. And they say it is because we are not getting enough convention business. Am I supposed to go back home and ask my constituents to guarantee the financing of this so that you can in competition with the one back home that is not even getting enough business as it is? I do not think so.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. We do not ask your taxpayers to guarantee the project in any way, shape, form, or fashion other than what the President of the United States wants us to contribute, which is a maximum of \$14 million spread over a long period of time.

Mr. JACOBS. That is right.

Mr. GRAY. And have it ready for the bicentennial. That is all.

Mr. JACOBS. It is the other thing that bothers me, if you want to be frank about it, and that is the expense, because when you translate \$14 million into a Rayburnese or an FBI-ese building, you get to a very astronomical sum, just for the record, and I know the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past 100 years is filled, just filled, with warnings that were unheeded and later proved to be absolutely true.

So I do not know whether we should not amend this bill to call this project the "Famous Last Words Memorial Convention Center," because that is exactly what it is going to be.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, I will support the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire, but in regard to whether or not your taxpayers are going to have to pick up that deficit, you know the bonds are guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the District of Columbia Government, and you being a member of that Committee on the District of Columbia, know that whatever they put in their budget comes back out of the Treasury.

Mr. JACOBS. I agree. That is exactly what the situation was in Indianapolis. They were only guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the municipality, and they are going to have to back it up now.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. JACOBS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Here again there are no bonds authorized in this bill. We are building this facility exactly like we are 63 other Federal buildings in this country.

Mr. JACOBS. Again the problem is

that you are going to be right back here asking for bonds when this project falls on its face. I can predict it just as certainly as night follows day. That is exactly what will happen and it is wrong.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. We are trying to build it at a total Federal cost of no more than \$14 million, which will be spent over a period of 30 years, compared to the building which will be built in the gentleman's hometown for a cost of over \$20 million.

Mr. JACOBS. I have no higher respect for any Member of this Congress than I do for the gentleman from Illinois, and I know that he will try to do the right thing and he will try to accomplish this as he says, but I also know that he will fail, because it cannot be done.

I urge the members of this committee, do not make the same mistake that we made back home. Do not go in competition with us, because they are having trouble there already and we are only 600 miles away.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I only wish that my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, were here today so that we might hear equally inflammatory rhetoric in opposition to this bill as a whole, and in support of this amendment as we have heard for it.

My second wish would be that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky had included the section of the bill that includes the naming of various Federal buildings throughout the country for sitting Members of the Congress, even though some of them are retiring and most deserving.

I hope that puts that one to rest, and that we can have a lot more fun about it before the day is over.

However, I rise primarily, Mr. Chairman, to point out another reason why this amendment should be adopted. The question has been well exercised as to whether or not the family of General Eisenhower wishes it named after him and/or made the memorial. But in addition to that, as far as the pure rhetoric of the bill is concerned, this gives far too much power to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. It authorizes him in many instances to provide for the development and the construction, and it says that the Center shall be in accordance with the plan designed by the Commissioner and the District Council, and others. And it says notwithstanding the provisions of the Redevelopment Act, and others and plans approved according to the Commission and reportedly the Houses "notwithstanding any other provisions of law," and so forth, and it is replete with exceptions to existing laws that past Congresses and this Congress have passed. It has the power of condemnation under the right of eminent domain.

It states the Commissioner is authorized to include negotiated contracts for the financing, design, construction, and maintenance of the Center, and to determine a nominal rental. This is much,



much too much power for any Commissioner, any board, and council, or any mayor, because mayors, like ourselves, come and go, and once in a while a bad apple turns up in the barrel.

It goes ahead to say that purchase contracts will be at the Commissioner's discretion, and we are abdicating the power of the Congress as a council for the District of Columbia, and no other law in the interim withstanding. We should not do this! We should decide what the reasonable rate of interest on the outstanding principal is. But is this for the Commissioner to decide? If so, we have given him a carte blanche for change orders, including but not limited to the payment of taxes and the carrying of insurance.

This bill is filled with provisos waiving existing law that invites politics, patronage, and before-the-fact commitments which will never be kept.

I have trouble in believing that the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government is not committed on page 19, line 10, subsection (e), where it says:

The full faith and credit of the Government of the District of Columbia is hereby committed to guarantee, upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, the fulfillment of all obligations—

And this is one bird that will come home to roost, if in the meantime someone does not feather their own nest overwhelmingly.

Furthermore, we go ahead to say that the Commissioner may provide for the performance of the operation, including the use of rental of the Civic Center or its equipment, motor vehicle parking facilities, and so forth.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we say that there is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$14 million for the Federal share of the contribution to the District of Columbia for the purposes of this act.

I ask you, is any such huge sum now available in our bankrupt Treasury? Is there any sum not otherwise appropriated? Is this therefore timely, and can we expect to go ahead and not have this bird come home to roost, as has Dulles, as has the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, as has well been brought out here today? And, finally, as has the Robert Kennedy Stadium?

Now, the real priority and the need for such expenditure of funds are such, and in my opinion, as has been so oft repeated in the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the District of Columbia, not a highway, not more access, not more performing centers, not more sports plazas, but the real need is dissemination, and if we must build something else in the District of Columbia let us build a jail that will hold the 1,600 prisoners that we have in the one now that was built in 1868 for only 400, and which is a disgrace to the Nation, and from which a murderer escaped only yesterday. Let us have priorities where they ought to be, let us quit the competition with in-being businesses, and get down to the fact of the matter and save this unnecessary and ill-timed expenditure of money.

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

I believe I understood the gentleman from Illinois to say that there would be 110 acres of real estate in the District of Columbia covered with concrete when the civic center is built.

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. No; it is 10 acres. Originally, the District of Columbia government proposed taking 25 acres from Mount Vernon Square as an urban renewal area in the Chinese downtown area. Our committee said no.

Mr. MYERS. Continuing further, I understood the gentleman to say also, and I realize this is eight blocks from the President's visitors center—was there any consideration given to building this center closer to the visitors center, so that you can utilize a common parking lot? I think everyone in this Chamber realizes often when we have constituents who come here, the biggest problem here is the parking problem which is not sufficient to park within the District of Columbia or within a number of blocks here of the Capitol.

It seems to me consideration should be given to build this center, if it is necessary at all, closer to the visitors center. Was consideration given to that?

Mr. GRAY. For the very obvious reason that the gentleman pointed out, we did, however, consider putting them together. Constituents are going to be at the visitors' center and parking there and the conventioners might be staying in a hotel or motel. We feel it better to keep them separated in order to avoid traffic congestion.

Mr. MYERS. It does not seem to me like the gentleman makes a valid argument here—admitting the interest here is entirely different. Visitors of our Capitol come here in the daytime. I think the visitors' center would be used about the same time. The civic center probably would be an evening attendance center. I just cannot understand still—over eight blocks apart and they are going to have to bus and there is a tremendous cost of busing.

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. The subway will be operative by the time these facilities are constructed between both the visitors' center and the convention center.

Someone staying downtown can get up to the visitors' center or the convention center. I want to advise that the subway connects with the visitors' center, so these large conventions like the Democratic and Republican National Conventions where there may be as many as 50,000 or 100,000 people, there will not be enough parking to take care of all of them put together, and there would be too much traffic congestion also.

Mr. MYERS. I do not think the gentleman has made a very good argument.

I have one last question.

On page 31 of the report, there is this language and I quote:

In this connection, it is interesting to note that an amendment in Subcommittee to require that contract be let to the "lowest and

best bidder, as determined by the Commissioner," failed.

Why did the committee turn down an amendment like this—to let it to the lowest and best bidder and that it will not be done this way?

Mr. GRAY. First let me state that this facility is going to be built as a turnkey project. The reason that the RFK Stadium was way out of reach in cost estimates was it was done in increments. One contract was awarded for the foundation; another one for the superstructure; and another one for finish work. This was what caused the cost to go up, the same way as the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

What we propose to do here is to allow a private entrepreneur to come in and bid now on all items, the architectural work, the plans, the land acquisition, the building itself—whatever is involved in putting this up—so we will know exactly to the penny what it is going to cost in advance.

If a bidder is looking at it from the dollars-and-cents standpoint alone, we could not accept that just because the dollar figure bid was the lowest. We want something to uphold the great dignity of the Capital City, something that will be approved by the Fine Arts Commission, by the National Capital Planning Commission, the President Bicentennial Commission, and the Mayor and his District Government. Dollars are important, but also the aesthetics of the project are important. We cannot go out and ask for bids and say, "Give us 300,000 square feet of space," and then take whatever comes. It might look like a tarpaper shack. We have to trust the President. We have to trust the Bureau of the Budget. We have to trust the Mayor. We have to trust the Council. They would have to review and approve this project before it could be built.

Mr. MYERS. I do not think it is a matter of trust. It is a matter of good business. As a businessman I would not think of building something and disregarding the cost. What we usually do is we have an architect draw up whatever we want. That is the first thing. We have that first approved. I think we would do that in this case. Then the architectural plans are submitted to the prospective bidders, and we have them bid, and we take the lowest and best bid.

Mr. GRAY. A turnkey project does not work that way. We cannot go any other way and have the project completed by 1976, the bicentennial. Furthermore, if we go turnkey we will save a lot of money by getting one bid price in advance. The \$128 million FBI building is a good example. We authorized \$60 million and the cost has more than doubled because we did it the way you propose, in steps.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I indicated that Mrs. Eisenhower reaffirmed her desire that as a memorial the Eisenhower College be continued on behalf of the family, but the record also shows that Mrs. Eisenhower, the widow of General Eisenhower, has no objection to this project being given the name of

Eisenhower. I think she even has gone further, she has no objection so long as the District of Columbia project does not prejudice the support the Congress in the past has given to Eisenhower College on what it might do in the future.

There is no question in the record that as far as the President and this administration are concerned, they are for this project. As I understand the amendment that is currently before the committee, it would in effect remove from the legislation the convention project for all intents and purposes. I want it clearly understood that the administration opposes the amendment and supports the bill with the project included.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, along with my colleague the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) there is no Member for whom I feel greater respect than the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) and for the distinguished committee on which he serves.

My support of this amendment is not dictated by any feeling about home rule that has been brought into this argument. I think that might be a good idea, too. And it is not brought about by an overriding concern, although I have a concern—about the budgetary problems—that is not my primary reason either. It is not because of any feeling concerning our late President General Eisenhower. I admire him greatly. We were in the Army together.

Gentlemen, we have built a Kennedy Stadium down here and we have not paid a dime on the principal in 10 or 11 years. We fooled around and lost a baseball team as well. We have built this stadium, and we have not paid a dime on it.

We have had some talk about some bicycles and the Greyhound buses. I do not understand finance or budgets. Go down to the bank and borrow money to buy a Greyhound bus, and do not pay for it, and then go talk to them about borrowing more money for a bicycle. Gentlemen, we cannot be serious.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. If the Mississippi River should ever run dry, I will be in the gentleman's district. I have great respect for him, however. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. I do not think he was on the floor when a recent colloquy took place.

We have studied the RFK Stadium and the best analogy I can possibly draw is this. How many days or nights would we be able to meet in this Chamber if it had no roof on it? The same thing applies to RFK Stadium. All the stadiums throughout the United States with the exception of Cincinnati, Ohio, are losing money, all of them, but every single convention center in the country we contacted is making money. The city of Anaheim, Calif., last year with a 150,000 square foot arena made \$800,000 clear profit and they are doubling the size of it.

When the McCormack Place in Chicago burned down, Mayor Daley could not beat the door of the bank down fast enough to have it rebuilt.

Ask the people of Baltimore what their Civic Center did for the city of Baltimore.

I know my friend, being able and sincere, would not want to compare the RFK Stadium, which is a one-use facility, with a facility that can be used 800 or 900 times a year.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I will never be intentionally unfair. I would suppose if it is that profitable, if they are making that money—does Bob Short know that? I suppose he would have been willing to pay \$10,000 down and borrow the rest the way we hear some people buy a baseball team.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois' ability. He is right if we look at the facility, it is now a one-use facility, I think football. It used to be a two-use facility. We fooled around and lost the baseball team. If it is profitable and practical, believe me, the American businessman will find the money to build it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, why not build a roof on the stadium out there if it would make it practical?

Mr. GRAY. We checked into that and I guarantee all of you here that it would cost the taxpayer a great deal more than \$14 million. This bill was written by OMB Director Weinberger, and his staff with the help of the Mayor and his staff. They say it will fly. Does that side of the aisle trust its fiscal expert or does it not? This bill was written by fiscal experts.

Mr. HUNGATE. I still urge support for this amendment for the reasons stated. I believe I am right, although perhaps I am not. I would urge all Members, who think we have done the right thing so far with the stadium and that its problems should be disregarded in building this new memorial, to consider this.

There are, as I understand it, several vacancies on the District of Columbia Committee and there are to be several more, so I hope those Members—supporting this project—will all apply and go to work on solving that stadium problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. SNYDER, GRAY, JAMES V. STANTON, and CLEVELAND.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 183, noes 199, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—183

Abourezk  
Alexander  
Anderson, Ill.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Archer  
Ashbrook  
Aspin  
Bennett  
Bergland  
Blackburn  
Bray

Brinkley  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brotzman  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Burke, Fla.  
Burlison, Tex.  
Cabell  
Camp  
Carlson  
Carter  
Casey, Tex.

Cederberg  
Chappell  
Clancy  
Crawson, Del.  
Cleveland  
Collins, Tex.  
Conable  
Coughlin  
Crane  
Curlin  
Daniel, Va.  
Davis, Ga.

Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Denholm  
Dennis  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Dingell  
Dow  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, Ala.  
Ellberg  
Eshleman  
Findley  
Fisher  
Flowers  
Flynt  
Ford,  
William D.  
Forsythe  
Fountain  
Frey  
Galifianakis  
Gaydos  
Gettys  
Gibbons  
Goldwater  
Goodling  
Gubser  
Haley  
Hall  
Hamilton  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hastings  
Hathaway  
Hébert  
Heinz  
Henderson  
Hicks, Wash.  
Hillis  
Hogan  
Hosmer  
Hungate  
Hunt

Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Jonas  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kazen  
Keating  
Kemp  
Kuykendall  
Kyl  
Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Landrum  
Lennon  
Lent  
Link  
Lloyd  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
McCollister  
McDade  
McEwen  
McKevitt  
Mahon  
Mallory  
Mann  
Martin  
Mayne  
Mazzoli  
Michel  
Mikva  
Mills, Md.  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Mosher  
Moss  
Myers  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Obey  
O'Hara  
O'Konski  
Passman  
Pelly  
Pettis  
Poage  
Powell  
Price, Tex.  
Rallsback

NOES—199

Abbitt  
Abzug  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Anderson,  
Calif.  
Anderson,  
Tenn.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Arends  
Ashley  
Aspinall  
Badillo  
Baker  
Barrett  
Begich  
Biester  
Bingham  
Blanton  
Blatnik  
Boland  
Bolling  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brown, Mich.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Mass.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Burton  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Byron  
Caffery  
Carney  
Chamberlain  
Chisholm  
Clark  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Collier  
Collins, Ill.  
Conover  
Conte  
Conyers  
Corman  
Cotter  
Daniels, N.J.  
Danielson  
DeLuca  
Dent

Randall  
Rarick  
Rees  
Roberts  
Robinson, Va.  
Robinson, N.Y.  
Roncalio  
Roush  
Rousselot  
Roy  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
Satterfield  
Scherie  
Schneebell  
Shoup  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Skubitz  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Spence  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Ullman  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Wampler  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winn  
Wyatt  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young, Fla.  
Zwach

Diggs  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Drinan  
du Pont  
Edwards, Calif.  
Erlenborn  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fascell  
Fish  
Flood  
Foley  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fraser  
Frelinghuysen  
Frenzel  
Fulton  
Fuqua  
Garmatz  
Gonzalez  
Grasso  
Gray  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Grover  
Gude  
Halpern  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Harrington  
Harsha  
Harvey  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Hicks, Mass.  
Hollifield  
Howard  
Hull  
Jarman  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jones, Ala.  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kee  
King  
Kluczynski

Koch  
Latta  
Leggett  
McClory  
McCloskey  
McFall  
McKinney  
McMillan  
Madden  
Mailhard  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mathis, Ga.  
Matsunaga  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Metcalfe  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Ohio  
Mills, Ark.  
Minish  
Minshall  
Mitchell  
Mizell  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Murphy, Ill.  
Natcher  
Nix  
O'Neill  
Patman  
Patten  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Peyser  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Podell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Pucinski  
Quile  
Quillen  
Rangel  
Reid  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Riegle  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers  
Rooney, Pa.



Rosenthal	Smith, Calif.	Van Deerlin
Rostenkowski	Smith, Iowa	Waggonner
Roybal	Springer	Waldie
St Germain	Staggers	Ware
Sandman	Stanton	Whalen
Sarbanes	J. William	Whalley
Saylor	Steed	White
Scheuer	Steele	Widnall
Schwengel	Stokes	Wilson, Bob
Scott	Stubblefield	Wolff
Sebellus	Stuckey	Wright
Seiberling	Symington	Wydler
Shipley	Thompson, N.J.	Young, Tex.
Sisk	Tiernan	Zablocki
Slack	Udall	Zion

## NOT VOTING—49

Abernethy	Esch	Mollohan
Annuzio	Evans, Colo.	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Gallagher	Nichols
Belcher	Gialmo	Purcell
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Rooney, N.Y.
Betts	Gross	Runnels
Bevill	Hagan	Schmitz
Biaggi	Horton	Stanton
Boggs	Keith	James V.
Bow	Lujan	Teague, Calif.
Carey, N.Y.	McClure	Teague, Tex.
Celler	McCormack	Terry
Clay	McCulloch	Thompson, Ga.
Colmer	McDonald	Wiggins
Culver	Mich.	
Davis, S.C.	McKay	
Dowdy	Macdonald	
Dwyer	Mass.	
Edmondson	Mink	

So the amendment was rejected.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SNYDER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Page 19, after line 9, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) No purchase contract for the construction of such civic center shall be entered into, pursuant to the authority of this section, until thirty legislative days following submittal to and approval by the Senate and House Committees for the District of Columbia, and the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, of the design, plans, and specifications, including detailed cost estimates, of such civic center."

And renumber the remaining sections.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is almost identical, but not in toto, with an amendment that was adopted to this bill in the other body.

This bill provides for contract authority to build a civic center. Once the bill is approved, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the District of Columbia, who know more about this District than the Committee on Public Works does, have no more authority over it; the contract can be let and the commitment is made.

Now, the cost estimates that have been testified to before the committee are about \$65 million, and considering the interest rate, about \$135 million. If the estimates on this are in error, the same as they were on the stadium, then it will cost four times that or around a half a billion dollars.

All this amendment requires is that after the design is put together and after the plans are made and after the specifications are approved and the detailed cost estimates are made, then these must be submitted to the respective committees; the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. With their approval the project can go forward.

We have been talking about the cost today. Those who oppose the project, as

I do, of course, look with the greatest disfavor on it and perhaps boost a little what can happen, and those who are in favor of it keep the cost down.

The statement is made that there will only be \$14 million coming out of the Treasury as far as the Federal Government is concerned, but we have made the point before—and it is true—that any deficit must be made up by the District government, which, in turn, must come here for their Federal payment as they have done on these other projects.

Now bear this in mind. I have said it before, and I must say it again. There was an amendment offered in the subcommittee that this contract be let to the lowest and best bidder as determined by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. That was rejected. There is no more control over this project so far as this cost is concerned by the Congress after today unless you adopt this amendment. This is an amendment that expresses fiscal responsibility to your people back home. It is an amendment that says after you get the final, fixed-cost estimates, not the whole Congress but the District of Columbia Committee and the Appropriations Committee, who in the final analysis are going to be called on to put up the money later on down the road, will get a look at it to see whether or not it is as fiscally sound as it is proposed to be.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my distinguished friend from Kentucky for yielding to me.

I am sure he would not want to leave the impression that the Appropriations Committee will not have a 100-percent control over every nickel of that \$14 million that the President calls upon the Congress to appropriate. So what the gentleman's amendment would do would be to delay this project to the point where we will not have it ready for the bicentennial.

Mr. SNYDER. The impression I want to leave is they have now only control over the \$14 million and nothing beyond that, when the deficit shows up. If this amendment is adopted, at least they can look at the whole project to see whether or not it looks like there will be a deficit—and I think there will be—and whether or not they want to approve that deficit.

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, he knows full well that the language of the act speaks for itself. There is not one nickel more than \$14 million that can be approved by the Congress under this authority.

Mr. SNYDER. This gentleman is a little denser than that. He does not know that.

Mr. GRAY. Would the gentleman like me to read the language to him?

Mr. SNYDER. I have studied it quite thoroughly, and I know the full faith and credit of the District of Columbia is behind the balance over and above the \$14 million. If they do not have it when the deficit shows up, then it has to be picked up with a Federal payment.

Mr. GRAY. In that eventually, where will the District come to get the money other than from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right. But the

project is there then and they have no alternative but to give it to them. Let us let them take a look at it with detailed costs. Why are you afraid of that? Do you know something I do not know?

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield further? I trust President Nixon, I trust Mr. Weinberger, I trust Mayor Washington, I trust the bipartisan city council, and I trust all of the people in the District of Columbia who are able to run their own affairs.

Mr. SNYDER. Do not make a speech on my time.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SNYDER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I trust those people, but I also trusted the same people and their predecessors when they came in with the Kennedy Center, and I trusted those same people and their predecessors when they came down for the RFK Stadium. They were wrong on those counts; their track record is terrible, and I am not going to trust their judgment in this case. And that is why, after they get final cost estimates, I say that they ought to let the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee and the District of Columbia Committee take a look at it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, the House will recall a little over 2 months ago we passed the Public Buildings' Amendments Act of 1972. This legislation was requested by the President of the United States to take a long backlog of buildings and get them started. I am happy to say that in a short 2 months' time the General Services Administration has not only planned these 63 buildings, but are now going out for bids and a dozen or more of them have come back with private entrepreneurs offering to build these buildings at interest rates aggregating about 7 to 7.5 percent, which is a very good rate on today's market. We are getting ready to start digging dirt in 63 communities. You could visualize, if you will, that if they had taken all of these 63 buildings and referred their plans back to the Committee on Appropriations to take a look at them, and where they have a very limited staff, that it would take several months' time for them to go out and look at each facility, and then approve them, and at the way that inflation is increasing, at 5 percent, do you know that that would cost about \$100 million additional for these 63 buildings.

All we are doing here is giving the President and the Commissioner of the District authority to move forthwith and to award contracts, and get started so that we can use this facility at a time when it will be needed.

If we should agree to this amendment all we will be doing is delaying this project, and because of inflated prices this means that the costs will be increased for the construction.

I hope that we can vote down this amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROVER. Would the gentleman agree that we are not trying to take away the right of oversight or the looking over of contracts by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from New York is eminently correct; however, the 52-member Committee on Appropriations, for whom I have a very high regard, if we adopt this amendment, and if they decide to do so, they could delay this project but they do have oversight with the committee bill.

Mr. GROVER. Will the gentleman not agree further that the language in section 4(b), which authorizes the appropriation, will have to be handled under the scrutiny of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Finance Committee of the Senate?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is correct. Every single time will have to be authorized by the Appropriation Committee under this bill and the proposed amendment is only a delaying action.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, the effect of which is to give the District of Columbia Committees and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate another look at this project before it is launched, as it will be launched without any further congressional scrutiny if we pass this bill today.

That there is doubt about this bill must be apparent from the recent vote on the taking out the whole civic center section, and the vote was 199 to 183, so that there is doubt about it.

Let me tell you something about the hearings that we held in the Committee on Public Works. Let me tell you why if this Congress does not add this extra step of scrutiny that we will be acting most imprudently. Up until very recently this project we are talking about today was a 25-acre project. And this was the project that engendered much of the input that has gone into these discussions. Last summer on very short notice it was changed from a 25-acre project to a 10-acre project, and on that project we had but 1 day of hearings.

In the general debate, and the discussion on the previous amendment, I asked the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) if he meant that 85 percent of the—and he quoted—of the people, as well as the landowners, were in favor of this new project.

I can only say according to the report and I quote:

Hearings before the committee and local surveys have indicated that 85 percent of site can be acquired from willing sellers.

There is nothing about the tenants.

And again in the hearings on page 58 of the printed hearings—again this question was asked and this time it was 80 percent of the people—people who owned 80 percent of the land in that four-block area are in favor of the center. Nothing about tenants, occupants, or leases.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) has said that the survey included tenants. And he may have some information that I do not have. He may have some information that is not in the

printed hearings or in the printed report. But there is some doubt. It must be apparent we are dealing here with a project that only enjoyed 1 day of hearings and there has not been sufficient time or study. I do not see how the House in its wisdom can object to letting the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee and the District of Columbia Committee have a last look at this before it is finalized. I do not see why they do not accept the amendment.

At one time I understood from the ranking member on the Republican side that he had no objection to the amendment. I am not sure what his position is right now. Yes; this might delay the project for 30 days or it might delay the project for 60 days. But with a project of this size—with the honest questions and doubts that have been raised here during this debate—what is wrong with a 30-day or 60-day delay—if indeed it will be that much of a delay?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer that question?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I think my distinguished colleague from Kentucky gave the best answer. He made the statement in the well that we could not have this facility ready for the bicentennial in 1976. So any delay of 1 month to 3 months is not only going to cost more money but it might preclude us from having this facility ready for 50 million people who are going to be coming here in less than 4 years. That is the main reason.

Second, the reason it is not needed is because the Appropriations Committee will review any request for Federal funds for this project.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The Appropriations Committee as I understand from the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. NATCHER of Kentucky—we were talking on the floor of the House—will have a chance to review the request for funding if this project falls on its face. He is not going to have a single word to say if we get it started and you are going to come to the House if it does not work and say "Look, we need some money to make it work."

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. We have heard so much about Congress subsidizing the District, which is true to a degree. We have increased the Federal payment by over \$70 million this year. But we also can credit to the District of Columbia government raising almost \$600 million from taxes, generated by the local people. So this is the tail wagging the dog—the argument about Congress being big brother for the District.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Thank you very much. I have been told the figure is 70 percent but perhaps you are right—perhaps I am wrong.

I think this House would be very poorly advised not to adopt this amendment. At the most it would delay the project only 30 or 60 days and if there is some fear about delaying the project for that

short a time I think the reasons should be spelled out in more detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. SNYDER, GRAY, GROVER, and JAMES V. STANTON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 250, noes 137, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—250

Abourezk	Ford, Gerald R.	Mailliard
Alexander	Ford,	Mallory
Anderson, Ill.	William D.	Mann
Andrews,	Forsythe	Martin
N. Dak.	Fountain	Mathias, Calif.
Archer	Frelinghuysen	Mathis, Ga.
Arends	Frenzel	Mayne
Ashbrook	Frey	Mazzoli
Aspin	Galifianakis	Michel
Baker	Gaydos	Mikva
Barrett	Gettys	Mills, Md.
Bennett	Gibbons	Minish
Blester	Goldwater	Minshall
Bingham	Gonzalez	Monagan
Blackburn	Goodling	Montgomery
Blanton	Grasso	Mosher
Boland	Griffin	Myers
Bolling	Griffiths	Natcher
Bow	Gubser	Nedzi
Bray	Haley	Nelsen
Brinkley	Hall	Obey
Broomfield	Halpern	O'Hara
Brotzman	Hamilton	O'Konski
Brown, Mich.	Hammer-	Passman
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Pelly
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Pettis
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Peyser
Burleson, Tex.	Harvey	Pirnie
Byrnes, Wis.	Hastings	Podell
Cabell	Hathaway	Powell
Caffery	Hechler, W. Va.	Preyer, N.C.
Camp	Heckler, Mass.	Price, Tex.
Carlson	Heinz	Quie
Carter	Henderson	Railsback
Casey, Tex.	Hicks, Mass.	Randall
Cederberg	Hicks, Wash.	Rarick
Chamberlain	Hogan	Rhodes
Chappell	Horton	Roberts
Clancy	Hosmer	Robinson, Va.
Clausen,	Hull	Robison, N.Y.
Don H.	Hungate	Roncallo
Clawson, Del	Hunt	Roush
Cleveland	Hutchinson	Roussetot
Collier	Ichord	Roy
Collins, Tex.	Jacobs	Ruppe
Colmer	Jarman	Ruth
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Sandman
Conover	Jonas	Sarbanes
Conte	Jones, N.C.	Satterfield
Cotter	Jones, Tenn.	Saylor
Coughlin	Kazen	Scherle
Crane	Keating	Schneebeli
Curlin	Keith	Schwengel
Daniel, Va.	Kemp	Scott
Davis, Wis.	King	Sebelius
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Shoup
Dellenback	Kyl	Shriver
Denholm	Landgrebe	Sikes
Dennis	Landrum	Slack
Derwinski	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Devine	Lennon	Smith, Iowa
Dickinson	Lent	Smith, N.Y.
Dingell	Link	Snyder
Downing	Lloyd	Spence
Dulski	Long, La.	Springer
Duncan	Long, Md.	Stanton,
du Pont	McClary	J. William
Edwards, Ala.	McCollister	Steele
Ellberg	McCulloch	Steiger, Ariz.
Erlenborn	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Eshleman	McEwen	Stephens
Findley	McKay	Stubblefield
Fish	McKevitt	Sullivan
Fisher	Macdonald,	Talcott
Flowers	Mass.	Taylor
Flynt	Mahon	Terry



Thomson, Wis.	Whalen	Wolff
Thone	Whalley	Wyatt
Tierman	White	Wydler
Ullman	Whitehurst	Wyllie
Vander Jagt	Whitten	Wyman
Vanik	Widnall	Yates
Veysey	Williams	Yatron
Vigorito	Wilson,	Young, Fla.
Wampler	Charles H.	Zion
Ware	Winn	

## NOES—137

Abbutt	Evins, Tenn.	O'Neill
Abzug	Flood	Patman
Adams	Foley	Patten
Addabbo	Fraser	Pepper
Albert	Fulton	Perkins
Anderson,	Fuqua	Pickle
Calif.	Garmatz	Pike
Anderson,	Gray	Poage
Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Price, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Grover	Pryor, Ark.
Ashley	Gude	Pucinski
Aspinall	Hanley	Quillen
Badillo	Harrington	Rangel
Begich	Harsha	Rees
Bergland	Hawkins	Reid
Blatnik	Hays	Reuss
Brademas	Hébert	Riegle
Brasco	Helstoski	Rodino
Brooks	Holifield	Roe
Broyhill, Va.	Howard	Rogers
Buchanan	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Ala.	Rosenthal
Burlison, Mo.	Karth	Rostenkowski
Burton	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Byrne, Pa.	Kee	St Germain
Byron	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Carney, N.Y.	Koch	Seiberling
Carney	Kyros	Shipley
Celler	Leggett	Sisk
Chisholm	McCloskey	Skubitz
Clark	McFall	Staggers
Collins, Ill.	McKinney	Stanton,
Conyers	Madden	James V.
Corman	Matsunaga	Stokes
Daniels, N.J.	Meeds	Stratton
Danielson	Melcher	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	Metcalfe	Symington
Delaney	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Miller, Ohio	Udall
Dent	Mills, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Diggs	Mitchell	Waggonner
Donohue	Mizell	Waldie
Dorn	Moorhead	Wilson, Bob
Dow	Morgan	Wright
Drinan	Moss	Young, Tex.
Eckhardt	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Edwards, Calif.	Nix	

## NOT VOTING—44

Abernethy	Esch	McMillan
Annunzio	Evans, Colo.	Mink
Baring	Fascell	Mollohan
Belcher	Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.
Bell	Gialmo	Nichols
Betts	Green, Oreg.	Purcell
Bevill	Gross	Rooney, N.Y.
Biaggi	Hagan	Runnels
Boggs	Hanna	Schmitz
Clay	Hillis	Steed
Culver	Lujan	Teague, Calif.
Davis, S.C.	McClure	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	McCormack	Thompson, Ga.
Dwyer	McDonald,	Wiggins
Edmondson	Mich.	Zwach

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: Page 30, after line 5, insert the following new section:

Sec. 35. The United States courthouse and Federal Building to be constructed in the block bounded by the proposed Makai Street, Halekauwila Street, Kakaako Street, and Ala Moana Boulevard, in Honolulu, Hawaii, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole Building".

Sec. 36. The Federal office building to be constructed in the city of Albany, New York, is hereby designated as the "Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building", in honor of Leo W. O'Brien, a distinguished Member of the United States

House of Representatives from 1952 to 1967, and any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building".

Sec. 37. The United States Federal office building to be constructed in the block bounded on the south side by Market Street, north by Art Street, east by 6th Street, and west by 7th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "William J. Green, Jr. Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to "William J. Green Jr. Federal Building".

Sec. 38. The United States courthouse to be constructed in the block bounded on the south side by Market Street, north by Art Street, east by 6th Street, and west by 7th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "James A. Byrne Federal Courthouse". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "James A. Byrne Federal Courthouse".

Sec. 39. The Federal building at East 9th Street and Lakeside Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Anthony J. Celebrezze Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Anthony J. Celebrezze Federal Building".

Sec. 40. The post office and Federal building at Jefferson and Walnut Streets, Green Bay, Wisconsin, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "John W. Byrnes Post Office and Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "John W. Byrnes Post Office and Federal Building".

Page 30, line 6, strike out "35" and insert "41".

Page 30, line 9, after "32" insert a comma and the following: "38, and 40".

Mr. GRAY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be brief. On a day when Ralph Nader and others seem to want to criticize the work of this great body, I think it is more than appropriate that we pause and look back over the past few years at such great giants of Congress as Mendel Rivers, who built a military establishment to defend our country. I think it is time to pay our great respects to retiring Members such as EMANUEL CELLER, the beloved dean of the House, who is leaving the House, and many other colleagues too numerous to mention to perpetuate the great work that all of these deceased and retired Members of Congress have performed for their Government. This recognition and tribute is well deserved and long overdue.

In considering this legislation, we inadvertently left out six of our colleagues. Therefore, the amendment before us is to name six additional buildings after either deceased or retired Members of Congress. There is one in Hawaii, one in New York, two in Pennsylvania, and

one in Cleveland, Ohio, and one in Wisconsin.

There is no cost involved to the Federal Government, and I am sure all my colleagues will want to vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: Page 20, line 18, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "Provided, however, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall be made available for one year during which applications may be received by the House Committee on Public Works from any municipality in the Nation for the construction of a Bicentennial Civic Center under terms and condition set forth in this Act."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. It simply says that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated shall be available for 1 year during which applications may be received by the House Committee on Public Works from any municipality in the Nation, for the construction of a bicentennial civic center under terms and conditions set forth in this act.

I should like to reemphasize the "under terms and conditions set forth in this act."

Much has been said here today, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that many cities have such centers as we here consider. In fact, I believe the statement was made that all 24 cities larger than the District of Columbia have established convention centers, and that they are making great profit. Others are building, many with Federal funds. If so, why should they not likewise be honored by having bicentennial civic centers under the same arrangements and terms set forth in this act?

This would simply delay for the time being, pending the receipt from other municipalities—and the determination by this committee—of those who would like also to honor the bicentennial of the Revolution and the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Chairman, I feel no further statement is necessary in support of this amendment. I offer it in all good faith and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall be brief.

I have great respect for my distinguished neighbor from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, we are doing much for the 50 States. As I mentioned a moment ago, we are spending over \$4 billion building 63 Federal buildings all across this country, in almost every State in the Union.

