tinguished Republican has stated the situation precisely.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am sure that the distinguished majority leader would want me to say that rollcall votes, and/or live quorum calls, can be expected daily throughout next week.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished assistant majority leader.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Republican leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1972

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian, St. Valentine's Day, Monday February 14, 1972.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9:11 p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1972, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9, 1972:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Harold C. Crotty, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for the remainder of the term expiring July 19, 1972.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John A. Penello, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1976.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, February 9, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let the peace of God rule in your hearts to which you are called in one body: and be thankful.—Colossians 3: 15.

O God and Father of us all, we pray for our country and for those who are leading our people in this hour, shaping the future of our beloved land. Give to us courage, faith, and wisdom that the plans formulated, the decisions made, and the actions taken may be in accordance with Thy will for our Republic. May Thy spirit dwell in us richly as we continue to work for freedom, justice, and peace in our world.

Bless the people of our Nation and of all nations. Together may we realize our dependence upon Thee and in so doing learn to live with one another in the spirit of a true and living brotherhood. Thus may we promote the welfare of our country for the good of all mankind.

In the spirit of Him who went about doing good 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 SENATE

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

H.R. 12488. An act to change the name of the Columbia lock and dam, on the Chattahoochee River, Ala., to the George W. Andrews lock and dam.

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

S.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast between certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees.

The message also announced that Mr. COTTON had been appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 12067) entitled "An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes" in place of Mr. FONG, excused.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86–42, had appointed Mr. COOK as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the U.S. group of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, February 17 to 20, 1972.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 35]

Andrews	Dwyer	Moorhead
Ashbrook	Edwards, La.	O'Konski
Aspin	Esch	Pelly
Baring	Forsythe	Pike
Belcher	Fraser	Powell
Bell	Fulton	Preyer, N.C.
Biaggi	Galifianakis	Price, Tex.
Blatnik	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Broomfield	Gibbons	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Rosenthal
Cabell	Griffin	Roush
Carey, N.Y.	Hagan	Ruppe
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	Ryan
Chisholm	Hawkins	Satterfield
Clark	Hébert	Scheuer
Clawson, Del	Helstoski	Schneebeli
Clay	Hillis	Springer
Collier	Howard	Stanton,
Corman	Jacobs	J. William
Culver	Keith	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Dellums	McCloskey	Teague, Tex.
Denholm	Macdonald,	Udall
Dickinson	Mass.	Wiggins
Diggs	Mann	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 358 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 748—U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FUND FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS, INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 748) to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92–830)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 748) to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, 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 numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "Directors'.

"SEC. 21. The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country which has—

"(1) nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens;

"(2) taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens; or

"(3) imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned;

unless the President determines that (A) an arrangement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation has been made, (B) the parties have submitted the dispute to arbitration under the rules of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress aimed at providing prompt, ad-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

equate, and effective compensation under the applicable principles of international law."

And the House agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
M. MANSFIELD,
G. D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY 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 amendments of the House to the bill (S. 748) to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the United States contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXPROPRIATION AMENDMENT

House Amendment.—Contains a provision which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country which—

(1) nationalizes, expropriates, or seizes control of property owned by United States citizens,

(2) has taken steps to nullify contracts with United States citizens,

(3) imposes discriminatory taxes, etc., on property of United States citizens, or

(4) seizes a vessel of the United States in territorial waters or the high seas on the basis of rights or claims which are not recognized by the United States and requires a charge to be paid to secure the release of the vessel and crew,

unless the Secretary determines that (A) arrangements for compensation have been made, (B) the dispute has been submitted for international arbitration, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress.

Senate Bill.—No comparable provision.

Conference Action.—Adopts the House amendment with the following modifications:

(1) Strikes out all references to the Secretary of the Treasury, and instead, gives to the President of the United States the responsibility to give instructions with respect to the voting against any loan or other utilization of funds for the benefit of any country which expropriates property.

(2) Deletes the matter appearing in paragraph 4 relating to the seizure of vessels of the United States.

NARCOTICS DRUGS

House Amendment.—Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President of the United States makes a determination that such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (which are produced in, or transported through, such country) from (A) being sold illegally within such country to United States Government personnel, or (B) entering the United States unlawfully.

Senate Bill.—No comparable provision.

Conference Action.—Adopts the House provision.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
M. MANSFIELD,
G. D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 749, U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO SPECIAL FUNDS, THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 749) to authorize U.S. contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-831)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 749) to authorize United States contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 1, line 10, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert the following: "President".

On page 2, line 11, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert the following: "President".

And the House agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
M. MANSFIELD,
G. D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY 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 amendments of the House to the bill (S. 749) to authorize United States contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXPROPRIATION AMENDMENT

House Amendment.—Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country which—

(1) nationalizes, expropriates, or seizes control of property owned by United States citizens,

(2) has taken steps to nullify contracts with United States citizens, or

(3) imposes discriminatory taxes, etc. on property of United States citizens,

unless the Secretary determines that (A) arrangements for compensation have been made, (B) the dispute has been submitted for international arbitration, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress.

Senate Bill.—No comparable provision.

Conference Action.—Adopts the House amendment with the following modification: Strikes out all references to the Secretary of the Treasury and, instead, gives to the President of the United States the responsibility to give instructions with respect to the voting against any loan or other utilization of funds for the benefit of any country which expropriates property.

NARCOTICS DRUGS

House Amendment.—Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President of the United States makes a determination that such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (which are produced in, or transported through, such country) from (A) being sold illegally within such country to United States Government personnel, or (B) entering the United States unlawfully.

Senate Bill.—No comparable provision.

Conference Action.—Adopts the House provision.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
M. MANSFIELD,
G. D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2010, INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2010) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-832)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2010) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, 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 disagree-

ment to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 1, line 11, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert the following: "President".

On page 2, line 11, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert the following: "President".

And the House agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
M. MANSFIELD,
G. D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY 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 amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2010) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXPROPRIATION AMENDMENT

House Amendment.—Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country which—

(1) nationalizes, expropriates, or seizes control of property owned by United States citizens,

(2) has taken steps to nullify contracts with United States citizens, or

(3) imposes discriminatory taxes, etc. on property of United States citizens,

unless the Secretary determines that (A) arrangements for compensation have been made, (B) the dispute has been submitted for international arbitration, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress.

Senate Bill.—No comparable provision.

Conference Action.—Adopts the House amendment with the following modification: Strikes out all references to the Secretary of the Treasury and, instead, gives to the President of the United States the responsibility to give instructions with respect to the voting against any loan or other utilization of funds for the benefit of any country which expropriates property.

NARCOTICS DRUGS

House Amendment.—Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors of the Bank and the Association, respectively, to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President of the United States makes a determination that such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (which are produced in, or transported through, such country) from (A) being sold illegally within such country to United States Government personnel, or (B) entering the United States unlawfully.

Senate Bill.—No comparable provision.

Conference Action.—Adopts the House provision.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY GONZALEZ,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
M. MANSFIELD,
G. D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12067, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12067) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PASSMAN, ROONEY of New York, LONG of Maryland, ROYBAL, HATHAWAY, GALIFIANAKIS, MAHON, SHRIVER, RIEGLE, MCEWEN, ROBINSON of Virginia, and BOW.

WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all take satisfaction at the news of the settlement of the west coast dock strike. I think the settlement provides proof, if proof were needed, that voluntary collective bargaining can serve a useful purpose in resolving issues arising between management and labor. As a result of my efforts to help bring about a workable solution to the west coast dispute, I have found it necessary to absent myself from the floor for considerable periods of time and was, thereby, unable to answer a number of rollcalls, a circumstance I hope my constituents will understand. Had I found it possible to be on the floor I would have voted for the bill to increase American participation in the International Development Association and against amendments to reduce the American contribution. Similarly, I would have voted to expand the membership of the American Bi-Centennial Commission, for the Bald Eagle Protection Act and for extension of the Federal Pollution Control Act. Happily, all of these bills passed by comfortable margins; therefore, my absence was not crucial to determination of the issue.

SOME ABC'S OF OUR PRECARIOUS FISCAL SITUATION

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the administration's request for a $50 billion increase in the public debt ceiling. I take this time to recite a few of the ABC's of our precarious fiscal situation. On January 24, I spoke at great length on the subject.

The public debt subject to the debt ceiling is now about $425 billion.

The 1973 budget message estimates that the debt will reach about $482 billion by June 30, 1973.

The 1973 budget message requests new spending authority for fiscal 1973 of about $271 billion, some $21 billion above the current year total.

The 1973 budget message estimates expenditures on the unified budget basis of $246.3 billion, about $9.7 billion above this year.

The 1973 budget message estimates the Federal funds deficit, which is the deficit closely related to the debt ceiling, at—

For fiscal 1972, $44.7 billion.

For fiscal 1973, $36.2 billion.

The 1973 budget message estimates that in the 4 fiscal years, 1970–1973, the Federal funds deficit will total $123.9 billion—an average of $31 billion a year.

On a Federal funds basis, including fiscals 1972 and 1973, we have had 37 deficits in the last 43 years.

Last year, congressional actions and inactions in their impact on budget estimates of fiscal 1972 expenditures were about a standoff. There were a number of reductions and a number of increases, but the net effect was as I have just stated.

In the tax bill last year, tax revenues were reduced by about $15 billion over a 3-year period. Of course, the hope is that the tax reductions will stimulate the economy and tend to offset the revenue cut, but this is by no means assured.

ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL YEAR 1973 BUDGET

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when we examine the administration's fiscal year 1973 budget, recently presented to the Congress, we find that the American taxpayer is expected to pay $21.2 billion merely to pay off the interest on the national debt.

This amounts to a payment of over $40,000 per minute—merely to pay off the interest.

But, the debt is not new in America.

In 1902 when Theodore Roosevelt was President, the national debt was $1.2 billion.

It gradually rose to $17.5 billion in 1929 under Herbert Hoover's first year as President.

Under President Franklin Roosevelt's administration, the national debt in-

creased, on the average, by $17.6 billion per year.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt died in 1945, our debt was $259 billion.

Under the Truman and Eisenhower years, the debt increased by $4.3 billion and $3.5 billion respectively, per year.

The national debt increased by $6.9 billion per year under President Kennedy, and $11 billion per year under President Johnson.

In 1969, the total national debt was $353.7 billion.

Today, the administration is requesting congressional approval to increase the national debt to $480 billion.

During the last 4 years, the debt has increased by approximately $30 billion a year. The national debt has increased by one-fourth in the last 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, during the minute I spoke, the American people paid $40,000—merely to pay the interest on this tremendous debt.

It is time for a hard look at the national debt.

It is time to reduce this $480 billion burden on the American people.

CLOSING THE MEDICINE CABINET AS A DRUG SOURCE

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, testimony during the hearings before the subcommittee on public health and environment indicate that we have a good chance now of beginning to eliminate the household medicine cabinet as a major source of abused drugs.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has recommended a cut in the production of amphetamines by 40 percent this year. That is a significant cut.

The Food and Drug Administration testified that they would recommend an additional 30 percent cut making a 70 percent cut in amphetamines to be produced in this country. One of the companies that has been exporting about 99 percent has now agreed to its total production for export.

With these reductions we will eliminate almost 89 percent of the current duction of amphetamines.

I am also encouraged that the committee has been able to get the Food and Drug Administration to address itself now to barbiturates. FDA has said it is going to recommend a reduction in the production of barbiturates in about 3 months.

If we can quickly implement the amphetamine quota and move as fast as possible to bring about realistic checks on barbiturates, I think we can eliminate the medicine cabinet as one of the major sources of drug abuse.

One of the most important things in addition to the regulation of these drugs will be to implement a physician education program, for eventually they hold the key to the floodgates of these and other prescription drugs.

NATIONAL FORESTS

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) in introducing an important conservation measure to aid in our efforts to enhance the reforestation work in national forests.

This is but the first in a series of legislative proposals designed to bring about a comprehensive program of "Trees for People."

Congressman KYL is to be commended for his leadership efforts in initiating this project. His work will help renew and enhance our Nation's public forests.

The bill we are introducing is particularly beneficial in that it funds the improved reforestation program by means of a fund consisting of revenues derived from import duties on timber products. As such, this program will assure an adequate funding level on a predictable basis. Our initial estimate is an annual program of $62 million.

In addition, such a program would reverse the existing situation in which the only funds available for reforestation efforts are those derived from the sale of timber on national forestlands.

I am thoroughly familiar with reforestation needs of the vast public forests in my "redwood empire" congressional district. Enactment of this legislative package would make the redwood empire of California the greatest tree growing area in the world.

THE REMARKS OF WHITE HOUSE CHIEF OF STAFF ROBERT HALDEMAN

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the incredible remarks of White House Chief of Staff Robert Haldeman still remain on the public record. I refer to his irresponsible and unsubstantiated charge that those who differ with the administration's Vietnam policies are "consciously aiding and abetting the enemy."

This blanket charge of treason, by the President's chief of staff, is obviously without foundation and must be retracted if people are to have any faith at all in the integrity of the administration.

It is therefore essential that the White House officially repudiate this unfounded charge—and clear the air. Official silence only confirms everyone's worst fears. If this unfounded charge is not retracted, then Mr. Haldeman should be relieved of his official responsibilities without delay. This issue must be resolved one way or the other.