I will not plow over old ground, but this is a very modest amount to be spent for this facility. We are taking very good care of the rest of the United States. The best way I can describe this proposal is to give you some good southern Illinois language by saying that we are offering here a champagne plan on a beer

pocketbook. Very little taxpayer money will be needed. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 45, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: Strike out lines 23 through 25 on page 29, and lines 1 through 5 on page 30, and renumber following sections accordingly.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Members who do not have the bill before them, this would strike out that section of this bill which is not pertinent, which has no place in the bill, nor indeed in the Committee on Public Works, extending the special privileges of our past Speaker in the 91st Congress for an additional 2 years.

I submit this amendment without any lack of love for our past Speaker. I would like to disabuse anyone's idea that it is submitted in that spirit.

I submit it simply because it is a bad precedent to establish, indeed a continuation that is a bad precedent, as it was bad in the beginning. It is unwarranted. It is improper, if not illegal use of taxpayers' money.

Section 34 is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works. When House Resolution 1238 was brought before the House during the 91st Congress, it came before us out of the Committee on House Administration. We were then led to believe during the debate on House Resolution 1238 that these benefits granted to our former Speaker, the Honorable John McCormack, would be for only a 2-year duration.

I would quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 32, page 43316, where it says:

In order to ease the transition and to settle matters relating to the Speaker's official and very extensive legislative and administrative matters, the House resolution authorizes for the use of the Speaker, for a period of 2 years immediately following the expiration of his present term of office as a Representative in the 91st Congress, and originally the various allowances granted Members for the operation of their office.

I think this is self-explanatory, but for emphasis I repeat: "2 years immediately following. We all know that section 34 is not germane, according to rule XVI of clause 7, and this is another reason that the Members should support this amendment."

This applicable section is "where a bill merely extends an official's authority under existing law, and an amendment permanently amending that law has always been held not germane."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the committee report makes no mention of section 34 of this bill.

The Speakers of the House of Representatives are elected by we, the Representatives of the people, but not by the people who are the taxpayers. The taxpayers' funds have never been available

for the blessed name of charity or for such needs as this even though they be decided by the Congress, and this is a constitutional truism.

I urge support of this amendment, and I recommend that in view of our beloved former Speaker's affluence, his known attention to detail, and the fact that he himself requested that many of the benefits of the original amendment brought out of the Committee on House Administration be stricken, that we now strike this unneeded section from the bill.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for our distinguished friend from Missouri, Mr. HALL. My heart is really saddened that he offered this amendment.

For 43 years John W. McCormack served with dedication and great distinction in this body. He was an outstanding Speaker. He is housed in the Federal Office Building in Boston, Mass. He is writing his memoirs and he is gathering up all of his official documents. As he goes into the sunset of his life he certainly deserves to be permitted to stay in this suite he has in this old Federal office building in Boston for 2 more years. Is this too much to ask, for this Congress to grant, for 43 years of dedicated public service to our country? There is not one great program or law in this country that his name has not appeared on or received his support for the past 43 years. We give Secret Service protection to former Presidents' wives and children and now are even giving Secret Service protection to candidates. Are we going to say "No, John McCormack, you cannot have an office for 2 additional years in Boston."

That is all the bill does, and the gentleman from Missouri would strike it out. I hope we do not have one person voting in favor of this amendment. I hope we will vote down the amendment.

Mr. GROVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROVER. I concur with the gentleman's remarks.

I can just understand the letdown feeling our former Speaker would experience if this House, which he loved so much and to which his life was dedicated, denied him this last little legislative courtesy to permit him to complete his works.

I hope, as the gentleman from Illinois requests, that we do not have a record vote and, in any event, that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my friend. I agree with him. I love John McCormack and I know almost everyone does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 8, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16645) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1136, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this:

Under the provisions of rule VIII of the House of Representatives, should a Member sitting today, for whom a building is being named, vote on a proposal in which he has a direct personal interest? In other words, should a Member for whom a building is being named in his honor be excused from voting on the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that is entirely within the judgment and discretion of the individual Member.

Mr. VANIK. And the rule of the House leaves it within the discretion of that individual Member?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the Speaker.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HALL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALL moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 16645, to the Committee on Public Works, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike section 13, page 23, lines 10 to 160.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.



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

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Speaker appointed as tellers Messrs. GRAY, SNYDER, KEE, and GROVER.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: This vote that is being taken by tellers with clerks is a vote on final passage of the bill, is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the Speaker.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 212, noes 169, answered "present" 9, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

[Recorded teller vote]

AYES—212

Abzug	Erlenborn	Mahon
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard
Addabbo	Fascell	Mathias, Calif.
Anderson,	Flood	Matsunaga
Calif.	Foley	Meeds
Anderson,	Ford, Gerald R.	Meicher
Tenn.	Fraser	Metcalfe
Andrews, Ala.	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.
Arends	Fulton	Miller, Ohio
Ashley	Fuqua	Mills, Ark.
Badillo	Garmatz	Mills, Md.
Baker	Gettys	Minish
Barrett	Gonzalez	Minshall
Begich	Grasso	Mitchell
Bergland	Mizell	Gray
Biaggi	Green, Pa.	Montgomery
Bieber	Grover	Moorhead
Blanton	Gubser	Morgan
Blatnik	Gude	Natcher
Boggs	Halpern	Nix
Boland	Hammer-	O'Neill
Brasco	schmidt	Patten
Brown, Ohio	Hanley	Pepper
Broyhill, Va.	Hanna	Perkins
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Peyser
Burke, Fla.	Harrington	Pickle
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Pike
Burlison, Mo.	Harvey	Pirnie
Burton	Hathaway	Poage
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Preyer, N.C.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Price, Ill.
Byron	Hechler, W. Va.	Pryor, Ark.
Caffery	Helstoski	Pucinski
Carey, N.Y.	Hicks, Mass.	Quile
Carlson	Hollifield	Quillen
Carney	Horton	Reid
Celler	Howard	Reuss
Chamberlain	Jarman	Rhodes
Chisholm	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Clausen,	Jones, Ala.	Roe
Don H.	Karth	Rogers
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Conover	Kee	Rosenthal
Conte	Keith	Rostenkowski
Conyers	King	Roussiot
Corman	Kluczynski	Roybal
Curlin	Koch	Ruppe
Daniels, N.J.	Kuykendall	St Germain
Danielson	Latta	Sandman
Dellums	Leggett	Sarbanes
Dent	Lent	Saylor
Dickinson	Link	Scheuer
Diggs	Lloyd	Schwengel
Dingell	Long, La.	Scott
Donohue	McClary	Seiberling
Dorn	McCloskey	Shipley
Dow	McCulloch	Sisk
Drinan	McFall	Slack
du Pont	McKinney	Smith, Iowa
Eckhardt	Macdonald,	Springer
Edwards, Calif.	Mass.	Staggers
Eilberg	Madden	

Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Symington  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tiernan

Abourezk  
Alexander  
Anderson, Ill.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Archer  
Ashbrook  
Aspin  
Bennett  
Bingham  
Blackburn  
Bolling  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brotzman  
Brown, Mich.  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Burlison, Tex.  
Cabell  
Camp  
Carter  
Casey, Tex.  
Cederberg  
Chappell  
Clancy  
Clawson, Del.  
Cleveland  
Collier  
Collins, Tex.  
Conable  
Cotter  
Coughlin  
Crane  
Daniel, Va.  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Denholm  
Dennis  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan  
Edwards, Ala.  
Eshleman  
Findley  
Fisher  
Flowers  
Flynt  
Ford,  
William D.  
Forsythe

NOES—169

Fountain  
Frenzel  
Frey  
Gallifanakis  
Gaydos  
Gibbons  
Goldwater  
Goodling  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Haley  
Hall  
Hamilton  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hastings  
Hays  
Heckler, Mass.  
Heinz  
Henderson  
Hicks, Wash.  
Hogan  
Hosmer  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Jonas  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kazen  
Keating  
Kemp  
Kyl  
Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Lennon  
Long, Md.  
McCollister  
McDade  
McEwen  
McKay  
McKevitt  
Mallory  
Mann  
Martin  
Mathis, Ga.  
Mayne  
Mazzoli  
Michel  
Mikva  
Monagan  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Myers  
Nedzi  
Nelsen

Widnall  
Wilson, Bob  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wylder  
Yatron  
Young, Tex.  
Zablocki  
Zion

District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GRAY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRAY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 3943 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 16645, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center Act."

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) it is essential to the social and economic development of the District of Columbia to establish major centers of commercial and economic activity within the city;

(2) such a center of activity would result from the development of a civic center located in the downtown area of the District of Columbia;

(3) a civic center would (A) attract large numbers of visitors to the downtown area and result in increased business activity in the area surrounding the center; (B) enable national organizations to hold their conventions and other meetings in the District of Columbia and thereby encourage citizens from the entire Nation to visit their Capital City; (C) provide a new source of revenue for the District of Columbia as a consequence of its operations and the expanded commercial activities resulting therefrom; and (D) provide expanded employment opportunities for residents of the District of Columbia;

(4) it is fitting that said civic center be established as a memorial to the late President, Dwight D. Eisenhower;

(5) the prompt provision of major convention facilities in the District of Columbia will significantly contribute to the commemoration of the Nation's bicentennial year; and

(6) the powers conferred by this Act are for public uses and purposes for which public powers may be employed, public funds may be expended, and the power of eminent domain and the police power may be exercised, and the granting of such powers is necessary in the public interest.

Sec. 3. The Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), as amended (40 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 18. (a) In order to provide for the District of Columbia facilities for the holding of conventions, exhibitions, meetings, and other social, cultural, and business activities, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia (hereinafter, Commissioner) is authorized to provide for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of the civic center to be designated as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center on a site in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia within an area bounded by Eighth Street, H Street, Tenth Street, New York Avenue, and K Street.

"(b) (1) Such civic center shall be in accordance with a plan, indicating the design and estimated costs, approved by the Commissioner and the District of Columbia Council, and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission pursuant to section 5 of the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1005) and section 16 of the Act approved June 20, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-428), and reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts to the extent required by section 1 of the Act approved May 16, 1930 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-410).

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5-711), the urban renewal plan, approved pursuant to section 6(b)(2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 5-705(b)(2)), for

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9

Abbott	Belcher	Colmer
Abernethy	Betts	Hull
Aspinall	Bow	Smith, Calif.

NOT VOTING—40

Annunzio	Glaimo	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Nichols
Bell	Gross	O'Konski
Bevill	Hagan	Purcell
Brademas	Hillis	Rangel
Clay	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.
Culver	Lujan	Runnels
Davis, S.C.	McClure	Schmitz
Dowdy	McCormack	Teague, Calif.
Dwyer	McDonald,	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	Mich.	Thompson, Ga.
Esch	McMillan	Wampler
Evans, Colo.	Mink	Wiggins
Gallagher	Mollohan	

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1136, I call up from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the Senate bill (S. 3943) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for the construction of a civic center in the

an urban renewal area in which the civic center is located shall be deemed to be modified by the plan approved pursuant to this subsection and the National Capital Planning Commission shall certify such urban renewal plan, as modified, to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

"(3) In the development of the civic center in accordance with the plan approved pursuant to this subsection, the Commissioner, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may open, extend, widen, or close any street, road, highway, or alley, or part thereof, by the filing of a plat or plats in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia showing such opening, extension, widening, or closing.

"(c) The Commissioner shall acquire by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, all real property necessary to provide for the civic center.

"(d)(1) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into purchase contracts, including negotiated contracts, for the financing, design, construction, and maintenance of the civic center. The Commissioner is further authorized to lease the site described in subsection (a) at a nominal rental for a period of not more than thirty-five years. The payment term of said purchase contracts shall not be more than thirty years from the date of acceptance of the civic center and such purchase contracts shall provide that title to the civic center shall vest in the District of Columbia at or before the expiration of the contract term and upon fulfillment of the terms and conditions stipulated in the purchase contracts. Such terms and conditions shall include provision for the application to the purchase price agreed upon therein of installment payments made thereunder.

"(2) Such purchase contracts shall include such provisions as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall deem to be in the best interest of the District of Columbia and appropriate to secure the performance of the obligations imposed upon the party or parties that shall enter into such agreement with the Commissioner. The purchase contracts shall provide for payments to be made to—

"(A) amortize the cost of site acquisition, including the relocation payments required by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, and such other moneys as may be advanced by the contractors to the District of Columbia;

"(B) amortize the cost of construction of improvements to be constructed;

"(C) provide a reasonable rate of interest on the outstanding principal as determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B) above; and

"(D) reimburse the contractors for the cost of any other obligations required of them under the contract, including (but not limited to) payment of taxes, costs of carrying appropriate insurance, and costs of repair and maintenance if so required of the contractors.

"(3) For the purpose of the purchase contracts provided by this subsection for the erection of the civic center, the Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with any person, copartnership, corporation, or other public or private entity to effectuate any of the purposes of this subsection.

"(4) No purchase contract for the construction of such civic center shall be entered into, pursuant to the authority of this section, until thirty legislative days following submittal to and approval by the Senate and House Committees for the District of Columbia and the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, of the design, plans, and specifications, including detailed cost estimates, of such civic center.

"(e) The full faith and credit of the Government of the District of Columbia is hereby

committed to guarantee, upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, the fulfillment of all obligations imposed by the provision of this section.

"(f)(1) The Commissioner is authorized to accept and administer gifts, personal services, securities, or other property of whatever character to aid in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(2) The Commissioner is further authorized to provide for the operation of any or all aspects of the civic center by any department or agency of the Government of the District of Columbia, or may provide for the performance of such operations, including the use or rental of the civic center or its equipment, motor vehicle parking facilities, concessions, and other activities, by contract entered into with any person, copartnership, corporation, or other public or private entity, upon such terms and conditions as may be stipulated in the agreements, and for such purposes may utilize or employ the services of personnel of any agency or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia, with the consent of such agency or instrumentality, upon a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, and may utilize voluntary or uncompensated personnel."

SEC. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such sums shall remain available for obligation until expended.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation and out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$14 million for a contribution to the District of Columbia as the Federal share of carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Federal office building and United States courthouse to be constructed in the southwest portion of that block bounded by Mitchell Street, Pryor Street, Central Avenue, and Trinity Avenue, in Atlanta, Georgia, is hereby designated as the "Richard B. Russell Federal Building", in memory of the late Richard Brevard Russell, a distinguished Member of the United States Senate from 1933 to 1971, and any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Richard B. Russell Federal Building".

SEC. 6. The Federal building to be constructed in the block bounded by the west side of New Orleans Avenue, north of Main Street, and the east of Jackson Street, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "William M. Colmer Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "William M. Colmer Federal Building".

SEC. 7. The Federal building to be constructed in the block of West Commerce Street bounded on the west side by Columbus Street and on the east side by James Street, in Aberdeen, Mississippi, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Thomas G. Abernethy Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "Thomas G. Abernethy Federal Building".

SEC. 8. The Federal building being constructed in the block bounded by Ninth Street Northwest, Tenth Street Northwest, E Street Northwest, and Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a ref-

erence to the "J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building".

SEC. 9. The Federal office building now under construction in the Capital Plaza area of Frankfort, Kentucky, is hereby designated as the "John C. Watts Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "John C. Watts Building".

SEC. 10. The Federal building in the block bounded by Second Street Southwest, Third Street Southwest, Cleveland Avenue South, and Dewalt Avenue South, in Canton, Ohio, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Frank T. Bow Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such Federal building shall be held to be a reference to the "Frank T. Bow Federal Building".

SEC. 11. The jet propulsion laboratory at 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, California shall hereafter be known and designated as the "H. Allen Smith Jet Propulsion Laboratory". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such jet propulsion laboratory shall be held to be a reference to the "H. Allen Smith Jet Propulsion Laboratory".

SEC. 12. The Federal building at 1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "George P. Miller Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "George P. Miller Federal Building".

SEC. 13. The United States courthouse and Federal building at 302 Joplin Street, Joplin, Missouri, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Durward G. Hall Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Durward G. Hall Federal Building".

SEC. 14. The United States courthouse and Federal building at 225 Cadman Plaza, Brooklyn, New York, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Emanuel Celler Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Emanuel Celler Federal Building".

SEC. 15. The post office, United States courthouse and Federal building at 401 West Trade Street, Charlotte, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Charles R. Jonas Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Charles R. Jonas Federal Building".

SEC. 16. The United States courthouse and Federal building at the corner of Princess Street and Water Street, Wilmington, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Alton Lennon Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Alton Lennon Federal Building".

SEC. 17. The post office and Federal building now under construction in the block bounded on the north by East Sixth Street, west by North Diamond Street, south by East Fifth Street, and east by North Adams Street, Mansfield, Ohio, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Jackson E. Betts Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Jackson E. Betts Federal Building".

SEC. 18. The Federal building in the block bounded on the north by Edmond Street, south by Charles Street, west by Eighth Street, and east by Ninth Street, St. Joseph,



Missouri, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "William R. Hull Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "William R. Hull Federal Building".

SEC. 19. The United States courthouse and Federal building to be constructed in the block bounded on the north side by Lombard Street, east by Hanover Street, south by Pratt Street, and west by Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Maryland, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Edward A. Garmatz Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Edward A. Garmatz Federal Building".

SEC. 20. The post office and Federal building to be constructed in New Bedford, Massachusetts, under authority of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-313, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Hastings Keith Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Hastings Keith Federal Building".

SEC. 21. The post office and Federal building at 333 West Fourth Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Page Belcher Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Page Belcher Federal Building".

SEC. 22. Federal building at the corner of Main Street and High Street, Farmville, Virginia, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Watkins M. Abbott Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Watkins M. Abbott Federal Building".

SEC. 23. The Federal building to be constructed in Roanoke, Virginia, under authority of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-313, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Richard H. Poff Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Richard H. Poff Federal Building".

SEC. 24. The post office and Federal office building at the corner of Lincoln and Central Streets, Essex Junction, Vermont, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Winston Prouty Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Winston Prouty Federal Building".

SEC. 25. The Earth Resources Observation System Facilities Development Foundation at 101 West Ninth Street, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Karl E. Mundt Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Karl E. Mundt Federal Building".

SEC. 26. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare South Building located at 330 C Street Southwest, Washington, District of Columbia, is hereby designated, and shall be known as the "Mary Switzer Memorial Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Mary Switzer Memorial Building".

SEC. 27. The Federal office building to be constructed in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, on the site bounded by Maine and Academy Streets on the Marman Parkway, is hereby

designated and shall be known as the "Philip J. Philbin Federal Office Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Philip J. Philbin Federal Office Building".

SEC. 28. The post office and Federal office building to be constructed in the block bounded by Grinage Street, Verret Street, Lafayette Street, and High Street in Houma, Louisiana, is hereby designated as the "Allen J. Ellender Post Office and Federal Office Building". Any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Allen J. Ellender Post Office and Federal Office Building".

SEC. 29. The Federal building at 334 Meeting Street, Charleston, South Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "L. Mendel Rivers Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "L. Mendel Rivers Federal Building".

SEC. 30. The United States courthouse and Federal building at the corner of Avenue A and Seventh Street, Opelika, Alabama, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "George W. Andrews Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "George W. Andrews Federal Building".

SEC. 31. The Federal building to be constructed in Florence, South Carolina, on the site bounded east by Sanborn Street, west of North McQueen Street, and north by West Evans Street, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "John L. McMillan Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "John L. McMillan Federal Building".

SEC. 32. The United States courthouse and Federal building located at 400 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Wayne N. Aspinall Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Wayne N. Aspinall Federal Building".

SEC. 33. The post office, United States courthouse and Federal building at 207 West Main Street, Wilkesboro, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Johnson J. Hayes Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Johnson J. Hayes Building".

SEC. 34. The effective period for each provision relating to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Ninety-first Congress which is contained in H. Res. 1238 Ninety-first Congress, as enacted into permanent law by chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971 (84 Stat. 1989), is hereby extended for an additional two years from the date on which (but for this section) such provision would expire.

SEC. 35. The United States courthouse and Federal Building to be constructed in the block bounded by the proposed Makai Street, Halekauwila Street, Kakaako Street, and Ala Moana Boulevard, in Honolulu, Hawaii, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Prince Jonah Kūhio Kalanianaʻōle Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Prince Jonah Kūhio Kalanianaʻōle Building".

SEC. 36. The Federal office building to be

constructed in the city of Albany, New York, is hereby designated as the "Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building", in honor of Leo W. O'Brien, a distinguished Member of the United States House of Representatives from 1952 to 1967, and any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building".

SEC. 40. The post office and Federal building at Jefferson and Walnut Streets, Green Bay, Wisconsin, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "John W. Byrnes Post Office and Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "John W. Byrnes Post Office and Federal Building".

SEC. 41. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) Sections 6 and 7, sections 10 through 23, inclusive, sections 25, 31, and 32, 38, and 40 shall take effect January 4, 1973.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 16645) was laid on the table.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 3943 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that in the program for tomorrow, it is our intention to call up House Resolution 1142.

This resolution confers authority to entertain motions to suspend the rules on any day after Monday next. Also, to suspend the two-thirds rule required for a vote on a rule on the same day.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I understand that that resolution is not limited to 1 day, but to any day and all days next week except Monday?

Mr. BOGGS. It begins on Tuesday, the day after Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And that there could be suspensions Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. At the option of the Speaker?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And there is no date certain set for adjournment sine die?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is this not somewhat odd, unusual procedure?

Mr. BOGGS. The procedure is not odd. The only thing about the procedure, if I may answer the gentleman further, is the fact that it does not include a sine die adjournment date. We are frankly not in a position to do that, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is not the House in a position to pass an adjournment resolution sine die with a date certain; I am suggesting October 14, and send it over to the other body?

Mr. BOGGS. It has happened certain times in the past, but we are not prepared today, the leadership is not prepared—

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it not within the prerogative of the House to pass a resolution with a date certain and send it to the other body?

The SPEAKER. It is in the prerogative of the House to pass a resolution setting a date certain, but it is not within the prerogative of the Speaker to recognize for suspensions of rules until that sine die resolution passes the other body.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To clarify, the House can pass such a resolution with a date certain?

The SPEAKER. Yes, the House could; but it would not be operable until agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BOGGS. But it has no impact. It has no effect, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I understand that, but I think it would help to initiate some action to get an adjournment if we should just pass such a resolution on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. BOGGS. I share the gentleman's desire to adjourn, but I also know that we have a responsibility to pass the legislative program before the House. The only way I know of to pass it next week is the adoption of this resolution tomorrow. We will debate it on the floor tomorrow, but I can assure the gentleman that a sine die motion will not be included. We cannot include it at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Well, you could include it. It is a judgment on the leadership part, on that side of the aisle, not to include it, is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes but, I do not like to pass judgment on the leadership on the other side of the Capitol. It is obvious that the other body is considerably behind this body. I believe I would be un-

realistic if I said to the gentleman I thought the other body could conclude its work next week. We can.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If I might make an observation, it was my understanding—and apparently I was in error—that the resolution gave the authority for one suspension date Tuesday, October 10. Now, under the explanation of the gentleman from Louisiana, it is a free rein: Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. I believe that goes too far.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has every right to his opinion. I am not going to argue the question with him.

We completed on yesterday six or seven of the 46 suspensions, some of which are not very controversial but some of which are very controversial. The chairmen of the committees have indicated most of these measures are necessary. Many of them come from downtown, come from agencies in the Government. We are trying to complete that program.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

In a slightly different vein, is it not true, in passing on the rule the gentleman announces will be brought up tomorrow, and presumably handled by the Committee on Rules, or at least under their direction, it will require simply a majority vote?

Mr. BOGGS. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALL. Is it not true, therefore, that this circumvents or obviates the ordinary rules of procedure and the Reorganization Act of 1970, without establishing a sine die adjournment or without bringing up a rule, as announced, with a two-thirds majority required, to bring up suspensions for the balance of next week following the Columbus Day holiday?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is stating a parliamentary conclusion. I am not going to pass judgment on that.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Do I correctly understand the gentleman's request includes the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules on Monday next?

Mr. BOGGS. No; only after Monday.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONSIDER BUSINESS SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY NEXT ON TUESDAY NEXT

There was another item. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business scheduled for Monday next, which is District day, be carried over from Monday next until Tuesday next.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe, while the Members are here assembled and, under this device, we should recognize the stratagem and program previously announced by the majority leader for exactly what it

is, and we should all come to the floor of the House when this is brought by the Committee on Rules tomorrow, prepared to vote it down by a majority plus one. This will take the pensive thinking and the probing judgment of all Members who value the rights of the minority or of the individual elected Congressman.

Secondly, I am not sure we should not recognize the "squeeze plays" we always have on the floor of the House as we dawdle, on the tendrils of the other body like marionettes, not exercising initiative enough on our own to send them a message by a proper resolution, or the leadership refusing to recognize those who would, for a similar vote to this other coming out of the Rules Committee, on a resolution to adjourn on a date certain sine die, and sending it to the other body.

Many of us can remember when the House used to adjourn for short periods, with no legislation promised in the interval, and we would send a message to the other body with a date certain in mind, and this forced action on the other body.

Goodness knows. If in the olden days of the founding of this Republic taxation without representation was tyranny, this is now unconscionable with representation. The longer we tarry the worse the "cleanup" legislation and greater the cost to the taxpayers.

I use this means only, since I could not get recognized otherwise, as pointing out what the Committee on Rules is doing to the entire membership, what the leadership is doing, and what we are allowing the other body to do to us; when those of us who seek to return to the representative form of government should be home "mending our fences," and communicating with our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the request and in view of our former folly to declare long weekends on the legal holidays, to say nothing of work very short hours only last week, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I made this request for one purpose only, and that is that we have officially, by act of Congress, made Columbus Day a national holiday, and the leadership announced early this year that that holiday would be duly recognized and legislation would not be scheduled.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to his opinion about the leadership. He frequently castigates us. I have become accustomed to it. We do the best we can, sometimes under difficult circumstances.

I do not care about his castigations; I will let the record speak for itself. But I do think that what he has done now is to reflect upon the memory of one of the greatest men of all times, and also to reflect upon every American who is of Italian or Spanish descent.



# INCENTIVE PAY TO MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14909) to amend section 552(a) of title 37, United States Code, to provide continuance of incentive pay to members of the uniformed services for the period required for hospitalization and rehabilitation after termination of missing status, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "period" insert ", not to exceed one year,".

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the Senate amendment is to this bill of the Committee on Armed Services and whether or not there is an additional cost involved, and is it germane to the House-passed bill?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has approved the House-passed bill, H.R. 14909, which provides for the continuation of incentive pay for POW's during periods of hospitalization and rehabilitation after the termination of their missing status. As approved by our committee, there was no limitation on how long the former POW's could continue to receive their incentive pay.

However, in approving the bill our committee had noted that the period of hospitalization and rehabilitation following the return from POW or missing status will be a particularly trying time for the men themselves and their families. The committee did not want the family income reduced during that period by a cutoff of incentive pay.

In approving the legislation the Senate inserted a 1-year limitation; that is, the period of rehabilitation or hospitalization during which the incentive pay will continue shall be limited to 1 year.

The 1-year limitation would seem to be reasonable for extension of incentive pay. Of course, we have no experience with how long the rehabilitation and hospitalization of returned POW's will take since we have never had the experience with men who have been in a missing status as long as those presently in North Vietnam. The bill as amended by the Senate would provide a needed authorization on the books, and later amendments could always be considered if deemed necessary.

Therefore, I recommend that the committee instruct the chairman to ask the House to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 7130, FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Education and Labor, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7130) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage under that act, to extend its coverage, to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky is contrary to the provisions of clause 1 of rule XX, disregards the established precedents of the House and is not in order, and I request an opportunity to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may be heard on his point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky's motion, to take the bill H.R. 7130 from the Speaker's desk, to disagree with the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon, is in violation of clause 1 of rule XX. Rule XX provides in part:

That a motion to disagree with the amendments of the Senate to a House bill . . . and request . . . a conference with the Senate . . . shall always be in order if the Speaker, in his discretion, recognizes for that purpose and if the motion is made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bill or resolution. (Emphasis added.)

This rule clearly provides that such a motion is only in order if it is made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bill or resolution. Moreover, the rule is clear in its intent that it only authorizes the committee to direct one motion to be made. The rule states that "a motion" shall be in order "if the motion" is made at the direction of the appropriate committee.

On August 1, 1972, the Committee on Education and Labor directed the gentleman from Kentucky to make a motion to disagree with the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 7130 and to request a conference. A motion pursuant to the direction of the committee was made on August 1 and defeated by a rollcall vote of 198 to 190—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 26152-26156. Furthermore, motion to reconsider was at that time made and laid on the table. Reconsideration of the original motion is therefore not in order.

The provision in clause 1 of rule XX allowing a bill to go to conference by simple motion was added to the rules on January 4, 1965. In explaining the intent of that provision the then majority leader, Speaker CARL ALBERT, stated:

The purpose of these . . . changes in the rules, of course, is to expedite the busi-

ness of the House and to make available other methods of handling the legislative business of the House. They do not seek to change any the rules governing the Committee on Rules or other procedures, all of which are left intact. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 1, p. 35; emphasis added.)

Commenting on the same provision, Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK made the following statement during floor debate:

The other . . . amendments are very simple. Certainly when a bill is going to conference the regular procedure is for the Member in charge to ask unanimous consent for the bill to go to conference. In 19 cases out of 20 or even 29 cases out of 30 unanimous consent is granted. It is very seldom unanimous consent is not granted for a bill to go to conference. This proposed rule would permit the will of the House to be ascertained and the majority of the Members present and voting then could send the bill to conference. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 1, p. 38.)

The intent in amending the rule to allow a bill to go to conference by a simple motion is clear: The House was to have an opportunity to work its will. No other changes in the rules or other procedures were intended.

The gentleman from Kentucky made the motion provided for in clause 1 of rule XX, and the House worked its will in refusing to send the bill to conference. Rule XX does not authorize a committee chairman to make repetitive motions on a question already determined by the House in the vain hope that he will someday wear down the patience of the Members and be successful. How many times will the gentleman from Kentucky be allowed to ride a dead horse?

Mr. Speaker, it is a firmly settled canon of general parliamentary law, including the rules and precedents of this body, that once motions have been made, and have failed, similar motions cannot be made during the same stage of proceedings. To permit otherwise would be to obviate any semblance of orderly procedure. Rule XX is no exception; it does not grant a license to committee chairmen to make a series of motions, hoping sooner or later they will be successful. Rather, the rule clearly provides for one opportunity to have the question considered by the House, and the will of the House must prevail. It would be a travesty upon this body to allow repetitive motions of this sort once the House has decided the question.

The Chair is aware of the precedent found in section 6325 of volume V of Hinds' Precedents. That precedent has the following summary in its caption:

A motion to request a conference on disagreeing votes of the two Houses having been rejected, may not be repeated at the same stage of the question, even though a recess of Congress may have intervened.

This precedent is clear. The present motion of the gentleman from Kentucky is not in order, and clause 1 of rule XX was not intended to supersede this precedent or to grant more than one opportunity for the House to work its will on this issue. As plainly stated in the caption to the precedent, the fact that a recess—or even an adjournment sine die—intervened does not alter the parliamentary situation. The substantially similar

motion is still not in order and may not be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my point of order, and urge the Chair to sustain it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the point of order should not be sustained. The rule of the House under which I am proceeding is clause 1 of rule XX which in part reads:

*Provided, however, That a motion to disagree with the amendments of the Senate to a House Bill or Resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate or a motion to insist on the House amendments to a Senate Bill or Resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, shall always be in order if the Speaker, in his discretion recognizes for that purpose and if the motion is made by the direction of the Committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill or resolution.*

Mr. Speaker, the rule is very clear. It says this motion shall always be in order if two conditions are met. First, the Speaker must recognize a Member for the purpose of making the motion and second, the motion must be made after the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter has directed the Member to make the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has directed me to make this motion.

It is certainly true that on August 1 the House Education and Labor Committee directed me to make a similar motion under the rule with respect to this legislation and the motion was made and defeated. But subsequent to that time and specifically on Tuesday, August 8, 1972, the committee directed that I make this motion with respect to this legislation.

Clearly a new set of circumstances has now been generated under which the right to make the motion under rule XX exists. Let me again stress that the above quoted provision says it shall always be in order to make the motion if the Speaker recognizes the Member for that purpose and if the committee having jurisdiction has directed the Member being recognized to make the motion.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) rise?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard very briefly further on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky has now insisted that the motion which he repeats on this occasion and which is the identical motion that he made on August 1, 1972, is always in order—and that the rules change says that such a motion shall always be in order.

He thereby draws from the word "always" the conclusion—and I think it is an entirely unwarranted conclusion—that that word means that you can continue day after day in a repetitive fashion, to repeat an identical motion.

The word "always" within the rule says the motion shall always be in order. What the rule simply means is this—that it is a preferential motion. That is the mean-

ing of the word "always." It is because it is in the nature of a preferential motion that it shall always be in order. There is nothing in this rules change, I repeat, that disturbs the earlier procedures and the other rules of the House or the precedents to which I have referred.

The gentleman from Kentucky has placed an entirely erroneous interpretation and meaning upon the word "always." It is a preferential motion that makes it always in order—and not that it is a repetitive motion identical in nature to that which was offered and defeated in this House on August 1.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is a new motion made by the new authority and new direction from the committee, and it is always in order in the discretion of the Speaker.

We submit to you here that we have complied with this provision and the conditions that I quoted clearly makes it in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Kentucky has moved, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, that the House disagree with the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 7130 and request a conference with the Senate. The gentleman states that he has been authorized to make this motion by the Committee on Education and Labor by its action of August 8, 1972.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has raised a point of order against this motion on the ground that since the House has once rejected such a motion, it cannot be repeated.

In support of his argument, the gentleman cites a precedent which is found in volume V, section 6325, of Hinds' Precedents.

The Chair has examined that precedent—which carries the following headnote:

A motion to request a conference on disagreeing votes of the two houses having been rejected, may not be repeated at the same stage of the question, even though a recess of Congress may have intervened.

The Chair believes that precedent is clearly distinguishable from the present situation. In that case, which the Chair notes occurred in the 34th Congress, the two Houses had reached the stage of disagreement with respect to the Senate amendments to the House bill. The stage of disagreement having been reached, there were other motions available in the House which could be used to dispose of the amendments in disagreement. A reading of that precedent shows that after the Speaker had declined to recognize for a second motion that the House ask a further conference with the Senate, the first such motion having already been rejected, the House at a later time did in fact consider the motions to recede from disagreement and to adhere.

In the present situation, the Chair notes that the stage of disagreement has not been reached. Any action on the Senate amendments to the House bill—that is to take the bill from the Speaker's table and to concur, to concur with amendment, to disagree—would have to be by unanimous consent.

The only motion which is in order under the present situation under the rules of the House is to disagree and ask a conference.

The Chair thinks it should also be pointed out that rule XX, clause 1—the portion thereof making such a motion in order—was adopted in the 89th Congress.

It is obviously a much later expression of the House than the precedent cited from the 34th Congress.

The Chair realizes that this is the first time this particular question has arisen since the adoption of the amendment to rule XX. The Chair's ruling in this case is thus one of first impression. And in making such a ruling, the Chair is always aware of the admonition of Mr. Speaker Reed, to the effect that rules of the House should be construed in such a way as to expedite the business of the House and not interpreted to prevent the House from acting.

Mr. Speaker Reed stated:

The object of a parliamentary body is action, and not stoppage of action.

It might be suggested that to permit repeated use of the motion under rule XX would be to invite its use as a dilatory motion. That does not appear to the Chair to be a real possibility, since the motion can be made only by direction of the legislative committee having jurisdiction over the measure and can be called up only if the Speaker in his discretion recognizes for that purpose. Both of these restrictions would prevent its employment as a dilatory tactic.

Finally, the Chair would like to point out the precise language of the rule, which is that the motion "shall always be in order, if the Speaker, in his discretion, recognizes for that purpose and if the motion is made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction."

For all these reasons, the Chair holds that the motion is in order and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, we all know what this motion is about. I think the Members of this body want a minimum wage bill this session.

If we vote against this motion and the motion is voted down, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to get a minimum wage bill during the remainder of this session of Congress. A vote against this motion will seriously jeopardize chances of passing a minimum wage bill.

I do want to state that it will be the intent of the conferees on the part of the House to undertake to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate and as much so as possible to uphold the House provisions in this legislation. I think it is necessary and I believe the majority of the House feels it is necessary that we get a bill during this session. I would hate to think that anyone here would believe that we are going to go over there and bring back the Senate bill, or do anything else that is objectionable to the House. As far as we can, we will be reasonable and bring back a reasonable bill. There is no intent on the part of the House conferees to abandon the House position and it is my hope that the Members on both sides of the aisle will vote to send this bill to conference.

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



Mr. PERKINS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will vote against this motion to go to conference. As far as I am concerned the bill from the other body is unacceptable. It will not only be damaging to some segments of the economy but even more so it will be damaging to the young people of this country. If there is an increase in the minimum wage at the rate that is proposed in the Senate bill, we are going to see a further increase in unemployment among young people. The present law has a totally unworkable youth differential. There are very few young people hired under it because the prior certification requirements are just unacceptable to employers. What we need is a youth differential where employers can hire full-time students and 16- and 17-year-olds who have dropped out of school at 80 percent of the minimum.

Let me talk specifically about these 16- and 17-year-olds. Today there are a number of young people who cannot take the high schools. They have dropped out. Nothing we can do can convince them they ought to go back to high school. It does not meet their needs. They have been turned off. They cannot get jobs. What is happening to them? Many of them, and this is happening especially in the ghettos, many of them are turning to crime. If we do not provide a youth differential in the new minimum wage legislation we are going to see an increase in crime among youth and we are going to see an increase in the use of drugs and we are going to increase the cost to the Federal Government to finance these kids to go to school if no one will make jobs for them to work. That is going to happen.

There are kids who are denied the opportunity that most of the Members and I have had, the opportunity to work when we were young. They are denied the chance to do something that is of benefit to themselves and their communities. They are denied the chance to do something they can look to for self-dignity.

Unless we have this youth differential we are going to see an increase in the youth unemployment. There was an increase in employment of young people this summer, but now in August we see an increase again in unemployment. The rate for the 16- and 17-year-olds seasonally adjusted is at 20.5 percent, almost four times the overall unemployment rate. That is even worse among non-whites and it is even worse among non-white females. These are individuals who if they could get a job for \$1.60 an hour would be off the street and doing something worthwhile.

A number of people have studied this and if there is one subject that almost all academic economists agree upon it is that a minimum wage is likely to increase unemployment especially among the unskilled, inexperienced, and disadvantaged; namely, our young people 16 to 17 and especially members of minorities. Several recent articles in the best economic journals come to this conclusion which is shared by economists of all political persuasions from

Milton Friedman to Paul Samuelson. A recent study "Crime, Youth, and the Labor Market" by Glad Phillips and Harold L. Votey, Jr., University of California, Santa Barbara and Darold Maxwell, Harvard University in the Journal of Political Economy, June 1972, has again found a strong causal link between high youth unemployment and low youth labor force participation rates and the crimes of larceny, burglary, auto theft, and robbery. This study combined with the above studies on minimum wage effects on youth represents strong evidence that the failure to enact the youth differential provision will almost certainly increase the number of crimes against property and person committed in our urban and suburban areas.

I think we should also point out that lower starting rates for youths have been established by law or collective bargaining in the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, and the Netherlands. In France and West Germany firms are allowed to pay 16- to 17-year-olds up to 20 percent below the minimum wage. In both of these countries a recent DOL team sent overseas to review how these countries handled the youth unemployment problem concluded that there was "no significant youth unemployment" in these countries. The youth differential undoubtedly contributed to achieving a low youth unemployment rate in these countries.

It is clear from economic theory and statistical evidence from our country and abroad that a high minimum wage for 16- to 17-year-olds will increase unemployment among this group making it more difficult for them to earn money for college, to develop an appreciation for the benefits of work experience, and to receive the on-the-job training they must have to earn higher wages later on in life.

The costs of not having a youth differential will be borne by taxpayers faced with higher taxes to fight crime and drugs, to provide student aid, and to meet increased welfare payments as well as adverse social and economic effects on the young people, themselves.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, the House version which passed this body had a good youth differential provision in it?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And what the gentleman from Minnesota and others want is for the House to stand firm for a good youth differential?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. There is some latitude. We do not have to be adamant that they take every word of ours, but a good youth differential for these youths, and 16- and 17-year-olds.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I further understand that in the bill that came out of the House Committee on Education and Labor, that there was no meaningful youth differential provision?

Mr. QUIE. So it was felt by the House. There was not a meaningful youth differential. That is why the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) included

in his substitute the language adopted by the House for a meaningful youth differential and why it was accepted.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is rather difficult for a number of us, but I would not want to leave one thought which was expressed by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. PERKINS of Kentucky, to stand without a challenge.

That is, that a vote to not send this legislation to conference today, is a vote against a minimum wage bill; to kill minimum wage legislation. Nor would I want to leave standing the impression, especially since I follow the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) here in the well, that we are interested only in a youth differential.

There are many other facets to this bill which are equally, if not more, important. There is, for example's sake the question of money. The compromise has to be somewhere between the Senate and the House bills.

Let me say that diligently and in earnest a number of us; some of us, like men not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, have worked in good faith with Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DENT, and some others, and they, themselves have in my own opinion, worked in good faith, to try to find an answer to this bill. It is a big big job.

But, there is a question of money. There is the question of extended coverage, extended coverage that some of us had better be concerned about, because most of us have wives back home. This country is filled with wives, and these housewives are going to be concerned if something equitable and functional does not come forth from this legislation having to do with the coverage of domestics.

Domestics have never been covered in this country before.

We had better be concerned about elected officials who are concerned with the question of extending coverage to Federal, State and municipal employees. For those who voted for the revenue-sharing proposal, remember that these are the same mayors and councilmen and Governors and officials who pressured this Congress into voting for revenue sharing. I think they could have that same influence again.

Then, there is the question of overtime exemptions for some who presently have it, and those who are engaged in seasonal employment; those who earn their dollar doing business with perishable goods. These things are to be considered as well. Do not forget the dollar ceiling for small business.

There are any number of other things to be considered. There is the section of the bill having to do with class action suits that most people have not spoken to, but which could be very detrimental to this country.

Now the situation is this: Both sides have been negotiating, trying to find an answer, and doing it in good faith. We have made some real progress, and we are getting closer, by the hour, to an an-

swer that everybody can live with. I just simply believe that if we are permitted to have a little more time—because there have been people brought into this thing today who have not been a party to it before—there is an answer everybody can live with. We need that time. Really only hours.

Failing in our efforts to gain that time, I believe that we are going to come up with a piece of legislation we are going to regret, a piece of legislation whose coverage is going to be too broad, a piece of legislation that is going to be inflationary. It will be a piece of legislation we are going to regret passing.

So I am here again very reluctantly opposing this legislation going to conference. I oppose its going to conference because I still believe something can be worked out.

Members are looking at a man who never has until this year voted for a minimum wage bill, but a man who wants to vote for a minimum wage bill. I believe that the working people of this country need some sort of minimum wage bill. That is the reason I voted for the House bill. I just believe it is a little more difficult in an election year to legislate with regard to matters like this than it would be at other times; but nevertheless we should legislate this year.

I just believe we need a little more time, and we can gain the concurrence and understanding we need to get a bill that both bodies and this country can live with. From the depth of my heart, as one who has been a little bit involved, I ask that we be given a little more time. We have been negotiating in good faith and making progress, but agreement we do not have. Let us not have this legislation go to conference at this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to endorse what the gentleman who preceded me in the well has said. Any assertion that to vote "No" on this motion today is the end of this minimum wage legislation is not accurate.

The issue which has been presented to us is one that comes about because of the history of what has happened to legislation in the general field of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor over a period of time, at least during the time I have observed it as a Member of the House. All too often, I know Members are well aware, the House speaks its will by amending legislation from that committee or adopting substitute bills and sending the legislation to the other body. All too often the other body passes a bill very similar to that rejected by the House. And almost without exception the conference committee Members appointed by the House accede more to the provisions of the other body than they try to protect the provisions which the House has adopted.

Now, with that history we are in the same position again on this bill. There are deep divisions between the people on our committee who were for the committee bill and those who were for the substi-

tute adopted on the floor. There are deep divisions between the House and the other body. In light of these deep divisions, the chairman of our committee asked unanimous consent to send the bill to conference.

He informed us at that time it was his intention to recommend to the Speaker six Members who supported the provisions most akin to the bill passed by the other body and that reported by our committee, and there were only four who were clearly identified with the majority opinion of the House.

I objected to sending the bill to conference under those circumstances. The gentleman was authorized to move to send the bill to conference.

We debated the question, and I pointed out the precedents of the House for protecting the position of the House in the conference, and I would like to quote from those precedents.

In section 536 of Jefferson's Manual it states:

The Speaker appoints the managers in the House selecting them so as to represent the attitude of the majority and minority of the House on the disagreements in issue; and while it is usual to represent the party divisions of the House, the representation of opinions as to the pending differences is rather the more important consideration.

Here is another precedent:

In selection of the managers, the two large political parties are usually represented, and also care is taken that there shall be a representation of the two opinions which almost always exist on subjects of importance. Of course, the majority party and the prevailing opinion have the majority of the managers.

Now, that is what we are asking for: That we have managers on the part of the House, at least a majority of them; we do not say, "all of them."

We do not exclude any individual in our thinking, but a majority of the managers on the part of the House ought to stand for the House position rather than to send this to conference under conditions where we can almost anticipate with certainty that the position of the House will not be properly represented.

There have been negotiations between those who are in conflict on this issue, but none of them have been over that question of having managers on the part of the House who will stand up for the House position.

We have talked about some of the issues. Members of the press have said, "How can you resolve the differences before you even go to conference?"

Well, if we cannot have people who are going to be supporters of the House position, the only way we can protect the House position is to have agreement on the major issues and have those who have been opposing us all along the line agree that they will support in conference these particular provisions in the House-passed bill. We have been unable to get that kind of agreement.

If the House again shows it wants its prerogatives protected, I think if the House today refuses to send this bill to conference, then reason will prevail. Then those who really want to see the

Senate bill adopted rather than the House bill will see that is not possible and will then agree to a fair resolution of the differences that divide us.

I hope the Members will vote "no" on the motion to go to conference.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I read a long time ago, as did many of the rest of the Members, about the lady who protested too much. It has been said we have not really tried to get somewhere, that we are going to bring back the Senate bill.

I told the House on the first day, the day of the first motion, that I was opposed to the Senate bill, and if I have not proved it, let me read to you what we agreed on just 5 minutes before the bill was called up. In order that there be no misunderstanding before this group, we went into conference with six points of difference:

First, on the wage itself. The House passed a bill which amended the provisions of the Dent bill, with the Erlenborn substitute. But the Erlenborn substitute had the very same dollar figures in it as the Dent bill.

An amendment was made to that particular Erlenborn amendment, and it changed the figures around and varied the money amount.

Now, I state to you, do not let anybody give you any talk about domestics or any other side issues.

This is a gut fight for bread and butter for poor people. This is for the underpaid workers in this country of ours that in every instance can prove that they are the lowest echelon of workers in this entire country.

We in this Congress have passed raises for the civil servants where, if we had given the same raise to the \$1.60 workers under the minimum wage, we would find that their wages today would be \$2.18 an hour.

What are you talking about here? You are talking about going back to 1961 and putting back into the legislation child labor. The only thing we have had in the last 11 years is subminimal wages for students, and that was in my bill. No man in his right mind in this room would expect me to come in here to put back into this legislation some minimum wage for permanent full-time workers under the age of 18.

We have spent billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money trying to go into the boondocks, into the byways and alleys of this country to pick up the dropouts and send them back to college.

Upward bound, forward march, and all of the fancy names you can give them, but you say give them jobs and deprive the full-time worker, the family man, of a measly little job at a minimum wage.

In my State if a man works at a minimum wage for the entire year, without losing a day's work and without losing 1 hour of employment, he would earn at the end of a full year of employment, mind you, with Pennsylvania's 2 $\frac{3}{10}$  percent gross wage tax at the State level and 2 percent gross wage tax at the local



level and social security 5.5 percent—not counting hospitalization and other costs that pertain to employment in this country—that greatly overpaid minimum wage worker would receive \$2,832.

Now let me show you something. I think you ought to recognize what we are talking about here.

Uncle Sam has estimated how much it would cost a mythical retired couple to live in various parts of the country about a year ago at various annual budgets for a retired couple. They say that for a retired couple living in the city the cost ranged from \$3,319 minimum to a level of \$4,776 at an intermediate level.

Now, who in his right mind in this body, or anywhere else in this country, who in his right mind, would demand that a man go to work to keep his family at anywhere from \$1,000 to \$3,000 less a year than he would get on relief? Everything comes out of the pocket of the little man.

Mr. Speaker, I sent you a letter today about bread, just everyday bread. That is what we are talking about here. Youth labor? Where? I will tell you where the demand on youth labor comes from. It comes from the new type of ownership of the restaurants of this country, the conglomerate entity that has nothing to do with restaurants but has walked in to the U Blind Co. and the Squid Co. and has bought the Kentucky Fried Chicken and Toddler companies and other houses with nationwide outlets.

What do they want? They want to work the kids at 30 cents an hour less. Do you think for 1 minute they will give a young married man or a GI who has come home a job in preference to saving \$2.40? Do you think they will?

Oh, it is fun to smirk when you are making \$42,500 a year with a 42-percent increase. It is fun to smirk come January when you will probably get another raise to \$50,000. And I want to see the men who vote for that. I want to see you stand here and tell me that \$1.60 an hour is too much for a man who works.

I am not talking about a man who shirks. I am spelling it with a W. I am talking about the men that go pounding at the gates of employment agencies looking for a job so that they can earn whatever they do in dignity.

Let me tell you about you Southerners who come to me and say you could not live with cotton processing, sugar processing, tobacco processing, and seafood processing. This is in the other bill, my bill when it came to the floor contained an elimination of your exemption, but my bill did not contain an elimination of your exemption when I promoted it and gave it to my committee. The amendment to eliminate the exemption came from the men who are asking you today to defeat me on this floor, it came from the Republican side leadership in my committee. The amendment to take processing rights away from the farmhand that went into the tobacco shed, it took him out of the exemption. How did the farmworker in the tobacco fields get the exemption in the first place? In 1961 the family farmworker was covered by

the minimum wage bill. I was on the committee, and the tobacco people were there, and another one who is opposing me today came to me and said that it worked a hardship on the family-type farmworker, because unless he gets it into the shed during the dry season he can stand to lose about 50 percent of his income. And against labor, against my liberal colleague, and because I thought it was right, I put the amendment through that exempted the farm family worker, and it was exempted in my bill this time, gentlemen of the subcommittee, until it was put in by my Republican colleagues. You learn your lesson.

But I have been in this business now for 40 years, and I have learned my lesson, but I have never learned the character of men. It is these two points that they can use to kill me. It is these two points that they can use with you, and they are using them today. And any warped idea that this is going to start pushing heroin in this country to give the working man \$2 an hour, and that it is going to increase crime, I do not believe that. If I believed for 1 minute that this bill was going to increase crime in this country—and here I stand, the grandfather of seven children, would I promote this legislation? I am not built that way.

How far and how deep can you dig to get yourselves an alibi, to get an excuse to vote, for what? Two percent is what you are voting against.

Let me just go on to say this: Concerning the matter of domestics, not one word was raised in my conference, we said we would leave that between the conference between the House and Senate, and I agreed.

And when we came to Government employees, Federal, State, and local, they said we will leave that to the conferees, and I agreed.

Let me just give you some facts so that you do not get any screwy ideas about what we are trying to do. In 1966, we covered Federal Government employees to the tune of 693,000. In 1966, we covered State and local government people to the tune of 2,655,000 for a total, mind you, of 3,140,000. And the new addition we are making now is only 3,077,000. It is not anything new.

I have nothing to sell here, but the truth, and the truth as I know it to be. I have handled this kind of legislation for a period of 40 years, and I have never seen it go before any legislative body where it did not turn out to be a pack of misery for the little people who have no other lobby, but fellows like myself, fellows who have a deep interest, and who have come from large families where they have had to go to work when they were 7 years of age, and have worked their way up the ladder. I have voted for every educational bill in the 40 years that I have been in this legislative business simply because I was denied an education. But I was not denied the right to go to work when I was 7 years of age. Why? Why?

And you want me to agree to child labor? Never, so long as there is a breath in this body of mine.

So then what else did we agree to?

Do not be impatient—you will have time to hang the poor creatures.

On agricultural processing—we agreed. And I want you to know that we agreed to take your cotton and to take your sugar and to take your cotton ginning and to take your tobacco out of this bill and leave it just as it is. An agreement was made—and I do not care who denies it. And the proposition came not from me, but from others.

That is the only thing we would cut down—that would be the weekly period from 20 to 10 and from 14 to 7—in two States—in canning.

Let me tell you about canning. I make it my business to know. I do not care about any lobbyist who comes and tells me something I know to be different. They come to me. Five years ago the canners stood in my room in my office and told me if we would take them off the hook they would come before us with an agreement, because they knew when you had that they did not need this period of overtime. And there is not a canner in the United States using that overtime.

Do you know what they must do with peas and beans and cover crops, and corn? They had to get it into the shed in 1 hour. There is not a canning process in the whole world that can handle it in an hour, but what do they do? I made it my business to go to a large processing plant. They quick freeze it in 200-pound blocks—and then leisurely they can it as it comes time to do so.

Believe me—you vote against it—vote against it with your eyes open. You are voting for child labor. You are voting for the selfishness of the great conglomerates which one of these days will be a great subject of concern in this great Congress of ours.

In my bill I wanted to exempt and did exempt every establishment in the United States of 250,000 or less because I believe that the small merchant in the small town, whether he belongs to a small or large chain, has the right to work his lease and work his land and work his store and live in that community.

And do you know what happened because of the conglomerates in many of my towns at home? Elderly people have to depend on somebody to stop to go by their little store to pick up something for them because all the shopping centers under the conglomerate type of ownership are way out off in the country. There are not even any little drugstores around in small towns of 12,000 to 13,000 people any more.

I come from a community of farmers. Not one unit of Government in my whole district has more than 17,000 people in it. You talk to me about farmers? Why, I was milking a cow when most of you fellows, for goodness' sake, were not even out of the cradle. I learned about three-legged stools long before any of you even thought of coming in here, and you are trying to tell this House that I am not treating the farmer right? Why would I be able to represent a State with 96,000 farm families and be able to stand here to tell you there is no opposition from the farmers? Oh, yes, there is. A fellow by the name of deGeorgio, a farmer by

the name of Schenley Industries—a farmer by the name of Ford Foundation—oh, yes—you will find a lot of these farmers opposing it. Why? And that is who you are voting for—and all the alibis and all the talk that you can put on will never in God's earth erase this from the record. And this is the last time you will get a chance at this bill—unless the Speaker in his wisdom understands that maybe it would be better if we work and come back after the election on this legislation. I think it is that important. Already you have held up the \$1.60 worker for 9 months. Then they say to me, send it to the Committee on Rules. Why, the Rules Committee held it long enough—not only to study the bill, but to write and read it, and dissect it. They held it up for 9 months to get this bill. And what was \$1.80 9 months ago is still \$1.60. And after you vote today it will still be \$1.60.

Let me say what we did on wages—and these were offered by the opposition to my bill—and not me. And this was agreed to by the chairman of the Senate committee. I insisted upon an agreement of the conferees in our committee, the ones that were working on this legislation.

The minimum wage—we went away from the straight \$2 in 60 days and we moved to \$1.90, and then a year later on to the \$2, and that was amended by a member of the conference, not on my side, to \$2.10 an hour.

In the latest agreement—not from us, from the other side—they said, "Let us go on to \$2.20 in 1976," and I bought it; \$2.20 in 1976.

Let me tell you: I took my wife to dinner just a few weeks ago when she was in town, and I thought, well, I will take her where all the brass goes, so we went to one of the well-known restaurants. Do you know how long a minimum-wage worker would have to work to pay the normal 15 percent tip on what I paid for two steak dinners and two scotches and sodas? He would have to work 3½ hours just to get enough for the tip. He would never be able to eat in there unless he mortgaged his house.

The Members talk about what they are doing. The gentlemen are working to make preparations. I gave it to the Members. I swear to the Members on this spot here now that my word is still good, regardless of what the others on that committee wanted, except they wanted me to sign my name. For 40 years I have made commitments in politics, and for 40 years I have never walked out on them. If my word is not good enough, then my signature is no better.

My father told me a long time ago:

Never put your word where you would not put your bond. Never do that, son, and you will never have trouble.

I never had trouble until now. People wanted my signature. I tell the Members that if I go to the conference, if the Members allow me to go, I will keep the processing exemptions for the Members. I will move in this direction that we had agreed on—\$1.90, \$1.60, \$1.80, \$2, \$2.10, \$2.20, \$1.50, \$1.70, \$1.80—10-cent increases. What more do the Members want?

In the stores that I am talking about, in these conglomerate restaurants, remember, with the tip allowance that I was foolish enough to sponsor for them, when they go up 10 cents, they ought to pay a nickel. The waitress seeks the other nickel herself as a tip by being nice to us amorous old men.

Five cents is all it is going to cost McDonald's, and I am going to tell the Members what Mr. So-and-So from McDonald's said to me. He said:

We are spending millions of dollars advertising to make you come in to McDonald's and get a Big Mac, a Coca-Cola, some french-fried potatoes, and change.

Do the Members know where the change comes from? He said:

If you put this Minimum Wage Bill in, they will not be able to get back the change.

I said:

Well, you take it out of their pockets now; why do you not get your workers paid?

They ought to be interested in getting people to come in for Big Mac.

I looked at the returns, because I own stock in quite a few little ventures myself. I have been successful even though I did not get so much college education. I want to tell the Members McDonald's is a much better buy in stocks than it is in the Big Mac. They are trying to keep it, and the Members are going to help them do it, and there is no way out of it. The indictment stands; the jury is out; and the conviction will come in. The Members are responsible.

I say to the gentleman that I would hate to think that the President of the United States is guilty of what Jack Anderson said he is, but to me I absolve him of that charge. I cannot help what my people are going to think when the Members defeat this as a Republican Party.

In the third proposition under retail chains I told the Members that I stood for the \$250,000 exemption. In the conference I still agreed, to the credit of the McDonald chain. I will give them credit. They agreed to the phaseout, but they also agreed to go along to allow the little independent chain, the independent merchant in the cities, to have a \$250,000 exemption. They agreed to take the phaseout, and I went along with that. I could not go along any more. I could not do any more than if I just let them write an unborn bill.

I want to say to the gentlemen that if God is willing and I live long enough, we will get a bill, because the Members cannot keep minimum-wage workers at \$1.60 much longer. The gentlemen are not going to be able to keep them at that. Any sly remarks that people make that they have got an angle, they are going to make a unanimous-consent request, they are going to send it to the Rules Committee—what is the good of that? Eventually it still has to go into the conference.

The only way we can have a conference is to name Members.

I want to say to all the Members that I have lived quite a few years. I will soon be up to retirement age, God willing. I have never yet in my life walked away from an agreement and sometimes I have

even stayed after those who worked with me or those I thought worked with me walked away from me. No person in my entire political life has ever been able to say I did not keep my word. I will keep my word if I am with you and I will keep my word if I am against you. At this moment I have mixed emotions as to whether I am for or against, but Members can bet their lives that wherever I stand that is where I will be, and I will be against when the right time comes. I will be against when the time is timely, because I will not allow conditions like this to keep on existing when my vote or those of any of my friends is concerned. When I give the sugar people what they want, and they want to deny a measly \$1.70 an hour or \$1.80 an hour or \$1.90 an hour or \$2 an hour in the far distant future, then here is the grand score on sugar, and I voted for it. Yes, sir. Sugar subsidies. Many talked \$200,000. Do Members mean to tell me I will be defeated by the sugar group in this House when I have no friends except for little people I grew up with? I am not going to stand here and see them crucified on an economic cross while I stand here and vote for \$200,000 and \$300,000 and \$400,000 contributions. I will not.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman and I know what he is going to ask me.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman was on the floor when I had a brief colloquy with the chairman of the full committee on August 1. I stated at that time I had voted for the committee bill, and I was able to do that because I felt that the drafters of that bill had retained the exemptions for certain of our seasonal agricultural employees, specifically the cotton ginners, and also had denied expansion of coverage or broadening of coverage to certain agricultural workers who I felt could not be covered, because my farmers are going bankrupt now and they could not afford this increased expanded coverage.

I have listened intently to the remarks of the gentleman. I appreciate that he was willing to keep those exemptions in the bill. He did have it in his committee bill and I voted for it.

Now I will ask the gentleman if this motion is passed and goes to conference, can he give me the assurance that the exemptions that he has mentioned for the cotton ginners will be retained in any conference report that will come back to this House?

Mr. DENT. I will answer the gentleman by saying that one time there were 14 devils in a room and one little angel walked in. A man standing there with a match was waiting to set it afire. The angel said: "Would you burn me too with the devils?" He said: "No, my compassion compels me to save you and let the devils live, too."

So I will support the gentleman in the conference.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. I thank my friend.

Will the gentleman yield very briefly for me to propound that same question



to the chairman of the full committee on that specific exemption?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman we intend to protect the farmers in this country. We do not expand their coverage anywhere along the line. There are only a few farmers in the country covered today, and they are the big corporate farmers. We expect to leave that coverage stand as it has been in the past with no expansion.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this overtime exemption will be retained for the seasonal cotton employees?

Mr. PERKINS. I well recognize that cotton ginning is seasonal, and we intend to do what is reasonable.

I hope that the little farmers in the South and everywhere else do not get the impression that they are covered under this bill. They are not covered. I think, if you look far enough down the road, that it is to the welfare of the farmers in this country to vote for this legislation and I believe it is to the welfare of the agricultural processing people in this country to vote for this legislation.

I realize the problems which the farmers have in this country. I have seen them disappear by the hundreds of thousands since I have been here. I have always worked to see that we have maintained and protected the farmers under this minimum wage legislation. That we have done and will continue to do.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. DENT. Let me just clear one thing up. The very serious view was taken that the conference would not be had, because we were not reporting what we said to be the full purpose of the House. The Senate happened to pass its bill unanimously. This substitute was passed by a margin of five votes. That point should be made, that a majority of those who voted with the House were knocked down by the majority leader when on the floor he asked that conferees be named that would go along with the minority view, because the majority view was against—

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

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any Member from a big city district who has tried any harder than I have to see that the rural economy of our country was not trampled by the mere accident of fact that more people live in cities than live on farms. I have no apologies to make in any respect for my voting behavior as it has affected the agricultural segment of the economy.

I know, and everybody else knows all big crops are coming up next year. I know, and everybody in this hall knows, how difficult it is to get Members whose districts cannot see the correct linkage between their best interests and those in the rural areas to vote for sensible legislation.

I want it to be perfectly clear, and I am going to be a conferee, that I will support the assurance given by the distinguished subcommittee chairman. I

am a man of my word. I will support the assurance given by the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee.

We are going to write a bill that those of us on this side of the aisle can live with, not just in the cities, but in the rural areas. If those on the other side of the aisle want to see a political backlash, let them take the blame for denying the poor employees of this country in the city districts from getting any kind of increase in their minimum wages, an increase that they have been denied through the entire 4 years of the Nixon Republican administration.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. DENT. Do you intend to yield any more time? Is there any time left?

Mr. PERKINS. There are several people wanting time. However, I do not want to deprive the gentleman from Pennsylvania of any time which he may need.

Mr. DENT. We used to have a pass-word in one of the clubs to which I belong. You can answer it in your own way. "Friends or foe?" That was the outer guard. What does the inner guard say?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Earlier in the debate the gentleman from Louisiana made some statements about negotiations and agreements. My good friend from Pennsylvania also made some statements about negotiations and agreements. I understand there is a rebuttal which should be made, and some points clarified. The gentleman from Louisiana has already spoken. I shall be glad to yield to him at this time, because I do believe we should amplify some of the questions raised and some of the assurances we have received.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is not a rebuttal to anything.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) has had to say to the Members about the tentative agreements is accurate to the extent that we did reach tentative agreement on all the points mentioned. Make no mistake about it. We did. We talked to all these points.

But let me say this to my friends of the House: We asked, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) said, if he would mind giving us a written memorandum—he and the other conferees—setting forth these areas of agreement, and he declined. I understand his declining. We simply wanted to avoid a misunderstanding. But later this afternoon some of us, still trying to work something out, asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), if they would be willing, in a colloquy here on the House floor, to answer questions about these areas of tentative agreement and commit themselves to stand by these areas of tentative agreement, or else there would be no conference report.

I want the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. DENT) to listen to me, because the gentleman said he would not and therefore would not engage in such a colloquy. I understand his not doing it. He had what appeared to me justifiable reasons.

But now he has set forth for the House, after declining to engage in such a colloquy, these areas of agreement. This indicates that someone broke in agreement. Let me enunciate them for the Members. They coincide in large part, although he did not speak in great detail to them, to what he had to say. No one has broken their word on either side.

I am talking about the areas we talked about. We talked about money for those covered prior to 1966. We talked about and reached a tentative agreement of \$1.90 now, \$2.10 January 1, 1974, \$2.20 January 1, 1975; and we talked about those covered in 1966 or later, and we tentatively agreed to \$1.80 now, \$2 January 1, 1974, \$2.10 January 1, 1975 and \$2.20 January 1, 1976.

And we talked about agriculture. We had a tentative agreement it would be \$1.50 now, \$1.70 January 1, 1974, \$1.80 January 1, 1975, and \$1.90 January 1, 1976.

Does this sound like people talking who do not want to make some concessions and reach an agreement? Certainly not.

Then we talked about some other things. We agreed that it would be left entirely to the conferees—and this represents considerable concession on the part of the House, in view of the proposal the House passed—that the conferees would freely negotiate with regard to the coverage of Puerto Rican and Virgin Island employees, and that the conferees would negotiate in the area of Government employees, Federal, State, and local employees. We agreed to let the conferees negotiate in the area of domestic coverage.

We agreed to let the conferees negotiate in the area of a youth differential, except in the area of postcertification, and we held out for postcertification rather than precertification. We talked about some other things, and we had some tentative agreements.

We agreed that with regard to the \$250,000 exemption for small business, that we would agree to the phaseout of some of these people who are engaged, not just in an independent business where they have a number of establishments, but where they have other primary interests as well. A multitude of interests.

This would affect the big businessmen; it would not affect the little businessman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. We agreed that the \$250,000 exemption would be held for the little independent businessman, even though he had maybe more than, for example, say, two or three restaurants.

But we also agreed, Mr. Speaker, that sugar employees, tobacco employees, seasonal seafood employees, cotton em-

ployees, and the loggers would be represented, but cannery would lose exemption of a number of weeks, but retain the same number of exempted hours.

The point is simply this—and now I am right back where I started—we are talking about details, and we cannot reach in this 1 hour that agreement, but we are awfully close as the Members can see. It is too complicated.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see why we cannot, seeing the way things have gone, rise and not vote on this issue, and see if we can resolve it, with a little understanding over tonight, and settle the issue tomorrow.

I would agree to that and would request of the chairman that we withhold the vote and see if we cannot resolve the issue in these areas. This is the way to get a needed minimum wage bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if I ever reneged on an agreement, I would not deserve to be chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. It is true that these points mentioned by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) were discussed, but I think it ought to be clear to everyone by now that no agreement was reached. Now, there is something more important here, Mr. Speaker, than talking about "Who killed Cock Robin?" if this measure is voted down. I am telling you that it will be extremely difficult to have another vote on this bill in this session if we vote down this motion. If we are so near the agreement that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) refers to, I do not think any Member under the sound of my voice in this body should be fearful of voting to send this minimum wage bill to conference today.

I am hopeful that all the Members in this body will vote to send this bill to conference, and we will resolve these differences. I am hopeful that we can come back with some of the suggestions enumerated by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

There are areas of disagreement, yes, but let us resolve those differences in the way that we resolve the differences in all conferences. We are going to maintain the integrity of this House.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I do not intend to use much more time, because I think I understand what is going on, and most of the Members understand exactly where I stand.

I only say to you, in spite of any inferences to the contrary, I intend to abide by what I said on this floor, as I always have.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DENT. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor if he would stand firm on those comments and those points to the negotiations of the other body in conference, and if they will not agree, would he not agree himself?

Mr. DENT. I will come back. I would do what I think the chairman would ask me to do; I would come back and ask the House for instructions.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is not the answer.

Mr. DENT. I do not know of anything else to do but come back and say that we have a deadlock. You do not want me to do anything else. There might be such a small difference between us that the House might not decide. I attended one of those conferences and brought back a report and we killed the minimum wage bill in 1960.

If you remember—and you ought to remember if you were here—that became the sole and only issue that Jack Kennedy had in his campaign in the field of economics. I thought you ought to know that.

So I am asking you one and all, if you believe these people are deserving of consideration for an increase in pay which is long overdue, if you believe that to be a responsibility of this Congress, then I ask you to believe in me, and I would keep your trust.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 196, answered "present" 2, not voting 43, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 404]

#### YEAS—189

Abourezk	Dingell	Jacobs
Abzug	Donohue	Johnson, Calif.
Adams	Dow	Jones, Ala.
Addabbo	Drinan	Karth
Anderson,	Dulski	Kastenmeier
Calif.	du Pont	Kee
Anderson,	Eckhardt	Kluczynski
Tenn.	Edwards, Calif.	Koch
Andrews,	Eilberg	Kyros
N. Dak.	Fascell	Leggett
Ashley	Fish	Link
Aspin	Flood	Long, Md.
Badillo	Foley	McCloskey
Barrett	Ford	McDade
Begich	William D.	McFall
Bennett	Fraser	McKay
Bergland	Fulton	McKinney
Blester	Garmatz	Macdonald,
Bingham	Gaydos	Mass.
Blanton	Gibbons	Madden
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Matsunaga
Boggs	Grasso	Mazzoli
Boland	Gray	Meeds
Bolling	Green, Pa.	Melcher
Brademas	Griffiths	Metcalf
Brasco	Gude	Mikva
Brooks	Halpern	Miller, Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Mills, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Hanley	Minish
Burton	Hanna	Mitchell
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Idaho	Monagan
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Moorhead
Carney	Harrington	Morgan
Celler	Hathaway	Moss
Chisholm	Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.
Clark	Hays	Murphy, N.Y.
Collins, Ill.	Hechler, W. Va.	Nedzi
Conte	Heckler, Mass.	Nix
Conyers	Heinz	Obeys
Corman	Helstoski	O'Hara
Cotter	Hicks, Mass.	O'Neill
Coughlin	Hicks, Wash.	Patman
Danielson	Hollifield	Patten
Delaney	Horton	Pepper
Dellums	Howard	Perkins
Denholm	Hungate	Peyser
Dent	Hunt	Pike
Diggs	Ichord	Podell

Price, Ill.	St Germain	Tiernan
Pucinski	Sandman	Udall
Randall	Sarbanes	Ullman
Rangel	Scheuer	Van Deeren
Rees	Seiberling	Vanik
Reid	Shipley	Vigorito
Reuss	Sisk	Waldie
Riegle	Slack	Whalen
Rodino	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Roe	Stanton,	Charles H.
Roncalio	James V.	Wolff
Rooney, Pa.	Steele	Wylder
Rosenthal	Stokes	Yates
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Yatron
Roush	Stuckey	Young, Tex.
Roy	Sullivan	Zablocki
Roybal	Symington	
Ruppe	Thompson, N.J.	