REPLY TO STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take this 1 minute, but I want to reply to my friend and colleague from Michigan and simply advise him that unless he has had his ears closed, the President of the United States has just been on the radio telling the country and the world that he charges none of the people who oppose him with insincerity, treason, or anything else. He just hopes that the process of debate, for which America is so justly famous, will not play into the hands of the enemy and cause a postponement of a resolution of the Vietnam war until after the election this fall.

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

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Has the President in fact repudiated the remarks made by Mr. Haldeman on national television? Yes or no?

Mr. WYMAN. As the gentleman knows, Mr. Ziegler has publicly indicated that what Mr. Haldeman said, he said for himself. I would construe the President's remarks to the Nation this morning as being the very antithesis of the implications of the gentleman from Michigan concerning President Nixon's position, which I deeply resent.

INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the remarks of Under Secretary of the Treasury Charles E. Walker at a meeting here in Washington yesterday, in which he was projecting the interest rates for this year and the coming year. I find the projections, both from the Under Secretary and from other administration spokesmen, very unrealistic and misleading. I suggest that looking at the amount of the deficit being added to the public debt, and at the methods by which public and private debts are financed, interest rates will be up in the commercial banking field to about 6 percent during 1972 and will very likely be up toward 6½ percent in 1973. Anybody who projects a rosier picture than that is not in touch with reality.

The facts, quite simply are that in 1970 the Federal Government's debt was up to $301.1 billion. This figure does not include the $38.8 billion of debt of the Federal financial agencies. The total private debt was $1,356.9 billion of which $582.8 billion was corporate debt and $126.8 billion was consumer debt. The administration itself predicts a 9-percent increase in consumer credit activity and a Federal deficit in 1973 of $25.5 billion added to 1971's $23 billion and 1972's $38.8 billion. All of this adds up to substantial demands being made on the money markets in this country with the inevitable result being an increase in interest rates.

I for one am at a loss to understand how the administration can predict increases in both public and private de-

mands on the money market and in the next breath predict that interest rates will not increase.

THE OUSTER OF TWO REPORTERS FROM THE UNITED NATIONS SHOWS THE TRAGEDY OF OUSTING NATIONALIST CHINA

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of excluding Nationalist China from the United Nations is now becoming more and more apparent. The latest example of what a great mistake was made by this administration when it failed to help keep Nationalist China in the United Nations was demonstrated by the act of the U.N. Secretary General who recently ousted two Nationalist Chinese reporters from the United Nations because Nationalist China no longer is recognized by the U.N.

Their credentials have been withdrawn, and they are barred from coverage at the United Nations under the specious excuse that since Nationalist China is no longer recognized by the United Nations, these two newsmen are not permitted to cover the news in that agency. I hope the conscience of this Congress can be aroused to repudiate this action. And I hope the press of the free world will register such outrage at this disgraceful act that the new U.N. Secretary General will reverse the ban and restore these two reporters' credentials.

CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT BY CANDIDATES

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) raised a question about the President repudiating one of his staff members. I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House and read what the President said today in his published statement at 11 o'clock.

I have no complaint over the fact that during this period when I have been ending the war I did not begin I have been subjected to vigorous criticism. I do not question the patriotism or the sincerity of those who disagree with my policies to bring peace.

But as I said in 1968, when I was a candidate for President, we have only one President at a time. Only the President can negotiate an end to the war. There should always be free debate and criticism so that our policy will represent the best thinking of our nation. But a candidate for President has a higher responsibility than the ordinary critic. A candidate should make any criticism he believes would contribute to bringing an honorable peace.

But I would hope that anyone seeking the Presidency would examine his statements carefuly to be sure that nothing he says might give the enemy an incentive to prolong the war until after the election.

Trust in the United States among the 45 nations with which we have treaty commitments is essential if peace and freedom are to be preserved in the world.

Let us end our involvement in the war in Vietnam in a way which will not destroy that trust.

Mr. Speaker, I think that pretty much answers the question which was raised by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) today.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-249)

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 Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I prepare to set out on my summit trips to Peking and Moscow, it is especially timely for the American people and the Congress to have available a basis for understanding the Government's policies and broad purposes in foreign affairs. That is the function of this, my third annual report.

These annual reports trace the evolution of our policies over the years of our term of office and describe our responses to new problems and issues as they have arisen. They provide an insight into our philosophy of foreign policy and our new approaches to peace.

The broad framework presented here will be filled out in two other major documents: the Secretary of State's second annual report, which will describe in detail our relations with individual countries and set forth the major public documentation of our policy, and the annual Defense Report of the Secretary of Defense.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1972.*

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATE OF THE WORLD MESSAGE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's state of the world message is an honest, thoroughgoing analysis of our foreign affairs which helps the American people view our foreign relations in proper prospective and promotes world understanding of our actions.

Regarding the President's comments on his upcoming trip to Peking, I join with the President in his hope that the trip will establish a basis for future negotiation with the People's Republic of China of all points of conflict between our two nations.

I also share the President's view that we will never collaborate with the North Vietnamese to turn South Vietnam over to Communist rule. To me, this is the nub of the current debate over Vietnam policy. The United States should not be a party to any so-called peace settlement that would assure a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

I would also single out for special mention in connection with the President's state of the world message his call for a major series of new trade talks. It is absolutely mandatory for the future economic well-being of the United States that a Nixon round of trade talks be initiated and pursued to a successful conclusion. Our trade negotiators, because of our new economic policy, are in a stronger position to achieve better terms in dealing with other nations.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 809 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 809

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12910) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 809 provides a closed rule with 4 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 12910 to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit. The resolution also provides a general waiver of points of order. The reason for the waiver is that the original Liberty Bond Act provided for an appropriation and any time you amend that which initially appropriated money, bypassing the Appropriations Committee, that amendment remains subject to a point of order.

Under present law, the permanent debt ceiling is $400 billion and a tempo-

rary increase of $30 billion is provided, making an overall limit of $430 billion, effective through June 30, 1972.

H.R. 12910 provides for a further temporary increase of $20 billion, also effective through June 30, 1972. There is no change made in the permanent debt limitation. Therefore, the total debt limitation through June 30, 1972, will be $450 billion. The total debt limitation as of July 1, 1972, will revert to $400 billion.

The limitation for fiscal year 1973 will be considered at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has explained the resolution and has explained the present situation regarding the debt limit. The administration did ask for a $50 billion increase to take them through February 1973.

The Ways and Means Committee wanted to have this bill held to $20 billion, so that it could be looked at again at the end of the fiscal year. The bill went out of the committee on a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked over the schedule of the number of times the debt has been increased since I first came to the Congress. In 1956 the total permanent and temporary debt limit was $281 billion. With this increase today, almost 16 years later, there will be a total and permanent debt limit of $450 billion.

That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what is going to happen to the future of our great country if the Congress keeps spending and spending more than we take in.

I support the rule, but once again I will not vote for the increase, because I have not voted for the measures that have caused this debt increase each time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 809.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. 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. 12910) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

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. 12910, with Mr. HUNGATE 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 Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my fellow Members will agree that it would not be hard to find a more popular piece of legislation than the measure before us. Raising the debt ceiling is not pleasant to contemplate. None of us on the Ways and Means Committee is happy to have to bring the measure before you. We do this solely because we have no recourse. The plain fact is that if we do not take action, the actual debt itself will exceed the maximum permissible limit in a month or less. Accordingly, we must provide more leeway in the debt ceiling at this time if the Government is to continue to operate and continue to pay its bills. The pending bill will allow the Government to do this. At the same time, when we have heard the complete story, I am sure all of us will agree that in setting the new debt ceiling the committee has kept the tightest possible rein on it.

Mr. Chairman, the need to increase the debt ceiling stems, of course, from the very huge increases in budget deficits that we have been incurring in recent years. As you know, the administration's recent budget document indicates that the unified budget deficit for fiscal year 1972 will be $39 billion and not the $11 billion plus predicted in the original budget submitted to the Congress. This is more than one and a half times the biggest previous peacetime deficit, which occurred in 1968 when the unified budget deficit amounted to approximately $25 billion.

In fact, the $39 billion unified budget deficit expected for fiscal year 1972 is almost within the range of the enormous deficits that we attained in World War II despite the fact that we are supposed to be phasing down our involvement in Vietnam. Moreover, current estimates are that the unified budget deficit will remain high in the upcoming fiscal year, 1973. The administration estimates a unified budget deficit of $25.5 billion for that fiscal year. Let me add that for the 3 years 1971, 1972, and 1973, based upon actual facts and estimates by the Office of Management and Budget, the unified budget deficit for the 3 years is expected to be in excess of $87 billion.

It is a sad but nonetheless inescapable fact that the $39 billion unified budget deficit now projected for fiscal year 1972 is over $27 billion larger than the $11.6 billion deficit originally projected in the 1972 budget. The most important single reason for this difference was a $13 billion shortfall in tax receipts resulting from the fact that the gross national product failed to reach the levels projected by the administration in calendar year 1971. The administration initially forecast a GNP of $1,065 billion, but the actual GNP for the year 1971 was $1,047 billion. This, of course, was in no small part due to the repressive economic policy which the administration followed until last August 15. We are indeed fortunate that our policy was almost wholly reversed at that time, or the situation we will face this coming year would be still worse.

Increased spending was almost an equally important factor in accounting for the growth in the actual budget deficit for fiscal year 1972 beyond the levels originally projected. We may be able to control this spending better in the coming year if we adopt an expenditure ceiling as has been proposed and make up our mind to put our fiscal house in order.

The budget deficits that we have been incurring are even more gigantic on a Federal funds basis—which differs from the unified budget deficit in that the large surpluses in the social security and other trust funds are not used as an offset against the deficit of the general fund. On a Federal funds basis which excludes the trust funds, the estimated deficit for fiscal year 1972 amounts to $45 billion. For the fiscal year 1971 through 1973, these deficits total an amazing $111 billion.

From the standpoint of the debt ceiling, the Federal funds deficits are more significant than the unified budget deficits since they more accurately reflect the amount of borrowing, some of which is from the trust funds, necessary during the fiscal year.

Under present law, the permanent debt limit is $400 billion and the temporary debt limit is an additional $30 billion, making a total of $430 billion effective through June 30, 1972. In view of the large budget deficits anticipated for fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973, the Treasury Department recommended that the permanent debt ceiling be raised $50 billion to a new level of $480 billion for the period through June 30, 1973. However, the Treasury estimated and stated that this new debt ceiling of $480 billion would be adequate only to cover the expected debt to about the middle of February 1973, not even enough to carry us through the next fiscal year.

In considering this request, the Ways and Means Committee held public hearings in which various Government officials, including the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, presented factual and analytical material regarding the administration's request for a higher debt ceiling. We also received the views of a number of Members of this House. In addition, we had the benefit in executive session of a frank interchange of views with the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

This detailed and comprehensive examination which covered the fiscal, economic and monetary considerations involved in an increase in the debt limit, convinced the Ways and Means Committee that we have no choice—none at all—but to raise the debt limit at this time in accordance with the provisions of the bill before us. I might add that this conclusion is unanimous on the part of the committee. It is a bipartisan conclusion shared equally by Republican, as well as Democratic, Members.

This is not to say that we are happy to see the debt limit increased—far from it. But, at the same time, we all recognize that once the expenses have been incurred, the Government just has to pay for them. As I have pointed out on

a number of occasions in the past, a refusal to raise the debt limit to meet the Government's obligations is like giving your wife a credit card, turning her loose on the town to buy whatever she pleases and then—when the bills are presented—refusing to pay for the purchases that she made with the card you gave her.

However, in the pending bill, we pared down the increase in the debt ceiling proposed by the Treasury and also made it applicable for a shorter period of time so as to keep a tighter rein on the Government's fiscal affairs. More specifically, the bill increases the temporary debt limit to $450 billion instead of the $480 billion requested by the Treasury. In other words, the committee's action increases the temporary debt limit by $20 billion instead of the $50 billion as recommended by the Treasury. Also the $20 billion increase in the temporary debt ceiling provided by the bill expires on June 30, 1972, while the $50 billion increase under the Treasury's proposal would expire a year later on June 30, 1973.

In providing this considerably more restricted debt ceiling than the Treasury proposes, we were motivated by a number of considerations, all of which are designed to help keep the debt under better control.

In view of the very substantial increase in budgetary deficits in recent years, we believe it is especially necessary to keep close surveillance on the size of the public debt. This objective is furthered by limiting the increase in the temporary limit on the debt ceiling to an amount which though substantial in absolute terms, is relatively small in present circumstances; namely, $20 billion. The fact that this temporary increase will be effective only up to June 30, 1972, or less than 5 months, means that an opportunity will be given to the Congress to make another examination of the debt ceiling soon.

The resulting $450 billion temporary debt ceiling which will apply through June 30, 1972, is a tight ceiling. It represents the minimum amount that the Treasury estimates is necessary to carry the debt through June 30, 1972, and not one penny more. Accordingly, the new debt limit provided by the bill will serve as a restraint on spending during the period it is effective and yet be adequate for the economical management of the public debt.

Between the end of last December and June 30 of this year, the Treasury expects a $26 billion cumulative deficit in the Federal funds budget. Adding this deficit to the $425.5 billion debt outstanding on December 31, suggests the need for a debt limitation of slightly over $451 billion. However, the cash balance at the end of December 1971 was slightly over $11 billion, a higher cash balance than it is expected will be necessary in the remainder of the fiscal year 1972. The Treasury Department has estimated that the peak debt subject to the limitation, assuming a constant $6 million cash balance, will reach a level of $450 billion on June 15, 1972.