#### NAYS—196

Abbitt	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
Abernethy	Frenzel	Pettis
Alexander	Frey	Pickle
Anderson, Ill.	Fuqua	Pirnie
Andrews, Ala.	Gallianakis	Poage
Archer	Gettys	Powell
Arends	Goldwater	Preyer, N.C.
Ashbrook	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Baker	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Belcher	Grover	Quie
Betts	Gubser	Quillen
Blackburn	Haley	Railsback
Bow	Hall	Rarick
Bray	Hammer-	Rhodes
Brinkley	schmidt	Roberts
Broomfield	Harsha	Robinson, Va.
Brozman	Harvey	Robison, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Rogers
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Roussot
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Ruth
Broyhill, Va.	Hogan	Satterfield
Buchanan	Hosmer	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Hull	Schneebell
Burleson, Tex.	Hutchinson	Schwengel
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Scott
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Sebellus
Caffery	Jonas	Shoup
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Shriver
Carlson	Kazen	Sikes
Carter	Keating	Skubitz
Casey, Tex.	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Kemp	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	King	Snyder
Chappell	Kuykendall	Spence
Clancy	Kyl	Springer
Clausen,	Landgrebe	Stanton,
Don H.	Landrum	J. William
Clawson, Del.	Latta	Steed
Cleveland	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Collins, Tex.	Lloyd	Stephens
Colmer	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Conable	McClary	Talcott
Conover	McCollister	Taylor
Crane	McCulloch	Terry
Curlin	McEwen	Thomson, Wis.
Daniel, Va.	McKevitt	Thone
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Vander Jagt
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Vessey
de la Garza	Mallory	Waggoner
Dellenback	Mann	Ware
Dennis	Martin	Whalley
Derwinski	Mathias, Calif.	White
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Whitehurst
Dickinson	Mayne	Whitten
Dorn	Michel	Widnall
Downing	Miller, Ohio	Wiggins
Duncan	Mills, Md.	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Mizell	Winn
Eshleman	Montgomery	Wyllie
Findley	Mosher	Wyman
Fisher	Myers	Young, Fla.
Flowers	Natcher	Zion
Flynt	Nelsen	Zwach
Ford, Gerald R.	Passman	
Fountain		

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Mailliard	Wright
-----------	--------

#### NOT VOTING—43

Annunzio	Dowdy	Hagan
Aspinall	Dwyer	Hillis
Baring	Edmondson	Lujan
Bell	Esch	McClure
Bevill	Evans, Colo.	McCormack
Biaggi	Evins, Tenn.	McDonald,
Byron	Forsythe	Mich.
Clay	Gallagher	Mink
Culver	Gialmo	Mollohan
Daniels, N.J.	Green, Oreg.	Nichols
Davis, S.C.	Gross	O'Konski



Purcell  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Runnels  
Saylor

Schmitz  
Staggers  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.

Thompson, Ga.  
Wampler  
Wyatt

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Nichols against.  
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Hagan against.  
Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Purcell against.  
Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Teague of California against.  
Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Baring against.  
Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Esch against.  
Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Thompson of Georgia against.  
Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Wampler against.  
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Schmitz against.  
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey for, with Mr. Dowdy against.  
Mr. Gialmo for, with Mr. McClure against.  
Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Wyatt against.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Byron against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Clay with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mr. Molohan with Mr. Forsythe.  
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Gross.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. O'Konski.  
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. McCormack.  
Mr. Bevil with Mr. Aspinall.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Runnels.  
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Hillis.

Messrs. LONG of Maryland and KEE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE). If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL). If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY OF BREAD

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to call attention today to the celebration of International Day of Bread as part of Harvest Festival Week.

At this traditional time, peoples of the world come together in spirit and express thanksgiving for the annual harvest in their native lands. I cannot think of a more appropriate time to commit ourselves to achieving a better tomorrow through world cooperation and understanding.

There is a growing awareness around the world among nations concerned with the problem of feeding the hungry and malnourished of the importance of bread as an international food.

Bread, a product of wheat, symbolizes the harvest of all crops and of food itself. The significance of bread is most impressively demonstrated by the fact man regards this product as the "staff of life." Wheat is man's oldest crop and cultivated food, and provides more nourishment for the peoples of the world than any other food. Yet the problems of world hunger and malnutrition remain formidable. There is an urgent need for intensive research in this field, since the nutrition of bread and wheat products must be utilized to provide the daily nutritional requirements for the hungry and malnourished.

In this regard, I would like to insert into the RECORD a most informative bulletin, "What You Need to Know About Your Daily Bread for Health's Sake."

As the Day of Bread is observed the world over today, the past merges with the present. Since 1953, the people of West Germany have celebrated a "Day of Bread" as part of a Harvest Festival on a commonly accepted date in October. The observance spread to Austria, and in the United Kingdom, the English church annually joins in a similar occasion marked by a display of different breads and ecclesiastical mention of their significance.

The practice of observing a "Day of Bread" each year has also been initiated in Central and South America, and in the Orient. Consideration of an international observance has also been indicated by the Bread Institute of Sweden and the Millers' Associations of Switzerland, as well as other European nations. Truly, this observance is becoming international in scope and meaning.

I also think it is important that on this day we pay tribute to the American farmer. He ultimately will enable us to win—or to lose—the fight against hunger and malnutrition. Today the farmer's industry and productivity allow the consumer to spend 83 percent of his disposable income for nonfood items. The farmer's efficiency contributed a \$2 billion favorable trade balance in fiscal year 1972. In effect, the farmer is subsidizing the U.S. business growth and industrial development. It is only right the farmer shares in the prosperity his labors have created.

It is apparent that "Harvest Festival" and "Day of Bread" observances transcend national consideration. This is an opportunity to contribute to greater international communication and understanding among the nations of the world. I am hopeful that you will join us as we break bread together in thanksgiving and in committing our resources to a better tomorrow.

The bulletin follows:

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT YOUR DAILY BREAD FOR HEALTH'S SAKE

WHAT IS THE STORY OF "ENRICHMENT"?

"Just before World War II, it was determined that there was widespread and serious malnutrition in the United States in the form of vitamin deficiency diseases—diseases which were prevalent to an extent unimaginable today. Thousands of people were actually dying from them every year, and hundreds of thousands more were existing in a state of miserable 'half-health' because of them. In 1941, it was decided that it would

be practical and feasible to improve the nutritional quality of bread by adding to it the elements that were so dangerously deficient in the American diet, the vitamins: thiamine, niacin and riboflavin, and the mineral: iron. And, in the years that followed, the serious deficiency diseases (pellagra, beriberi, ariboflavinosis) disappeared as public health problems—due in large measure to the nutritional improvement brought about by the use of enriched bread. It has been said that the elimination of these vitamin deficiency diseases was one of the greatest success stories in the history of public health improvements."—Dr. W. H. Sebrell, Jr., Director, Institute of Human Nutrition, Columbia University.

CAN EATING MORE BREAD HELP STAVE OFF HEART DISEASE?

"An increase in the amount of bread consumed represents our best chance to lower the fat content of the American diet and thus take an effective step in trying to lower cholesterol levels and mortality from our number one cause of death, atherosclerotic heart disease."—Dr. Jean Mayer, Professor of Nutrition, Harvard University.

IS BREAD FATTENING?

"Bread is a good source of energy, as measured by calories, but contrary to popular belief is not a particularly fattening food. Because of bread's low fat content, it has a low caloric density and should be included in the diets of weight-conscious consumers rather than being shunned by them."—Dr. William J. Hoover, Chairman, Department of Grain Science and Industry, Kansas State University.

IS BREAD JUST EMPTY CALORIES?

"Bread and cereals provide 25 percent of the food energy, 17 percent of the protein and about 25 to 30 percent of the iron consumed in the nation . . . Bread is a good food and is not an example of empty calories. It provides important nutrients to the diet and plays a proud role in nutrition."—Dr. Philip L. White, Secretary, Council on Foods and Nutrition, American Medical Association.

ARE "HEALTH FOODS" BETTER THAN REGULAR GROCERY SHELF FOODS?

"Any local grocery or supermarket is a health food store. Its brands of foods are as good, as healthy and certainly far cheaper than that sold in a 'special' health food store."—Dr. Fredrick J. Stare, Chairman, Department of Nutrition, Harvard University.

HOW DOES AMERICAN ENRICHED BREAD COMPARE NUTRITIONALLY WITH OTHER BREADS IN THE WORLD?

"The bread with the highest over-all nutritional value was a semi-white Finnish bread made with a mixture of whole wheat and white flour and 4.3 percent milk solids . . . The bread which ranked second in over-all nutritional value was the enriched white bread typical of that sold in the United States."—Study made at Massachusetts Institute of Technology by Dr. Robert S. Harris, et al., of nutrient composition of 44 typical national breads of the world.

HOW IMPORTANT IS BREAD AND OTHER WHEAT PRODUCTS FOR GOOD HEALTH?

"Work carried out in recent decades indicates that: (1) wheat has an ameliorating effect on blood cholesterol levels which may be important in reducing cardiovascular deaths; (2) wheat decreases the incidence of dental caries in children; (3) wheat contains proteins of such high biological quality that normal young men can be maintained in excellent health for long periods of time when wheat is their only source of protein; (4) wheat lowers the blood urea level which may be efficacious in the reduction of renal (kidney) diseases; and (5) wheat provides an economical and adequate means of providing a nutritious diet for large numbers of

people now that food is considered a critical factor in human survival."—Dr. Olaf Mickelsen, Professor of Nutrition, Michigan State University

#### HOW IMPORTANT ARE WHEAT AND OTHER CEREAL GRAINS TO THE WORLD FOOD PROBLEM?

In testimony on the "Wheat and Wheat Foods Research, Education and Promotion Act" before Committees, House and Senate, U.S. Congress: "Increased cereal consumption in this country would be beneficial and cereals provide the major hope for feeding the world now and in the future."—Dr. D. M. Hegsted, Chairman Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council

#### A "DAY OF BREAD"

Emerging as a major factor in the solution of the world-wide hunger problem is bread—so common and so universal through the years that it is known as the symbol of all food. Wheat is the world's most widely cultivated food plant. It is eaten in various forms by more than one billion people and makes a larger contribution to the calories and protein available to man than any other food.

The universality of bread and the growing concern, both at home and abroad, over the issue of hunger and malnutrition gave rise to the "Day of Bread" in the United States—to focus attention on this critical problem and urge industry and government to join in a campaign to improve popular diet.

The "Day of Bread," observed on Tuesday of the first full week in October, called Harvest Festival Week, is a revival of an ancient custom, celebrating the annual bounty of agriculture. The modern version began in West Germany in 1953 and spread to other countries of Europe, South America, Asia and Africa. It started in the United States in 1969, proclaimed by President Nixon, state governors and mayors throughout the nation.

#### WHO RUNS NADER?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the past several months have seen a legion of young Ralph Nader zealots on Capitol Hill investigating anything and everything in sight. The marvelous 100-page questionnaire which kicked off the now famous "Congress Project" has already been given the resounding response it so richly deserves. The inept personal interviews of Members followed soon thereafter. Now we are informed that the biographical sketches resulting from these efforts will hit the newsstands by the middle of the month. But this will be only one of an estimated 20 fact-filled volumes which Mr. Nader has promised.

In fact, the first of the volumes in this massive work has already been published, and provides a likely taste of what is to come. This little dandy is entitled "Who Runs Congress?—the President, Big Business, or You?" After reading the brief sections of the book devoted to me I found myself wondering who runs Nader?

The reference occurs on page 140 in a discussion of the scurrilous conflicts of interest which Mr. Nader would like the American public to believe haunt each of the Members of this body. I am cited as currently owning a radio station in my hometown while at the same time serv-

ing on the Communications Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The fact Mr. Nader and friends omitted to point out was that this station was sold by me 2 years ago, and I retain absolutely no interest in it at all.

I put the station, WCOM-FM, on the air in Urbana, Ohio, only 3 days before my father died in 1965. It was not until more than a year after I won his seat in a special election that I was assigned to the House Commerce Committee, and not until some time after that that I was assigned to the Communications Subcommittee. FCC regulations prohibit the sale of a radio station for 3 years after it is put on the air. So it was not until 1969 that I could legally divest myself of it, and the sale was consummated early in 1970.

If nothing else, one would have expected that Mr. Nader would have called me or the radio station or the Federal Communications Commission before going to press with his inaccurate information. He did not.

The matter is all the more curious, however, because more than a month and a half ago during the personal interview to which I submitted with Nader's Congress project reporters, they brought the same charge up and I set the record straight then. The biography soon to be published hopefully will reflect this fact, along with the corrections of the 21 errors which I pointed out when I read over the draft which was made available to me recently.

Contrary to what Mr. Fellmuth, who heads up this project, would have the public believe, the majority of these errors were not spelling mistakes and grammatical slips, but gross factual distortions which were the product of reportorial misfeasance and nonfeasance, or Mr. Nader's right hand not knowing what his left hand is doing.

If Ralph Nader has any doubt about the reason why the vast majority of Members of Congress hold him in low esteem, he need look no farther than the hogwash printed in his own book. As I said earlier it is only a taste of what is to come, so settle back for a good laugh. The congressional watchdog has been caught catnapping.

#### UPDATED INFORMATION ON THE SOUTHEAST ASIA AND PACIFIC AREAS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I submit this New York Times article to my colleagues as updated information on Southeast and Pacific areas.

These remarks were made by Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., the former commander of all our forces in the Pacific.

On November 1, 1972, Admiral McCain will retire after one of the most distinguished careers in the military service.

In my opinion Admiral McCain has the best knowledge on Southeast Asia of almost any American.

THE FORMER COMMANDER OF ALL U.S. FORCES IN THE PACIFIC JUST RETIRED, SEES VIETNAMIZATION AS A SUCCESS AND HOLDS IT "ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL" TO REMAIN A POWER IN THE PACIFIC

(By John S. McCain, Jr.)

HONOLULU.—Viewing my tenure as commander in chief of Pacific forces, I am struck by the realization that there have been tremendous changes in this vast area within these four years. The United States has made great strides in attaining the goals of the Nixon Doctrine, which call for continued United States leadership in the Pacific—but with reduced American forces.

Under the Nixon Doctrine, foreign policy and our national security strategy of realistic deterrence, we have carefully and safely reduced our military manpower in the Pacific command from a high of more than one million servicemen and servicewomen to less than 500,000. United States military withdrawals are continuing as our friends and allies assume ever greater responsibility for their own defense.

In South Vietnam, successful Vietnamization has permitted continued disengagement and redeployment of United States forces, so that by Dec. 1 we will have reduced our commitment there from over half a million men to less than 27,000. From a military viewpoint, I feel this is a sound figure. Were it not for the hordes of new North Vietnamese invaders into South Vietnam this spring, the United States military presence throughout South Asia could have been even further reduced.

President Nixon's plan to reduce the total United States troop commitment in South Vietnam is a result of our confidence that the South Vietnamese can continue to improve their capability for their own defense. We are seeing a much-improved South Vietnamese fighting force. The South Vietnamese are doing sound military planning; the South Vietnamese Army has come of age; and the South Vietnamese Air Force is performing a steadily growing role in support of South Vietnamese Army ground forces. Vietnamization is successful.

During the last four years South Vietnam has survived two major offensives from the North. The first was the Tet offensive of 1968. The second came last Easter weekend.

Many factors contributed to the halt of this most recent North Vietnamese invasion. The most important is the gallant manner in which the South Vietnamese armed forces rose to stop the enemy. They have shown the enemy and themselves they can succeed. They are good. The second most important resulted from the President's decision to mine the port of Haiphong and other North Vietnamese waterways, and to attack North Vietnam's logistics lines and war-making capability.

The President's decision to mine the harbors and renew the air attacks was a most courageous one. All of the ports have been mined, and the minefields have not been crossed or breached since then by any merchant ships. While we have seen some minor lightening activities, this has been minimal; and we have destroyed many of the small craft involved in that lightening activity. The effect of the mining will be most apparent as the stockpiles of the North Vietnamese are depleted and her ability to mount major military activities on strict timetables are thereby denied.

The United States forces have fulfilled their role in supporting the South Vietnamese in a superb manner. Particularly noteworthy and effective have been the United States air operations against the invading enemy forces. The B-52's, naval surface ship gunfire, the Air Force and Navy tactical air support aircraft, the gunships and air transports working on a round-the-clock basis in conjunction with the growing Vietnamese Air Force—all contributed a decisive role in



beating the enemy invaders in Kontum, in Anloc, and now in Quangtri. This United States naval and air power has assisted the South Vietnamese ground forces in taking the initiative on the battlefields against a highly mobile invading force of superior numbers and sophisticated firepower.

Two other factors have a direct influence on the North Vietnamese failure. First, North Vietnam's leaders had counted on a general uprising among the populace of South Vietnam. It did not take place. The South Vietnamese people, unwilling to go over to the other side, moved south by the hundreds of thousands to avoid coming under control of the northern forces, just as they did in 1954.

Another area of significant change in the Pacific came on May 15, 1972, with the reversion of Okinawa to Japanese prefectural status. Since the end of World War II, Okinawa had been under United States control. Planning for this reversion began in 1969, and culminated last May. The agreements with Japan provide that the United States may retain military bases there, a key requirement for the United States deterrent posture in the Pacific.

Korea is a third area of dramatic change. The conflict that had dominated that area for more than 25 years began to be eased in July as the Governments of North and South Korea began bilateral talks. These talks, coming on the heels of twenty years of vituperation and conflict, directly reflect the wisdom of President Nixon's policy of normalizing our relations with all nations, particularly the People's Republic of China.

As commander in chief of all United States Pacific forces, I have had the responsibility for the defense of our national interests and our deterrent posture from the Arctic to Antarctica and across the broad expanse of the Pacific from California to the western Indian Ocean. Indicative of this great expanse and indicative of the importance of even the most remote parts of this broad area of United States interest, we are building a communications facility on the island of Diego Garcia in the middle of the Indian Ocean. This facility is being built with the cooperation of the United Kingdom, and the United States will continue to operate ships in the Indian Ocean periodically.

Free world security throughout East Asia continues to rest on a combination of United States defense treaties, such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and ANZUS; the other strong regional agreements among Asian nations; and the five-power defense arrangement for Malaysia and Singapore, which involves forces from Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia.

I have regularly and strongly upheld the wisdom of maintaining adequate military defense in the Pacific through collective security during my four years as commander. Lately, I find it necessary to remind my countrymen that the finest weapons systems won't mean a thing if we don't support the men who defend our people and our soil.

I visited Vietnam on a regular basis as commander in chief in the Pacific. I have been out in the heartlands to the tiny base camps and fire-support bases. I have visited the major military installations. Throughout these visits, I have talked with hundreds of our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen. I find this group of American young men as outstanding as any youth I have known anywhere any time. They are intelligent, dedicated to the performance of their duties, and a credit to our country. I am extremely proud of them. Our nation can be proud of them.

Looking to the future, the strength of our United States air and naval forces in Southeast Asia will depend on the political actions taken to resolve the conflict, and on the enemy's military actions. I am convinced the

months immediately ahead are critical for the preservation of all that the United States and allied forces have achieved thus far in Indochina.

Our ultimate goal in the Pacific is the encouragement of strong, viable economies and the right of self-determination for all the peoples of the region. I have no doubt that our assistance will be required and will be forthcoming in Asia in the years ahead. It is absolutely essential for the stability of the free world that the United States remain a Pacific power.

## A STORY OF INITIATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Knight newspaper chain recently ran a full page ad in its papers with excerpts from other media praising the initiative and journalistic responsibility of two of its Washington bureau reporters.

The Knight papers have a right to be proud of these two young men who have been cited for their handling of the Senator EAGLETON incident. They are Knight bureau chief Robert Boyd and reporter Clark Hoyt. It has been my privilege to know both of these men for many years and I can attest to the fact that they richly deserve the praise which has been heaped upon them.

Boyd, 44, began working for the Knight chain at the Detroit Free Press in 1957. In 1960, he was assigned to the Washington bureau and became its chief in 1967. Hoyt, 29, became a reporter in 1966, after 2 years on Capitol Hill as a research assistant. In 1968 he joined the Detroit Free Press and, in 1970, came to the Knight Newspapers' Washington Bureau representing the Miami Herald.

In so highly a competitive business it is most unusual when a member of the journalism community takes time to pay tribute to a competitor. The fact that such notable sources as Time, Newsweek, the New York Times, the St. Petersburg Times, the Chicago Tribune, the Milwaukee Sentinel, the Christian Science Monitor, the Roanoke Times, and CBS News all saw fit to comment on Boyd's and Hoyt's fairness and sense of responsibility indicates the high regard in which they are held.

I am pleased to bring their comments to the attention of our colleagues.

### THE EAGLETON CASE, A STORY OF INITIATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY

This is the story of how the case of Sen. Thomas Eagleton first came to the public. Knight newspapers had the basic information about the senator's past psychiatric problems, but we did not publish it until we had gone to Sen. McGovern's staff and to Sen. Eagleton himself for verification and explanation.

Like any aggressive news organization, we like exclusives—and we're proud to say we have more than our share. But no exclusive is worth sacrificing our professional principles.

From the first response to the telephone call about Sen. Eagleton, through the painstaking check of sources in Missouri, the submission of what we had discovered to the senators, and final publication, Knight newspapers lives up to this basic tenet of our philosophy:

"We try always to present the news fully, accurately and with fairness and balance."

LEE HILLS,

Publisher, Miami Herald, President, Knight Newspapers.

FROM TIME MAGAZINE

"The assignment given to Clark Hoyt of the Knight Newspapers Washington Bureau was strictly routine: research the background of Senator Thomas Eagleton and produce a profile for the eleven-paper Knight chain on the newly named Democratic nominee for Vice President. But Hoyt, 29, wound up last week uncovering the biggest political story in years. Only after McGovern confronted Eagleton with Hoyt's information did Eagleton detail his full medical history of psychiatric treatment.

"... The admission set off an uproar, and obscured the fact that Knight was done out of a scoop while performing in the best tradition of responsible journalism.

"Newsmen in the Midwest and Washington had been aware for years of rumors that Eagleton had experienced fits of depression and drinking, but proof had always been lacking. While Hoyt was en route to St. Louis, Eagleton's hometown, the phone rang in the office of John S. Knight III, editorial writer for the Detroit Free Press and grandson of the chain's editorial chairman. The caller seemed "very nervous," and said that he was a McGovern supporter. But he knew that Eagleton had been treated for mental disorders, and thought the fact should be publicized early so as not to embarrass McGovern later. The information was vague, but the caller mentioned a St. Louis psychiatric hospital.

"The gist of the call was relayed to Hoyt, who found the hospital adamant in refusing to discuss the matter—but the refusal was couched in terms indicating the information was true. Hoyt also heard of other Eagleton hospitalizations for "gastrointestinal" problems and "sudden weight loss." He thought the evidence strong enough to warrant a detailed memo to Robert Boyd, Knight's Washington bureau chief. The two arranged to meet at Rapid City, S. Dak., and discuss whether to approach McGovern's staff.

"Hoyt and Boyd, though sitting on a major exclusive story, decided to turn over a two-page summary of Hoyt's memo to Frank Mankiewicz, McGovern's campaign director. Mankiewicz took the summary to McGovern. In return, Boyd and Hoyt expected some corroboration of their story and a chance to interview Eagleton before breaking it. But the McGovern camp decided to present Eagleton as voluntarily admitting past mental disorders rather than responding to an accusation. Aides rushed him into a public admission at a press conference that robbed the Knight papers of an exclusive they had earned through Hoyt's hard digging."

NEWSWEEK REPORTED

"... It was the investigative digging of a team of reporters from the Knight Newspapers that forced the Eagleton story into the open. The Knight papers lost their scoop because their reporters gave Sen. George McGovern and his staff a chance to contemplate the evidence. In repayment for that opportunity, the Democratic high command stalled until its leaders could make a public announcement. But, for whatever consolation it was, the 11-paper Knight chain could legitimately claim to have practiced 'responsible journalism.'"

ST. PETERSBURG TIMES

"... It is worth more than a footnote that the manner in which Sen. Eagleton's problems were disclosed lived up to the best traditions of American journalism. Aggressive reporters from the Washington staff of the Knight Newspaper chain dug out the facts, setting in motion the actions that led to the public press conference about Eagle-

ton's treatments. There is no better answer to Vice President Agnew's charges that the press plays favorites."

#### THE NEW YORK TIMES

"... Clark Hoyt and Bob Boyd of the Knight Newspapers meticulously checked out the original rumors of Senator Eagleton's mental problems. They lost a scoop when they submitted their evidence to the McGovern campaign staff before publishing it. They lost a scoop, but earned honors for integrity."

#### THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

"Two reporters for Knight Newspapers actually broke the Eagleton story, forcing the candidates' admissions, after a painstaking search for facts and corroboration of those facts. This is also a story of their sense of fairness and responsibility, both to the candidate and to the public."

#### CBS NEWS

"After the Democratic Convention, the Knight Newspapers chain received a call from a man who insisted he not be identified, tipping it to Sen. Thomas Eagleton's medical records. For eight days, Knight reporters worked to check out the story and verify it. That checking caused them to miss a major exclusive... the senator preempted it with his own announcement."

#### MILWAUKEE SENTINEL

"... It so happens that the Eagleton episode produced a splendid example of responsible journalism which, unfortunately, has gone virtually unnoticed because attention has been focused on the Anderson affair."

"We refer to the work done by Bob Boyd, chief of the Knight newspapers' Washington bureau, and an assistant, Clark Hoyt. Acting on a tip, they dug out the story of Eagleton's health history, but instead of rushing into print with it, they prepared a memo on their findings and presented it to a McGovern aide. This led to the news conference at which Eagleton disclosed his medical record to the world, in the process denying Boyd and Hoyt of scoring a well-earned exclusive story."

#### THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

"Our journalistic brethren have a mixed record in the affair of Senator Eagleton and the vice presidential nomination. Highest prize goes to the Knight newspapers for the diligence and responsibility of their reporters."

"Two of them, Bob Boyd and Clark Hoyt, uncovered the story of the three times when Senator Eagleton sought psychiatric treatment. Instead of rushing into print they took their findings to the McGovern staff for confirmation."

#### ROANOKE TIMES

"The prizes in the newspaper world—Pulitzers, Sigma Delta Chi, state association, etc.—are for stories that are published. A worthy nomination this year is for two reporters whose story did not get published: Robert Boyd and Clark Hoyt of the Knight Newspapers organization. They had the story of the previous illness of Senator Eagleton but because they pushed and checked to make absolutely certain, the McGovern organization broke it to the press generally."

#### THE FORT WORTH FIVE

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 4 of this year, the American-Irish Historical Society will present an award

to Mrs. Richard M. Nixon as the "outstanding American of the year of Irish lineage."

Also that evening while the awards are being presented in the posh surroundings of the Waldorf-Astoria, there will be another group of Irish-Americans who will be gathering together, but they would not be giving or receiving any awards and they will probably draw very little attention.

The outsiders that I am referring to are the Fort Worth Five—the five Irish-Americans from New York who were held in a Texas jail pursuant to an alleged gun running plot to Northern Ireland until Justice Douglas finally ordered bail—and their supporters who will be picketing the awards dinner.

The tragedy that befell these powerless Americans is in sharp contrast to the plaudits that will be bestowed on Mrs. Nixon who has done nothing more to deserve an award than to be the wife and representative of the very powerful.

It is also interesting to note that those five picketers were placed in this situation as a result of inexcusable violations of their civil rights by the Nixon administration.

How sad it is that the Irish-American Historical Society is so blind to the fact that they bestow their honors on those who persecute their own people. The wife of the man who was responsible for indiscriminate mass arrests in Washington demonstrations, so similar to the hated British internment policy receives an award while those who have suffered so much from this callous disregard for our civil liberties are the outsiders forced to the picket lines.

I therefore find it regrettably necessary to voice my strong opposition to this award being presented to Mrs. Nixon. I find it to be completely contrary to what an "outstanding Irish-American" should be.

#### ARE YOU LISTENING, MR. DANZANSKY?

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware, during the past 6 months I have taken an active interest in the spread in beef prices between what the grower gets at the slaughterhouse and the housewife pays in the supermarket.

Earlier this year I submitted a comparison of slaughter prices and retail prices for beef in New York and Washington during the past 20 years. Almost without exception these showed that the farmer, the beef grower, did not share in these upward price swings. Indeed, these data demonstrated that such supermarkets as Giant and Safeway here in the Washington area were the principal beneficiaries of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer.

Last week an official Agriculture Department report showed that supermarkets widened the beef price gap between farmers and consumers to a record

margin during August. The Department's report added:

... thus falling to pass along to housewives recent declines in cattle prices.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the AP dispatch which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, September 29, 1972, be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### U.S. REPORT FINDS INCREASE IN THE FARMER-CONSUMER GAP ON BEEF PRICES

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28.—A government report showed today that supermarkets widened and beef price gap between farmers and consumers to a record margin in August, thus failing to pass along to housewives recent declines in cattle prices.

The widening farm-to-consumer meat-price spread, the subject of White House pressure on retailers earlier this month, has shown in a "market basket" report issued by the Agriculture Department.

In August, the report said, the average retail price of beef dropped 1.5 cents a pound from the record high in July of more than \$1.17 a pound to slightly less than \$1.16.

But while cattle producers saw their share drop 8.4 per cent in August, middlemen representing packing plants and retail stores widened their margins 12.6 per cent.

Broken down, a pound of choice beef—a major indicator for family food spending—had a "farm value" in August of 71.0 cents per pound when sold in supermarkets. That compared with 77.5 cents in July.

#### YEAR'S COST DROPS

Today's report showed the total cost of a market-basket food list—theoretically enough to feed a typical family for a year—actually declined by \$1 in August from the record high of \$1,322 in July.

The decline was attributed mainly to the lower retail prices for beef and poultry. Slightly higher prices were reported for several items, including pork, which has been at record highs both on the farm and at meat counters.

The \$1,321 index was 4.5 per cent higher than a year ago. Meantime, the total spread between the "farm value" and the retail price increased to a record high of 44.8 cents a pound for retail beef in August, from 39.8 cents in July.

Henry A. Badger, a market-basket specialist with the Economic Research Service in the Agriculture Department, said that there was nothing to indicate that the beef farm-retail spread had ever exceeded the August mark.

#### WHOLESALE SHARE UP

The mark was approached last March when the gap widened to 36.8 cents a pound. At that time the retail price of beef was nearly \$1.16 a pound, a record at that time.

Broken down further, the farm-to-housewife beef spread showed that the retailer's margin was another record of 37.3 cents a pound in August, compared with 33.0 cents in July.

The farm-to-carcase spread, or wholesale share, in August was 7.5 cents, up from 6.8 cents in July. Earlier this year, however, the carcass spread was higher, reported at 8.1 cents last May.

Donald Rumsfeld, director of the Cost of Living Council, told food retailers in August that the wholesale price of beef began to decline in July and that the council "expected to see a corresponding reduction" in supermarkets. Mr. Rumsfeld repeated the expectation on Sept. 7 and said that Government reviews would be started to monitor beef prices in major food chains.

Although today's figures showed that food costs dropped slightly in August, last week the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that retail grocery prices during the month rose 0.2 per cent.



# A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS A. PELLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise on this occasion to salute our distinguished colleague from the First District of Washington, TOM PELLY. As you know, Tom is retiring at the end of this session after having performed 20 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives. As one who has served closely with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for a major portion of those years, I consider it a distinct privilege to lead in this salute.

Tom has worked hard to achieve his successes. Instead of attending college, he went to work full time putting up signs for a real estate firm. Later, he became a bank manager. During this time he studied nights, taking correspondence courses in business law and banking. He had a progressive career in banking, reaching the position of assistant trust officer in the Seattle National Bank. He resigned from that position in 1930 to enter the stationery and printing business as vice president of Lowman & Hanford Co. Here, too, his career was marked by success and when he was elected to Congress in 1952, he was president and general manager of the firm. During these years, he acquired a substantial financial interest in this business which he sold in 1954.

Although his business kept him busy, TOM PELLY found time to serve his community. He was active in civic organizations such as the Seattle Symphony Orchestra and the Community Fund. Prior to his election to Congress, he served two terms as president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce; and in 1950 he was given the First Citizen of Seattle Award by the Seattle Real Estate Board.

Since coming to the 83d Congress, TOM PELLY has continued to win honors and achieve successes, especially as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He has a fine record in the maritime, fisheries and conservation fields.

We have all heard the old saying that a prophet is without honor in his own country. But this is not the case for TOM PELLY. When he announced his voluntary retirement earlier this year, the King County Republican Convention passed a resolution which read as follows:

Whereas Congressman Tom Pelly has served the citizens of the First Congressional District and the Republican Party in an exemplary manner for twenty years;

Whereas his service to his fellow Americans is worthy of our highest acclaim;

Whereas Congressman Tom Pelly has by word and deed dedicated himself to the highest aspirations of the American people and the Republican Party;

Be It Resolved, that we hereby declare ourselves, in Convention, on May 13, 1972, or record, that he will truly occupy an elevated place and position in the hearts of all Republicans in this County heretofore unattained by any elected office holder and servant of the people. We hereby declare him to be a true "Advocate of the People" and to join the ranks of those few so honored.

Tom loves to quote the ancient Roman Senator, saying he would rather have people ask why there was no statue of him than why there was one. This humble attitude has marked TOM PELLY's approach to public life. He has never sought nor wanted public acclaim but has desired to provide his two children and 10 grandchildren with a record of accomplishment and integrity they will always cherish and take pride in.

And his family can indeed be proud of him. In his long service in this body, Tom never voted on legislation in which he had a personal interest. He observed meticulously the House rule against voting where he might have a conflict of interest. He leaves an unblemished record on every count of good ethics as we, his friends in the House, so well know. This personal record of integrity and his 20-year record of legislative accomplishment give to his family a legacy to which they can point with pride.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Tom has been instrumental in furthering the goals of this subcommittee.

My distinguished friend has taken an active role in the affairs of this House, and his legislative efforts cover a wide scope. In the area of conservation alone, there is not time to mention all the legis-

lation this great man has fostered. Some indication of his dedication can be gleaned from the public laws enacted as the direct result of this one man's concern for the conservation goals of this one subcommittee: three in the 89th Congress; five in the 90th Congress; four in the 91st Congress; and four to date in this Congress.