In order to keep a tight rein on debt increases, the new temporary debt ceiling provided by the bill does not make any provision for the usual $3 billion margin that the Treasury prefers to have to meet unexpected contingencies. This action which was taken with the agreement of the Treasury Department assumes that such contingencies are unlikely to occur within the short period of time covered by the new ceiling.

Timing the new temporary debt ceiling to expire on June 30, 1972, will give the Congress an opportunity to reexamine the ceiling in the light of later developments regarding tax receipts and expenditures. At the present time, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the size of the tax receipts that can be expected in fiscal 1973. In large measure, this is because it is most difficult to estimate what the economic situation, which influences these tax receipts, will be in fiscal 1973. The need for such a reappraisal of tax receipts later on this year is highlighted by the fact that budget receipts for fiscal 1972 were grossly overestimated because it was anticipated that the economic situation would be better than it actually turned out to be.

Similarly, we are likely to have a more accurate picture in June of what Federal outlays will be for fiscal 1973. Since Congress has not yet reached any decisions as to the level of appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, it is difficult at this time to estimate how the outlay requirements for that year which are presented in the budget might be modified by congressional action. An additional uncertainty results from the fact that the budget projects almost $14 billion more outlays in the second half of fiscal 1972 than in the first half of the year. In fiscal 1971, outlays in the second half of the year were only $3 billion above the figures for the first half of the year.

We believe that the adoption of the $450 billion temporary debt ceiling provided by H.R. 12910 represents responsible and prudent action. We are all unhappy about the large deficit spending that has taken place in recent years which has been responsible for the rapidly mounting public debt. But I think we must all recognize that it is essential to provide the Government with a means of financing its essential operations.

Any delay in enacting an adequate public debt limit would have most severe consequences. While there would be no question concerning the legality of the outstanding debt in such a situation, the Treasury Department would be unable to issue any new securities. This prohibition would apply to issues designed to replace maturing issues as well as to securities representing new debt.

As a result, savings bonds could not be issued and payroll savings plans would be disrupted. In addition, the Treasury cash balance would be depleted rapidly. Substantial amounts of Treasury bills become due on a weekly basis. If new bills cannot be issued to replace these issues, the Treasury cash balance would soon be exhausted.

Once the cash balance is exhausted, the Government would be compelled to delay full payment—or resort to partial payments—of contract obligations, Government salaries, various loan and benefit programs, and grants to States and local governments when they become due. The economic hardships resulting from such action would, of course, be most severe in those areas where there are large concentrations of Federal employees or employees engaged in production under large Government contracts.

All this could not help but have an unfortunate impact on confidence in the dollar abroad and there would be grave danger of another currency crisis.

These consequences of failure to provide for an adequate debt limit cannot be regarded with equanimity. I am sure that when the Members of the House consider these consequences, they will agree that we cannot permit them to happen and will take action to prevent them from happening by enacting the pending legislation.

Let me turn now for just a moment to a subject which concerns me very much, our uncontrolled spending. What we are talking about is an increase in the debt ceiling by $20 billion to enable us to take care of expenditures in excess of our receipts for a period of less than 5 months.

I am sorry to be a little ancient in my thinking.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, I am sorry to be a little ancient in my thinking sometimes, but in the first year I was in the Congress in 1939, when President Roosevelt was in office, we received a requested budget expenditure from his administration of $9 billion. That $9 billion was to maintain what small cadre of Armed Forces we had. It was to pay for WPA, through which we made workingmen out of idle men. It also was to pay for PWA, with which we were making job creating, public works projects available to localities.

I remember that I sat on the floor of the House, and I listened to the great statesmen of that day deploring the fact that we had reached a $9 billion level of spending in the 1940 fiscal year. And we talked about each of the appropriation bills for at least a week at a time trying to find areas where we could cut—and we did cut them.

But now, compare that—and that is ancient history, I know—to the situation of today when we have to increase the debt ceiling by $20 billion to take care of the difference between our receipts and expenditures for just a 5-month period of time.

I think it is high time for us to be thinking, on days other than those when the debt ceiling is before us, about where we are going and what is going to happen to us as a nation and what is going to happen to the funds that people have worked over a lifetime to accumulate, if we do not do something about it. The time to do something about it is not in connection with legislation on the debt ceiling—after the debts have been incurred. The time to do something about it is when we consider the authorizations of the agencies of Government whose

spending in excess of our receipts creates these debts. And all of us know this.

This is the time, I think, for the Congress of the United States to put the interest of the future of this great country ahead of personal interests and personal ambition. Let us tell the American people, if they do not already know it, that we just cannot carry on as we are carrying on now. Think of the spending which created Federal funds deficits of $111 billion in 3 fiscal years. Never in our history has there been a comparable period of time, unless it occurred during the period of World War II, when we were not concerned about any dollars or anything else, except the lives of our people and the winning of the war.

But this creation of deficits has gone far enough. That is why the committee has decided to take care of the obligations that we have already created in connection with fiscal year 1972, but not to assume the debt burden from the creation of payment obligations for fiscal year 1973 until a later time when we can understand what our revenues are going to be, when we can have an opportunity to get a better understanding about what the Congress ought to do with respect to these requests for spending authority.

Look at the budget. I know the Members of Congress study it as painstakingly as I do. The President has not asked for $246 billion spending authority for 1973, which is what he plans to spend next fiscal year. He has asked for better than $270 billion of new spending authority which, when added to the carryover on June 30, the end of this fiscal year, of better than $266 billion, means that if the Congress gives him what he has asked for in his budget, there will be in the pipelines better than $535 billion over which the Congress will have lost complete control.

Is that the way Congress wants to operate? I hope it is not.

I have insisted over the years that the Congress should restore to itself the right given it under the Constitution to say how much is to be spent in any fiscal year. The only way left to do it is to put in a congressionally enacted ceiling on total expenditures. Congress can change it. Yes, Congress does change it, but nobody downtown can change it. I resent the fact that Presidents over the years have said, "Give me this much authority—keep my pipeline filled this much—but I will only spend this amount out of that total." That is a complete violation of the provisions of the Constitution to my mind, and if we do not wake up before long, there will be better than a trillion dollars in the pipeline.

Think how fast total appropriations in the pipeline have gone from $200 million to better than $535 billion.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I agree completely with the gentleman that the debt limit is no place to apply an effective discipline and I agree completely also with the idea of expenditure control. But expenditures are only a part of the problem.

Would the gentleman not agree with me, it would make a great deal of sense if the House early in each session would face up to the entire budget picture and consider a resolution dealing with the budget and to recommend and to anticipate the debt and a budget debt as well as expenditure control and make the approval of the budget by the House a condition that must be met before the House could consider any appropriation bill whatsoever?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I agree with the gentleman. We enacted a provision—I will remind the gentleman, which was probably enacted before we had the pleasure of the gentleman from Illinois being seated here as a Member of Congress—in 1946 when we had a reorganization of the Congress. We did what you are talking about. We established a joint committee on the overall budget, expecting that it would recommend the total of what we should spend and appropriate and that we would live within those totals set by the joint committee.

It was made up of members of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and of the Finance Committee and members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I think we met two times but we did not come out with any effective way of controlling the budget. There was opposition to it on the part of certain people who believed that, by bringing the Senate into the process, the House gave up its basic constitutional authority of developing and initiating revenue measures and appropriations.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Then perhaps we could improve on that and recommend that provision of the budget which is certainly a House operation and discipline ourselves.

But I might add further that in that provision of the Government Reorganization Act, there was no requirement that this budget ought to be approved before the House could consider an appropriation bill. Is that so and would the gentleman favor doing something like that?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am in favor of almost anything that would enable us to get back to an effective method of controlling expenditures.

As to the point that the Senate should not be in it in the first place, I want it in. If we do not have the Senate in on the initiation of the measure, the procedure will not stand up. I think it should be a joint effort. I have no pride of authorship, I must say, about the idea. I think all of us need to begin to think in terms of where we are going and how we can get back control of the rate of spending.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman is without any question the most eminent figure in the Chamber with respect to the whole matter of monetary expenditures. Can he tell us the first step we should take beginning today to get a revision of our procedures accomplished so we can bring the Government back to where we believe it ought to be and in the proper hands?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I wish I had jurisdiction over the question of a ceiling on spending. If so, there would never be a request to increase the debt ceiling brought to the floor of the House that I would not make every effort in the committee to have accompanied by a ceiling on spending. I would put it at a figure, under all circumstances, less than what the President has asked for. I do not know how much it would be. It would depend upon how much he is seeking. In any event I would certainly cut back the rate of anticipated spending at a time when the administration was talking about going to the public and borrowing another $40, $50 or $60 billion.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I am among those Members of the House and the committee who feel that a tax reform program at least could be updated. It is long overdue. Would the distinguished chairman advise the committee as to his reaction with relation to the need for further tax reforms before we consider a further increase in the debt ceiling?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. On February 7, I wrote to the President pointing out that following his action on August 15, 1971, he advised Congress that in the second session, he would submit a tax reform program. I indicated that if I understood this, he meant a program of further elimination of preferences and loopholes in the Federal income, estate, and gift tax. I suggested further that if Congress were to complete action on any such proposal, he should give us the benefit of his thinking no later than March 15, 1972. I indicated that my suggestion was not with respect to any new type of tax, such as a value-added tax which I am sure the President did not include in his definition of tax reform. I also pointed out the interest in the House in this regard relative to the continued increases in the debt ceiling.

I insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter I sent to the President:

FEBRUARY 7, 1972.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall in your address to the Congress following your action of August 15, 1971, establishing among other things an incomes policy, you advised the Congress that in the Second Session you would submit what you called a tax reform program. To me, and to most others, this term means a program of further elimination of preferences and so-called loopholes in the Federal income, estate, and gift tax system. If this is what you had in your mind, and I am sure it is, let me call your attention to the fact that in order for the Congress to complete action on any such proposal you should give us the benefit of your thinking in a Message either delivered in person to the Congress or submitted by messenger to the Congress not later than March 15, 1972. My suggestion is not with respect to any new type of a tax, such as the value-added tax, which I am sure you did not mean to include in your definition of tax reform in your appearance before the Congress.

Since your statement advising us of your intention, this matter has become all the

more important because of developments in the House in recent days raising the question about support of continued increases in the debt ceiling unless such requests are coupled with tax reform ostensibly that would produce additional revenues.

To me this matter is most important if there is to be a debt ceiling increase to accompany borrowings required under the 1973 Budget. I hope you will give it your immediate attention.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS, *Chairman.*

Mr. Chairman, in 1942 the Congress passed a tax reform proposal. We were in the midst of World War II. We needed revenue. So instead of reducing anybody's taxes concurrently with an increase under the reform proposal of the taxes of other people, we increased them somewhat. The result was that we had some additional revenue in this bill, some relating to tax reform and some relating to general increases in tax.

But every tax reform that has taken place in the Congress since then has resulted in a loss of revenue because of the awareness of the membership of Congress, I suppose, of the heavy burdens that are being borne by all taxpayers. Rather than to increase our revenues as we raised the taxes of one group of taxpayers, we have taken the increases and reduced the taxes of other people that we thought were bearing an inordinately heavy burden.

I think it would be difficult to change our habits in that respect. Unless we change our pattern of action the next tax reform bill in all probability will give back more revenue over a period of time than it will take in over the same period of time.

In the past I have been a party to the accompanying reductions because I knew the heavy burdens that were being borne by low-income people and the middle bracket taxpayer. Their burdens have been heavy. Their taxes at the local level are always increasing, and they probably increase faster than the reductions we have made available to them in the last 3 or 4 years. So it is difficult to get additional revenue from tax reform.

Let me also call your attention to this fact: In 1969 we had a tax reform bill, all aspects of which are not yet in effect. Those that are in effect have materially reduced the abuse on the part of taxpayers or inequitable treatment of one group as against another group. When it is fully effective, there will be less and less of the inequities that existed previously.

I would also like to comment on the 112 returns with adjusted gross incomes over $200,000 which it was recently reported paid no income tax in 1970. Some have suggested that this reflected on the effectiveness of the Tax Reform Act of 1969. I do not believe that this is the case. An analysis of these returns which we have begun bears me out in this respect. I am inserting at this point an explanation of these returns which I have prepared:

EXPLANATION OF THE 112 RETURNS FOR 1970 WITH ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME OF $200,000 OR OVER WHICH PAID NO TAX

In actual numbers, the 112 returns in 1970 which paid no tax represents a drop of 63 percent from the 300 returns so classified in 1969. Probably more important, the non-taxable returns in 1970 represented .7 of 1 percent of all returns with $200,000 or more of adjusted gross income. This was a decline from 1.6 percent in 1969. It might be interesting to note that only 12 of those who were in this nontaxable category in 1970 also were in this category in 1966—the returns studied for the 1969 Act.

It is important to emphasize that this tabulation of nontaxable returns for 1970 is preliminary. Because of this many of these returns may well turn out to be returns on which tax is payable after an audit is made.