Perhaps one of the most significant of these public laws is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Recognized as one of the most important conservation laws ever enacted by the Congress, the act created the Council on Environmental Quality which, as you know, is responsible for a broad and independent review of current and long-term trends in the quality of our national environment. My good friend from the State of Washington was instrumental in the enactment of this legislation, and continues to take an active interest in the effectiveness of the Council.

Of current interest, TOM PELLY introduced and fostered amendments to the Fishermen's Protective Act to expedite the reimbursement of U.S. vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of vessels and crews illegally seized by foreign countries. Agreement has been reached between the House and Senate on this significant legislation, and early enactment is anticipated before the end of this Congress.

Another current piece of legislation is the so-called ocean dumping bill Congressman PELLY cosponsored this legislation that would generally regulate the dumping of waste materials in the oceans and initiate a comprehensive program of research on the effects of ocean dumping. This is another landmark bill on which agreement between the House and Senate has been reached, and we expect early enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that—no matter how active or aggressive he may be—a minority Member's name does not always appear on legislation he may have introduced or supported. I, therefore, request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a list of legislation which emanated from our committee. The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY was instrumental in the enactment or in the conference status of all the legislation listed, and I think this achievement deserves permanent recognition in the RECORD.

## PUBLIC LAWS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS M. PELLY FROM THE 89TH THROUGH 92D CONGRESSES

89TH CONG.

Bill No.	Public Law No.	Explanation	Participation
S. 998	89-85	To amend sec. 4 of the Fish & Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for the financing and refinancing of new and used fishing vessels, and to extend the term during which the Secretary can make fisheries loans under the act.	No identical bills.
H.R. 1975	89-233	To amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission.	Pelly bill—H.R. 9734.
S. 2218	89-658	To establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States.	Pelly bill—H.R. 10183.
S. 2720	89-701	To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate.	Pelly's—H.R. 16095, also conferee.
H.R. 10327	89-777	To require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels, and for other purposes.	Pelly was conferee.

PUBLIC LAWS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS M. PELLY FROM THE 89TH THROUGH 92D CONGRESSES—Continued

## 90TH CONG.

Bill No.	Public Law No.	Explanation	Participation
H.R. 158.....	90-81	To amend sec. 309 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration.	Pelly bill—H.R. 1028.
H.R. 12639.....	90-358	To remove certain limitations on ocean cruises.	Pelly was conferee.
S. 2047.....	90-397	To exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from requirements of certain laws.	Pelly bill—H.R. 13366.
S. 1752.....	90-427	To amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels.	Pelly bill—H.R. 10227.
H.R. 15189.....	90-471	To authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.	Pelly was conferee.
H.R. 13781.....	90-477	To amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966.	Pelly was conferee, as well as cosponsor.
S. 2269.....	90-482	To amend the act of Aug. 27, 1954, relative to the unlawful seizure of fishing vessels of the United States by foreign countries.	Pelly bill—H.R. 4451.
S. 3866.....	90-551	To extend the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964.	Pelly bill—H.R. 18808. Also was cosponsor.

## 91ST CONG.

H.R. 11363.....	91-135	To prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes.	No identical bill.
S. 1075.....	91-190	To provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes.	Pelly was conferee.
H.R. 13407.....	91-215	To consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact.	No identical bill.
H.R. 15424.....	91-469	To amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.	Pelly was conferee.
H.R. 14678.....	91-514	To strengthen the penalties for illegal fishing in the territorial waters and the contiguous fishery zone of the United States, and for other purposes.	Pelly was cosponsor.

## 92D CONG.

H.R. 4724.....	92-53	To authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs in the Department of Commerce.	Pelly was cosponsor; also conferee.
H.R. 19.....	92-75	To provide for a coordinated national boating safety program.	Pelly was cosponsor.
H.R. 6239.....	92-79	To amend the maritime lien provisions of the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920.	Do.
H.R. 5208.....	92-118	To authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, and to authorize the annual active duty personnel strength of the Coast Guard.	Pelly was cosponsor; also conferee.
H.R. 2587.....	92-125	To establish the National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere.	Pelly was cosponsor.
H.R. 5060.....	92-159	To amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide a criminal penalty for shooting at certain birds, fish, and other animals from an aircraft.	Do.
H.R. 155.....	92-163	To facilitate the transportation of cargo by barges specifically designed for carriage aboard a vessel.	Do.
H.R. 3304.....	92-219	To amend the act of Aug. 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin.	Pelly was author.
H.R. 11589.....	92-296	To authorize the foreign sale of certain passenger vessels.	Pelly was cosponsor.
H.R. 9552.....	92-323	To amend the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Assist 4 remaining vessels to carry cargoes and cruise.	Pelly was cosponsor.
H.R. 12143.....	92-330	To provide for the establishment of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.	Do.
H.R. 6479.....	92-339	To provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels.	Do.
H.R. 8140.....	92-340	To promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States.	Pelly was cosponsor; also conferee.
H.R. 13188.....	92-343	To authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength of the Coast Guard.	Do.
S. 2684.....	92-374	To amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. Mortgages on hydrofoils.	Pelly's bill—H.R. 1300.
H.R. 13324.....	92-402	To authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and for related purposes.	Pelly was coauthor.

## MOST CURRENT LEGISLATION FROM THE 92D CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO HONORABLE THOMAS M. PELLY NOW PENDING

Bill No.	Explanation	Status	Participation
H.R. 56.....	Environmental data bank.	Conference.	Pelly is conferee.
H.R. 7117.....	Illegal seizures.	Agreed.	Pelly was conferee.
H.R. 9727.....	Ocean dumping.	do.	Do.
S. 3507.....	Coastal zone management.	Conference.	Pelly is conferee.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has yielded to me on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, we will be saying goodbye to a great many colleagues at the end of this Congress, dear friends who are retiring voluntarily after many years of service. I cannot think of anyone with more friends in this body than the gentleman from Seattle, Wash., TOM PELLY. If he has any enemies on either side of this political aisle I do not know who they are. I am certainly glad some of them planned this well-deserved tribute for Tom.

The other day at a reception honoring the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I observed that the landmark legislation to revive the American Merchant Marine after decades of neglect

would remain his monument. It stands also, of course, as a monument to the ranking minority member of that committee. The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was a product of the kind of close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of Government, between Democrats and Republicans in the Congress, and among all segments of management and labor in the maritime industry, that self-appointed critics of our political system either ignore or misinterpret. TOM PELLY was a pillar of strength in that important national effort to insure the future security of our country on the seas. Nor should we forget Tom's many contributions in the fisheries and conservation fields, or his faithful service to his constituents.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest accomplishment any Member can look back upon after 20 years of service in this House is the making of friends. Not merely the friendship he has received, but the friendship he has given. TOM has excelled in this, and he and his lovely wife Mary Virginia will

take these friendships with them when he leaves the Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to pay tribute to our very distinguished colleague, Congressman TOM PELLY of my State of Washington.

It is a particular pleasure for me because I knew Congressman PELLY long before he came to the Congress of the United States. He was an outstanding Seattle businessman who contributed generously of his time to programs in the State of Washington needing consideration and assistance. He was an effective spokesman many times on behalf of our highway programs, education



details, the University of Washington, conservation and fishing.

As you are well aware, he was elected to the Congress of the United States in 1952 and came here to begin his long and diligent service. When I came to Congress in 1960, Congressman Pelly was already well established as a leader in the maritime, conservation, and fisheries fields here. Together we have had the privilege of working for much legislation that today affects this Nation's well-being. We had a long and difficult fight for the 12-mile limit to protect our fisheries. We have worked together for the North Cascades National Park, to mention only a very small part of the activities in which he has so actively participated.

Knowing TOM PELLY as a person is just as much a privilege as working with him. He and his delightful wife, Mary, are two of the nicest human beings I have ever known. Tom and Mary always have time to be gracious, courteous and kind. Not all people in political life retain these essentials of good manners and grace. His daughter is married to a former colleague of mine in the State House of Representatives, and they too are delightful people.

I am sorry to lose Tom from the House of Representatives. There is now no one from our State on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House and I deeply regret it. I represent a district with a long coastline of natural beauty, a district with fishing fleets, and where shipping is a vital part of our economy. My district will miss you, Tom, as I shall miss you. But all of us in my district and I wish you the very best in retirement, and, may I say as a little postscript to that statement, of course the best part of retirement is an opportunity to again live in the State of Washington the year round.

I salute you for your service, Tom. Thank you for your courtesy, and I offer my warmest congratulations for a job well done. My best wishes also to you and Mary and your family for your active years ahead in our State, speaking out as you have always done for programs in which you believe.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. Hansen) for her remarks.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the things that he and others have said about TOM PELLY's service here in the Congress. We came here together in January of 1953. I think that first term Tom served on another committee, but for 18 years we served side by side on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. When I succeeded to the ranking position on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Tom succeeded me on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We have a very complex jurisdiction in this committee which some people

would like to refer to as a minor committee. But we do not think it is. And over the years Tom and I have shared responsibilities, with my taking a sort of major role on maritime legislation and Tom doing a perfectly splendid job with the gentleman from Michigan in our very important Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation.

It is quite a twinge to break these ties that have lasted so long. I know that Millie would want me to mention her joining in wishing Tom and Mary a very delightful and productive retirement. I know he is not the kind who just would sit around doing nothing, but even that is a great pleasure when you are able to live in the Puget Sound area, and I know we are going to miss him probably a good deal more than they are going to miss us.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, you have heard from northern California on this subject, and I want you to know that southern California echoes the same sentiments.

In his opening remarks the gentleman from Michigan quoted our friend, TOM PELLY, as saying like a great general that he would rather there be no explanation of why a statue was erected in his memory rather than why there was not.

I can tell you if we ever got around to a statue for TOM PELLY, I would like to see it put up on Point Loma in our San Diego community. I think it very properly would belong alongside the statue that already exists thereof Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, the man who sailed around the Horn and first dropped anchor in San Diego Bay.

It happens that the descendants of Cabrillo are the Portuguese fishermen who form our tuna fleet, and they owe a very considerable debt of gratitude to TOM PELLY.

It is easy for a man who has fishermen as constituents—and TOM PELLY has many fishermen among his own constituents, but they are not tuna fishermen, and their problems are very different from the problems of tuna fishermen. But regardless of this TOM PELLY never missed an opportunity when our fishermen were under attack in southern waters to come to their defense in the most realistic and practical ways.

I can remember times when he might well have remained out of sight, when he voluntarily took the lead on behalf of our tuna fleet. They will not soon forget this man, and I as their representative will not forget.

Mr. PELLY was just as aggressive when it meant combating his own Republican administration as in earlier days when it meant combating a Democratic administration. This man knows no partisan bounds when it is a case of right or wrong. I could not be any more enthusiastic than those on his side of the aisle and those coming from his State than I am when I say Godspeed to this very great Member of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank

the distinguished gentleman from California.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my friend from Michigan for yielding to give me an opportunity to join TOM PELLY's friends here on the floor in paying a well-deserved tribute to him as he completes 20 years of service in this body and retires voluntarily from public life. I do not know what Tom's plans are for the future, but I suspect, as someone has already said, that he will not be entirely idle because that is not his nature.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from Washington have already recounted Tom's career in some detail before he came to Congress—his business career and his career in a civic way up in Seattle. I was very pleased to hear those remarks, because I come from a section of the country far removed from the Northwest and would not have been expected to know of those things in Tom's life. I was happy to hear them expressed here today. I am pleased that I am on the floor during this hour, coming as I do from a section of the country which has not been heard from so far during these proceedings, to say that Tom's friends are not exclusively those Members who come from the great Northwestern part of the country, but friendships that he has formed here in Congress extend down to the Southland.

TOM and I, as did BILL MAILLIARD, came in here at the same time in January of 1953. We are members of the 83d Club and have been friends all down through the years and closely associated in the activities here on the floor. My association with TOM has been far more extensive than that to be expected to occur on the floor. I do not serve on the committee with him, but we have had a very close social life relationship. His wife, Mary, and my wife, Annie Elliott, have been very dear and close friends all down through the years, and I know she would want to join me on this occasion in wishing for TOM and Mary in the retirement TOM so richly deserves and has so well earned a long life of good health, good fortune, and peace of mind.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

I am very pleased that we have an opportunity this afternoon to pay our respects to TOM PELLY. TOM and I have shared the responsibility for the city of Seattle for the last 8 years, and I want him to know personally from me and from, I am certain, the people of the city how much we have all appreciated the things that he has done for us and the legislation he has worked on with us to see that the people have done as well as we possibly could.

These have been difficult years—the last 3 or 4—and I know we have not agreed on every issue, but on the main issues that have affected our community, I want TOM to know how much all

of us appreciate the time and effort that he has taken to try to help the people of our area.

Tom's daughter, as he knows, is married to one of my closest friends, and I know that he will now enjoy with Mary time in the Northwest where he can do all of the things that he has had to give up, being in Washington for a great portion of the last several years. I hope that he will have a chance to return home and enjoy his family and spend time with his many friends in Seattle.

As one who has served with the gentleman on the Science and Astronautics Committee, I hope the people of Seattle appreciate and I know they do appreciate the great things the gentleman has done for them in serving on that committee.

Betty and I wish the gentleman and his wife, Mary, very well in the coming years and we are looking forward to seeing him when we return to Seattle. Once again I express my gratitude and the gratitude of the people of our area for the services of the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the gentleman from Michigan taking this special order to honor our very close friend, the gentleman from Washington, TOM PELLY.

It is rather ironic that we are here on the floor of the House extolling the virtues and commending the gentleman from Washington, Mr. PELLY, because it was just this morning that I asked Tom to participate in a television program wherein, together, we could convey to the people of California a progress report on what was taking place in an area in which the gentleman has a special expertise; namely, the upcoming International Law of the Sea Conference.

While I think a great many things can be said about the gentleman I think it is most important that we convey and record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that TOM PELLY as an individual is more loved, admired, and respected by more Members of the Congress than anyone I know of in this House of Representatives. I fully realize that what I have said is a very significant statement. He is respected, because of his abilities as a legislator. He is loved and admired by those of us who have had an opportunity to share in the great effort to provide some form of protection and relief for the fishermen who are perplexed with many problems, particularly those operating in the coastal fishery areas.

One of the finest tributes that has been paid this gentleman is the fact that from my own Northeast of California constituency, the Fishermen's Wives Association as well as the National Federation of Fishermen have asked Mr. PELLY to serve in the capacity of chief negotiator for their cause at the International Law of the Sea Conference. This request demonstrates, clearly the extraordinary reputation this great and talented man enjoys. I am hopeful his appointment becomes a fact of life as we

look to the future and the International Law of the Sea Conference.

Tom is a very close and very dear friend. I can recall when I first came here nearly 10 years ago and said "Congressman PELLY I want to work with you on matters of legislation dealing with fish and fishery resources. The gentleman has done more than I could have asked for. I am deeply grateful."

My wife, Ollie, and my daughters, join me in wishing the gentleman a very happy retirement, but only temporarily, because we have some things in mind we are going to ask the gentleman to participate in. This man is a walking encyclopedia as a result of his vast experience in aviation, aerospace, and merchant marine and fishery matters. For the good of America we must use this expertise at the right time and the right places.

Mr. Speaker, what can I say about my friend TOM PELLY as he retires from the Congress?

He is my friend and I shall miss him.

He is an outstanding and effective legislator and his constituents in Washington will miss him.

And, he has served the Nation wisely and well and his country will miss him.

We can only hope that his retirement will not be complete and that he will continue to be able to serve the public interest.

As stated before, I have been privileged to work closely with TOM PELLY for the last 10 years.

There are a number of issues we have worked together on but none is more important than the effort to obtain more protection for coastal States and the fish and marine resources contiguous to our territorial limit. With Tom's help we have made the initial move to 12 miles over formidable opposition. The opposition remains but the tenacity and legislative skills of TOM PELLY have permitted substantial progress toward the species approach to fishery management goal and when it is established the country and the Congress will owe a great debt to the gentleman from Washington.

Tom has served in the Congress for 20 years. I know our friendship will continue beyond his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to wish Congressman PELLY a long and fruitful retirement and again express my own hope and expectation that his retirement will be from the Congress only and not from an active participation in public affairs.

As your close friends and committee associates are with you, here on the floor of the House, today—we want you to remember this occasion for the rest of your life.

Like the giant redwoods that grow in abundance in my Redwood Empire District of California, you, TOM PELLY stand straight and tall. You stand majestically as one of the truly big men in the House of Representatives—in ability, integrity, courage, conviction, principle, and dedication, as well as your physical stature.

Your family can be justifiably proud of your extraordinary record of accom-

plishments and your many contributions to your country and your fellow man.

May the good Lord treat you kindly, Tom, in the remaining years of your very fruitful and productive life. Let the record show that Congressman CLAUSEN of California will remain eternally in your debt for all you have done for me and the people of my district.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding. At the outset I commend the gentleman from Michigan, my good friend, for arranging this special order in spite of the fact that he is not from Washington, but he is probably the colleague who is closest to the man about whom we speak today and he has worked continuously with the gentleman for a number of years on the questions and problems that have been discussed by our colleagues today. I speak of both these gentlemen and particularly the gentleman from Washington, my colleague TOM PELLY, when I say that indeed the House of Representatives is going to lose a good and valued Member, and our State will lose a good and valued Member in the House of Representatives.

I have had the pleasure of serving in an adjacent congressional district now for almost 8 years and I have worked very closely with TOM PELLY as he has worked with the entire delegation. Again, as has been pointed out there, partisanship aside, when the good and the welfare of the citizens of the State of Washington was on the line there has been no showing of partisanship on Tom's part, and his efforts have made our delegation I think on both sides of the aisle one of the most compatible delegations in the entire Congress.

I would especially like to commend the gentleman for his work in conservation. As the gentleman in the well has said, the gentleman from Washington is one of the finest conservationists in the House of Representatives. I well recall his efforts on behalf of all the citizens of the United States and particularly the State of Washington in his efforts to help those of us who were working to create a North Cascades National Park.

Very effective and very helpful. His efforts in merchant marine and fisheries, particularly fisheries, are legion. Again, as the gentleman in the well told us, I think the whole House knows of his fine efforts in behalf of fisheries.

So, Tom, to you and your Mary, from me and my Mary, we wish you the best. I, like a number of others, think that although I am sure you may go back to Seattle for a while, I am sure you are not just going to stagnate.

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise also to join my colleagues in praise of the life and works of our lovable, genial, able colleague, TOM PELLY, of the great State of Washington.

As we all know, as has been said, Tom was elected in the 83d Congress and has been reelected ever since. That means that Tom is now completing his 20th



year of work and accomplishment in the Congress to his district and for our country. I have had the pleasure of serving with Tom on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for the last 10 years, and I can personally attest to the fact that he is a mainstay, not only of our committee, but also of the Science and Astronautics Committee, where he also serves.

It also goes without saying that Tom is admired and looked up to by his colleagues for these qualities which have made him an outstanding Congressman and legislator of great ability and judgment. I know we will always welcome his expert advice and good counsel even in his retirement.

When a man of his wisdom and judgment and experience leaves us, particularly at the committee level, where the real, substantive work of the Congress is done, the burden has to be shouldered. A great vacuum is experienced by the committee, and the burden has to be shouldered. I suspect that a great deal of that burden will have to be shouldered by my colleague, Mr. DINGELL, and myself. In shouldering that burden, we may look to you, Tom, to ease the changes a little bit with that wisdom which you have stored up in yourself.

As my colleague from Michigan has said, I will not take the time he has said he would not take, but would put further in the RECORD information about the many, many measures Tom was associated with in these past 20 years. Suffice it to say that he has been associated closely with some 40-odd major legislative acts in the last four Congresses. I dare say that not a piece of legislation in the area of U.S. Fisheries has been left without a PELLY influence.

We all know Tom has been a leading figure in all the Maritime legislation of any consequence over these many years. Perhaps the finest tribute to the legislative input of Tom PELLY, the ranking minority Member, and EDDIE GARMATZ, the chairman of the committee, is the monumental and landmark Merchant Marine Act of 1970. These great legislators did yeoman work on this bill, and it is a fitting tribute to their service.

They say all good things must come to an end, so we are approaching an end of our congressional relationship with Tom PELLY. Tom, I want you to know that I have enjoyed every moment of this friendship, and have had nothing but the most profound respect for your ability and accomplishment. You have truly had a fine career, and you can look upon it with a great pride.

Mary Grover and I want to wish you and your Mary the best of everything.

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my friend from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for taking this special order. I think the order itself and those who are participating in it indicate the wide respect and admiration that his colleagues have for the gentleman from Washington, Tom PELLY.

He has served a score of years in this body. In that time he has left a great legislative record of concern and accom-

plishment in the fields of conservation, protection of the environment, development of outdoor recreation, protection of our fisheries and wildlife; the development of a strong merchant marine in both peaceful and defensive capacities. Of course, there is his great work in the Committee on Science and Astronautics in advancing the research and technological capacity of our Nation.

As the last speaker so well said, there are over 40 major accomplishments in terms of significant legislation, and many more acts of legislative involvement and concern. Fishermen all over this country owe a debt of gratitude to TOM PELLY.

I am not going to attempt to chronicle—nor could I, in any reasonable time—the many things he has done in his career. I do not know how long any of us is remembered for what he does. Perhaps not long enough. But I do believe a Member on his retirement must take with him, if he has been a Member like Tom has been, a very deep sense of satisfaction, looking back over a career spanning 20 years, with the knowledge that because of some of the effort, because of some of the commitment, because of some of the concern he had people not only in his district and his State and in this country, but also in many places, are better for his service.

One of his personal qualities which has been mentioned by many speakers, which all of us who know him deeply appreciate, is that great stability, that courtesy and dignity which always marks Tom in every association he has with any Member of either party in any circumstance. Even in the most heated moments of debate he never once has lost the respect, the dignity, the courtesy that should mark the parliamentary ideal. I think of him in that respect as much as any other.

He has been in this Congress, as in the others in which I have served, the dean of our delegation. In this Congress he has been the only Member from our State in the minority.

That calls to mind a fable of Aesop concerning the census that was taken in the jungle among the animals, as to which animal had the greatest number of progeny. The census taker went from one animal to another and received various kinds of reports; some of them six, some of them eight, and some of them ten. When they came to the lioness she reported, "Only one, but that one is a lion."

For us on the Democratic side, we had only one Republican in our delegation in this Congress, but we have been deeply proud and honored to have served with him, because TOM PELLY, our sole Republican, our dean, is a lion. We all of us wish him the best for himself and Mary, his wife, and for his future retirement, which I know will keep him in contact with the interests of all the people of his district and State and all those many things he has advanced in the interests of all the people of the country.

Our warm and best wishes to you, Tom and Mary Pelly.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I am proud to yield to my friend from the State of Washington,

with whom I have worked so productively for so long.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends and colleagues for their kind words. Even though I do not fully deserve their praise, I do fully enjoy listening to it.

Now, at the conclusion of two decades of public service in the House of Representatives, I can truthfully say no one ever served with a finer group of persons than those who make up this body. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honor and privilege for me to be associated with you and the other Members of this House, such a fine group of colleagues.

As long as I live I will not forget these dear friends, and I will remain gratified for this association and for the many friends, including the staff members who have made my service here so memorable.

Especially I extend thanks to those who arranged for this special order, to my good friend, Mr. DINGELL, and others who participated in it.

Finally, I want to thank the Members of the Washington State delegation who have worked closely with me, as has been pointed out, but who I am really more proud to call my friends.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for the many kind words that have been said here tonight.

Mr. DINGELL. I am going to express my thanks to my colleagues, particularly to the fine delegation from Washington State, which is one of the finest in this Congress, and I thank them for their participation.

Mr. Speaker, I think just a few more brief words are in order.

I rather learned my trade with the assistance and kindness of my friend from Washington. He was one of the senior members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I was a freshman, and his courtesies and kindnesses to me were a matter of great pleasure and pride. He has cooperated closely with me.

I can truthfully report to this body and to his constituents that never has there been a partisan comment between the gentleman from Washington, Mr. PELLY, and I; never has there been a bit of bitterness or lack of cooperation at any time. Never have we failed to arrive at harmonious understandings and good legislation; never has either of us failed by reason of partisanship to be able to work together; and I can report that where he has felt the public interest demanded it, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) has consistently fought either administration, Democratic or Republican, as the needs of the Nation in his view required.

The legislative production of our subcommittee, with his assistance and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has been outstanding.

I think it should be said today that I have sought a privilege which I have never asked for before, and that was the privilege of leading this tribute to my distinguished friend, in concert with the very fine and able Members of his delegation from Washington, which, as I have indicated, is one of the finest in this Congress, and certainly the tribute

that is paid TOM PELLY is one which is well deserved for the fine and gentle and humane and effective and dedicated public service as an outstanding legislator.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I always hate to see good men leave the House of Representatives, and I especially hate to see an exceptional Congressman like TOM PELLY leave our ranks. TOM has always been held in high esteem by Members on both sides of the aisle and I have always had the highest respect for him.

TOM is concluding 20 years of illustrious service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee where he has been a tower of strength to the American Merchant Marine and has been extremely conscious of the fishing and shipping problems of the country. He will be sorely missed by those of us who realize his extensive contributions to the maritime commerce of America.

Since he was first elected to Congress in 1952, TOM PELLY has been a consistent, contributing, active Member of the House, always taking his duties seriously and conscientiously. He leaves an outstanding legacy of dedicated public service to his family, friends, district, State, and Nation.

I am confident, despite his retirement, he will continue to give the Congress and the country the benefit of his wise counsel and superior judgment. I will always cherish his friendship and unfailing courtesies down through the years.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the real pleasures of my 10 years in Congress has been my association with TOM PELLY. I have served with him on the Science and Astronautics Committee and in subcommittee work. I remember in my early days he was always the champion of the cause against "back door spending." I admired Tom's grasp of that issue and over the years always found his words and thoughts constructive and helpful to our Nation. I will miss TOM in the years ahead.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that I think of when I hear the name of Congressman TOM PELLY. Chief among these are those qualities that have kept him literally in the front ranks of all that he has ever tried to do and earned for him the deep respect, admiration, and affection of all who know him—such qualities as courage, diligence, and tenacity, the ability to see a job through, no matter how tough it might be.

These qualities are well known to his constituents in the great State of Washington, and are equally apparent to his colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Science and Astronautics Committee.

TOM was elected to the U.S. Congress nearly 20 years ago, on November 4, 1952. In those 20 years, he has compiled a record of achievement and accomplishment which stands out in these times, moving to change the face of his district and State, and contributing from his vast reservoir of knowledge and experience to the Nation as a whole.

TOM PELLY is retiring from Congress after this session. We view his retirement with mixed feelings.

It is certainly well-deserved and earned. TOM has given so much in his

lifetime, he has truly earned the time to devote to his family and friends in leisure activity.

But his State and our Nation will miss TOM in those areas he loved so well—protecting our natural resources, our fisheries, maritime activities, and insuring proper conservation so that our children and grandchildren can enjoy nature as we do and as our parents did.

Everything that Congressman TOM PELLY does—in Congress, in his committees, in his home district, and home State—he does with honor and valor in a manner reflecting credit on himself and his constituents.

Nearing the close of TOM PELLY's congressional career, I would like to congratulate him and extend my sincere best wishes in the years ahead for TOM, his fine and devoted family, and all his lovely grandchildren.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago TOM PELLY entered these Halls as a freshman with a potential of being one of the truly great Members of Congress. He has lived up to that expectation.

During that 20-year span, TOM PELLY has become a leading figure in matters of wildlife and conservation, science and technology. He is ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and its Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. In addition he is one of the ranking members of the Science and Astronautics Committee and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology.

What all of this means is that he has been in a position to serve two, often conflicting forces—science and nature—and has done so with finesse, understanding, and remarkable foresight.

We will all miss TOM PELLY. His decision to retire at the close of the 92d Congress will bring to an end a fine career of public service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I would like to join my colleagues in wishing him every best wish for a bright future and an enjoyable retirement from public life.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a record of distinguished service will end at the conclusion of this Congress when Congressman TOM PELLY of Washington leaves our midst.

Retiring after 20 years of distinguished service, THOMAS M. PELLY has left a mark that has seldom been equaled in this body.

From the time he came to these Halls, he has been noted for his diligence and faithfulness of purpose. Particularly has he been outstanding in the maritime, fisheries, conservation fields, and the space program.

There are many of us who are joining today to pay tribute to this distinguished statesman.

All of us will miss his wise counsel and particularly do we pay tribute to him for his having always placed country above partisanship.

On both sides of the aisle, TOM PELLY has the best wishes of his colleagues. It is my hope that he and Mrs. Pelly will enjoy many more great years as he leaves a distinguished mark in the records of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my high admiration for my very good friend, and a most able Member of this body, TOM PELLY.

TOM and I came to Washington together as Members of the 83d Congress. Throughout the past 20 years I have valued our association and friendship. As Members we have worked together and I must say that I have always been impressed with the dedication which TOM PELLY has brought to the service of the people of the First District of Washington and to the Nation. His career as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is certainly distinguished by his diligent efforts in behalf of conservation and the preservation of our maritime and fisheries industries. As the ranking minority member of the committee he has shown his leadership in these fields and I have valued his advice and assistance.

But more than this, I have known TOM PELLY as a friend and have always been impressed with his fairness and gentlemanliness. TOM is a man of character and I believe that, ultimately, that is the reason why he is such a popular and well-liked Member of this body and why he continues to deserve the respect and admiration of the people of the State of Washington. Combined with a genuine sense of devotion to the welfare of his State and the Nation, these attributes have made TOM PELLY a man who will be sorely missed in these Halls.

I know that I shall miss Tom's company and advice, and that the Nation will miss his sound counsel. I know, however, that he will enjoy a well-earned retirement. I wish him well.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for over 25 years, and I have seen many Congressmen begin and end their careers, but I have never felt such mixed feelings as today, when we are saying our formal farewells to Representative TOM PELLY.

I am sorry to see TOM PELLY leave because the State of Washington and the U.S. Congress and the Nation will lose an unusually capable and dedicated Representative; but I am also glad to see him leave, because he has earned the leisure and rest and contentment which we all wish him in his retirement—he has earned this through the long years of personal sacrifice that is required if a U.S. Congressman is to do his job well.

As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I can tell you that TOM PELLY has, indeed, done his job well. A committee chairman soon learns to judge the character and ability of his members, and over the years I learned to respect TOM PELLY, to value his knowledge of and interest in committee affairs, and—what is perhaps even more important—I came to realize that he could be depended upon when the chips were down, and that he would not allow partisan politics to impede the passage of vital legislation pending before our committee.

The scope of Congressman PELLY's interest has been as broad as the legislative sweep of the committee, and over the years he has become expert in all the



many subcommittee activities—an accomplishment which proved to be invaluable when he became the ranking minority member. The strong imprint of his legislative efforts will be felt for years to come, and the maritime, fishery, and oceanography industries have all benefited from his vast knowledge and persistent efforts. He played a key role in hammering out the legislative language which eventually became the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, and which is already regarded as landmark legislation that holds the best hope for revitalization of America's total maritime industry.

I could continue with a long and impressive list of this Congressman's legislative accomplishments, especially in relation to his work as ranking minority member on our Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee; but I understand that Congressman DINGELL, the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, as well as many other members here today, will want to pay tribute to TOM PELLY, so I will keep my remarks brief.

I do want to add the personal note, however, that I have known and worked with TOM PELLY for almost 20 years. In addition to respecting him for his outstanding legislative contributions, I have always admired him, because he has always been a gentleman. He contributed a warmth and a humanity to the halls of Congress that will be missed. I thank TOM PELLY for his friendship, and I wish him good luck and good health and happiness.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join in this well-deserved tribute to our good friend and colleague, TOM PELLY.

You cannot work with a man in an organization like the U.S. Congress for 20 years and not get to know him pretty well. You may not agree with him on all issues, and he may even make your job difficult at times. But after a few years, you will have a good idea of what kind of a man he is, and what makes him tick.

And if he is a good man, you are going to like him and consider him your friend.

TOM PELLY, judged by any yardstick, has proved himself a good man, a straight-forward man, and a hard-working man. He has done his utmost to represent his district in the way he thought best. When he retires at the end of this Congress, he will leave behind him a record of outstanding service to his constituents and to his country.

Even more importantly, Tom will leave here many friends—men and women from different walks of life, and all parts of the country, who have worked with him and learned to respect and like him.

All of us, I know, will be sorry to see him go.

Now there were times during the past 20 years when Tom and I did not see eye to eye on certain issues. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had to manage some bills that did not meet with his unqualified support. I must say, however, that on all those occasions, Tom was open and honest about his position and true to his word.

He has been a good colleague and, on those occasions when our convictions

differed, a worthy opponent. I have the highest regard for him.

I am very glad to have this opportunity to wish TOM PELLY many years of health, satisfaction, and happiness in the circle of his family and his friends.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is both an honor and a privilege for me to have the opportunity to participate in the tribute to the Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY who has served Washington State's First Congressional District with distinction for the past 20 years.

The high esteem in which he is held by his colleagues is indicated by the fact that today's special order was secured by two of the House leaders with whom Congressman PELLY has worked particularly closely—the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, dean of our Washington State Democratic delegation, and the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. Congressman PELLY is ranking minority member of this subcommittee as well as the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Though I have served only 2 years with Congressman PELLY, I know of the respect accorded him by the Washington State delegation. Particularly in the areas of conservation and fisheries, he has participated in the bipartisan efforts of our delegation, led by Senator MAGNUSON, Senator JACKSON, and Congresswoman HANSEN, to serve the best interests of Washington State.

I regret I am unable to participate personally and wish to express my appreciation to Congresswoman HANSEN for her thoughtfulness in submitting my tribute.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, many stellar Members will leave this House at the end of the present term; and one whom we will miss greatly is a man from the great Northwest of the United States, THOMAS M. PELLY.

He has accumulated many honors during his lifetime. I would mention one trait which, I assume, he brought to Congress and one which he will take with him. He is a good man—good in the sense that it is associated with integrity, pride, and getting things done.

He has made a record here of which he can be proud—and so can his family, and his district, and his State, and his region. And our country.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise on this occasion to join my many colleagues on both sides of the aisle to honor a distinguished Member of Congress, my good friend, TOM PELLY.

During almost two decades in Congress, TOM PELLY has devoted himself to the service of his country and the people of his district. His concern for the conservation of our wildlife resources, the welfare of our fishing industry, and his conviction that a strong merchant marine is essential to the economy and defense of our country naturally prompted him to serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. His service on the Committee on Science and Astronautics reflects his interest in the promotion of basic scientific research and

the importance of space-age technology to the economy of his district.

Congressman PELLY, now the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, entered Congress at a time when our merchant marine was composed largely of World War II ships. While the rest of the world was actively rebuilding its fleets to replace the ships inherited from the United States, this country was allowing its fleet to disappear from the high seas. A few voices were raised against this dangerous trend. One of those was that of TOM PELLY. Thanks to him and the dedication of other Members who have shared his conviction, the United States has maintained at least a nucleus fleet of cargo ships operating on essential trade routes around the world. It was, therefore, no mere coincidence that President Nixon chose the Port of Seattle in the fall of 1968 to announce his plans for the rebuilding of the American merchant marine. The perseverance of TOM PELLY and his friends has paid off generously.

The rebuilding of our merchant marine is now a reality, and the outspoken support of TOM PELLY contributed to this renaissance.