Actually, there are 8 of the 112 returns which probably should not have been included in the classification of nontaxable returns even before taking into account the possible effect of an audit. One of these represented a duplicate, 2 actually had paid a minimum tax, and one had exercised an election under the internal revenue laws to be taxed as a corporation and had been so taxed. In addition, 2 were nontaxable because of net operating loss carryovers from prior years. Had the carryovers been classified as business expenses as the instructions call for, neither of these 2 returns would have had adjusted gross income of $200,000 or more. After these returns are examined more closely there may be more returns falling in this category. Finally, the last 2 of these 8 returns represent returns for earlier years which were late in being filed. The 1969 Act did not apply to these cases.

The reduction I have suggested so far reduces these returns to 104. Of these 104 returns, 6 paid no U.S. tax because of foreign tax credits. In other words, they paid taxes to foreign governments even though not to the United States. I might add that the foreign income involved was largely wages.

Of the 98 remaining returns, 12 involved large deductions for State income taxes. In large part, these represent cases where the individuals involved had larger incomes in 1969 than in 1970 but paid the State income taxes attributable to the 1969 incomes in 1970. Probably their poor showing in 1970 was due to the downturn in the stock market. It might be interesting to note that the number falling in this category is approximately the same as the number occurring in this category in the 1966 tabulation which was used in the study made in connection with the 1969 Tax Reform Act; at that time, there were 14 with major deductions of this type. I should also note that it it possible that in some of these cases the State may have imposed an income tax on State or municipal bonds which are tax exempt for Federal income tax purposes.

Of the 86 remaining returns, 13 of them had charitable contributions as their largest deduction. Of these 13, 2 of the returns made use of the unlimited charitable contribution deduction which, over a period of years, is gradually being phased out. The number who made use of the unlimited charitable contribution deduction in 1966 was 49. In other words, there was a drop from 49 to 2 in the unlimited charitable contribution category with the complete elimination of the category to be expected in perhaps a couple of years. Of the remaining charitable contribution deduction returns, 11 represented deductions of approximately 50 percent of adjusted gross income—the percentage which was allowed all taxpayers by the 1969 Act. These, in order to return in no tax, had to be combined with a series of other itemized deductions.

Of the remaining 73 returns, 55 had interest deductions as the largest deduction shown on the return. For comparative purposes, it might be pointed out that there were 72 in 1966 which had interest deductions as the largest item. There are a number of reasons why large interest deductions may be shown on these tax returns without the return being subject to the minimum tax because the interest deduction does not represent "excess investment interest" to which the minimum tax applies. First of all, the deduction may be a trade or business deduction which is misclassified. These deductions should be taken off in arriving at adjusted gross income. To the extent the 55 fall in this category, they are not properly classified as returns with adjusted gross income of $200,000 or more. A second category of interest deduction represented here is interest paid on net leases entered into before the passage of the 1969 Act. Congress decided not to impose the minimum tax on these pre-existing contracts. A third category, which may account for the interest deductions, is interest on personal loans such as mortgages on personal residences. It is believed that this, however, accounts for few of the category. The fourth category of interest deduction is that which offsets investment income. The minimum tax applies only to the excess deduction over the investment income. Finally, we suspect that in many of the 55 cases the interest deduction involved represents interest attributable to an investment, in which case it is properly subject to tax—either the minimum tax in 1970 and 1971 or the regular income tax thereafter. An audit of these 55 returns will be required before we can be sure how many of them in the interest category are properly subject to tax.

The remaining 18 returns have deductions of various types which represent the largest deduction. We have begun a classification of these, and I will be glad to run through those by category on which I have information. First, 3 of them represent losses on securities pledged to cover a loan. The tax law specifically (sec. 166(f)) provides a deduction for such losses. Two more of these returns showed very large theft losses which undoubtedly will be examined carefully. Seven more represent cases where the investment expenses in connection with earning the investment income actually exceed the investment income. This may be because 1970 was not a good year in the stock market. In addition, in some of these cases the gain related to these securities may be realized in the form of capital gain in a subsequent year. One other case worth noting is where the gambling earnings were large but were matched by gambling losses. I should think this one would also be examined carefully.

I believe that when the auditing of these returns is completed, we will find the numbers very substantially diminished. It is important, however, to realize that there can be occasions when legitimate expenses do, in a single year, exceed an individual's income. As a result, it seems to me that one cannot promise under any tax system no matter how "reformed" that there may never be anyone with adjusted gross income of $200,000 or more who pays no tax.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman agree with me that we cannot save very many millions until we start saving the thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Certainly. They do not spend anything downtown that we do not make available. The problem is that we have been so generous in filling the obligation pipeline that, when they have wanted $250 million, we have given them $500 million.

Mr. GROSS. And we cannot start saving billions until we save millions.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I do not understand billions and millions, but I do understand dollars and cents.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Iowa may not understand billions, but we are confronted with a Federal debt of billions here today.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. I was interested in the colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas a few minutes ago in relation to saving thousands, in order to save the millions. We were confronted with a bill in the Foreign Affairs Committee today that called for creating another new international organization. It calls for $400,000 to $500,000 merely to get it off the ground.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Could not the gentleman find one already in existence to carry out these functions?

Mr. GROSS. Of course. But I was interested in the colloquy, because the gentleman from Illinois is the sponsor of this bill to provide for another new international organization. I was constrained yesterday to object to the consideration on the floor today of conference reports on three bills. I am not sure that I was right in not permitting the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), to bring those bills to the floor to beef up three international lending organizations around the world to the tune of hundreds of millions of American dollars.

It is all well and good to engage in and listen to the rhetoric here today, but the proof of the pudding will come tomorrow or after the recess in the consideration of these and other spending measures as to whether this House is determined to stop this business of mindless spending which is the reason for raising the debt ceiling.

There is also pending before the gentleman's committee—I have had it there for years, and I am proud of it—the bill H.R. 144 to provide for balanced budgets and orderly annual payments on the Federal debt. I am hopeful that some day before I leave Congress, either voluntarily or involuntarily, the Ways and Means Committee will approve and pass out that bill.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I would hope we could do it, and I will tell the gentleman why: Because any piece of legislation that has the author's name as the title, H.R. 144, Mr. H. R. GROSS, deserves favorable consideration.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman can tell us anything that has been done to improve the methods the Budget Bureau uses for projecting anticipated income?

This $450 billion debt we have here is obviously the result of another error in anticipating income. I recently made a study of the past 50 years, and I find that the Bureau of the Budget has been wrong 30 times in the past 50 years in anticipating revenues.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right. I do not remember a time when they have been right in anticipating revenues.

One can do all he wants about restudying and revising methods, but he is not going to find any administration in office that will predict a downturn in the economy, even though it knows there will be one, predicting a decline in the tax receipts from businesses and individuals.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute, and I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is the gentleman saying that the Bureau of the Budget is knowingly deceiving both Congress and the American people?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, they are not deceiving. This is a practice that has developed to prevent further deterioration in the economy at a time, when they may expect some deterioration, by emphasizing that deterioration in the budget. It is not a question of deceiving. It is a practice that has been used over the years to keep things from becoming worse.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 30 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE).

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is the exigencies of our fiscal situation, what we have voted to do at other times, and the requirements of politics that bring this bill to the floor and require a full-fledged debate, I realize, but of course it is unthinkable that we would not raise the debt ceiling.

We all know that the results are a foregone conclusion.

I also agree that the debt ceiling is a rather poor control device but I do believe it offers us a good opportunity to review our situation, and it is important that we do this from time to time in order to understand the factors which have put our fiscal situation apparently out of control.

My leader and chairman has spoken very forcefully and effectively about expenditures, and I find very little to quarrel with in his remarks.

I would like to look at the factors that complicate our tax system as a device for the collection of revenue. That is first and foremost the function of the tax system—to raise the money that the Government spends.

There is a second function that has come into considerable currency lately, since we have fallen under the influence of the economists, and that is to use this central institution between the people and the Government as a device for restraining or stimulating the economy, depending on what the economists deem necessary at a given time. In other words, we have deliberately moved to relax taxes in certain ways for stimulative purposes or have imposed additional tax burdens to restrain an economy that was at super heat.

A third function of our tax system, often misunderstood and further complicating the whole process, is the expression of national priorities. Tax preferences are efforts by this Congress and the Presidency when the President requests such things of us, to reflect our national priorities by encouraging the flow of private capital into areas which we are unwilling to appropriate money for; and in this light tax preferences are as surely expressions of national priority as are the appropriations we make here on the floor of the House.

Now, one man's tax preference is another man's loophole, There is an historical reason for every preference we have in our tax system. Sometimes those historical reasons are no longer as significant to us as they were when they were first put in the Tax Code. However, I have heard it said that as much as $45 billion could be recovered if we had no tax preferences. That statistic itself is used as a shocker when people are talking about what they also refer to as loopholes or tax giveaways.

It is important to remember what these preferences are. They not only relate to special interests in the more classic sense—the so-called insidious oil lobby, the bloated business interests—but they relate to other purposes which all of us would feel were entirely legitimate under any circumstances. For instance, one of our major tax preferences is the double declining balance form of depreciation for multiple housing.

We found that public housing is a very expensive way to meet our housing needs. Therefore we have tried to facilitate the flow of private capital into the field of multiple housing by giving a good tax break. Frankly, we are achieving our housing goals this year primarily because of the private capital that is flowing into this field.

Charity is another motivation that we have sought to encourage in the pluralism of our system. Charities, of course, are something that every Member of this House wishes to encourage to sustain problem solving at all levels of our society.

In short, there are tax preferences and tax preferences, and I am sure there are very few people on deliberation who would wish to give it all up, no matter the staggering statistics of revenue loss which result from preferences.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONABLE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Just to call attention to the fact that when we speak of $45 billion in preferences, it should be mentioned that the most costly of all the preferences is the personal exemption, the standard deduction, and the low-income allowance.

I do not know of anyone here today who talks about preferences who would advocate at this time the elimination of those preferences, but they have to be acknowledged as a limitation on the amount of an individual's income that is taxed.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for his contribution. I think what he says makes additionally clear that just to call

something a tax preference does not automatically put it into the category of a loophole that will cause grave problems for the legitimate goals of our tax system.

There has been a lot of talk about the need for reform as a condition for the raising of the debt ceiling. Tax reform has been identified—and Chairman MILLS dealt with this issue to a degree—as a continuing need in the Congress, and I quite agree that tax reform requires a much greater oversight than we have been willing to give it in the past. I think we must have an accelerated schedule of tax reform. But I would hate to see this used as a device to try to hold up the necessary raising of the debt ceiling so that the Government can pay its bills.

Mr. Chairman, one item which has given impetus to the talk of the need for tax reform is recent disclosures that in 1971 supposedly 112 people, following the initial implementation of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, had adjusted gross income of over $200,000 and yet paid no tax. I do not know the source of this information. It, obviously, must be someone in the IRS, but one thing perfectly clear to people who consider it for a moment is that those returns filed in April of 1971 have not yet been audited. In fact, the auditing will probably not be complete on complicated returns, as these must inevitably be, for as much as a 5-year period.

And so, to speak of this as a deficiency in our tax system is rather misleading and premature. I do not know what is going to be disclosed upon an audit of these returns, quite obviously, but I could suggest several probable areas which will explain why these people paid little or no tax.

First of all, there is a great deal of confusion about the minimum tax imposed by the 1969 act. The minimum tax is imposed, for instance, on investment interest deducted, but not on business interest. The distinction between investment interest and business interest is a gray area and a lot of interest has been misidentified by taxpayers who did not understand it.

Under this new act, also, deductions have been taken—and no one would really quarrel with the right of the taxpayer to take this deduction—for State income tax paid for a year of heavy income, but paid the following year, deducting against the low income the following year. But there is nothing wrong with the law that State income taxes are a Federal tax deduction and our State officials would urge it not to be changed in any way, I am sure, because it is an indirect form of revenue sharing.

Another problem area has to do with charitable deductions. As a result of earlier disclosure of people who had substantial income but paid no tax, including many who had 100-percent charitable deductions, this was changed by the 1969 act, but it was phased out. It was not immediately reduced to the 50-percent maximum deduction now imposed by the act.

However, I suspect that among those 112 people whose lack of paying tax has been disclosed prematurely, you will find many people who have claimed the 50-percent charitable deduction, and no one would argue that they do not have a right to do that, but in combination with other types of tax preferences the charitable deduction has resulted in substantial elimination of their tax.

I have mentioned several preferences which I think are acceptable. Others may not be so readily accepted, but until we know the facts, I think we should abide by the event and have some confidence in the tax system.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONABLE. I yield to the gentle- from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the gentleman from New York mentioned municipal bonds. That is pointed out sometimes as being a tax loophole. I think that ought to be examined very carefully because it seems to me if we try to remove the tax deductibility of interest from municipal bonds that the bonds would have to be sold at higher prices.

Mr. CONABLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The local school districts and local cities would have to pay more for these services they render, they would have to raise the property tax. So that is a sword that cuts boths ways. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CONABLE. Yes; you are correct. Of course, we do not have information on the holders of municipal bonds since the interest is not taxable income from which we can determine the extent to which it enters into the figures of people not paying taxes. But the gentleman from California makes a point that is important. In all these areas of tax reform and tax preference there are constant tradeoffs. We can knock off tax preferences of one sort or another, but there is always a price in terms of socially desirable goals and the price of taxing municipal bonds may or unquestionably would inevitably be a higher cost for the financing of municipal improvements. The committee considered this very carefully in 1969, and decided the price was too high to pay, or at least, although we did try to do something with it in the course of our negotiations with the Senate and in the course of the very substantial public concern which poured onto the committee during this period, it was decided that this could not be effectuated in the climate then prevailing.