Those of us from the west coast owe Tom a special debt of gratitude for his tireless efforts on behalf of the American fishing industry. His interest in our fishery resources has encompassed all of our fisheries from New England to Alaska and all of our fishing fleets whether in-shore or ranging over the oceans of the world. The establishment of our 9-mile contiguous fishery zone, the creation of the Fishermen's Protective Act to assist our tuna vessels illegally seized in South American waters, and most recently the enactment of legislation to protect the endangered Atlantic salmon reflects the breadth of TOM PELLY's concern for the welfare of our fishermen and the conservation of vital fishery resources.

Over the years, TOM PELLY has been the conscience of our Government in his efforts to secure just treatment for our tuna fishermen who have been compelled to endure the perils of the sea and the very real risk of bodily harm at the hands of South American navies. That industry and the entire fishing industry is losing its principal champion on the floor of the Congress in the retirement of TOM PELLY.

The growing presence of massive foreign fishing fleets off our coasts has prompted TOM PELLY to expand his interest in the conservation of our fishery resources beyond the legislative arena and into the international forum.

He has advocated the international acceptance of a biological approach to fishery management which recognizes the unique dependence of salmon resources upon the Nation which maintains the spawning grounds and the overriding interest of coastal States in their Continental Shelf fisheries without regard to arbitrary limits.

Fortunately, this philosophy now underlies the U.S. position for the Law of the Sea Conference which will seek a new international regime for fisheries management over the next several

years. Many of my colleagues already have urged the President to appoint TOM PELLY to the U.S. delegation for the Law of the Sea Conference as one of our principal fisheries negotiators. I join my colleagues in urging the President to take advantage of TOM PELLY's unique experience in these challenging negotiations.

Perhaps what we will miss the most is TOM PELLY's ability to fight hard for what he believes in while at the same time treating everyone with courtesy and dignity. The causes he has championed have not been easy ones. A lesser man might have given up or at least lost his sense of humor in the process. TOM PELLY has done neither, and these qualities are the true measure of my friend, TOM PELLY.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in this tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY). In his 20 years of service to the Nation and the First District of Washington, TOM PELLY has provided the type of leadership which is essential to the House of Representatives.

Those of us in the House who have been urging that Congress move to the forefront of the fight for a quality environment will particularly miss TOM PELLY. His work on both the Science and Astronautics Committee and especially the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, where he ably served as ranking Republican, was geared toward improving the Nation's environment. His efforts have paid off in the form of significant legislation toward the improvement of environmental quality in the oceans of the world having been passed in recent sessions of Congress.

While I will miss TOM PELLY in the 93d Congress, I want to express the hope that his next 20 years in private life will be as rewarding as the 20 he has served in the House. Mrs. Brotzman joins me in wishing the Pellys every good wish in their well-earned retirement and in extending an invitation for them to often visit their friends in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Honorable THOMAS J. PELLY, whose service to his district and to the State of Washington is drawing to a close after 20 years in this body.

Rather than saying goodbye to TOM PELLY, I would rather say simply, "Thank you, Tom." I would thank him for being a good friend, for being helpful to the freshmen of both parties as they groped their way around unfamiliar surroundings, and I would thank him most especially for being first, foremost and always, a true gentleman among us.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to join with my fellow Members of the House in paying tribute to our colleague and friend, Congressman THOMAS H. PELLY, on this special occasion marking the end of his long and distinguished career in Congress.

During his 20 years in the House of Representatives, Congressman PELLY has established a fine record in the

maritime, fisheries, and conservation fields and has made a significant contribution to the enactment of legislation benefiting our country—the rejuvenation of our dying merchant marine being among the most significant. Through his leadership and perseverance the rebuilding of the merchant marine has become a reality, and this accomplishment coupled with his numerous other achievements will stand as a reminder of his true dedication to public service.

While his expertise and experience will be sorely missed by all who have had the privilege of working with him, I know that Congressman PELLY will continue to serve the people of the State of Washington and the Nation with dignity and honor, and I extend to him my sincere best wishes for much successes and enjoyment in his forthcoming pursuits.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to join in this tribute to our colleague and good friend, TOM PELLY.

As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries TOM PELLY developed expertise in fisheries and conservation that has been of immense value to the Congress in the shaping of legislation in those areas. Coming from a great maritime State, he has been diligent in seeking benefits for his region but never at the expense of the national interest.

Unlike many of us, TOM PELLY came to the Congress at the beginning of the Eisenhower administration without prior service in elective political office. He had distinguished himself in the private sector, as head of a printing and stationery firm and as a director of the Seattle Trust and Savings Bank and the Northern Life Insurance Co. He also served 2 years as president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

So it was as a successful businessman that TOM PELLY, at the age of 50, began a new career in winning a congressional seat in the election of 1952. How well it turned out can be measured by the tributes being paid to him today.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to TOM PELLY as he prepares to retire from Congress after 20 years of service in the House of Representatives.

During those two decades, Tom has worked diligently in the conservation, maritime and fisheries fields—areas in which he has had considerable influence as ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and its subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation.

He has piloted through useful legislation to protect our commercial fishing interests and regulate fishing in territorial waters.

Probably his greatest contribution in the conservation field was his conscientious work toward passage of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the act which established the Council of Environmental Quality.

I wish Tom all the best as he returns to private life.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished

gentleman from Washington. His career in this body has been one of dedication to the United States and to the people of his great State.

Our country owes a tremendous debt to his fine work, and the Halls of Congress will not soon cease to echo his presence.

I am confident that he will continue to contribute significantly to the well-being of our Nation, and I know that his record of service will be an inspiration to Members of Congress in the years to come, just as it has in the past.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in saluting Congressman TOM PELLY.

TOM and I came to the House of Representatives two decades ago, and since that time I have watched him diligently serve his constituents here in Washington. A hardworking, dedicated man, one with the courage of his convictions and a man for the people—these are words that describe the kind of person TOM PELLY is. Of course these things are quite evident—one just has to look at Tom's record in Congress and his record with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on which he has served with never-ending persistence.

TOM PELLY is the type of man that I am proud to have served with here in the Congress of the United States.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in this tribute to TOM PELLY, and in wishing him the best life has to offer in the years to come.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in this special order paying tribute to our good friend and colleague from Washington (Mr. PELLY) who is retiring at the end of this session. As chairman of the House Republican Conference, I think I can speak for all my colleagues on this side of the aisle in saying that we will greatly miss the presence of TOM PELLY in this body both as a friend and a legislator of great experience and competence. And the bipartisan nature of this special order alone is a clear indication that such feelings are not confined to this side of the aisle but are shared by Members of both parties in this body who have come to know Tom over the years.

TOM PELLY was first elected to the Congress in 1952, the same year we sent Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to the White House as the first Republican President we had had in 20 years. And Tom has served in this body for the past 20 years with honor and distinction under four Presidents. He truly leaves behind an indelible mark on the pages of legislative history written by the Congress over the past two decades—an enviable record of which he can be justly proud, and for which we are proud of him.

TOM PELLY has particularly distinguished himself by his long and dedicated service as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Science and Astronautics Committee. As the ranking Republican on the former committee he has provided all of us an example of leadership and diligence, of expertise and ability—qualities which all in this body seek to develop and emulate.



In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to wish my good friend from Washington all the best in all he seeks to do after leaving this body. I know he has many happy years to look forward to, especially the deep enjoyment that must come to a man blessed with 10 grandchildren. And they have every reason to be abundantly proud of their grandfather who has done so much for this country as a U.S. Congressman these last 20 years, leaving this a better place to live for them and their children and grandchildren.

So it is with mixed feelings that we pay tribute to TOM PELLY today. We are sorry he is leaving us, but we are grateful for all he has left us.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we hate to see our good friends go. I know that Members on both sides of the aisle feel that we will deeply miss TOM PELLY in the 93d Congress. I particularly will miss his advice and counsel. For two decades, he has represented King County, the interest of a strong U.S. Navy, our fishermen, and the people of Seattle and its environs.

TOM PELLY and I came to Congress together in 1952. We have served through 20 years of tumultuous change. We have had crises of mutual interest. At all times, TOM PELLY has been a sturdy staff, a man to depend on for solid judgment and constructive solutions to our problems. He has been a battler for our fishermen, the U.S. fishing rights when other nations sought to seize the seas by imposing limits out to 200 miles. He has worked hard for the salmon industry, balancing conservation with an adequate harvest and insisting on U.S. rights on the high seas. He has worked to keep our naval facilities strong and our defenses up. He fought the good fight for the SST. When our fishing boats were grabbed, he was among the leaders in getting funds to alleviate their losses.

TOM PELLY has been a leader in the fight for fiscal responsibility. He has constantly warned that overspending led to overtaxing. His background in fiscal affairs before coming to Washington uniquely qualified him to evaluate Federal budgetary maneuvers. He has been a steady influence on the Science and Astronautics Committee as our space program moved from the Sputnik era to U.S. leadership in celestial exploration and travel. He has been the fisherman's friend, a strong supporter of U.S. shipping during his many years on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

TOM PELLY, the man, has been a pleasure to serve with as a colleague. I will remember the 1960 National Republican Convention when he went around passing out his "PELTY buttons" as a favorite son vice presidential candidate, along with his theme song: "Has Everyone Here Seen PELTY? P-E-Double L-Y."

I join my colleagues in the House in thanking TOM PELLY for his years of service to the Nation, the Republican Party and the Congress. The people of King County have had top-notch representation for 20 years. We hope he now finds time to do some of the things that the press of congressional business has kept him from doing. I am sure that TOM

PELLY will always be a "favorite son" of the Evergreen State that he has served so long and so well.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the close of this 92d Congress will also mark the end of the outstanding congressional career of my good friend and our colleague, THOMAS M. PELLY of Washington.

It is fitting that we take some time today to honor TOM PELLY for the 20 years he has served in this Chamber. Those years have been distinguished by his superb service to his constituents and to the country.

Nowhere is his record more glittering than in the maritime, fisheries, and conservation fields. As the ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, his work and his influence have been strongly felt around the country.

He has also brought his considerable talents to bear through his role as an important member of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

He has been an advocate in these fields and he has been effective because he possesses not only a deep knowledge in these areas, but also the willingness to do the hard work required for success.

All of us who have had the pleasure of working with him, know that his absence from this Chamber will be sorely felt. But ours is not the only loss. The citizens of Washington's First Congressional District are losing a legislator of uncommon ability and dedication. And the Nation is losing a man who has distinguished public service by his involvement in it.

I join with all my other colleagues today in wishing Tom and his family the very best of everything in the years ahead. His family can be justifiably proud of the record he has built, and Tom himself can take great satisfaction in the accomplishments he has scored over two decades of outstanding service.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with TOM PELLY's colleagues expressing our appreciation and admiration for his fine service in this House, to the people of his district, and to our country.

TOM has written a notable record during his 20 years of service in this great deliberative body. He has won the admiration of Members of both sides of the aisle. He has authored a great deal of constructive legislation particularly in maritime and fisheries matters.

TOM was a working conservationist before this field became as crowded and as popular as it is today.

It has been my personal privilege to have worked with him on legislation to protect wetlands and endangered species. Of particular importance were our successful efforts to protect the Atlantic Salmon. His patience and legislative skills have permitted him to achieve many important goals.

It is my hope that TOM PELLY and his family are taking great pride in his fine record and the integrity with which he has served his district.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, the Honorable TOM PELLY, will retire at the end of this session of Congress after 20 years of dedicated service to the people of the First District of the State of Washington.

His legislative contributions in the areas of conservation and maritime matters have been significant and many. Additionally, for four consecutive terms, he has been the recipient of the National Associated Businessmen's "Watchdog of the Treasury Award." This honor reflects his attitude on fiscal responsibility and efforts to curb inflation and the cost of living.

Congressman PELLY's constituents have been fortunate to be represented by such a conscientious legislator for two decades. I wish for Tom much happiness in his retirement and trust he will be able to do many of the things he has always wanted to do.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, TOM PELLY has served his constituents, the residents of the State of Washington, and the Nation with distinction. For 20 years, he conscientiously worked in their behalf.

As ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and in his service prior to reaching that position, Tom has accomplished a remarkable record in the bills within his jurisdiction and in conservation. Certainly, many future generations will benefit from his dedicated efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in these tributes to Tom this afternoon. I congratulate him on his outstanding congressional service. I hope he will thoroughly enjoy his retirement in the knowledge that the people of his district and the Nation are deeply grateful for his contributions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) has announced his retirement. The people of the First District of Washington will lose an effective Representative, and this House will lose one of its most respected Members.

For 20 years TOM PELLY has served his district, his State and his Nation in the Congress. We, who have served with him here in Washington, are well aware of his outstanding record in the fields of conservation, maritime affairs, and fisheries. He was a distinguished advocate of conservation long before it became a fashionable topic.

TOM PELLY has fashioned a record of public service which any of us would be proud to claim. We are each sworn to well and faithfully discharge the duties of our office. For 20 years the gentleman from Washington has fulfilled that oath to the utmost.

In my 6 years in this Chamber I have known and respected TOM PELLY as an effective Congressman and friend. We will miss him, and the excellent advice he offered. However, I hope that he will enjoy his retirement which he most richly deserves, and will have the time to devote to his family, and especially to his 10 grandchildren.

Good luck to you, TOM. You have our best wishes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY of the Washington First District is retiring from Congress after 20 years of distinguished service.

Having served for a time as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on which TOM PELLY is

currently the ranking minority member, I had ample opportunity to see for myself his outstanding capacity for committee work, and his extraordinary ability for dredging consequential testimony from reluctant committee witnesses. The same talents have been displayed to a similar extent, for the past few years, at the hearings of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, on which TOM PELLY is third-ranking minority member. His clarity of statement and incisive interrogative techniques have rendered him vital, in the opinion of his colleagues in general to the committee process.

As a former director of a banking institution, an insurance company, and a stationery company, and one-time president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, TOM PELLY brought with him to Washington a knowledge of the business community that served him well and served the Congress well.

As a consequence of his earnest awareness of problems confronting the Congress and the country, he has played a major role in the consideration and passage of many measures helpful to the people of his district, and the best interests of our country.

I would like to extend congratulations to TOM PELLY for a job well done, and best wishes for the future.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join in these special remarks to honor our colleague from Washington, the Honorable TOM PELLY, who is retiring from the House of Representatives at the end of this session. Tom has served his district and the Nation well for the past 20 years, and he will be missed in the Congress.

I have had the privilege of serving with Tom for the past 12 years and during that time I have admired his dedication and hard work approach to the problems of his constituents. In particular, Tom developed an expertise in the area of maritime and conservation through his service on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. As ranking minority member of that committee, he helped shape many landmark bills dealing with conservation and the protection of our Nation's natural resources.

I wish Tom and his family a most satisfying and enjoyable period of retirement from the arena of public service.

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, among the most pleasant experiences I have had since coming to Congress in 1965 has been the opportunity to work on numerous projects of interest to our State with my distinguished colleague from the other side of the aisle, THOMAS M. PELLY.

Mr. PELLY, as many of you know, antedated my presence here by 12 years, having been elected to the 83d Congress in 1952. We have often worked closely on areas of mutual concern including conservation, control of water pollution, problems of fisheries worldwide and in particular those of our Northwest fishermen, the SST, and establishing a healthy American merchant marine. The latter is only now approaching reality.

TOM PELLY grew up in the Northwest and is deeply attached to this part of

the earth. As a youth he hiked the trails of our inspiring forests and mountains, so perhaps it was natural for him when he came to Congress to become a leader in the long effort to establish a North Cascades National Park. He wanted to hold in trust the grandeur of the things he loved—for all persons, and for all time. The country, but especially the people in the State of Washington, will be forever grateful for his untiring efforts to preserve the natural beauty in this Park in perpetuity.

His strong personal concern for conservation and animal life has come to the fore time and again in his unceasing work to protect the world's major fisheries and the interests of our country's fishermen. In recognition of these outstanding services, the Seafarers and National Maritime Council recently presented Mr. Pelly with a plaque denoting their appreciation.

If TOM PELLY had decided to stay at his former home on Bainbridge Island, I would have had the honor to count him among my constituents, as I gained this area in the last redistricting. However, I understand he now plans to make his home in Seattle. His family there is among the earliest and most illustrious in Seattle's history.

His father, a British subject, first came to Canada at the behest of his sister who had married the Bishop of New Westminster (Episcopal Church). They resided in Vancouver, British Columbia. Later his father moved to Seattle where he served as a member of the British Consulate. In Seattle he met the daughter of Dr. T. T. Minor, one of the city's pioneer leaders. Dr. Minor had originally been sent to the Northwest by the Smithsonian to study the flora and fauna. He stayed on to practice medicine, and in time was elected Mayor of Seattle.

TOM PELLY himself had a distinguished career in business before coming to Congress. He started with the Seattle National Bank, later joining the printing and stationery company of Lowman and Hanford to become its president and general manager. From 1949 to 1951 he was president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. In 1950 he was selected as Seattle's First Citizen.

His charming wife, Mary Virginia, whom he married in 1927, is a native of Washington, D.C. They met in Seattle where she had come to visit friends. They have two children, both outstanding citizens of the State of Washington.

Thus, on this occasion I want to add my voice to the chorus of well-wishers bidding farewell to Tom and Mary Pelly. May they enjoy retirement and a happy future together.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, during my 4 short years in the House, I have had the honor to serve on two committees with TOM PELLY. I served for 2 years on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with Congressman PELLY, and for all 4 years on the Science and Astronautics Committee. During this period of time I have had the opportunity to watch and learn from an outstanding legislator. His work and efforts have paid off in landmark legislation in the mari-

time, fisheries, and conservations fields. But more important to me from a personal side than these legislative accomplishments was his patience and understanding in working with the younger members of the committees. All of us were not only able to participate, we were also given added responsibility through the efforts of TOM PELLY.

It was with a great deal of sadness that we learned that the Congressman from Washington was retiring after 20 years of wonderful service in the House of Representatives. We in the House are proud of Tom. We know that his family and the people of his district are also proud that they have had a Congressman who cares. I join with all his other colleagues on both sides of the aisle in wishing the Congressman health and happiness and in thanking him for his outstanding service to his Nation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, no one in Washington will miss TOM PELLY more than I.

He is one of my closest associates and I have had the privilege of enjoying his steadfast friendship, as well as his sound advice and counsel, for a great many years.

Mr. PELLY is considered by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be one of the most able and effective legislators who has ever served in Washington. The House of Representatives will not be the same without him.

He has not only taken statesmenlike positions on national issues, but has fought effectively and successfully for all matters affecting his district and issues under the jurisdiction of his committees.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to join in paying tribute to one of our outstanding colleagues, TOM PELLY, who is retiring after 20 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives.

Tom has earned the reputation of being a hard-working Congressman, perceptive to the problems confronting our Nation, and judicious in his decisions. His diligence to his responsibilities as ranking Republican on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has inspired the other committee members with less seniority to work hard, and he has served as a fine example of what a Member of Congress should be and should do. We have all benefited greatly from Tom's expertise in maritime, fisheries, and conservation fields.

Big TOM PELLY will be missed not only for his intellect, but for his patience and congenial manner. Usually he sat down in front of the Chamber on the aisle where many Members would consult with him about their problems as they passed by. Always obliging and cooperative, he never did try to impose his judgment and will upon others, but usually gave them good advice.

Tom has been a credit to the House of Representatives, to the Nation, his constituents, and to his fine family. We shall miss him, but his friendship and many accomplishments will always be treasured.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to realize that TOM PELLY will not



be here in January. When I began my service in the House, he had already been here for two terms. I had assumed that he would be around for many more years.

Although those of us who will still be here next year will miss the distinguished, able and genial gentleman from Washington, we respect his decision to retire while he is still able to enjoy some years of leisure and have time for quiet contemplation. As he looks back on the 20 years that he has served his district in these historic halls, he can take justifiable pride in his accomplishments as a legislator. The record that he has written will be one that those who follow him may study with profit.

The Washington to which our esteemed colleague will return will be a less hectic place than the Washington he will be leaving. True, the Nation's Capital is an exciting place, where people from every State in the Union and from the four corners of the earth gather, where decisions of far-reaching import are made. Nonetheless, I am confident that TOM PELLY will be closer to the real America when he returns to his native State.

Mr. Speaker, as our colleague departs from the House, where he has served for so long, so ably, and with such fruitful results, our best wishes accompany him. May he enjoy health and happiness and may he live as long as he enjoys life.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my pleasure at having the opportunity of paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the Honorable TOM PELLY, is exceeded only by my regret that this occasion for doing so is brought about by his retirement.

TOM's efforts and achievements in the maritime, conservation, and fisheries area of legislation have earned him the gratitude and appreciation of those on whose behalf he has labored, the people not only of his constituency, but of this Nation.

His unfailing courtesy, generosity, and helpfulness to all with whom he has come in contact in the House during two decades of service have earned him the respect and friendship of his colleagues.

I am proud to have had the privilege of working with TOM as a Member of Congress, and even prouder of the fact that I may call him a friend. It is my sincere hope that the years ahead will bring him the happiness and satisfaction that he has so richly earned.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is said that a great man is what he is because of what he was. This could certainly be said about our distinguished colleague from the State of Washington, THOMAS M. PELLY.

TOM PELLY was born in the same area which he has represented so well for 20 years, the city of Seattle. There he displayed at an early age the leadership and hard work which was to accompany him to the U.S. House of Representatives. His successes and many contributions to the business community in Seattle are clear testimonials to this fact.

TOM PELLY has rendered yeoman's service for the people of America on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Com-

mittee and the Science and Astronautics Committee. It was my distinct privilege to serve with him on the first of these. There is not a Member of this body who is not aware of TOM PELLY's diligent efforts in the fields of conservation, maritime affairs, and fisheries.

Robert Frost once said:

What makes a country great at first is a good piece of geography. After that, it is people.

He might have added that it is people like TOM PELLY. For TOM PELLY has provided the calibre of representation and leadership which has added to the stature of every American and contributed to the vitality of our Nation. And through his work in conservation, he has done so much to preserve that good piece of geography that Frost talked about.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss TOM PELLY. The U.S. House of Representatives will miss him. But I am certain that the country will benefit from Tom's counsel and leadership in his capacity as a private citizen for many years to come.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, although I have had the privilege of serving with him for only one Congress, I do want to join with his many friends in paying tribute to our truly distinguished and hard-working colleague, TOM PELLY.

I am sure the natural magnificence of his native State of Washington has a lot to do with his energetic efforts in the fields of conservation and wise management of our natural resources. Even though he and I do not share the same committee assignments, it is impossible to miss the tremendous energy and effort he has extended on behalf of America's fishing industry and, equally, his concern and efforts on behalf of the preservation and conservation of those marvelous denizens of the deep who need protection.

From my colleagues, I learned of his untiring efforts for many years in alerting the Nation to the needs of our maritime industry. I understand that it was at TOM's urging in the fall of 1968 that the President chose Seattle, TOM's home city, to announce plans to rebuild the American Merchant Marine. His perseverance has paid off, and I am pleased that I have been able to work with him during the past 2 years in seeing the rebuilding of the Merchant Marine become a reality.

TOM PELLY is compassionate and understanding, fairminded and conscientious. Most of all, he is a man of complete and utter integrity and intellectual honesty. We can all admire the public service he has rendered to his State and Nation. His career will not soon be forgotten. His contributions have been great—and he will be sorely missed.

We all, I know, wish him every happiness for many years to come.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years, Congress and the Nation have been fortunate in enjoying the services of my good friend and colleague, Congressman TOM PELLY of Washington.

TOM came to the Congress with the convening of the 82d Congress on January 3, 1951. Through the years he has distinguished himself through hard work,

honest thought, and dedication to the cause of freedom at home and abroad.

Although TOM PELLY and I represent differing political parties, I have never known him to place party loyalty above national interest. His service on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has left a highly beneficial mark on the Nation's merchant fleet and on the ecological improvements in which he has been strongly interested.

TOM PELLY, also serving as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, gave significant leadership to the United States entry into the space age. He was one of those who worked so hard to make it possible for Americans to be first to land on the moon. He contributed to the vital satellite network which now is such an important link in our national defense effort and in the world of communications.

With a background in finance, having served as an officer of two financial institutions before coming to Congress, TOM PELLY has used his expertise to keep a constant watch on the fiscal policies of the United States. He constantly fought against increasing the national debt and ever alarming deficit spending. His warnings against excessive spending have clearly been needed.

Now, he has decided to return to his native State of Washington to enjoy a well-earned retirement from the rigors of congressional work. As one who is proud to call him a friend, I shall miss the sage advice, high good humor, and strong wisdom of TOM PELLY.

To TOM and to his beloved wife Mary and their family, I join in extending my very best wishes for the years ahead.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to our good friend the Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY who is retiring at the end of this session after 20 years of dedicated service in the House of Representatives.

I was pleased to serve with TOM on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He is a conscientious member of that committee, and I was inspired by his dedication to solving the problems of the maritime and fisheries industries.

I am sure the people of Washington will miss the outstanding representation in the House that TOM has so generously given during the past 20 years, and his colleagues here will miss having the leadership and guidance of this distinguished Member of Congress.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my four colleagues for securing this special order to pay tribute to TOM PELLY and thank them for allowing me to participate. I have always been impressed with TOM PELLY's dedication and devotion to duty. He is a man who has taken seriously his responsibilities to his constituents and Nation for the last 20 years.

Even though TOM and I represent different sections of the country with varying needs and even though we are members of different parties, I sincerely appreciate this thoughtfulness and consideration on the floor and in committee.

He has been a real friend and his advice has been highly valued by me.

I wish him the very best in retirement and hope he will come back often to visit with his colleagues.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the accomplishments, character and service of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELL).

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

There was no objection.

#### A BILL TO ENCOURAGE FAIR AND EQUITABLE INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which I hope will go some distance toward resolving the deadlock we find ourselves in with regard to international trade. The purpose of the bill is to assure a healthy growth of foreign trade while establishing conditions that will prevent the ill effects of unduly rapid increases in imports and unduly deep penetration of our market from disrupting and even halting normal economic growth in the United States.

To this end it seeks restoration of the competitive conditions that fostered the development of the world industrial leadership achieved by this country in the past 75 years. The system of production and distribution developed in this country represented a sharp departure, not only from our own past, but also from our economic forebears in Europe. While the industrial revolution which brought such great industrial changes to England predated our industrial development, our subsequent adoption of mass production in the 20th century as an offspring of a dynamic technology, soon moved us far afield from our earlier industrial heritage.

Particularly noteworthy among the basic supporting factors in our great departure were: First, a recognition of competition as an incitement to effort by producers to merit consumer favor as a condition of producer reward; second, perception of the dependence of mass production on mass purchasing power; and third, appreciation of the role of employee compensation as the predominant ingredient of the buying power of the market place.

Pursuit of production in this framework, guarded by laws against monopoly, by laws designed to prevent erosion of purchasing power through low-wage competition, such as outlawing of child labor and sweatshop operation, plus minimum wage laws, and laws in support of collective bargaining, led to an amazing proliferation of production of a vast variety of consumer goods far beyond the level of necessities—propelled by the profit motive.

Because of dependence of production on consumption, and the propensity of consumers to respond to the condition or anticipated condition of their pocketbook, the system, so highly geared to the production of goods far beyond the merest essentials, became sensitive to any factors that might be expected to affect the market, either favorably or unfavorably. Such factors might be visible and stubborn and therefore directly influential with consumers, or anticipatory or suspected and therefore psychologically operative in either a negative or positive fashion on both producers and consumers. The antennae of producers were sensitized to both actual and anticipatory movements that might affect the market; that is, consumer inclination to purchase more or less.

Negative factors led to producer hesitation or outright retrenchment while positive factors or interpretations fostered expansion.

Although imports and exports each represents only about 4 percent of the gross national product, different products partake in widely varying degrees above and below the average. In other words, both imports or exports may be important in particular industries.

In combination, the effect of imports may produce a depressing effect on domestic production beyond the positive displacement of workers in domestic plants because of repercussions of the market outlook thus induced and entertained by domestic producers. If imports increase rapidly because of a decided market advantage the domestic producer may cancel any current plans to expand his operations, and await developments. He will not hire any part of the increasing work force that appears on the labor market each month and each year.

If he is a producer of a new and developing product such as historically in this century have expanded into great industries or even into smaller ones and have thus employed in the aggregate millions of workers in newly generated jobs, he will not commit his capital nor will his enterprise attract risk capital very copiously, if he cannot have reasonable assurance that the market will be his if he develops it; or if it seems quite clear that despite his patents he will face competition from abroad that will rob his patent of all meaning.

It is not necessary that his product be a wholly new one. Thousands of existing products are constantly undergoing improvement through invention and research in efforts to reduce costs and to gain a march on competitors who are in the field similarly motivated. At home a productive innovation may be protected by patents, and the producer can feel reasonably assured—patent infringement aside—of the fruits of his labors for a reasonable period of time. He willingly undertakes projects that may require several years to mature.

If, however, he knows that he may be outflanked from abroad, his outlook is clouded. He may even decide to move a substantial part of his own operations overseas because of wage differentials, particularly if the export of his product beckons as a source of additional profit. Because he finds that by employing

workers abroad he can produce at a lower cost, he will forgo his effort to export from this country or he will supplement his exports by producing abroad, thus hedging his future. Alternatively, he may license foreign producers to use his patents.

Meantime, the increased employment that he would have provided in this country is curtailed or set aside completely. If unemployment in this country is not to increase, someone else must then hire the additional workers that come on the scene by population increase. The workers he employs abroad do not absorb the new workers in this country.

Thus is subverted the formula by which this country rose to world industrial leadership in this century. New products or radically improved products can no longer be put on the market here with the assurance that the great national consumer potential might be tapped through progressive cost reductions aimed at an elastic demand, because of the danger and the overt evidence of outflanking possibilities from abroad.

Even if the producer protects himself by going abroad, American employment is outflanked.

#### PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill is designed, not to reduce our foreign trade, but to bring its growth under control in such fashion that the American producer can operate under the same assurance that he had during the years before the American technology had been adopted and so energetically pursued by other industrial countries.

Under present conditions, the American producer can no longer do so for the simple reason that foreign products may virtually preempt the market growth that he could formerly claim confidently as his own.

The bill provides for import limitations under specified circumstances, with well-defined exceptions. At least 10 percent market penetration must have occurred during the two immediately preceding years to qualify for a quota. Also, there must have been an upward trend in the past few years in the imports of any given product before eligibility can be established.

The base year for the quota is the average imports during the 3-year period of 1969-71. If imports have increased rather sharply during the past several years a moderate cutback in imports may be made from the base period.

Items on the free list will not be subject to quotas, nor items that are now under quota limitation so long as they remain so limited.

Imports once under a quota may increase or decrease in proportion as domestic consumption of the article increases or declines in this country.

The bill makes no effort to discourage foreign investments. However, it seeks to prevent the objectionable effects that are imputed to foreign investments, to it: First, by limiting imports to a defined share of our market if the penetration is over 10 percent, and then restricting import growth to that recorded by our do-



mestic market; and second, by fixing limits on the share of the market that may be supplied by imports of products that have patent protection. During the first 5 years of a patent's life, imports may not rise above 5 percent of our market for the same article. During the second 5 years not over 10 percent of our market for the article may be supplied by imports in any one year. In the next 5-year period the limit is 15 percent, and this will be the final limit.

Once the patent expires the imports will be governed by the other provisions of the legislation.

By thus controlling imports of patented products the usurpation of our market by imports will be inhibited. Domestic patent holders are then assured of a market that will enable them to proceed in full confidence that they will not be prevented by cost-advantaged imports from reaping the benefits of their efforts to establish a national market.

The domestic investment climate will be restored to the conditions under which this country developed the world's most productive economy. Expansion of production, the opening of new facilities, and the hiring of additional workers to meet rising production schedules, will be sparked by the vision of a mass market as costs are cut to a level low enough to tap the mass pocketbook.

Under these conditions, assuming elasticity of demand, consumption will rise sufficiently to call for rising employment in this country. Imports, limited as provided in this legislation, will not remain a hovering threat as they are now—poised to despoil the market for domestic producers; nor, on the other hand, will they be discouraged insensibly or unreasonably.

Any article may be produced abroad by domestic or foreign capital without limitation. The domestic market will not be closed to such products produced abroad, but it cannot be ruined as a source of employment or as a source of profit for domestic capital invested in the home market by unimpeded imports or products from low-wage, low unit-cost areas of the world.

I include the text of the bill:

H.R. 16959

A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be known as the "Fair International Trade Act of 1972".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to prevent the destructive effects of an undue increase of imports on the domestic economy while providing for the expansion of imports in proportion as the domestic market for the same or similar products may expand.

Achievement of the goal of full employment, and the maintenance of a growing and diversified production base in the United States, are essential to promotion of the domestic and foreign policy of the United States. In recent years rapidly rising imports, sometimes promoted by foreign governmental assistance or unfair trade practices, have seriously injured and in some instances severely encroached upon or even preempted the normal growth in the United States of new or established industries. It is the in-

tent of Congress through the enactment of this bill to prevent such destruction in the future.

To the extent that the production of goods that have historically been produced in the United States or that, as the result of new inventions or innovations, might, in the absence of low-cost imports, be produced advantageously in the United States, has been transferred abroad, thus preventing or discouraging the new and growing domestic employment that has until recent years gone hand-in-hand with the development of a market for new or substantially improved articles, it is the intent of Congress to prevent the underemployment and the curtailment or stagnation of industrial production in the United States resulting from such transfer of production or potential production abroad.

To this end this legislation should be administered in such manner that a fair share of the American market, actual or potential, as hereinafter provided, be reserved for domestically produced goods.

SEC. 3. The functions and duties of the United States Tariff Commission shall be modified to include compliance with the requirements of this Act. Upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives upon its own motion, or upon a filing of a petition by a trade association, a national labor union, or other interested party, the Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation and hold such hearings as it may be required by this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) The term "domestic industry" as used in this Act shall be interpreted as the productive operations in the United States devoted to the production of the article or articles that are subject to the provisions of this Act, and may be confined to a single category of articles or a group of closely related categories of articles if the competitive impact of imports is concentrated on the single category or on closely related categories of the article.

(b) Any quantitative limitations established under this Act may be divided into categories of closely related articles and allotted by country of origin on a representative historical basis during the most recent ten-year period: *Provided*, That the imports of the combined categories do not exceed the quantitative limitation proclaimed by the president, and that they may be divided into quarter- or half-year periods. If separate categories are not pertinent to the safeguarding of the domestic industry concerned, total imports of the article without regard to categories may be allotted by country of origin on a representative historical basis during the most recent ten-year period: *Provided further*, That 5 per centum of the total quantity may be reserved for allocation to such countries as were not significant exporters of the article to this country during the historical period, if application for allocation of the reserve is made by one or more of such countries, and that such allocation shall be made in the calendar year after the application is received but in no case sooner than six months after its receipt. Only such part of the total quota, not to exceed 5 per centum thereof, shall be allotted to the applicant country or countries as they may reasonably be expected to fill. The remainder or unallocated portion of the 5 per centum reserve, if any, shall be prorated among the existing countries.

SEC. 5. The term "domestic consumption" as used in this Act shall be understood to mean domestic production of the article in question, plus imports thereof, less exports or re-exports of the same article during the same period, making proper allowance for carry-overs at the beginning or end of any year.