The gentleman is perfectly correct that this is a major area which could be called a tax loophole, or called aid to municipal financing, whichever way you want to look at it. The point is that in considering such areas, whether you call it tax preference, or whether you call it a tax loophole, does not mean that automatically it should be changed 100 percent immediately.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this opportunity to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) on the remarks that he has been making, and is making, on this very complicated and very important subject. As always, the gentleman from New York is talking sense, and that is something that on this particular subject has not often been heard in this Chamber. I think the gentleman's remarks ought to get a wider circulation. There is always a good deal of demagoguery involved whenever the question of tax loopholes arises, and the discussion of the gentleman has made it perfectly clear that there is always going to be some price if we make changes in our tax structure. When it comes to paying that price some of those who call the loudest for eliminating the so-called loopholes are not always too willing to pay the price. I too favor tax reform. But the job is not an easy one and I commend the gentleman for a very courageous and helpful statement which puts the whole issue in proper perspective.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank my friend for his friendly remarks.

I would like to say, though, that I would hope that my comments here would not be interpreted as opposing a continuing review of our tax system and continuing efforts at tax reform in order to make our progressive system more equitable. Certainly it is terribly important that people understand the tax system, and that they have an appreciation of the various things we are trying to do in it.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) in complimenting the gentleman for his remarks today. I know that the gentleman also spends a good deal of time on congressional reorganization, and I wonder if the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentelman from New York has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE).

Mr. FINDLEY. I wonder if the gentleman has any observations to make about our procedure here in the House of Representatives dealing with appropriations, revenues, and general budget matters. Are there any changes that the gentleman could suggest at this point?

Mr. CONABLE. I heard the colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois and the chairman of our committee. I think it is a very appropriate area of study. We do need to do something with our procedures. We need to look at the forest more and not at the individual trees which sometimes seem to be growing everywhere helter-skelter without any particular pattern for sensible forestry.

I would like to close my remarks, if I may, my colleagues, by referring back to my original statement. Our tax system

has several functions—to collect money; to restrain or stimulate the economy; and to reflect national priorities.

We are coming to a point where we are going to have to decide which of those functions are the most important and not permit others to detract from the primary functions.

If we had not passed the tax reform act of 1969 and put so much tax relief into it and if we had not deemed it was necessary to stimulate the economy in 1971 by enacting the President's tax package, we would have $22.4 billion additional revenues this coming year and our deficit would not appear to be so out of control.

In summary, the revenue side is terribly important as well as the expenditure side.

One last point: If we enact a ceiling on expenditures—and I think we should—we are going to be increasing the pressure for tax preferences of one sort or another. These are not subject to the ceiling on expenditures, because they are indirect tax subsidies rather than an outflow from the Treasury.

There is no man in this Chamber who has not sponsored bills designed to increase opportunities for private investors who are willing to engage in socially useful pursuits like building factories in slum areas and things of that sort. It is politically popular to do that sort of thing but it costs revenues and increases our deficits just as surely as unwise appropriations do.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this request for an increase in the debt limit demonstrates that the administration's economic policy has been a failure. This is clearly true of the economic policy prior to last August 15. The indications are that the policy since August 15, while it may not be a failure will not be nearly as successful as the administration claims. Once again, they are looking at the effects of their policy on the economy through rose-colored glasses. While it is unlikely that their current projections of economic recovery improvement in the unemployment rate and slowing down of inflation will be as far from a mark as their previous forecasts, it is also unlikely that the economy will respond to the current policy in the way their optimistic pronouncements would have us believe.

Direct evidence of the failure of the administration's economic policy is their request for an increase in the debt limit of $50 billion to $480 billion. This is the latest indication of the cumulative ineffectiveness of the administration's economic policy. It is a result of the cumulative unified budget deficits for the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973 of $86 billion and $111 billion on the Federal funds or administrative budget basis. The full measure of the policy failure can be seen when we consider the fact that most of the cumulative deficit results from the low level of economic activity the administration deliberately implemented in order to slow down inflation. Their initial policy prescription which they called "gradualism" was deliberately designed to slow down the economy and thereby reduce the rate of inflation. They claimed that this result would be achieved without any increase in unemployment.

In its efforts to slow down the economy, however, the administration was more successful than it intended. On one hand this policy of slowing down the economy generated substantial deficits because of the fall-off of tax receipts in response to the economic slowdown. On the other hand, it was not successful in breaking the back of inflation which, in fact, toward the end of the period actually became worse. In other words, as most everyone outside of the administration knew, the policy was not capable of slowing down the economy without causing the substantial increase in unemployment we have observed.

As a consequence, we were confronted with the cumulative effects of this ineffective policy—a sluggish economy, high unemployment, an excessive rate of inflation, and huge deficits. In short, the administration slowed down the economy and incurred these deficits without achieving its basic purpose of controlling inflation—a failure which extracted a heavy price from the American people without any significant benefit in exchange.

The administration's policy reversal contained in the President's August 15 announcement admitted the failure of the previous policy and adopted measures to control prices and stimulate the economy which, if they had been implemented early in President Nixon's term, might have avoided the recession.

In addition to being too late, the current policy is not likely to be as effective as the administration claims. It has its rose colored glasses on again, although this time perhaps not as heavily tinted as before.

The administration's economic projections appear to be too optimistic. It appears unlikely that a reduction in the unemployment rate to 5 percent by the end of 1972 will occur. The administration's projection of an increase in GNP of about $100 billion to a level of $1,145 billion for 1972 also appears too optimistic. The stimulation provided by the recent tax reductions and the pick-up in private spending is likely to be less than the administration is forecasting. Moreover, the administration apparently now expects the stimulation of the economy provided by the recent tax reductions and the increase in private spending to be substantially less than it did last September when it presented its tax reduction proposals. This is indicated by the substantial increase in Federal outlays they now plan for the first half of calendar 1972.

If this overly optimistic GNP level is not reached there will be a shortfall in receipts below the $221 billion the administration estimates for fiscal year 1973. This means the administration's projected deficits of $25 billion on a unified budget basis and $36 billion on a Federal funds basis are likely to be too low. These higher deficits, in turn, mean that the requested $480 billion debt limit is not sufficient to carry the administration through fiscal year 1973 unless there is a significant cutback in projected outlays.

The wage-price freeze and the phase II wage and price controls were an explicit admission by the administration that its previous policy to control inflation by slowing down the economy was misconceived. This reversal was a clear-cut admission of the complete failure of the approach the administration had mistakenly pursued. Moreover, it has yet to be demonstrated that the phase II controls will be an effective and equitable solution to the problem of inflation over any significant period of time.

The failure to control prices in the administration's original economic policy also led to a deterioration in our international position reflected by a trade deficit and increasing speculative pressure on the dollar. The new policy approach of suspending the convertibility of the dollar into gold, devaluing the dollar and negotiating currency realinement is not a complete answer to this problem. Moreover, it is important to point out that exchange rate adjustments are not costless. By reducing the value of the dollar in relation to other currencies, the cost of imports goes up and consumers must pay more for imported goods. In this respect, an exchange rate adjustment operates very much like a tariff or a sales tax on imported goods as far as consumers who purchase these imported goods are concerned. The point is simply that the expected increase in exports resulting from the exchange rate adjustments, while they may be necessary in view of the position we are in, comes only at the cost of higher prices for imported goods.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this increase in the debt ceiling only because it is absolutely necessary in the conduct of the Nation's business.

However, I serve notice now that I will not support a later expansion of the debt ceiling, unless more substantial efforts are made to bring about a more acceptable relationship between Federal income, Federal expenditures, and Federal deficit.

I also serve notice that I will not support an increase in the debt ceiling unless tangible progress has been made to tighten the tax system which is riddled with loopholes and tax giveaways. It is also essential that ceilings be placed on the contingent obligations of our Government which have a unique way of flowing into the cash debt.

Our unprecedented debt devalues the dollar at home and abroad and is directly related to inflation and increased consumer prices.

It is argued that this deficit is designed to create jobs. The record casts serious question on this issue.

I opposed the Revenue Act of 1971 because it was a revenue-losing bill. On October 5 of last year, I stated in this House that the administration's tax program for 1971 was a tax giveaway. The tax program was designed to produce a

vibrant bloom of corporate profits this summer and a harvest if bitter fruit with higher taxes in the cold seasons ahead. The tax package was inequitable, ineffective, and cruel to the individual taxpayer, who will have to pay higher taxes in the years ahead.

The 7-percent investment credit, the exporters tax gimmick commonly known as DISC, and the repeal of the motor vehicle excise tax will develop an annual Treasury loss of $12 to $15 billion per year by 1977. Over the next 10 years, the investment credit will cost the Treasury over $50 billion while the cost of DISC will total about $3 billion.

A $15 billion reduction in this year's deficit would have been a more certain tool for recovery. It would have produced the business confidence which leads to jobs instead of tax giveaways which are pocketed or invested abroad.

The repeal of the motor vehicle excise tax will cost the Treasury over $3 billion per year—every year from now on. Although I come from a community with considerable employment in the automobile industry, I felt that the permanent loss of this revenue overbalanced the advantage of a little temporary "ping" in the economy. The revenue loss resulting from the repeal of the excise tax will soon equal the Treasury loss in the revenue sharing proposal designed to aid our States and cities.

The administration claimed that 600,000 additional domestic car sales could be translated into 150,000 additional jobs as a direct result of the excise tax. This has not been the case. There were increased car sales for the months of September and October of 1971, but trends now are uncertain. This boom in auto sales did not create a substantial increase in employment in that field. Today, jobs in the automotive industry reveal a net loss when compared to the period preceding the new economic program.

I will not vote for another debt ceiling increase until the administration develops a thorough "tax reform package" that will effectively tighten the present loopholes that exist in the tax system. The committee hearings will disclose my efforts to expose the 112 individuals who made more than $200,000 in 1970 and who did not pay any income tax. Any person earning that kind of income ought to pay taxes. Any program that fails to include these individuals as contributors to the Government is defective and unfair. Our fractured revenue system critically needs tax reform.

I am pleased that our distinguished Chairman WILBUR MILLS has addressed a letter to President Nixon urging that he submit a tax reform program to the Congress. It is my hope that our committee will report tax reform legislation to the House before we again consider the debt ceiling later this year.

In the course of our hearings, I was shocked when Ezra Solomon—a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers—told the Ways and Means Committee that it would be a "tragic mistake" to try to balance the budget by raising taxes, even if the increased revenue came from closing tax loopholes. I cannot understand his rationale against fiscal prudence.

Nor can I understand Secretary of the Treasury John Connally when he refused to concede that there were loopholes in the Federal tax structure.

As I stated in my supplemental views on this bill, the $450 billion debt ceiling proposed by this legislation is only a part of a potentially larger debt obligation that shadows the American economy.

The contingent obligations of the Federal Government approximate an additional trillion dollars of potential debt including:

[In millions]

Government guarantees, insuring private lenders against losses (FHA, VA, etc.)	$135,157
Insurance commitments (overseas private investment corporation insurance, etc.)	773,589
Unadjudicated claims (Corps of Engineers, HEW, IRS)	3,623
International commitments (International Bank, Inter-American, Asian Bank, etc.)	7,258
Other contingencies not included above (Export-Import, SBA, rural housing)	13,506
Total	933,133

Although a considerable portion of this trillion-dollar liability is not likely to become debt, it is reasonable to expect that liability is likely to result on at least 5 percent of this debt, or $50 billion.

In recent years, the contingent liability in "high-risk programs" appears to be growing much too rapidly. The Price-Anderson Act provides a potential liability of $10 billion, while the rest of the atomic energy program provides a potential liability of $90 billion more. At the present time, there are 20 commercial nuclear powerplants in operation. The liability on each plant in case of a nuclear incident is $560 million. Although there is a small insurance payment by utilities, a contingent liability of tremendous dimension is shifted to the public.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is another case in point. In fiscal year 1971, $9,847 billion in insurance was issued to American companies to encourage them to invest in high risk areas abroad. The cost of this insurance to the companies amounted to $33 million in fiscal year 1971. In 1971, $16.5 million was paid to these companies in claims by OPIC. The takeover of mineral interests in Chile could increase claims to over $500 million. If these claims are sustained, the investors will have an immediate claim on the taxpayers.

It is incredible to reckon with the power we have given to non-elected officials of the Government. While we struggle over every dollar of appropriations, the bureaucrats of the Overseas Private Investment Insurance Corporation, can commit the Treasury to incredible handouts while they and they alone decide on the degree of liability.

The Export-Import Bank has a contingent guaranteed loan obligation of $1,395,000,000.

The vested claims of military personnel not yet retired runs into scores of billions. The civil service retirement and disability fund places a liability on the general taxpayer which will soon rise to $1 billion per year.

In view of the sharp escalation in the contingent debt in recent years, it is incumbent upon the Congress to fix a ceiling on the contingent debt as well as the cash debt. We must control the manner in which many types of contingent liabilities have a way of moving into the actual debt.

In the next legislation relating to the budget ceiling, I hope that a limitation will be provided on the contingent debt. It is also my hope the Congress will review the entire contingent debt to determine whether proper premiums are paid by those those who directly benefit from these programs.