SEC. 6. The "share of domestic consumption" or "apparent domestic consumption supplied by imports", for purposes of this Act, shall be in terms of quantity unless quantitative measures are not available, in which event the dollar value of imports shall be used, reflecting the foreign value as defined in the Tariff Act of 1930, plus the estimated charges incurred for freight and marine insurance in bringing the goods to the port of entry: *Provided*, That in the absence of definitive official statistics on either quantity or value of imports of any article the Commission shall use the best available evidence and estimates in establishing the annual domestic production of articles in question and the share of domestic consumption supplied by imports. Should neither the quantitative nor the value measure alone provide a fair economic indication or index of the share of the market supplied by imports, the Commission shall use such a combination of both measures as in its judgment will most truly reflect such share: *Provided further*, That if a quantitative measure is used, increased unit values of the imports not attributable in major part to an increase in price, are to be treated as a quantitative increase in imports in proportion to the increase in unit value in determining the share of domestic consumption supplied by imports; while if a value measure is used, an increase in the total value of the imports attributable in major part to a price increase shall not be treated as an increase in imports in determining the share of domestic consumption supplied by imports.

The value of imports of articles as used in this Act shall be the dutiable value.

SEC. 7. The President shall within one hundred and twenty days after the effective date of this Act, except as otherwise provided, limit the total quantity of each category of goods, as defined in section 5, produced in any foreign country that may be entered in any calendar year or specified part thereof, beginning with the year 1973, to the average annual quantity of such category of goods as was imported during the three-year period of 1969 to 1971, as determined by the Tariff Commission.

No such limitation on imports shall be imposed by the President under this Act, (a) if the average imports of the article during the two most recent calendar year periods have not increased more than 20 per centum over the average imports during the next preceding two-year period, and if the average share of apparent domestic consumption supplied by imports of the article was less than 10 per centum thereof during the most recent two-year period; (b) if a quantitative limitation on importation of the article is in effect in pursuance of any other United States statute, provided that upon the termination of any such existing quantitative limitation, the article or articles which have been the subject of the limitation shall be withdrawn from the exemption from quantitative limitation under this Act and in lieu of the expired limitations, shall be treated as immediately eligible for a quantitative limitation under this Act at the same level in terms of the percentage of domestic consumption supplied by imports thereof during the last year of the effective period of the expired limitation; (c) if a limitation on importation of the article as provided in this Act would, in the judgment of the Tariff Commission, cause a serious increase in the price of the article in the domestic market as a direct result of any shortage caused by such limitation of importation; (d) if the Tariff Commission finds that the domestic industry producing the article has failed beyond a reasonable period of time to adopt the necessary technological improvements in production to remain competitive with the imported article; or (e) if the article is on the free list and is not bound on the free list in a trade agreement.

SEC. 8. No article on the production and sale of which an unexpired patent has been issued by the United States Patent Office to a domestic producer shall be imported in an amount by quantity or value that shall exceed 5 per centum of the annual apparent domestic consumption of the same article in the United States during the first five years after the issuance of the patent, or more than 10 per centum of such consumption during the second five-year period, or more than 15 per centum after the third five-year period after the issuance of the patent. After 15 years from the date of such issuance or after expiration of the patent, whichever occurs earlier, imports of the article may be increased year after year in the same proportion as apparent domestic consumption of the article increases over the immediately preceding year: *Provided*, That the share of domestic consumption supplied by imports of the article is not in excess of 15 per centum at the end of the 15-year period after issuance of the patent or at the expiration of the patent, whichever occurs earlier.

SEC. 9. If the share of the domestic market supplied by imports of the article or category of articles as defined in section 4(b), has increased by more than 10 per centum in the most recent three-year period over the share supplied during the next preceding three-year period but not more than 20 per centum, the base quantity for the imposition of the quantitative limitation shall be the average imports of the article during the three-year period of 1969 to 1971: *Provided*, That if the increase in the share of the domestic market supplied by such imports during the most recent three-year period over the next preceding three-year period was more than 20 per centum but not more than 40 per centum, the base quantity shall be fixed at 10 per centum less than the average imports during the 1969 to 1971 period: *Provided further*, That if the increase in such share of the domestic market in the most recent three-year period over the next preceding three-year period was over 40 per centum the base quantity shall be fixed at 20 per centum less than the average imports during the 1969 to 1971 period.

SEC. 10. If imports of the article are concentrated in one or more regional areas of the United States, the Commission shall calculate the share of domestic consumption supplied by such imports on a regional basis. The region or regions absorbing the preponderance of the imports shall be defined by State boundaries according to the market pattern, and the region or regions so defined shall be treated as consumers of the article in question in the same proportion of total national consumption as the population of the region bears to the total population of the United States. The share of domestic consumption supplied by imports shall then be calculated by each region by allotting imports among the regions according to the marketing pattern, as established by investigation of the Commission and the testimony of competent witnesses. The President shall treat the share of domestic consumption supplied by imports in any given region as if such share were national in scope and proclaim any quantitative import limitations accordingly by region.

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce shall upon the request of the Tariff Commission supply such import statistics as the Commission may need in order to carry out the provisions of this Act. He shall maintain current statistics on the importation of any articles for which quantitative limitations may be established under this Act, and on the domestic production of such articles. The Tariff Commission shall be guided by such statistics in carrying out the provisions of this Act, supplemented as may be necessary by statistics from other governmental departments or agencies.

SEC. 12. If the article is a seasonal or perishable agricultural product, quantitative limitations may be established by the quarter or half year and the period selected treated in the same manner under this Act as if it were a whole year. The share of domestic consumption supplied by imports shall be calculated separately for each quarter or half year and a finding made for each quarter—or half-year.

The President shall proclaim a quantitative limitation on imports of agricultural products under the same conditions with respect to the share of domestic consumption supplied by imports as govern other articles under this Act.

#### WHAT'S GOOD FOR THE GOOSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Nader cries he is "being blackmailed."

What is happening is that the goose is getting a taste of what it is like to be the gander and Mr. Nader is, for a change, on the receiving end of the kind of "blackmail" he tries on this body all the time.

My colleagues will recall that Mr. Nader, surprisingly, did not surface during the other body's recent debate on the no-fault insurance bill. Now it turns up that American Trial Lawyers Association, a strong opponent of no fault, has voted to donate \$10,000 to Mr. Nader and has pledged an additional \$10,000 to his auto safety work. When this was discovered, the usually accessible Mr. Nader refused to talk to reporters on the subject and would not even return telephone calls on the issue.

When a reporter requested a written statement from Mr. Nader—in lieu of the interview or telephone discussion he refused—Mr. Nader responded through an aide that he did not like "being blackmailed" into making a statement.

This is amazing. Right now, Mr. Nader has underway the greatest blackmailing of the U.S. Congress which has ever taken place. A full-blown study of the Congress—from the Nader vantage point—involving hundreds of people and including an exhaustive 600-plus-question survey for us to fill out, is promised for release in time for it to be used effectively in the November elections. And he cries he is "being blackmailed."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Ralph Nader has succeeded in elevating the cause of consumerism to something akin to the old shakedown racket.

In a recent issue of Newsday, syndicated columnist and television commentator Jeffrey St. John made some interesting observations about Mr. Nader's updated protection racket. Like any good racket, Mr. St. John pointed out, Mr. Nader's targets are carefully selected and indeed one-sided.

Mr. St. John observed that the consumer champion espouses strong consumer protection only when it involves an attack on the business community—such as the proposed Consumer Protection Agency—but ignores the consumer's interest when it conflicts with the interests of the labor movement—such as

the blatantly anticonsumer Burke-Hartke bill.

Such hypocrisy does not come as too much of a surprise to people who have been in the Washington environment for a while. What is frustrating, however, is the fact that this Nation's press—which seems to have a fixation on discovering hypocrisy in Government—blatantly ignores Mr. Nader's hypocrisy. As a result, to those who depend upon the media men for their information, Ralph Nader's purity is comparable to that of Caesar's wife. Mr. St. John has performed a significant service by pointing out that, despite what Mr. Nader wants you to believe, the consumer crusader is not without sin.

Taking a leaf from Mr. Nader's book, I would like to propose that this body not act on any piece of consumer legislation now pending until after the publication of Mr. Nader's report. If he refuses to be "blackmailed" by one reporter, this body should refuse to be similarly "blackmailed" by Mr. Nader's legion of zealots who will interpret this Congress and its Members out of their own preconceived notions.

Clearly, blackmail is what Mr. Nader's "study" of Congress is all about. Under the guise of public interest research Mr. Nader is threatening revenge on any Senator who does not support his notions about consumer protection. And Mr. Nader, himself, even admits that he is rushing his study to conclusion so that it can shape the voting pattern of this November's election. In other words, he admits its potential as a blackmail tool.

What is good for the goose must also be good for the gander. Mr. Nader apparently cannot stand up under the kind of scrutiny to which he subjects those in this body. I agree with Mr. Nader that it is wrong to be blackmailed. Therefore, in order that we not be blackmailed on any piece of consumer legislation which may come before this body, I urge the leadership of this body to bring such matters to the floor only after Mr. Nader has published his report.

Truly such a proposal is fair and equitable. Mr. Nader portrays himself as a public servant. Clearly, he would not mind according the public servants who serve in this body the same kind of rights which he so vociferously demands for himself.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Jeffrey St. John article to which I referred earlier at this point in the RECORD:

EMPEROR NADER

(By Jeffrey St. John)

"Nader insists," observes Charles McCarry in his book, "Citizen Nader," that those who act in the public's name must operate in the public view. But many of his actions that have profound public consequences are carried out in secret."

Ralph Nader's current secret campaign is by far his most ambitious and, if successful, will have profound consequences for consumers, commerce and the country. He is energetically pursuing enactment of a bill that would create a powerful autonomous Consumer Protection Agency (CPA). Fortune Magazine, in a profile of Nader last year, contended that CPA "would, in fact, attempt to do just the sort of thing that Nader is



doing now, but with the help of government funds and power."

Nader, in other words, is seeking to establish a political power base by proxy within the very federal bureaucracy he has heretofore vigorously denounced. It means that he ceases to enjoy the title of an ordinary citizen fighting for the public interest and is on the threshold of becoming a political powerbroker seeking special government franchise and privilege which he has castigated other lobbying organizations for doing.

Consumer activist Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal (D-N.Y.) admitted last October on the House floor that CPA is Nader's "baby." Neither Rosenthal nor his liberal ally in the Senate, Charles Percy (R-Ill.), denies that Nader fathered the agency concept and helped draft the bill's legislative language for both houses. However, the idea is not really new. Nader resurrected it from the FDR New Deal where it was tried unsuccessfully as part of the old NRA, which the U.S. Supreme Court declared unconstitutional.

The regulatory philosophy since the New Deal has run along democratic lines with an adversary proceeding providing all parties hope for arriving at an objective decision. While this approach has often been subverted by political considerations, punitive advocacy of a prosecuting attorney has never been the dominant thrust. CPA would be a radical departure from this tradition. Presumably hand-picked Nader's "raiders" would staff CPA. Armed with sweeping "discretionary" powers to advocate the cause of consumers, CPA would bird-dog any federal regulatory bureau that Nader and his allies believe is beholden to business at the expense of the consumer.

However, opponents fear that the agency will become a bulldog, sniping and growling at the heels of a sprawling "bureaucracy notorious for guarding its power and prerogatives. Conceivably CPA could be the catalyst for igniting an era of unprecedented power struggles within government between the old bureaucrats and Nader's eager and new bureaucrats who would certainly emulate his uncompromising style and bellicose tactics.

Nader has sought to minimize the dangerous consequences of this proposal. In replying to a recent U.S. Chamber assault on CPA, Nader insisted that the agency would have a "tiny budget" and a small staff. He is either naive or dishonest. For the role he envisions as consumer watchdog of the alphabet soup collection of regulatory agencies will require a massive amount of manpower and budget. A close look at the powers Nader wants for CPA makes this much clear—right to petition federal agency actions; a party to all such actions; appeal of agency decisions that CPA feels bad for consumers; the same subpoena power held by existing agencies; power to appeal decisions to the courts and to require, via court action, access to any information CPA decides is in the consumers' interest.

Nader claims to despise bureaucracy and elitism, but energetically seeks enactment of laws that will create a new bureaucracy staffed by the upper-middle-class elite who make up his followers and who are remote from the mass of America. He has made much of the alleged corruption and evil of business, but leave labor unions largely untouched. When presented, for example, with an opportunity to help the now murdered United Mine Workers crusader, Joseph Yablonski, clean up the corrupt UMW, he first consented and then withdrew from the battle leaving Yablonski to his fate. On the issue that brought him to fame, auto safety, he has verbally savaged the auto makers, but remains silent over the assembly lines that contribute to unsafe cars and to an endless recall of defective vehicles.

As the alleged leader of the consumer movement, Nader has led no crusade against the AFL-CIO-sponsored bill that would have profound consequences for the American consumer—the Burke-Hartke trade bill is one of the most blatant protectionist measures in four decades. In curbing investments abroad and rolling back imports at home it would profoundly affect the price of every consumer product and fire the opening shot in an international trade war.

In the final analysis, the rise of Ralph Nader is due almost exclusively to the intellectual default and moral cowardice of the captains of industry. They have lacked the courage and conviction to denounce consumer protection for what it is: a labor-inspired political racket. The consumer movement is guilty of the same practices that it maintains business carries on—misleading advertising, deceptive labeling and packaging, and unsubstantiated claims. Even Nader admits that all his consumer efforts enacted into laws have failed to do the job. The major accomplishment of the consumer movement has been to raise the price of most products that have come under consumer protection laws. Autos, for example, now cost more than they did in 1966 because of safety and anti-pollution devices. But during the drive for pollution-free and safer autos, this fact was carefully concealed from the American consumer.

The attitude of the U.S. Chamber, the Nixon administration and so-called pro-business segments toward Nader's current drive for a Consumer Protection Agency is a fresh illumination of a stale story, conceding the basic premises of your enemies. The U.S. Chamber does not oppose the concept of CPA as inimical to consumer interest, but it takes exception to the powers the agency would be granted for they readily acknowledge the "need" for consumer protection.

So the difference between Nader and the chamber is not one of substance and principle, but only of degree. The degree to which the government is permitted to further compromise the freedom of business and ultimately the American consumer. The irrationality of consumer protection laws lies in the bogus belief that consumers are monolithic when, in reality, consumers differ in taste and choice from person to person and from income group to income group. Consumer laws merely remove the decision-making power of the many to the hands of the few. And as Mary Bennett Peterson points out in her just-published "The Regulated Consumer," the consumer movement-government axis "is predicated on the premise that consumer sovereignty is more or less defunct.

"Most regulation," she adds, "is simply economic interventionism—the substitution of the Washington way—the public way—for the free market—the private way. It is the economic version of government by men rather than government by law. In the name of protecting the consumer, it undermines consumer sovereignty. In the name of preserving competition, it undermines competition."

Ralph Nader recognizes that the regulatory philosophy since the New Deal is bankrupt. But rather than consistently advocate a philosophy of economic freedom and deregulation as the answer, he fanatically pursues more regulation with the resurrection of New Deal ideas like CPA. Such contradictions, however, can be explained. Milton Friedman in "Capitalism and Freedom" describes Nader and all others who cannot bring themselves to see the virtues of the market and shortcomings of the state. "Underlying most arguments against 'the free market,'" he observes, "is a lack of belief in freedom itself."

## KEMP URGES CONGRESS TO RE-AFFIRM ITS COMMITMENT TO OUR POW'S-MIA'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, at what may be a watershed period in the negotiations between Dr. Kissinger and Le Duc Tho, we must continue to make every effort to insure that the human rights and dignity of our POW's is not forgotten. This Congress can render no greater service than to reaffirm its commitment to the sanctity of international law and call for the implementation of the articles of the Geneva Accords of 1949 which call for the humane treatment of POW's and identification of those missing in action.

At a time when the question of our POW's treatment and condition is on the lips of many in this country, this body should make clear its consistent and irrevocable position that all POW's have a sacred right to humanitarian treatment and protection from public abuse. To that end, I am introducing a resolution which will put this body on record urging all parties to the Geneva Convention to join with the United States in exercising every appropriate action to cause the North Vietnamese to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas the purpose of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, was to prescribe rules for the humane treatment of prisoners of war;

Whereas the Government of North Vietnam, having adhered to that convention on June 28, 1957, is one of the one hundred and thirty-one parties to that convention;

Whereas the Government of North Vietnam has failed to honor its commitment as a signatory nation of the Geneva Convention;

Whereas the Geneva Convention states, contrary to the view of the Government of North Vietnam, that the convention applies to "any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them";

Whereas the International Conference of the Red Cross adopted without dissent and with the support of one hundred and fourteen nations, a resolution calling upon the parties of the Vietnam conflict to abide by the Geneva Convention with respect to the humane treatment of prisoners of war;

Whereas prisoners taken by the United States in Vietnam are identified and accorded humane treatment, including adequate shelter, clothing, food, exercise, and medical care, and released if sick or wounded, all of which actions have been verified by international inspections;

Whereas the Geneva Convention requires the Government of North Vietnam to:

- (1) identify all prisoners of war;
- (2) exercise humanitarian treatment;
- (3) release sick and wounded prisoners;
- (4) protect prisoners from public abuse;
- (5) permit inspection of prisoners and quarters by a neutral party;
- (6) allow the flow of letters and packages;

Whereas the United States is complying with the above provisions of the Geneva Convention: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that all parties to the Geneva Convention should join with the United States in exercising every appropriate action to cause the Government of North Vietnam to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention, and to agree to an arrangement for the rapid exchange of all prisoners of war.*

SEC. 2. The Congress requests and urges the President to transmit a copy of this resolution to the heads of governments of all signatory nations of the Geneva Convention and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

#### REPORT ON BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today the press and public witnessed a performance by the Banking and Currency Committee that was unusual even in a committee famed for unusual procedures. Rules of the House and rules of the committee were not only ignored or broken, they were stomped on.

This committee has, during the past congressional session, been chaired under personal, frequently good-humored, rules of whimsy and caprice, but in today's meeting the personal rules could only be described as autocratic.

Committee members were not recognized; motions were not recognized; points of order were ignored; parliamentary inquiries were unanswered; and preferential motions were not put to vote.

Since an extension of the chairman's one-ring circus was not granted by the committee, many committee members will be content simply to wait for next year and a new deal. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that.

One of the items under consideration related to a bank charter issued within my district. The chairman's original staff study—released to columnist Jack Anderson more than 12 hours before it was released to me and other committee members—had raised questions of irregularity about the issuance of that charter.

I have mentioned my interest in the matter to the chairman twice. On one occasion during the consideration of the housing bill I asked for recognition on a point of personal privilege, and explained my interest to the chairman and the committee. Nevertheless, I was not recognized by the chairman today.

In addition, I had questioned the staff about its report incidentally, I was amazed to find that the staff, which accused others of being evasive in answering questions, was itself remarkably uncommunicative.

Mr. Speaker, since the issuance of that charter has been called into question, there certainly ought to be an investigation by our committee. If there are irregularities, changes in the law, or perhaps indictments, should follow. If the issuance of the charter was within the rules, each one of the people who have been tried in the press because of the staff report should be cleared.

Mr. Speaker, it is also reasonable for our committee to assume oversight obligations concerning the Bank Secrecy Act and transfers of foreign funds, or other funds through foreign banks, into the election processes of this country. Apparently the chairman did not want to conduct this kind of investigation. He apparently wanted to witch hunt against a single candidate. Therefore, a resolution was proposed to subpoena everybody in sight, including all of the telephone companies in the country and a half-dozen buildings.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is a matter of concern to the whole House when any Members are ignored when they wish to speak in committee on matters that pertain to their own districts. This kind of absolute authoritarianism exercised by the chairman is exactly the reason that the seniority system has come into such disrepute in the minds of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to get the time or consideration that is provided to senior, experienced, and wiser Members of this body. However, I believe I should be allowed, as a matter of common courtesy, to make comments on events and conditions that are being referred to within my own district.

Mr. Speaker, these are strong words, but my feelings are strong. The conduct of the committee today is sowing seeds that will be reaped by future Congresses. If we do not change, we will be changed. The primary change required here is a rule to allow a majority of the committee to control the committee's actions, rather than continuing the current practice—autocratic and arbitrary one-man rule.

#### SYMPATHY TO DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am certain all my colleagues join me in a most heartfelt expression of sympathy to our distinguished colleague JIM DELANEY on the recent passing of his beloved wife, Lola. Her passing is a grievous loss to all of us who knew her. She was a beautiful human being, a loving daughter, a devoted wife, and an ideal mother.

It was her warmth and understanding that was such a tremendous help to JIM during his many years of devoted public service to the people of Queens. Lola typified the very best. Her love, companionship and devotion to JIM was an inspiration to us all.

Lola, born in 1901, was the daughter of a prominent Marshfield, Mo., family. She graduated from Hutchinson College in Kansas and then taught elementary school for several years. Later she moved to Manhattan where she pursued a successful career in dress designing and modeling.

It was there that she met JIM, who at that time was an aspiring assistant district attorney in Queens and also Democratic leader in what was then the First District. Lola and JIM were later married in St. Patrick's Cathedral and settled permanently in Queens.

I know what an immeasurable loss her passing is to JIM and her loved ones and I extend my sincere condolences to my friend and colleague JIM, to Lola and JIM's fine son Pat, and Lola's mother and brothers. We shall always cherish our loving thoughts of her.

#### ANTIHIJACKING ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 16191, the Antihijacking Act of 1972. This legislation is designed to help curtail the threat of airplane hijacking and it had my full and strong support.

I wish to take this opportunity, however, to point out that the language of the bill approved by the House differs materially from that adopted in the other body. A conference committee of Members of both Houses of the Congress will now have to be appointed to resolve the differences in the two versions.

One of the differences between the two measures lies in the fact that the other body included the language of a bill I have coauthored to permit the Civil Aeronautics Board to approve the creation of a scale of reduced air fares for senior citizens. As one who has long advocated allowing the elderly to benefit from the same lower rates given to young people I applaud the action of the other body and urge the conferees appointed by the House to favorably consider agreeing to this amendment.

It would have been preferable to have the specific bill for reduced air fares approved but because of the lateness of the session and the reluctance of many to consider this issue, this is now impossible. Therefore, I urge the conferees to seize this opportunity to make this program available to America's senior citizens to whom it would be of the highest value.

#### CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH P. ADDABO REPORTS ON THE 92D CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABO) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ADDABO. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each Congress, it has been my policy to summarize the activities of the Congress, reprint it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at my expense, and mail it to my constituents. This is my 12th such report and I believe this regular communication, together with my other special reports and questionnaires on the issues pending before the House of Representatives, keeps the lines of communication open between my constituents and my Washington office.

The large volume of mail which I receive both in Washington and at my district office and the many meetings which I attend in our district help me learn the thinking of the majority of people I represent in Congress. In deciding how to vote on various bills and in my other activities as a Congressman, I try to re-



flect the will of my constituents. In my last report sent earlier this year, I published the results of my questionnaire on the major issues before the Congress. At this time I would like to discuss those major actions which Congress took during the past 2 years and my position on those measures.

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An increasing number of Congressmen opposed continuation of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam during this 92d Congress. The Senate passed an amendment to withdraw all U.S. forces from Indochina within 4 months conditioned upon the release of American prisoners of war and a full accounting for those missing in action. I offered a similar amendment during consideration of the defense appropriation bill, both in committee and before the full House of Representatives. My amendment was rejected by the closest margin for any end the war amendment in the House since the Vietnam war began.

While Congress was not able to pass such an amendment this year, the frustration and dissatisfaction of the Congress has been made clear to the President. I will continue my efforts to bring about additional congressional pressure for an early end to the war and a shift of emphasis to strengthening domestic programs.

The Middle East crisis continues to present the greatest danger to world security. The tragic and senseless killings of the Israeli Olympic team at Munich, Germany, this year illustrates the uncivilized and violent pressures which exist in that part of the world. I have proposed that all foreign aid to Arab nations which harbor terrorists or any nation which refuses to cooperate in international efforts against terrorists be suspended by the President.

On a trip to Israel earlier this year, I met with Prime Minister Golda Meir to discuss United States-Israel relations. I am convinced that lasting peace can only be brought about in the Middle East through direct negotiations between the parties. In the meantime we must help Israel secure the necessary equipment, including jet aircraft, to defend herself against attack.

#### SELECT SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

My other committee assignment in the House is the House Select Committee on Small Business and last year I was named chairman of a Subcommittee on Minority Enterprise. During the past 2 years we have held extensive hearings on small business loan programs in an effort to make sure that the moneys appropriated are being used wisely and are actually helping those who need assistance. Additional hearings will be held next year because we are not satisfied that this particular program has been administered in the best interests of small business firms or minority enterprises.

Our committee also held hearings on national fuel and energy requirements which lead me to propose the establishment of a national power grid to prevent power failures, blackouts, and

brownouts such as those which plagued the New York metropolitan area for the past few years. I am hopeful that Congress will act in this area during the next session.

#### EDUCATION

The President vetoed two bills which would have provided increased funds for education. I voted for those measures and will continue to support increased spending to upgrade local education programs. In our own community I have fought for adequate funding for York College and the need for school construction and modernization throughout the country must be met before the situation becomes a crisis.

#### TAX REFORM

The 92d Congress did not tackle the complex problem of tax reform although it is now apparent that this will be one of the first items for hearing and debate in the 93d Congress. I have supported efforts in the House to bring about meaningful tax reform by plugging loopholes in the law and providing relief for middle- and low-income taxpayers. The subject of property tax relief will be thoroughly explored next year and I will be interested in any proposed relief which does not require large tax increases or the imposition of a national sales tax. The latter would be regressive and would hurt those who can least afford it.

#### DRUGS

The Congress authorized the establishment of a Special Drug Abuse Action Office in the White House to coordinate all Federal programs to control the problem of drug abuse. I voted for this proposal and have worked for adequate appropriations to increase the number of customs agents and other law enforcement personnel needed to stop the spread of narcotics. I also supported amendments to cut off foreign aid to nations which fail to help us stop the trafficking of drugs at their source. We must also pay special attention to the needs of returning veterans, both in terms of medical treatment and rehabilitation programs and providing maximum employment opportunities.

#### CONSUMER LEGISLATION

The consumer movement in America has had a significant impact on the Congress as in other parts of our society. The Federal departments and agencies are recognizing the need for consumer involvement and participation in more and more programs through advisory councils and appointments to local planning boards with responsibility for the disbursement of program funds. Two major consumer bills passed by the House are the consumer protection agency bill which would authorize consumer representation at the Federal level in the regulatory process and in litigation and the product safety bill which would set Federal standards for the safety of thousands of products sold in the United States. I have sponsored versions of these bills as well as a measure to regulate cosmetic products which may present health hazards to some consumers.

#### HEALTH

The 92d Congress could be characterized as a health minded Congress. A number of bills were passed and some were vetoed by the President but passed again by Congress. The House acted to increase expenditures for health manpower training to meet demand for additional physicians and nurses, construction of hospitals and modernization of all health facilities, expansion of the medicare program to include the disabled and establishment of a national attack on the causes of cancer, heart disease, and sickle cell and Cooley's anemia.

The 93d Congress will continue to consider wide-ranging health legislation including the subject of national health insurance to protect all Americans from the staggering costs of health care.

#### ENVIRONMENT

Of local as well as national interest was the passage of the Gateway National Park bill which I originally sponsored in the House. The park has been renamed the William Fitts Ryan Gateway National Recreation Area in memory of our colleague from New York who passed away last month. I believe this measure will provide enjoyment for millions of Americans by protecting the unique resources of Jamaica Bay and other areas at the entrance to New York Harbor. The bill will also end proposals to expand Kennedy Airport into the bay thereby aggravating the aircraft noise and pollution problems. I will now press for the funds necessary to make the plan a reality.

We also voted increased funds to combat air and water pollution, an action which I supported in the Appropriations Committee. We also voted additional funds for sewage treatment assistance but I have been disappointed at the lack of administration willingness to spend the appropriated sums in that area. I was indeed pleased to have funded, opened, and now operating a Federal assisted sewage treatment plant at Spring Creek.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Congress voted to increase social security benefits by 20 percent and make future increases automatic as the cost of living increases. We must bring social security payments up to a realistic level if we are to keep older Americans off the welfare rolls and make their retirement years enjoyable and secure, and make provisions that increases in social security do not result in diminishing other pension receipts or benefits.

#### APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

As a member of the important House Appropriations Committee, I have had a unique opportunity to participate in decisions involving the reshaping of our Nation's priorities. In that regard I was pleased though far from satisfied with the action of our committee and the House in cutting more than \$4.2 billion from the requested Defense Department appropriation bill. I was successful in offering an amendment to reduce spending for the antiballistic missile system, deleting construction of an ABM site around Washington, D.C. Our committee also recommended that the Navy

drop plans to reduce medical services at St. Albans Hospital.

In addition to my votes to make responsible cuts in defense and space spending, I was very active in the fight against the supersonic transport last

year. The noise and environmental problems so well known to residents of my district near Kennedy Airport would have been compounded by the SST project.

On the positive side, I voted in our

committee to increase Federal spending for programs related to basic human needs, such as education, health, day care, employment opportunities, and programs to provide improved social services to our elderly and young people.

# ACTIONS ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY CONSIDERED IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 92D CONG., 2D SESS. (REVISED TO SEPT. 30, 1972)

Does not include any "back-door" type budget or spending authority in legislative bills; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority, under earlier or "permanent" law,<sup>1</sup> without further or annual action by the Congress]

Bill and fiscal year	House actions			Senate actions		Enacted	(+) or (-), latest action compared with budget requests
	Budget requests considered	Reported by committee	Approved by House	Budget requests considered	Approved by Senate		
A. Bills for fiscal 1973:							
1. Legislative (H.R. 13955)	\$433,627,004	\$427,604,764	\$427,604,764	\$519,347,899	\$514,722,880	\$513,787,980	-\$5,559,919
2. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary (H.R. 14989)	4,687,988,600	4,585,054,350	4,587,104,350	4,704,326,600	4,820,717,769		+116,391,169
3. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans (H.R. 15093)	20,173,185,000	19,718,490,000	19,718,490,000	20,258,183,000	20,583,370,000	20,125,951,000	-132,232,000
4. Transportation (H.R. 15097)	3,040,362,095	2,891,060,095	2,922,795,095	3,040,362,095	3,038,175,095	2,999,118,095	-41,244,000
Fiscal year 1973 amounts only	(2,909,181,095)	(2,759,879,095)	(2,791,614,095)	(2,909,181,095)	(2,906,994,095)	(2,867,937,095)	(-41,244,000)
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds) (H.R. 15259)	343,306,000	332,306,000	332,306,000	343,306,000	313,706,000	316,393,000	-26,913,000
6. Labor-HEW (H.R. 15417, Vetoes)	[27,327,323,500]	[28,239,346,500]	[28,603,179,500]	[28,767,633,500]	[31,354,930,500]	[30,538,919,500]	+1,771,286,000
7. Labor-HEW (H.R. 16654, New bill)	28,767,633,500	29,603,448,500	29,603,484,500	28,767,633,500	30,538,919,500		+1,771,286,000
8. Interior (H.R. 15418)	2,520,340,000	2,529,558,200	2,529,558,200	2,527,154,000	2,550,922,800	2,548,935,300	+21,781,300
9. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government (H.R. 15585)	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	5,057,145,000	5,066,603,000	5,057,186,000	5,057,827,000	-8,776,000
10. Public Works-AEC (H.R. 15586)	5,489,058,000	5,437,727,000	5,437,727,000	5,489,058,000	5,571,696,000	5,504,914,000	+15,856,000
11. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 15690)	12,952,177,400	12,897,010,900	12,897,010,900	12,952,190,400	13,561,055,800	13,434,032,700	+481,842,300
12. Disaster Relief Supplemental, 1973 (H.R. 16254)	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	1,587,300,000	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	1,587,300,000	+17,500,000
13. Defense (H.R. 16593)	79,594,184,000	75,227,048,000	75,227,048,000				-4,367,136,000
14. Foreign Assistance (H.R. 16705)	5,163,024,000	4,195,155,000	4,195,155,000	5,163,024,000	2,823,897,000		-2,339,127,000
15. Military Construction (H.R. 16754)	2,661,384,000	2,278,675,000	2,280,784,000				-380,600,000
16. Supplemental, 1973 (H.R. —)							
Total, bills for fiscal 1973	172,462,672,599	166,676,582,809	166,803,476,809	90,400,988,494	90,961,668,844	52,088,259,075	-4,876,931,150
B. Bills for fiscal 1972:							
1. Urgent Supplemental (H.J. Res. 1097)	957,476,059	957,476,059	957,476,059	957,476,059	957,476,059	957,476,059	
2. 2d Supplemental (H.R. 14582)	4,775,261,477	4,124,123,358	3,954,453,358	4,865,943,389	5,063,517,439	4,347,698,270	-518,245,119
3. Special Resolution, Gold Revaluation (H.J. Res. 1174)	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	
4. Supplemental, Disaster Relief (H.J. Res. 1238)	100,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	100,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	+100,000,000
Total, bills for fiscal 1972	7,432,737,536	6,881,599,417	6,711,929,417	7,523,419,448	7,820,993,498	7,105,174,329	-418,245,119
C. Cumulative totals for the session:							
1. House	179,895,410,135	173,649,182,226	173,515,406,226				-6,380,003,909
2. Senate				97,924,407,942	98,782,662,342		+858,254,400
3. Enacted				59,289,423,842		59,193,433,404	-95,990,438

<sup>1</sup> The Budget for 1973, as submitted Jan. 24, tentatively estimated total new budget authority for 1973 at \$294,813,000,000 gross (\$270,898,000,000 net of some \$23,915,000,000 interfund and intragovernmental transactions and certain so-called proprietary receipts handled as offsets for budget summary purposes only). Of this total, an estimated \$109,754,000,000 does not require current action by Congress; it involves so-called permanent appropriations such as interest, various trust funds, etc., already provided for in various basic laws. The remainder, \$185,059,000,000, is for consideration at this session (mostly in the appropriation bills). About \$14,394,000,000 of this \$185,059,000,000 was shown in the January budget as being "for later transmittal" for new or expanded legislation, pay increases, and contingencies, and about \$45,817,000,000 of

the remainder requires legislative reauthorization through various annual authorization bills or where the authorization expires periodically.

\* Reflects deletion on House floor, by point of order, of \$170,000,000 for Amtrak.

\* "Not to exceed."

\* Excludes the \$490,000,000 proposal in the 1973 budget for "proposed legislation" for Urban Community Development Revenue Sharing which the Senate bill "considered".

\* As reported.

Source: Prepared Sept. 30, 1972, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

## MY WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK OFFICES

One of my most important duties as your Representative is to assist the people of the Seventh Congressional District with their individual problems involving the Federal Government. I try to be available at all times to constituents who wish to speak with me and as time permits, I attend meetings and other functions of various civic, fraternal, veterans, and religious organizations in the district.

For the convenience of my constituents, I maintain a full-time district office and my office in Washington is always ready to assist you. Please write or call me at room 2440 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 or at 96-11 101st Avenue, Ozone Park, N.Y. 11416.

## RESOLUTION VOTED DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5 minutes, trusting I will have the understanding of those present and the officers of the House who of necessity must remain here on duty at this late hour.