If a concerted effort is made by the administration and the Congress to hold down expenditures and recoup revenue losses though tax reform, a further increase in the debt limit may be averted. This would be the most effective way of stopping inflation and the uncertainty that festers unemployment and business disarray.

In an earlier colloquy, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, discussed the almost $44 billion of tax preferences reported by the Joint Economic Committee. A question was raised on whether individual personal exemptions were included. They were not included.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter of May 22, 1971 from Mr. Murray L. Weidenbaum of the Treasury Department addressed to the Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE along with a table setting forth the effect of selected tax provisions:

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1971.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economy in Government, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your September 21, 1970, letter you requested revenue cost estimates of so-called "tax subsidies" for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for inclusion in your pending study of Federal subsidy programs.

Mr. Jerry Jasinowski of your staff has indicated to us the various special tax provisions he considers subsidies. Our staff has prepared revenue cost estimates for the selected provisions and these are enclosed.

I should point out that there is considerable conceptual controversy over what is and what is not a tax subsidy. In no way should the enclosed information be interpreted as Treasury's identification of tax subsidies.

Furthermore, the estimates are prepared on an individual basis for each item on the assumption that the item would be eliminated from the law without any other changes in the law with respect to the other items. If two or more changes in the law are made, the aggregate revenue effect will frequently not equal the sum of the revenue effects of the individual changes. Accordingly, the costs of the items are not additive.

Sincerely yours,

MURRAY L. WEIDENBAUM.

EFFECT[1] OF SELECTED TAX PROVISIONS[2]

[Dollars in millions]

Item	Fiscal years 1970 Corporations	1970 Individuals	1970 Total	1971 Corporations	1971 Individuals	1971 Total
Exclusion of benefits and allowances to Armed Forces personnel		550	550		500	500
Exemption for certain income earned abroad by U S citizens		45	45		40	40
Exclusion of income earned by individual in U S possessions		10	10		10	10
Western Hemisphere trade corporations	55		55	50		50
Exclusion of gross-up on dividends of less-developed country corporations	55		55	55		55
Exclusion of income of controlled foreign subsidiaries	170		170	165		165
Exclusion of income earned by corporations in U S possessions	85		85	80		80
Farming: Expensing and capital gain treatment			880			820
Timber: Capital gain treatment for certain income			140			130
Expensing of exploration and development costs	340		340	325		325
Excess of percentage over cost depletion			1,470			980
Capital gains treatment of royalties on coal and iron ore			5			5
Investment credit			2,630			910
Depreciation on buildings (other than rental housing) in excess of straight line			550			500
Dividend exclusion		290	290		280	280
Capital gains: Corporation (other than agriculture and natural resources)	525		525	425		425
Bad debt reserves of financial institutions in excess of actual	680		680	380		380
Exemption of credit unions			45			40
Deductibility of interest on consumer credit		1,700	1,700		1,700	1,700
Expensing of research and development expenditures	565		565	540		540
$25,000 surtax exemption	2,300		2,300	2,000		2,000
Deferral of tax on shipping companies	10		10	10		10
Rail freight car amortization				105		105
Deductibility of interest on mortgages on owner-occupied homes		2,600	2,600		2,800	2,800
Deductibility of property taxes on owner-occupied homes		2,800	2,800		2,900	2,900
Depreciation on rental housing in excess of straight line			275			255
Disability insurance benefits		120	120		130	130
Provisions relating to aged, blind, and disabled:						
Combined cost for additional exemption, retirement income credit, and exclusion of OASDHI for aged		2,800	2,800		2,950	2,950
Additional exemption for blind		10	10		10	10
Sick pay exclusion		105	105		105	105
Exclusion of unemployment insurance benefits		350	350		200	400
Exclusion of workman's compensation benefits		210	210		210	210
Exclusion of public assistance benefits		50	50		50	50
Net exclusion of pension contributions and earnings:						
Plans for employees		3,150	3,150		3,075	3,075
Plans for self-employed persons		160	160		175	175
Exclusion of other employee benefits:						
Premiums on group term life insurance		440	440		440	440
Deductibility of accident and death benefits		25	25		25	25
Medical insurance premiums and medical care		1,450	1,450		1,450	1,450
Privately financed supplementary unemployment benefits		15	15		20	20
Meals and lodging		170	170		170	170
Exclusion of interest on life insurance savings		1,050	1,050		1,050	1,050
Deductibility of charitable contributions (other than education)		3,450	3,450		3,550	3,550
Deductibility of medical expenses		1,700	1,700		1,700	1,700
Deductibility of child and dependent care expenses		25	25		25	25
Deductibility of casualty losses		80	80		80	80
Excess of standard deduction over minimum		3,800	3,800		3,000	3,000
Pollution control amortization			15			15
Additional personal exemption for students		525	525		500	500
Deductibility of contributions to educational institutions		200	200		200	200
Exclusion of scholarships and fellowships		60	60		60	60
Exclusion of certain veterans [1] benefits		600	600		650	650
Exemption of interest on state and local debt			2,200			2,300
Deductibility of nonbusiness state and local taxes (other than on owner-occupied homes)		5,100	5,100		5,600	5,600

[1] Estimates are prepared on an individual basis for each item on the assumption that the item would be eliminated from the law without any other changes in the law with respect to the other items. If 2 or more changes in the law are made, the aggregate revenue effect will frequently not equal the sum of the revenue effects of the individual changes. Accordingly, the cost of the items are not additive.

[2] The specific tax provisions were selected by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee.

Note.—Consent to insert table obtained in the House by Wilbur Mills.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That may be true as to the particular list of preferences apparently referred to. But as has been mentioned, the term "preference" is a very elastic and subjective term and is often given a very expansive interpretation. Many of the lists of "preferences" include virtually all the deductions currently taken from gross income and one of the items, of course, is the personal exemptions.

Mr. VANIK. I hope before this discussion is ended we might have the joint committee submit for the RECORD an accurate statement of the preferences and whether or not they do include personal exemptions.

The debt increase which we are voting on today has a definite effect on the life of every person.

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

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) and also point out how very pleased so many of us are that the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has requested the administration to have their recommendations on closing tax loopholes before the next debt limit action by the Congress. Ultimately the primary responsibility to make more efficient and equitable our tax system lies with the executive.

A number of us in the Congress will be supporting the debt ceiling limitation today because we have so much confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and in light of his request of the President to forward the administration's tax loophole closing recommendations within the next few months. The next trip around we do expect, before we lend this issue our support, to see meaningful tax reforms along with the debt limit procedure.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

(Mr. ABOUREZK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about three things: Debt, taxes, and priorities. This bill would increase the temporary debt ceiling by $20 billion. It is the fourth debt-limit increase requested by the present administration, and, if approved, the temporary debt limit will have increased by $85 billion during the last 3 years. I recognize the problems that might occur as a result of delaying the enactment of an adequate debt ceiling and I recognize that this legislation will probably pass. However, I, personally, cannot with good conscience approve what I feel is financial mismanagement and irresponsibility as a result of bad tax policy and a bad set of priorities which favor wealthy corporations and harm the average citizen.

This leads me into the topic of taxes. I would like to commend my colleagues, HENRY REUSS, JAMES CORMAN, WILBUR MILLS, and many others who have been urging and working for meaningful tax reform. And I am speaking of tax reform, not increases. Tax loopholes for the rich such as the oil depletion allowance, executive stock-option capital gains, new depreciation rules, and overseas investment incentives deprive the Treasury of billions of dollars while they also cut down the number of jobs in this country. At the same time they also place the tax burden most heavily on the wage earners in South Dakota and around the country. I share the opinion of the Honorable WILBUR MILLS that the value-added tax does not fit the definition of tax reform. This is nothing more than a national sales tax which would continue to place the heaviest tax burden on the low- and middle-income segment of our population while the higher income bracket continues to pay less than its fair share. It is this fact that largely accounts for the fact that

the top 1 percent of our Nation enjoys over twice the national income that the bottom 20 percent receives.

Finally, I would like to look at priorities. We all know that the administration claims it is "winding down" the Vietnam war. Yet, despite this, the proposed defense budget includes an increase of over $6 billion, the largest increase for any single area in the entire budget. This occurs in the face of the huge deficit we are facing this fiscal year and the huge deficit that is forecast for the next fiscal year. I cannot account for or support proposals such as these. It is time that Congress demanded a long-run accounting of the administration's plans and budgets. We must be sure that the tax and spending policies of our Nation are, in fact, in our national interest.

For these reasons I would urge a shifting of our priorities away from unmanageable and unnecessary space and military spending and I would urge measures that will plug tax loopholes which exist for the wealthy. But without such changes, I cannot support or vote for this measure to increase the temporary debt ceiling.

I include with my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, February 5, 1972, entitled "Raise the Roof":

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1972]

RAISE THE ROOF

Secretary of the Treasury Connally has gone before the House Ways and Means Committee to plead the Administration's case for an increase in the statutory ceiling on the public debt from $430 billion to $480 billion. This $50-billion increase, the largest ever requested by any Administration, will still not be big enough to last beyond February 1973.

Both Republican and Democratic members of Congress are highly skeptical of the Administration's budget making—as well they should be, after the soaring of this year's deficit from an estimated $11.6 billion to $38.8 billion, and of Mr. Nixon's three-year total deficit to nearly $90 billion. The Ways and Means Committee has agreed to grant the Administration an increase in the debt ceiling to only $450 billion—a figure that would require the Administration to come back before the end of June for another grilling.

This is understandable Democratic politics, but fails to come to grips with the urgent need for a detailed scrutiny—and revision—of the Administration's budgetary plan. In the past, the Administration's budgets have never been subjected to the kind of comprehensive analysis and critique needed to prevent the wastage of billions and to ensure that its tax and spending policies best serve national interests—economic, social and military.

Such a searching inquiry into Mr. Nixon's new budget has become critical. The Administration—"winding down" the Vietnam war, as the President likes to say over and over—is about to launch a big military buildup, with untold billions to go for new weapons systems and higher troop pay.

Mr. Nixon has asked for budget authority to increase military programs by $6.3 billion. Before buying into programs that would set in motion enormously costly projects that will grow year after year, Congress should insist upon long-run budget estimates from the Administraton. Then, and only then, should Congress decide whether it wants to allocate scarce funds to ever-growing military outlays that may even reduce rather than increase the national security. Thus far the coming defense buildup has been scarcely mentioned in the debt ceiling inquiry—presumably because it is none of Ways and Means' business.

Congress—which has been a party to the Administration's splurge of tax reduction—finally appears upset over what it has wrought and has been pressing Mr. Connally, without success, for the Administration's plans for raising needed revenues. Mr. Connally, claiming that the Administration has not accepted the theory that a tax increase is needed, states that therefore no decision has been made on what kind of tax proposal it favors. Meanwhile, back at the White House, spokesmen say the Administration has developed a tentative plan for a value-added tax—a national sales tax—and will submit it to a high-level commission of Senators, governors and mayors.

Whatever the merits of a value-added or any other tax, Congress ought to require now a far better accounting of the past fiscal stewardship and the future plans of an Administration that is losing economic credibility among both its supporters and its opponents.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Ohio in the remarks he made on tax reform and also join with the gentleman from California in stating we will vote this time for the increase, but we also want to serve notice that when this debt increase comes up next time, if there have not been meaningful tax reform proposals before the House, we are indicating at this time that we probably will not vote for another debt increase. We must increase our revenues through the proper closing of tax loopholes, in order to avoid these continuing debt increases and to provide a fair system of taxation for our people.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 36]

Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Pelly
Andrews	Eilberg	Pepper
Badillo	Forsythe	Powell
Baring	Galifianakis	Price, Tex.
Bell	Gibbons	Pryor, Ark.
Biaggi	Goldwater	Rees
Bingham	Griffin	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Ruppe
Broomfield	Hawkins	Satterfield
Byron	Hébert	Scheuer
Cabell	Helstoski	Schneebeli
Carey, N.Y.	Hillis	Sikes
Chisholm	Ichord	Smith, N.Y.
Clark	Jarman	Springer
Clawson, Del	Jones, Ala.	Stanton, J. William
Clay	Keith	Stokes
Collier	Kuykendall	Stubblefield
Corman	Leggett	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	McKinney	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Wis.	Macdonald, Mass.	Tiernan
Dickinson	Mailliard	Widnall
Diggs	Mann	Wilson, Charles H.
Dwyer	Murphy, N.Y.	Zwach
Edwards, Calif.	O'Konski	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUNGATE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 12910, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 360 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. At the time the point of order was made, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) had 1 hour and 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) had 1 hour and 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge the Members of our side to support the committee bill and to do their utmost to see that this legislation is approved, and I would hope that Members on the other side would follow the good advice of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard in the last half hour or so some rumors that I cannot believe—rumors that I think must not be accurate. These rumors are to the effect that when we finish consideration of this legislation, an effort may be made to approve a resolution providing for a recess between the end of business today and the beginning of business next Wednesday, and then following approval of that, if it was approved, a motion would be made to adjourn the House without the consideration of the strike legislation.

I cannot believe that to be true, because of the necessity and essentiality of considering on the floor the antistrike legislation. But let me say that if these rumors are true, I want it known that we, to the extent the minority can, will fight any effort to adjourn today without the House working its will on the west coast dock strike legislation.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the minority side fight just as hard to bring all of its Members in to support the increase in the debt limit?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. We certainly are going to try, and that is why I prefaced my remarks with an expression of hope that the Members on our side will do their utmost to support the increase in the debt limit.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to the statement made by the distinguised minority leader, I should like to observe that I have no authority to speak for this side of the aisle as the gentleman has for the minority, but that so far as this Member of the House is concerned, who is handling the rule bringing this strike legislation to the floor, immediately after the adoption

of or disposal of this pending legislation I shall be on my feet seeking for recognition to bring that matter up for consideration by the House. And, further, that is a privileged matter and I have no fear that I shall not be recognized.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me add one other comment, if I may, Mr. Chairman. A straight motion to adjourn might be made at the conclusion of the consideration of this legislation without a motion being made to approve the recess adjournment. What I said in the other instance I repeat in this case: We will fight any such adjournment, because the House has an obligation and a responsibility to consider the west coast dock strike legislation. And if we are unable to get it on the floor—in other words, if the House adjourns and does not assume its responsibility—we will stay here tomorrow, the next day, and the next day, to make sure that the legislation is approved.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan.

I would first tell my good friend the gentleman from Michigan that no one on this side of the aisle has to apologize for the lack of responsible action with respect to the debt ceiling. I will provide for the RECORD the times in very recent years when not one Member, not a single Member, of the minority party voted to increase the debt ceiling when the Democrats were in power in the executive branch. I have always considered those votes the height of irresponsibility.

And on one occasion we had to come back here at least twice, to pass necessary debt ceiling legislation.

It is a fact at this time we have the highest increase and the biggest deficit that we have had since World War II; but, speaking for myself and I think for the majority of the Members on my side of the aisle, we will vote to increase the debt ceiling this afternoon.

Now, with respect to the other matter, there is no plan, there is no procedure, that has been decided upon on this side of the aisle. But I would tell the gentleman from Michigan that there is grave concern indeed on this side of the aisle about the procedure that is anticipated here.

I have served in this body, with the exception of the war years, since 1941, and this is one of the rare instances that I have seen the Rules Committee bypass one of the standing committees of the House of Representatives. I realize that is supposed to be in a good cause despite the fact that the information I have is that this labor dispute has been resolved.

But one should do a lot of thinking before voting turn over the legislative functions to the Rules Committee.

I am surprised that the committee bill is not even in order under this rule. It is as if the committee just did not exist at all.

I remember back in the 83d Congress when the gentleman's party was in charge of this House and we had a distinguished Member from New York, Mr. Reed, as the chairman of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means, and the Republican President, General Eisenhower, asked for an extension of the excess profits tax. Mr. Reed was opposed to that excess profits tax, and he did not call a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. So Mr. Halleck, who was then the majority leader of the House of Representatives, instructed the chairman of the Committee on Rules to bypass the Committee on Ways and Means. They were prepared to do so until the late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, then the minority leader, spoke up and said they would never do it unless it was done over his dead body.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to think a long time I about this procedure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the pending $20 billion increase in the debt ceiling because of a strong conviction that to do otherwise would be an act of irresponsibility. The Members of Congress, irrespective of party affiliation have enacted the authorizing and funding measures which make the proposed increase in the debt ceiling mandatory.

The Democratic Party is going to act in a responsible manner today on this matter. It has always acted in a responsible manner. The statesmanlike position which it took during the Eisenhower years stands in stark contrast to the Republican record of obstruction compiled from 1961 through 1968.

During President Eisenhower's administration there were seven rollcalls in the House on bills to increase the national debt ceiling. On six of these occasions not only did a majority of the Democrats support the request of a Republican President, but on each of these six occasions, a higher percentage of the House Democrats voted in the affirmative than did the Republicans. On not a single occasion during the Eisenhower years would the debt ceiling have been raised but for a substantial block of Democratic votes. Democrats under the leadership of our Speaker Rayburn acted to put their country first. They refused to indulge in cheap politics.

In contrast, during the Kennedy-Johnson years, on 12 different occasions a majority of the House Republicans opposed this type of legislation. On 10 rollcalls, fewer than 10 Republicans supported a necessary raise in the debt ceiling, and on four occasions in 1963, 1964, and twice in 1967, not a single Republican Member of the House elected to face up to his responsibility by voting to raise the debt limit. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and the Democratic Party were thus ill-rewarded for the help that Lyndon Johnson, Sam Rayburn, and John McCormack accorded Dwight Eisenhower during his Presidential tenure.

Although we Democrats were thus smitten time after time during the Kennedy-Johnson years, in Christian charity we have turned the other cheek since President Nixon took office and rallied to his aid in this matter. Both Speaker McCormack and Speaker ALBERT have, like Sam Rayburn, put country before politics. In 1969, 1970, and again in 1971, an overwhelming majority of House Democrats supported an increase in the public debt ceiling.

As I today am prepared to uphold the President of the United States as a matter of fiscal responsibility, so I would hope that, next year, my good friend the minority leader, should it become necessary once again to raise the debt ceiling, would place principle before party and come to the aid of the Democratic President then occupying the White House.

DEBT LIMIT VOTING PATTERNS

Year	Vote	Republicans For	Republicans Against	Democrats For	Democrats Against
1953	[1] 239–158	169	33	69	125
1954	[2] 193–31				
1955	267–56	133	13	134	43
1956	[3]				
1958	328–71	142	42	186	29
1958	286–109	120	65	166	44
1959	256–117	88	48	168	69
1960	223–134	83	60	140	74
1961	231–148	40	113	191	35
1962	251–144	60	98	191	46
1962	211–192	9	153	202	39
1963	213–204	1	172	212	32
1963	221–175	2	158	219	17
1963	187–179	0	147	187	32
1964	203–182	0	154	203	28
1965	229–165	6	122	223	43
1966	199–165	1	121	198	44
1967	215–199	2	173	213	26
1967	197–211	0	176	211	21
1967	217–196	0	176	217	20
1969	313–93	140	41	173	52
1970	236–127	107	59	129	68
1971	228–162	105	62	123	100

[1] Included 1 independent member.
[2] This was a standing vote.
[3] Voice vote.

NOTES

1. With the single exception of 1953, a majority of the Democrats supported every bill during the Eisenhower years to raise the debt limit, 6 out of 7 times.

2. In contrast, on 12 occasions during the Kennedy-Johnson years, a majority of the Republicans voted against raising the debt limit. On 10 of these occasions, there were fewer than 10 Republicans supporting a rise in the debt limit. On 4 occasions 1963, 1964, and twice in 1967, not a single Republican voted to raise the debt limit.

3. In 1969, 1970 and 1971, a majority of House Democrats supported an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I do not mind telling you right now that when and if this rule comes up to bypass the Committee on Education and Labor I am going to vote against it, because I want to say something to you Republicans. I do not care if the west coast dock strike goes on for a little while longer. It might save your President another big deficit, because as long as they cannot unload that junk from those Japanese ships maybe the people in my district who make glass, pottery, and steel can sell a little of it without cutthroat sweatshop labor Japanese competition.

You are not doing anything for the American people here today. You might think you are getting even with labor. Well, I have got news for you. You are getting even with your own constituents, because we have a $3 billion deficit right now in our balance of trade with Japan, and, as I said the other day, another $20 billion where we are providing for their national defense, because they do not have any or pay for any of their own.

So you think this is a big political issue. Well, I want to tell you something: You come out to my district and debate it with me and say you voted to settle the strike that is already settled so more Japanese junk can flood this country, and my unemployed and underemployed will run you right into the Ohio River.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in the hope that we can get back to the issue we are meeting on right now; namely, the fiscal problems of the United States, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Well, Mr. Chairman, here we go again. I do not remember how many times we have gone through this exercise, but in my 14 years it has been the same old tune with only a slightly different refrain.

It is always an emergency, Mr. Chairman, for the same reason, but varying excuses. How often we hear "It's the only responsible thing to do," or "The U.S. Government must honor its obligations" or "Now is not the right time to defeat raising the national debt ceiling"—on and on, ad nauseam.

Really, Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very unfair, misleading legislative manipulation, and if the public really analyzed it, they should be outraged.

Demagoguery is not uncommon in this body and we witness example after example, day in and day out. Already this week, because of the extremely emotional overtones, this House passed S. 1163 amending the Older Americans Act to provide grants to States to establish, maintain, and operate low-cost meal projects for 60-year-olds. It authorized $250 million-plus, and not budgeted.

This ailed by with relatively few protest votes in opposition, because there really are not many of our courageous Members that want to be on record "against the old folks"—particularly during this election year. But, and this will be most interesting to watch, just how many of these humanitarian—generous with public funds boys—are going to pull a triple reverse today, suddenly put on their economy hat, and self-righteously vote "no" on the debt ceiling increase and try to blame the President for the economic crisis and chaos?

I predict, Mr. Chairman, it will be the same crowd—the big spenders—the guys that vote for every emotion-packed program for kids, elderly, sick, and disabled veterans, and promise more. The guys who take credit for increasing welfare, unemployment benefits, social security benefits, aid to the poor, education at all levels—then today, when they know they are the ones who disregarded the budget, and busted it wide open, day after day, they will not vote to increase the debt limit to pay for their excesses which they wilfully and knowingly created.

Our Members, Mr. Chairman, should have the intellectual honesty to take the responsibility to meet the obligations they have created. In other words, since they did all the dancing, they should pay the fiddler, and not expect those of us who exercised frugality and fiscal restraint to bail them out, as has been the case year after year.

It would be great if the big spenders would pay heed to these admonishments so we could say "go forth and sin no more."

But history, Mr. Chairman, repeating itself with sickening frequency, demonstrates that this cycle will continue and there seems to be no end. It would make more sense to just remove the ceiling altogether, because our spenders know we will raise it once or twice a year to meet their over-indulgent excesses.

To compound this miserable situation Mr. Chairman, the Ways and Means Committee, being less candid than we have a right to expect, reports out a bill increasing the ceiling to $20 billion of the $50 billion requested—ostensibly for whatever political impact that may result in forcing the President to seek the balance, closer to the forthcoming election. This type of shenanigans covers this House with something considerably less than glory, and I think all the Members are aware of it.

Mr. Chairman, if I may interpolate for a moment, I would like to say to those of you who now and before have voted for increased expenditures, prior to the $246 billion budget, you fail to recall and to point out that $181 billion of it or 72 percent of it are uncontrollable locked-in items that we in the Congress are responsible for creating. So, do not try to put that on the President.

So do not try to put that on the President.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that we continually find ourselves in this position, and unless there are some major policy changes it will go on forever, with devastating results on future generations.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this is the way our people want their affairs run, and I will not be a party to perpetuating and compounding this continuous injustice. I will not bail out the compulsive "be damned with the consequences" spenders, and intend to vote against the increase in the national debt ceiling.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am going to vote to increase the debt ceiling. I voted seven times in the Eisenhower administration, and three, I believe, in this administration, for an increase.

But I would point out to the gentleman—and I do not disagree with the gentleman's personal stand on this subject, I think he has reason to speak as he does—but one-fourth of the total national debt has been incurred by this administration which has been in 3 years.

Mr. DEVINE. With a Democratic Congress. Do not forget to put that in.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, but the President does not have to spend it, you know. He does not spend anything he does not want to. He does not spend any money for sewage where they need it, and the gentleman knows that, your town cannot get money to help provide sewage treatment, but where he wants to spend it he spends it, such as for aid to Greece, and aid to God knows who else.

Mr. DEVINE. The Congress would scream to high heaven if he held up anything, because it is the Congress that authorizes and it is the Congress that appropriates, and that is what creates the debt.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering legislation recommended by our House Ways and Means Committee to increase our national debt from $430 billion to $450 billion.

For a number of years when our tax committee testified before the Rules Committee to secure a rule on tax legislation, I have been almost the lone voice in urging the chairman and members of the tax committee to bring in legislation reducing and eliminating most of the fabulous, and in some cases, fraudulent, major tax loopholes in our Federal tax laws.

Over the last 40-odd years powerful lobbies, big oil, big estates, foundations, real estate conglomerates, and so forth, have succeeded in persuading the House and Senate to enact special tax credits, exemptions, depletions, and so forth, until almost two-thirds of the Federal tax burden has fallen on salary and wage earners with an income under $20,000 per year. This tax burden includes annual Federal taxes, State taxes local taxes, sales tax, consumer tax, and so forth. In 1969 the Congress

for the first time in generations enacted a tax reform law which only slightly reduced some of the large tax loopholes and gave the small taxpayer but a minimum reduction in his heavy tax burden.

When Chairman MILLS and the tax committee testified before the Rules Committee yesterday to secure a rule for the enactment of a $20 billion increase in our national indebtedness, I again questioned and asked that the Ways and Means Committee hold hearings and take further steps this year on another tax reform bill. We then could complete the job that they merely started in 1969 on major tax loopholes. Chairman MILLS stated that he and the committee were setting hearings early in this session of the Congress to again review the tax loophole situation, for which I commended him. I hope we can succeed, before we adjourn this year, to eliminate or greatly reduce most of these excessive loopholes which were placed on the tax books over the years.