This morning the committee to which I belong, the Committee on Banking and Currency, by a vote of 20 to 15 voted down a resolution which would have empowered the committee to in turn authorize the chairman to issue subpoenas in order to fully look into this matter associated with the very questionable practice of foreign financial transactions through foreign banks and other financial institutions in a direct involvement in our election process and procedures here in America.

The argument was emotional, the atmosphere was naturally charged, because this is an election season and we have a highly partisan problem dominating these debates.

The minority party Members on a straight party vote did everything in their power to obstruct any kind of successful consideration of this motion.

I find it very difficult to reconcile the logic used by them and by those who argued along these lines against the resolution. They said, "Oh, it will jeopardize the rights of some who have been indicted." That means, then, that their prime reasoning is that any time the U.S. Attorney General decides to indict somebody, he will, therefore, preclude any legislative committee from looking into any matter connected directly or indirectly.

I think this is an abominable proposition. It is far from being germane to the main issue involved at this time. The reason why I say that is because ever since 1966 I have unsuccessfully attempted to get the attention of my colleagues in and out of the committee to look into these very same practices, because ever since that year and even be-



fore that I was aware of the fact that there was a heavy flow of money from foreign countries, mysterious and not completely accounted for but somehow reported.

For example, in Texas in 1966 in the U.S. Senate race there was a sworn affidavit reporting the receipt of over \$45,000 in that race from Germany, from German institutions. They were never explained. It was never known exactly what motivated that heavy flow of money into a purely domestic race in the State of Texas.

In the most recent case, which is what we were trying to get at in the committee, we found there was involved a heavy amount of money from Mexico and what I call "wetback dollars." We have been used to the wetbacks with respect to labor, but this is the first time we have had such a dramatic exposition of a heavy inflow of questionable and what I consider to be illegal and alien wetback dollars directly involving themselves in our most serious democratic processes, which should be immune from this type of interference.

I think that the Congress has long had the responsibility to look into this matter. From a legislative standpoint we have to know whether or not the existing statutes are sufficient; whether or not they need reform; whether or not we should add new ones; whether or not we should correct the ones we have; and whether or not we should expose hitherto undiscovered increments of money that have come from foreign and unaccounted-for sources into the middle of our election processes.

I deplore the fact that our committee by a vote of 20 to 15 voted against a vote of confidence in our ability to be able to legislate and voted against confidence in ourselves to remain immune from the siren call of partisan politics. I feel it is urgent that this Congress and this particular committee that I belong to assume their responsibility and look into it.

After all, it would seem to me almost any kind of work this committee would undertake along this line would have to go beyond the election date, anyway. It would make no difference as far as the outcome of the election is concerned.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance, I first requested permission of the chairman to let the subcommittee look into it. He felt—and rightfully so—that it was such an important matter that the entire committee should assume that responsibility. Today I have again requested the permission of the chairman for the subcommittee to look into the matter.

#### SOVIET HEAD TAX ON JEWISH EMIGRANTS: A MATTER OF QUID PRO QUO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday together with my able colleague from New York, the Honorable LESTER WOLFF, I introduced legis-

lation which would amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to prohibit the application of the most favored nation principle to certain countries who charge exorbitant or more than nominal exit fees to citizens who desire to emigrate to other countries. As the bill states, the intent of the amendment is to discourage nations, desiring closer trade relations with this country, the right to deny its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate to the country of their choice. This, then, is the clear intent of my bill to exert what leverage this Nation possesses, to exert the pressure of public opinion and the sense of moral outrage of free men everywhere over any attempts by any government in the family of nations to deny its citizens the right of emigration.

There is no point in obscuring the chief target, namely the Soviet Union, which has for some time been engaged through one device or another in attempts to discourage the emigration of Soviet Jews from the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union lately has hit upon the device of what can only be considered exorbitant exit taxes or fees for those Soviet Jews desiring to emigrate. Thus, while neither officially nor by law denying the right of emigration outright, the net effect of demanding what amounts to a ransom in amounts ranging from \$5,000 to \$30,000 is to deny this right of emigration to those attempting to exercise it. Mind you, these fees are all in addition to the usual fee of \$1,000 which could already be considered discouragement enough for many prospective emigrants.

Practically every Member of this House at one time or another has joined in one resolution or another to put this House and Congress on record as opposed to these schemes. The net result, however, can only be considered disappointing. The Soviets seem intent on ignoring world opinion, as they so often do, in this particular matter. One understands how upset the leaders of Russia must be over the expressed desire of so many of its well educated citizens to leave for other countries. However, instead of tackling the problem at its root and making life in the Soviet Union more palatable and hospitable to those of the Jewish faith, the Soviet Union seems to have taken the easier course of fining their desire to leave out of existence. I am sure that even the most bureaucratic Russian official has to see that in the long run this policy is doomed to failure and indeed exacerbates an already potentially explosive situation.

I suppose the knowledge that this will be the long-range result of present Soviet policies will at first give comfort to men of good will around the world. However, the chief drawback to this approach of watchful waiting for the Soviets to change their policies of their own accord is that in the meantime, over the period of however many years it will take, fundamental human liberties and freedoms are being denied and a people's future and religious customs are in greater jeopardy, each day these practices continue. Consequently, men of good will have been forced to search for more immediate means of bringing pressure

of public opinion outside Soviet Russia to bear on Russian leaders.

Now, some at first may feel a certain uneasiness about interfering in what might seem to be the internal affairs of another nation. However, since time immemorial mankind has recognized no national boundaries when it becomes incensed over officially sanctioned denials of fundamental human rights whenever they occur, whatever the country. Our own struggling colonists were the chief beneficiaries of sympathetic public opinion in their struggle against the might of the British Empire; similar feelings flowed to the democratic cause in the French Revolution. There was even widespread sympathy for those who overthrew the czarist regime in Russia, not too long ago, which subsequent controversies over the merits and demerits of successor governments and political philosophies have long since obscured. The practical fact of life is that no government today can either ignore world opinion totally or order it to keep out of its internal affairs and go about the business of denying people fundamental freedoms. Not long ago, the hue and cry was for an end to the systematic persecution and harassment in daily Russian life of those of the Jewish faith. The fact that Russia chose to ignore world opinion then brought us inevitably to today's demand of "let my people go."

In searching for the most available means of influencing Russian attitudes where it will do the most good, it did not take long to conclude that the Ways and Means Committee will have shortly under its consideration proposals to grant Russia most-favored-nation status in trade relations with this country. Consequently, it seemed totally opportune and altogether fitting and proper to serve notice both to trading negotiators in the administration and to their counterparts in the Soviet Union that we intend to put pressure on the Soviets where they might respond. Where else but their pocketbooks? This bill will make it incumbent upon the administration to explore the emigration laws and policies of nonmarket nations and to report to Congress as to whether these policies and laws constitute fair and equitable treatment of emigrants or whether on the contrary are tantamount to outright discrimination against potential emigrants. In my opinion, such legislation is not just timely, it is even overdue. In my opinion, this is one of those rare bills which in its very filing and with any cosponsors it manages to attract will serve a vital purpose and accomplish its objective of influencing the course of events even before passage. Because of its psychological potential, it would be the height of good sense to sponsor this bill even in the full knowledge that this Congress has only a few more days to run. A bill like this should be before the public and in the minds of our trade negotiators in the interlude before the next Congress convenes.

#### DIPLOMATS WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, personal diplomacy has a dangerous history—especially when it is applied to geopolitics. In the last few years we have been treated to more globetrotting summit diplomats than we can afford, especially when so many of them are without portfolio.

Opposing political parties have historically challenged incumbent foreign policies and at election time the steam emanating from charges and countercharges would run an engine, but I cannot ever remember a precedent for a man who obviously has utilized his former cabinet status to gain entry and apparent cooperation from the camp and capital of an enemy of the United States.

Ramsey Clark has perpetrated a monumental disservice to world diplomacy, given aid and comfort to the enemy, and jeopardized the patient and tedious efforts of those in our Government who are officially entrusted with negotiations. And worse, he has toyed with the frailty of human emotion by echoing the subtle propaganda of the enemy—promising what no man can promise, for political—or perhaps personal gain.

I have come to accept some changes in my time, but I will never endorse any concept which calls for collaboration while our troops are still in foxholes. I wonder what our pilots thought who read about the collaboration of Ramsey Clark, before leaving on a mission—and I wonder what thoughts would have crossed my mind as I sat in a wrecked glider in Normandy—if that morning I had seen a picture of one of our former Cabinet members smiling with Adolf Hitler.

We dealt with three of nature's noblemen during World War II and if they proved nothing else they proved that indication of weakness was abhorrent to them, and the oriental was the most dedicated of the three to this premise. History tends to repeat itself and the masters of guile and deception in Hanoi, make the two ambassadors who stood in Secretary Simpson's office while Pearl Harbor was bombed, look like rank amateurs.

Yet my namesake—to my sorrow—was taken on a guided tour, talked to some news editor—of all people—and has come up with no real plan, but a helluva lot of windy charges which add up to a VC Communist echo, the United States is an immoral "aggressor"—even while hundreds of thousands of North Vietnamese troops attack civilian-populated cities. They accuse our planes of indiscriminate bombing, while for 7 years they have thrown rockets and shells into the most heavily populated areas, they could contrive the assistance of the world press in portraying the—admittedly reprehensible—massacre at My Lai, while butchering thousands of the avowed southern brothers as object lessons for those who chose to oppose them.

It seems to me incredible that a man of Ramsey Clark's background and edu-

cation could be this naive, but it is also sickening to me that he would then assist the enemy in helping to publicize their monstrous perfidy. We admit what we are doing in defense of a people against an invasion and our military weekly publishes the statistics of war, regardless of how unpleasant they may seem. The Hanoi government consistently denied, until the most recent resumption of massive assault—that they even had combat troops in South Vietnam.

If, as Mr. Clark seemingly chooses to believe, Hanoi is intent only upon the "unification" of their war-torn country—and that all Vietnamese are really "brothers" who need no international interference, why is it that the pitiful columns of refugees that are caught up in the wake of each and every battle, never choose to head—north?

#### NEW HIGHWAYS IMPEDING NATURAL DRAINAGE PATTERNS

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent request I am today introducing a piece of legislation that will be of importance and significance to many farmers. It is neither a costly nor a complex bill.

My proposal requires assurances, in the form of an impact statement by State Highway Departments, that highways planned with Federal aid money will not disrupt drainage patterns on land through which they pass. The drainage impact statement is to be made for the Soil Conservation Service and their approval of the same is necessary before Federal funds can be used to carry out the project.

In my own Fourth Congressional District of Indiana the need for such legislation has been brought home to me.

When new highways are constructed, particularly in rural areas, they impede natural drainage patterns, much as a dam would impede the flow of a river.

Agricultural drainage is a complex task, depending on the interlocking of series of field tile and natural drainage channels. A blockage at any point in the system can alter entire patterns of drainage.

The problems caused by diverting a drainage way as the result of highway construction can often have an impact on the drainage of farms several miles from the construction site.

When a drainage pattern is severely changed by road construction, individual landowners may be forced to spend thousands of dollars in developing new tile and ditch systems. Water, forced by the highways into inadequate outlets or open ditches, can produce damage including increased soil erosion both on the roadway and in fields that line it.

It is, however, possible through engineering design of the highway drainage system to construct roads in such a way that these adverse effects are prevented. To do so would not, in most cases, in-

crease the cost of construction. It could, in some cases, increase the cost of planning and design.

There is now no explicit requirement that highway construction authorities take positive steps to make sure that highway construction does not alter drainage patterns so as to place an undue burden on adjoining landowners. Facts concerning drainage can be considered in determining payment for damages involving the highway construction, but there is no practical way for injured parties to press their claim for better design short of tangled legal procedures such as inverse condemnation suits, et cetera.

This bill would require that agencies responsible for construction of roadways using Federal funds determine the effect of the construction on drainage and take steps to assure that the engineering design of the project will be adequate to prevent disruption of the drainage pattern.

#### THE MORAL ISSUE OF VIETNAM

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a highly respected, articulate, and experienced member of the clergy, John J. Morrett, recently discussed the moral issue of Vietnam.

Reverend Morrett, minister of St. Albans Episcopal Church, Columbus, Ohio, went to Vietnam. He is knowledgeable. He was a prisoner of war in World War II. He is objective and finally, unlike many of his colleagues in the ministry, Reverend Morrett supports his nation:

#### THE MORAL ISSUE OF VIETNAM

(By The Reverend John J. Morrett)

I wish to deal with a sensitive and hard subject much on the minds of the American people—"The Moral Issue of Vietnam."

Statements have been made by many clergy and rabbis, demonstrations conducted, forums held, resolutions passed by a variety of church denominations strongly opposing America's involvement in the war, and in most cases, pressing for immediate unilateral withdrawal. Many call it "a crisis of conscience". Its implications have become so deep for us that the whole nation has become divided in controversy over it. I will express myself as a Christian minister who holds a different view to most of my fellow clergy, and, in fact, to some of the expressed statements of such important bodies as the World Council of Churches, The Synagogue Council of America, The National Council of Churches, and our own Executive Council of the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. who in May 1970 called for unilateral withdrawal.

Opposed to such statements, but not entirely sure of my ground, I went to Vietnam in the summer of 1970 and traveled throughout the country from the DMZ to the Mekong Delta. I saw infantrymen going out on patrol, and from a helicopter, bodies of dead who were killed in combat. I saw many things which for some would support all that has been critically said about Vietnam—"a dirty war" and a "colossal human blunder". I, too, agree every war is a dirty war and every war is a colossal human blunder.

As I have studied the background of this present conflict ten thousand miles from our



shores, I have noted that four presidents, beginning with President Eisenhower, have had to face the complex political and military problems of Vietnam. Each one of them, I believe as honorable men, dealt with this sad little warring country using the best judgment he could, to help it. Out of a variety of alternatives, each one could have handled the situation differently. As President and Commander-in-Chief of the United States Armed Forces, each had to make critical decisions. Every president sits in what we can call "The Hot Seat" and as President Truman put it, "The buck stops here." Ever since we escalated our forces from being military advisors under President Kennedy to ground, air and naval combat forces under President Johnson, peaking in 1969 to 549,500 men in the field, many people, and particularly youth and clergy, have been pressing for us to get out of Vietnam. From their point of view it was and still is an immoral war. They call for two things: (1) Admission of a mistake of judgment on getting into it, and (2) immediate withdrawal of all Armed Forces which in turn should insure the return of our prisoners of war from North Vietnam, South Vietnam and Laos.

The first proposition looks back toward the history of the situation, now well known but important to summarize briefly for the purpose of this paper. It is related to the request of South Vietnam for military help, at the time of President Kennedy. It was then, as it is now, a small constitutional government democratically oriented facing a serious problem of communist infra-structure. This was conducted by the Vietcong who sought, as it does today, to overthrow by all sorts of insurgency tactics the established government. The Vietcong were being given support in a clandestine way by the North Vietnamese Communist government.

Again an historical occurrence ties into the moral issue. In 1954 a treaty called "The Geneva Accords" partitioned the country, anticipating that in two years an internationally supervised election could be held and the internal strife between political forces of the north and south could be settled. The Geneva Accords was a sincere effort to settle both a divided Korea and a divided Vietnam and was initiated by the peace-seeking intentions of Great Britain, France and the United States, with the Soviet Union also brought in as a participant. Refugees at the time of the temporary establishment of a Demilitarized Zone could go either north or south, and the great bulk of them by far went south. Neither South Vietnam nor the U.S. signed the Accords for their own specific reasons. South Vietnam agreed to support the cease-fire, but objected to the partition of the country. The U.S. also expressed concern over the partition, but said we would do nothing to disturb the agreements. We did add, "We would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security." Well-planned efforts toward resolving conflict for nations, as well as for marriages and labor-management strife, often go awry. The south declined to enter into election proceedings feeling there could not be held a fair election in Communist North. Since neither North nor South Vietnam were signatories to the United Nations Charter, this international organization had no responsibility to resolve the dilemma.

One, of course, can get into a morass of history about the problems of Vietnam beginning as far back as one wants to go and which have implications for where it is today. Other nations have dominated it like the Chinese, who occupied it for 1,000 years, the French who colonized it, the Japanese who occupied it in WWII, and the Americans, who have tried to defend the south from communist aggression. Struggling for na-

tional identity in the most recent years, the single hero of the existing move toward independence within the communist ideology is Ho Chi Minh. In 1958 he completed a ruthless land reform program in the north which killed an estimated 100,000 people, and in 1962 his government announced a People's Revolutionary Party in South Vietnam.

To my way of thinking this is important history, but it is now academic. It is unfruitful and divisive to try to go back and say our involvement in the tugs and pulls between North and South Vietnam were at the beginning all wrong and what we have now is an immoral war. On the basis of international diplomacy, the nations of the world have for centuries involved themselves in all kinds of treaty agreements based in large measure on political bonds, military defense positions and economic arrangements to further their best interests. Such agreements are implemented on a basis of political morality probably most prominently illustrated today in the United Nations Charter. Countries that enter into these agreements must honor their obligations which in a very real sense become binding on people living within such countries. If they do not honor them, the nation itself falls into a condition of international immorality. In the case of southeast Asia for the United States to abandon Thailand and Indochina to what is now clearly communist aggression, or the part of the North Vietnamese, would be highly immoral and illicit abrogation of our serious commitment as a member nation to the SEATO agreement.

Article IV (1) states:

"Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the Treaty area against any of the Parties or against any state or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." Moreover, "by protocol to the Treaty the Parties unanimously extended the protection of the Treaty to the states of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the state of Vietnam."

It should be very clear on this matter that willful and unconcealable violation of a Treaty obligation like this would render as suspect all other U.S. agreements present and in the future, real or potential. International agreements of course can be revised by Congressional action, but unless done properly could create legal and moral dilemmas of fantastic proportions for the United States and in time discredit and emasculate our negotiating efforts abroad.

With this serious point of view in mind, the Bureau of Public Affairs of the State Department has set forth in clear and concise form the legal nature of our present obligations in Indochina. Under President Nixon's administration a legal position has been taken which has to do with the collective self-defense authorized by the U.N. Charter. Other legal positions having to do with the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the SEATO Treaty and respect for the neutrality wishes of Laos and Cambodia who have been occupied by North Vietnam forces for so many years, are included in the legal statements.

I conclude, therefore, it is a useless argument calling for admission of a mistake of judgment for our getting into the war. When counseling people in marital difficulty, I find it is fruitless to spend endless time trying to decide who is at fault. This generally intensifies the conflict and polarizes positions. Therefore, I disagree with the churches' recent moralizing resolutions, all extremely well meaning, but thus far futile, failing to take into account the political morality involved and generally doing nothing to resolve an already complex and terrible struggle within the Vietnam family.

On my second point, removal of all Armed

Forces, which in turn should insure the return of our prisoners of war, herein I find a real moral issue and the most difficult to solve. Presidents, Congress and in fact by our taxes and our military personnel in Vietnam, we have committed ourselves as a nation to the support of South Vietnam, being disrupted internally by the Vietcong and attacked from without by the North Vietnamese. The Vietcong strategy of terrorism is now well documented and is a colossal and terrifying story of killing, kidnapping, violent attacks on a peaceful civilian population and planned disruption of the established government in Saigon. In South Vietnam religions flourish, particularly Catholicism and Buddhism. The many churches, temples and shrines give the tourist the impression it is not unlike the deeply religious country of Austria. Democratic elections are periodically held and the economy is progressing at a fantastic rate. These continue even in the face of an obvious aggression on the part of the North Vietnamese who in recent months have leveled the provincial cities of Quang Tri, Kon Tum and An Loc. Refugees from these cities, almost one million, still have gone south and not north, indicating they do not want communism. I believe this blatant aggression is morally indefensible, and in fact the serious reason why we must have standing military strength still involved in a country that cries for peace. In the simplest terms there is one obvious way for us to stop bombing North Vietnam, mining its harbors and totally withdrawing our forces, and that is for the north to stop aggressive destructive attacks on the people and government of the south. Morally committed in this year 1972 to the defense of the South Vietnamese people, we cannot release our responsibility to them until their internal peace is secure. There are many important international ramifications to this position but its substance, I believe, is clear to the majority of the American people.

Probably today the most agonizing aspect of the second point I made at the outset of this address on the moral issue is the prisoner of war problem. I feel this matter deeply, having been a prisoner of war of the Japanese in World War II, and I am keenly aware of the anxiety and pain this caused my parents and friends for over two years and a half.

In South Vietnam there are now 36,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese in prison camps while an estimated 1,770 Americans are listed as POWs or Missing in Action (MIA). There is no clear estimate of South Vietnamese held as prisoners in the north. In the south the POW camps are systematically inspected by the International Red Cross following the guidelines of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949 having to do with treatment of war prisoners. I visited in the summer of 1970 the POW camp at Bien Hoa and was satisfied with what I saw as a humane confinement of a prisoner of war. South Vietnam on August 24, 1972, offered to repatriate 600 sick and wounded NVA POWs but the offer was curtly rejected. North Vietnam with great publicity, has announced the release of three Americans recently to anti-war leaders in the United States.

The prisoners of war issue has been a major block in the Paris Peace Talks since they were initiated. The United States delegates have repeatedly stressed that the treatment of POWs is a humane consideration separate from political and military issues . . . that the government of North Vietnam is obligated to comply with the Geneva Convention of 1949. In 1957 the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam notified the Swiss government of its adherence to the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, yet in contrast to the South Vietnamese, they have repeatedly refused to allow their camps to be inspected by the IRC. They see an attempt to use our prisoners as political hostages.

On October 7, 1970, President Nixon pro-

posed the immediate release of all POWs on both sides to eliminate their block to negotiations in Paris. In December the government of South Vietnam proposed with U.S. concurrence, as a first step, the release of all North Vietnam POWs held in South Vietnam—an estimated 8,000 men—in return for the release of all American and free world prisoners in Indochina and any South Vietnamese POWs held outside South Vietnam—an estimated 800 men. This offer and others for the repatriation of sick and wounded have been rejected. This, in my opinion, is one of the most serious conflicts we face with the North Vietnamese and proposals that we withdraw our forces without a clear solution to it by negotiation in my opinion is morally indefensible.

This brings us to the broad issue of the prolongation of the war and continuous efforts to find a solution. President Nixon, like a number of his predecessors, inherited Vietnam as a national problem of deep involvement and national commitment which no ideology against war can now eliminate. Upon assuming office he embarked on a logical process which for several years now I have called "responsible disengagement". I discovered in my visit to Vietnam, asking questions, observing, doing a lot of listening and general exposure, that our country had embarked upon a wise and responsible program to get out, and yet at the same time fulfill our moral commitment to the established government in the south.

It was based on two primary objectives: (1) Build up a war-torn nation so it could operate responsibly and defensively by itself, even in the face of aggression, and (2) establish a strong viable economic and political system in order to support itself. These two efforts were called "Vietnamization" and "Pacification".

These were new words for me, but they took on real clarity as I learned and saw for myself the transition of military responsibility moving from Americans to South Vietnamese. It was obvious this process would be technically difficult for the Air Force and, therefore, would take the longest period of time. It could happen most quickly with the Navy and move in a progressive, deliberate fashion with the Army over several years. As I sat in on daily combat briefings, it was, in a sense, a thrilling thing to watch the patient educational process at work.

Particularly with our chaplains, I was impressed with pacification—the building of schools, hospitals and medical clinics, the dispersal of health advisory teams in the hamlets, the introduction of animal husbandry and more productive grains of rice, etc. Here again Americans and Vietnamese together were patiently at work rebuilding this small nation still at war. Having been a missionary to China, this kind of American involvement was my cup of tea so to speak, and I identified with our many Americans, military and civilian, dedicated to nation-building efforts. Under this program local defense forces were organized to protect the peasant people in the hamlets and villages subject to the surprise attacks of the Vietcong. I was introduced to hamlet chiefs and members of local militia, many of them young girls and old men ready to defend their little communities from sudden subversive attack.

Seeing all this for myself I was proud to be an American in Vietnam and to see our country help shoulder the terrible burden put on a little agricultural nation whose people had determined they would stay independent and free of militant communism. Here is a magnificent story about Vietnam which never seems to be told.

Statistically Vietnamization has, as of this writing, reduced our forces from an authorized high of 549,500 military in July 1969 to 37,500 in August 1972. Defense spending has been reduced from 42.8% of the national budget in 1968 to 31% of the budget in 1972.

A tremendous volume of important facts and figures has been accumulated on pacification programs which up to now have been an unknown experience in the destructive process of war—nation building at the time an aggressor has been trying to destroy it.

As I see it the third primary aspect of "responsible disengagement" has been negotiation. In preparation for this address I have gone to Washington to talk with people deeply involved and informed about this knotty subject. I believe the whole world is aware of the fact that our numerous administrations involved with Vietnam, beginning as far back as the Geneva Accords of 1954, have sent American emissaries abroad to negotiate a settlement. In talking one morning with a member of the State Department negotiating team, he stated to me that at this point North Vietnam was still unprepared to make any serious accommodations to settle the war. This is after five years of talking and no appreciable headway. The north had sacrificed an estimated 750,000 of their own people and an upward figure to that in the south have been killed, maybe more. They cling tenaciously to the single political objective, the overthrow of the Saigon regime.

In large measure today I am going to place some of this sad and horrible intransigency on the well-meaning backs of the anti-war groups including the churches who have continued to press for unilateral withdrawal. I have read carefully the book entitled, "Vietnam: Crisis of Conscience" written by Robert McAfee Brown, Abraham J. Hershel and Michael Novak, published in 1967. Obviously it was published at the time the anti-Vietnam sentiment was at its height. It states on the cover page, "The war in Vietnam is impossible to justify. An appeal to the moral urgency, rallying Catholic, Jew, and Protestant to join in bold steps to end the conflict". The present administration over the past 3½ years has done the major things suggested in this book to get out of the war with the exception of unilateral withdrawal which I feel would be highly immoral. It has been estimated that unilateral withdrawal would conceivably cause a bloodbath of 3,000,000 people. When some Americans talk as if this never would happen, they just haven't done their homework. I refer them to "Vietcong Repression and Its Implications for the Future" by Stephen T. Hosmer, May 1970.

But my point is that visits to Hanoi by men like Ramsey Clark, off-the-cuff statements by Senator George McGovern that President Thieu should seek asylum in the U.S. after a post-war settlement, the offer of American clergy to serve as hostages for our POWs to the Premier of North Vietnam, only cloud negotiation proceedings and give unnecessary hope to Hanoi. A fundamental aim to conclude a war is to break the will of the enemy. From this point of view conscientious and well-meaning religious people are in fact aiding and abetting the enemy and, in hard reality, are prolonging the war themselves by expressions of hope for Hanoi.

While in Washington recently I picked up President Nixon's report to Congress, "U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's: The Emerging Structure for Peace". This was sent to Congress February 9, 1972. In my opinion Americans, particularly young Americans who are the future of our country, should read this document. It covers the world which in this late twentieth century has become a family of nations. Along with a most important section on Vietnam, in large measure dealing with the negotiations, it covers the major areas of substantive change—the Soviet Union, China, Europe, and the Atlantic Alliance. It covers continents in continuing transition like East Asia, Latin America, Africa, etc. Time does not permit me to go into any summary description of the document but it is a clear grasp of the condition of the world family of nations in this decade. All fami-

lies to live in peace together must negotiate at times and learn to live together with their differences. I would say North Vietnam with its stubbornness is sadly trailing a new world order of maturation, peace and prosperity struggling to come into its own.

On the moral issue, finally I want to refer to an experience in WW II which I think is related to those many people horrified and appalled by the Vietnam conflict. One day on Bataan in 1942 I was driving along the road to Hermosa and saw three Japanese divebombers destroy a little Filipino barrio nearby called Dinalupihan. When the raid was over I went to the wrecked and burning nipa shacks with my truck to pick up the wounded. It was a tragic sight, some old people wandering around in a daze. In picking up the wounded, blood soon was up to my elbows. I stopped in Hermosa to ask someone where the nearest hospital was located. There in the town square was Chaplain Tom Howden of the 200 Coast Artillery, National Guard and a good friend of mine. A shocked look came over his face as I ran up to him—the reason, I was covered with blood. War is shocking to people. I can appreciate my Christian brethren's being shocked by Vietnam—napalmed children, thousands of refugees moving down a road carrying pathetic belongings, soldiers losing their arms and legs, if not their lives, in battle. All wars are terrible, especially to those who have known them by first-hand experience. They have shattered and, in some cases, totally redirected our lives. Many of us had a horrible task to do in World War II and in Korea, and although the circumstances of military aggression is somewhat different today in Vietnam, we have a difficult task to do there too. I am convinced most American military men will do their jobs with honor, but also with humility and the pain of personal conscience, that is, being involved in something they would prefer very much not to do. But when it is over we will undoubtedly continue the exciting and challenging task of nation building in Indochina, and I pray not just in South Vietnam but also in North Vietnam.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ASPINALL, from 4 p.m., Wednesday, October 4, 1972, until noon October 6, 1972, on account of personal business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. QUIE, for 30 minutes, on October 4.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 15 minutes, on October 4.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. SCHERLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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



Mr. ADDABBO, for 20 minutes, today.  
 Mrs. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.  
 Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. CLARK, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN, for 60 minutes, on October 11.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN, for 60 minutes, on October 12.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ and to revise and extend his remarks.

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

Mr. DUNCAN.  
 Mr. GUBSER.  
 Mr. SNYDER.  
 Mr. ESCH in three instances.  
 Mr. WYDLER.  
 Mr. MINSHALL.  
 Mr. DELLENBACK.  
 Mr. GROVER in two instances.  
 Mr. ZWACH.  
 Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.  
 Mr. LLOYD.  
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. SCHERLE.  
 Mr. RAILSBACK in five instances.  
 Mr. SPRINGER.  
 Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.  
 Mr. WHITEHURST.  
 Mr. DU PONT.  
 Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.  
 Mr. KING in five instances.  
 Mr. PRICE of Texas.  
 Mr. VEYSEY in four instances.  
 Mr. WHALEN.

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

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.  
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.  
 Mr. RODINO in two instances.  
 Mr. WOLFF in two instances.  
 Mr. DRINAN.  
 Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.  
 Mr. FISHER in three instances.  
 Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.  
 Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.  
 Mr. WALDIE in six instances.  
 Mr. ROGERS in five instances.  
 Mr. MAHON.  
 Mr. BOLAND in two instances.  
 Mr. CARNEY in two instances.  
 Mr. TAYLOR.  
 Mr. DOWNING.  
 Mr. LEGGETT.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3203. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to extend under certain circumstances the expiration date specified in

a power of attorney executed by a member of the Armed Forces who is missing in action or held as a prisoner of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain potential water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to provide grants for Allen J. Ellender fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers to participate in a Washington public affairs program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2895. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Inc.; and

H.R. 10857. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain national forest lands within the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in the State of New Mexico for certain private lands within the Piedra Lumbre Grant, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 166. An act to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as, a part of the Washakie Wilderness heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

S. 722. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Stockbridge Munsee Indian Community, Wis.

S. 2441. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility and desirability of protecting and preserving the Great Dismal Swamp and the Dismal Swamp Canal; and

S. 3129. An act to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2388. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2389. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2390. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports an order suspending deportation in a certain case, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 635. (Rept. No. 92-1491). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11091. A bill to provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9604. A bill to prohibit the unlawful use of a rented motor vehicle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1496). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2208. An act to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15965. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, to provide certain revisions in the retirement benefits of public school teachers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16724. A bill to provide for acquisition by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of the mass transit bus systems engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the National Capital area, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2699. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands within the Vermejo Ranch, New Mexico and Colorado, for addition to the national forest system, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 16813. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11268. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 16793. A bill to prohibit the use of certain small vessels in

U.S. fisheries; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16925. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority for special pay for nuclear-qualified naval submarine officers, authorize special pay for nuclear-qualified naval surface officers, and provide special pay to certain nuclear-trained and qualified enlisted members of the naval service who agree to reenlist, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16924. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1144. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1316. An act to amend section 301 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and section 5 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, so as to increase from 50 to 80 percent the amount that may be paid as the Federal Government's share of the costs of any cooperative meat or poultry inspection program carried out by any State under such sections (Rept. No. 92-1516). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1145. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16656. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1517). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ONEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1146. A resolution waiving points of order against the conference report on S. 2770 (Rept. No. 92-1518). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15188. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc. (Rept. No. 92-1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 14171. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the American Ex-Prisoners of War (Rept. No. 92-1494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15453. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association (Rept. No. 92-1495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4800. A bill for the relief of Rita Swann; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7947. A bill for the relief of Jean Albertha Service Gordon; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14466. A bill for the relief of Edith E. Carrera; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 633. An act for the relief of James E. Fry, Jr., and Margaret E. Fry (Rept. No.

92-1509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 655. An act for the relief of certain postal employees at the Elmhurst, Ill., Post Office (Rept. No. 92-1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2469. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. Wolff (Rept. No. 92-1511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6821. A bill for the relief of Theodore Barr; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8722. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. John P. Dunn, U.S. Army, retired; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAILSBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10907. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Eugene J. Mikulenko, U.S. Army (retired); with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 16179. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission (Rept. No. 92-1515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 16951. A bill to prevent loss of food stamp benefits under the Food Stamp Act of 1964 as a result of increases in social security benefit payments under Public Law 92-336; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 16952. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 16953. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 16954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16955. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 16956. A bill to revise and simplify the Federal disaster relief program, to assure adequate funding for such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16957. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 16958. A bill to require assurances that highways assisted under the Federal-aid system will not impair the drainage pattern of adjoining land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 16959. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to encourage

the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 16960. A bill to provide for an equitable and expeditious means of handling railroad abandonments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. AD-

DABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16961. A bill to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN

of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. POPELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16962. A bill to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. AD-

DABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 16963. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of

Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. POPELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16964. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. GARMATZ):

H.R. 16965. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay for up to one-half of the costs of fire science programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of

Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. POPELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16966. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay for up to one-half of the



costs of fire science programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 16967. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16968. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16969. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16970. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16971. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr.

CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16972. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 16973. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16974. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. FRENZEL):

H.R. 16975. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16976. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16977. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970

to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16978. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 16979. A bill to provide that the recent action taken by the Federal Housing Commissioner in abolishing the adjusted premium charge imposed by section 203(c) of the National Housing Act shall be effective with respect to certain mortgage prepayments occurring on or after March 1, 1972; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 16980. A bill to establish in the State of California the Toyon National Urban Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 16981. A bill to authorize \$2,500,000 to be appropriated to the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library in the United States for the construction of educational facilities at such memorial and library, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 1320. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the second Sunday of October of each year as "National Grandparents Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSO:

H. Res. 1143. Resolution providing monetary allowances for toll-free telephone service for telephone calls to the district offices of Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 16982. A bill for the relief of Sergei Kourdakov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 16983. A bill for the relief of Del Monte Fishing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COLUMBUS DAY, 1972

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, next week we celebrate Columbus Day—a national

holiday that honors the man whose courage and imagination contributed to a new era of human existence.

Whether we honor Christopher Columbus on the second Monday of October or on the traditional date of October 12, we can capture the importance of this holiday by recognizing the accomplishments of a man who more than

anybody was responsible for turning the eyes of Europe westward across the Atlantic to a new age.

The Genovese explorer, Cristoforo Colombo, was indeed a remarkable man. Combining the creativity of the romantic with the precision of the scientist, he challenged the established procedures and norms of his day. Through personal