THE POWERFUL OIL LOBBY

Mr. Chairman, the major loophole that could be completely abolished is the 27½-percent oil depletion bonanza which was enacted back in the 1920's when the oil companies wildcatted for oil production, a method that has been eliminated long ago by scientific process in finding oil deposits. I might mention a few more loopholes the Ways and Means Committee could take up and recommend for curtailment, to wit: Intangible drilling costs—$750 million; lack of full taxation on all capital gains on inherited property—$3 billion; treatment of executive stock options as capital gains—$150 million; the $25,000 surtax exemption allowed on corporate earnings—$1.6 billion; the new depreciation allowances—$2 billion, and the newly approved investment tax credit—$3.5 billion.

I also list for the information of the Members a few of the Federal income taxes paid by large oil corporations in 1970:

FEDERAL INCOME TAXES OF LARGEST OIL COMPANIES
1970

	Net income before tax	Federal tax, percent
Standard (New Jersey)	$2,474,748,000	10.8
Texaco	1,137,666,000	6.4
Gulf	990,197,000	1.2
Mobil	873,744,000	10.9
Standard (California)	589,637,000	5.0
Standard (Indiana)	394,539,000	14.2
Shell	274,681,000	12.4
Atlantic	257,121,000	4.13
Phillips	198,241,000	10.0
Conoco	301,115,000	6.4
Sun	223,086,000	12.1
Union (California)	161,825,000	4.6
Amerada Hess	183,905,000	3.6
Marathon	153,783,000	5.3
Standard (Ohio)	66,351,000	(10.4)

The Atlantic Oil Co. from the years 1962 to 1966, with annual income ranging from $61 million in 1962 to approximately $127 million in 1966, paid no Federal taxes whatsoever during that period.

In 1964, Standard Oil of New Jersey, with a net income of approximately $1 billion $630 million paid 1.7 percent tax to the Federal Government. These are but a few examples of Federal tax loopholes before our 1969 tax reform bill was enacted.

Some companies are not protected by huge, high-priced lobbies.

As an example, three coal companies, the Consolidated Coal Co., Pittston Coal Co., and Island Creek Coal Co, have paid annual Federal taxes on their gross profits in figures ranging between 18 and 28 percent annually.

Mr. Chairman, I also incorporate with my remarks a UPI news dispatch of January 11 of this year on oil taxes, which extends to the American public some further information on oil tax loopholes.

The small businessman, wage and salary earner must realize that when the major corporations and industries pay their just share of Federal taxes the tax burden will be greatly lifted from the shoulders of millions throughout the Nation. The article follows:

TAX FAVORS TO OIL GIANTS SAID TO KILL SMALL RIVALS

WASHINGTON, Jan. 11.—An independent oil driller from Wichita, Kan., said at a congressional hearing today that political contributions from oil industry giants were paid off in tax favors that were driving small oil companies out of business.

Alfred James III told a subcommittee of the House-Senate Economic Committee that attempts to reform tax laws to deny the industry's giants their advantages always were stifled by the giants' political influence.

As a result, he said, the independents, who account for about 85 per cent of all drilling for new oil fields, are being driven out of business.

He said the independent oilmen were like family farmers who cannot influence the prices of their crops when competing with corporate farms.

"I'm not alone in saying that I think the reason for this may go deeply into the political system you gentlemen have inherited," James said.

"It is a system of political financing and privilege. In a recent book titled 'America, Inc.', the authors state that the oil industry is believed to outspend all others in political contributions and a look at the tax laws leaves no doubt that the spending has been worthwhile."

James said the oil import quota system, which severely restricts the amount of cheap foreign oil entering this country, could not be abolished unless the tax system was changed.

The tax laws, he said, enable international oil companies to reduce their United States taxes to almost nothing. Royalties paid to foreign governments are treated as tax payments to those governments and subtracted from taxes the firms owe on their domestic operations.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in what our good friend, majority leader FORD said regarding this dock strike on the west coast. I was also talking with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) just a moment ago, and I asked him if it was not a fact that it was in December 1969, when he brought a bill in the House giving the President complete power to stop rising prices, wages, rents, and so forth and curb inflation. That anti-inflation bill, passed this House by about a 50 majority, and then was enacted by the Senate by about a 25 vote majority. The next week President Nixon signed that bill. The President could have then issued an order and curbed prices, wages, and so forth.

That was more than 2 years ago, in December 1969.

When the House Committee on Rules, in an unprecedented move, without my vote, took the dock strike bill away from the Committee on Education and Labor, it was an unnecessary dictatorial operation because word had already been announced that the dock strike was settled.

For 22 months after the President signed that bill prices rose a number of times. The President made no move to stop inflation by enforcing the bill in which the Committee on Banking and Currency and this Congress gave him the power to so enforce.

At 9 o'clock on the evening of last October 16, without consulting Congress, the President put into effect his celebrated freeze which he should have put into effect when he signed that bill back in December 1969.

The dock employees, along with millions of workers over the Nation, had been victims of a rise in the cost of living for 22 months without wage or salary increase. Prices of food, steel, furniture, and many other necessities of life had risen rapidly. Those price rises for 22 months were caused by President Nixon not enforcing what the Congress gave him complete authority to enforce in December 1969.

This strike was brought on by the President's complete disregard of the order of this Congress to enforce what the Congress told him to do under the bill that would have restricted the rise of prices and wages. So the President is responsible for the inflationary conditions causing the dock strike by not enforcing the power Congress gave him authority to enforce almost 2 years previously.

Now we hear the members on the Republican side of this Chamber trying to make some political capital out of the failure of their own leader in the White House in not carrying out the Congress' order that was given in December 1969. The damage caused by this unfortunate negligence or delay of the President is the direct cause of many of our labor difficulties, including the dock strike.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is a very good thing that we do have a debt ceiling. I favor raising the debt ceiling by small amounts if for no other reason than that it does give this body an opportunity more frequently to talk about deficits and the Federal budget in general. But the pity is that the debt ceiling discussion comes at the wrong end of the string.

We consider it after all the decisions have been made and after all the important actions have been taken. It comes at a point in time when we really do not have any practical choice. I daresay that those who will vote against this

debt increase will hope that there will be enough affirmative votes to carry it. I doubt that anyone in his serious moments really would like to see our Government confronted with a rejection of debt ceiling proposal such as this.

So much better would be for this House to consider budgets, spending, taxes and debt at the other end of the string, early in the procedures that lead to the creation of the debt. Let us face the total budget picture early in the session through a resolution which will include all elements, and an item representing total expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year, another item, the expected revenue.

If it shows a deficit, then an item showing how we propose to finance the difference—whether by increasing the public debt or increasing taxes or by a combination of both.

The city of Pittsfield, my hometown in Illinois, with a population of 4,000 begins its fiscal year by approving a budget. Yet, the institution holding the purse-strings of the biggest government in the world never from one end of the year to the other adopts a budget. We deal with appropriations and with revenue in a piecemeal manner. We deal in a piecemeal manner, first of all because there is no correlation between what is done by the Committee on Ways and Means, the revenue committee, and the Committee on Appropriations, the expenditure committee.

These two committees ought to get together early in each session and recommend to the House a Federal budget. Let there be a requirement in the rules of the House that a budget must be approved before any appropriation measure can be taken up. By that means we could perhaps establish priorities, first looking at expected revenue, then looking at the amount of the public debt, deciding whether we think it is wise to increase the debt, or increase taxes or both.

This is the way to establish priorities and get down to the fundamental forces that create debt. It is a shame that we deal also in a piecemeal manner with the appropriation process. We take bits and pieces and consider them separately from the rest, never having made a decision on total expenditures. Under this unbusinesslike procedure how can we hope to exert a real influence on the level of the public debt?

I am making a search attempting to determine what ideas have been proposed to deal with the problem. Joe Barr, when he left the post of Secretary of the Treasury, made some interesting, I think excellent, recommendations to the House, but nothing has been done with them, so far as I can determine. It has been years since anything specific has been considered by the House in terms of total Federal budget control. In fact, in the last Congress we eliminated the only provision in the House rules requiring House approval of a Federal budget. It is high time in this era, when we are encountering bigger and bigger Federal deficits, that we confront this problem.

My suggestion is that the leadership of the House, on both sides of the aisle, establish a select committee of very prestigious Members and give it a certain time in which to make recommendations as to changes in our system, perhaps a change in the Constitution, perhaps a change in the Rules of the House, perhaps a change in public law.

The Federal budget is out of control. Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives is entrusted with the purse strings of government, the right to originate revenue and spending measures. We have let these precious strings slip from control. Our procedures are inadequate. Certainly what we are doing now is not good enough. It disturbs me greatly to recognize that little, if anything, is being done to find a way out of this difficulty.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

THE STRANGE AND UNAUDITED EXPENDITURES OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, today, the House of Representatives is being asked to increase the authority of the U.S. Treasury Department to reach into the pockets of the American taxpayers.

While this legislation—to increase the borrowing authority by $20 billion—is being rushed through, it would seem only right that there be some discussion about the kinds of activities which the Congress is willing to finance with this money. Surely, the American taxpayers would not be asking too much if they demanded that controls—including independent audits—be imposed on the expenditure of all of these funds—every penny. This seems the most minimal demand from the people who are putting up the money.

Yet, my colleagues, there is not a single one of us on this floor who can report to our constituents that all of this money is being audited or that there are controls over all the funds which are being spent within the Federal Government.

FOUR BILLION DOLLARS DISPERSED ANNUALLY BY THE FEDERAL RESERVE WITHOUT APPROPRIATION

When our constituents write us about this enormous debt—and the growing deficits—we will have to tell them that nearly $4 billion of these funds are handed over to a Federal agency each year without any controls, without authorizations or appropriations from the Congress, and without even the remotest semblance of an independent audit. If we were to reply to our constituents in an honest manner, we would have to tell them that this Federal agency is allowed to spend whatever part of this $4 billion fund that it pleases, for whatever it pleases, without the Congress raising any objections.

By its inaction, this House of Representatives has allowed the Federal Reserve System to draw down this fund—this $4 billion—each year from the U.S. Treasury Department. By its inaction, this House of Representatives has allowed the Federal Reserve to expend money for whatever purposes it desires without any kind of audit or other controls—without the authorization or the appropriations processes. To some, this fact may make it appear that this Congress is derelict in its duty to protect the public interest and to provide the proper control over the use of public moneys.

FEDERAL RESERVE HAS MUTUAL FUND AND DABBLES IN THE STOCK MARKET

How many Members of this House—on either side of the aisle—would vote an appropriation to set up a mutual fund to dabble in the stock market? How many Members would be willing to vote the money to contribute to this fund for the benefit of the employees of any Federal agency? How many members of the press gallery would raise a hue and cry if the Congress dared to make such appropriations?

Yet, my colleagues, $3,600,000 of the taxpayers money has been used to contribute to just such a mutual fund being operated by the Federal Reserve System for its employees. These funds—tax moneys—are being handled by a brokerage house which then invests the money in various stocks and other income-producing sources. For every $1 that an employee of the Federal Reserve System puts in the fund, the Federal Reserve System generously tosses in another 25 cents of the taxpayers' money.

This is a program that has not been authorized by the Congress and none of this money has been appropriated or even considered by the appropriations committee.

The Federal Reserve System's generosity with the public's money does not stop with this dabbling in the stock market. The Federal Reserve is big on sports or, at least, its spending vouchers would indicate that this is the case.

ILLEGAL EXPENDITURES OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SHOCKING

For example, the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia has vouchers in its files showing that public money has been paid out for $246 in greens fees, $70 to a "Pearson" golf outing, and $228 for baseball uniforms. This particular part of the Federal Reserve System, of course, did not forget the cultural side in these expenditures of public funds. The vouchers show that $781 of public moneys went for art and craft supplies and prizes for art contests and $400 for a choral society. And during all of this activity, the Federal Reserve bank used $121 of tax money to buy cigarettes.

Not to be outdone on the Federal Reserve's sports competition, the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta has vouchers which show $29.94 for the purchase of two basketballs, and $18 for the purchase of eight softballs.

During the course of carrying out its rigorous monetary responsibilities, this same Federal Reserve bank paid out $24.66 in supplies for a bingo party, $32.60 for trophies and engraving for a bridge party and $50 for a "Mr. Buddy Farnam" for performing "Moments of Magic" for a summer outing.

And between the bingo parties, the summer outings, and the displays of magic, there were serious moments when someone from the bank had to go off to Florida to attend the launching of Apollo

12. For this little sojourn, the taxpayers were required to put up $326.47.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis obviously wants its officials to be properly attired and they do not mind spending a little part of the taxpayers money to accomplish this goal. The vouchers discovered in this bank show an $8 fee for tuxedo rental so that one of its officials would be properly attired at an annual banquet put on by a branch of the American Bankers Association. The vouchers in this bank also show an $18 expenditure of tax money for "repair of suit pants while on audit of safekeeping department." Another voucher shows $8.50 for "repair of suit coat torn on bank car while in Helena." Later a voucher is entered for another $12.50 paid for "additional cost covering repair of suit coat."

After taking care of the clothing needs of its officials, this Federal Reserve Bank—using public funds—put up $200 as a registration fee for "H. Galusha" to attend a seminar entitled, "Toward Understanding Men." There is no indication of whether H. Galusha had any better understanding of men after the taxpayers put up the funds for this seminar.

And as part of this continuing effort at understanding, this same bank paid out a $35 registration fee—with tax money—for "E. McGuire" to attend a seminar on "Elements of Human Behavior for Executive Secretaries."

Mr. Chairman, these examples could go on and on. They could literally fill pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They involve expenditures which the Appropriations Committee and the Members of this House would never approve for any agency of the Federal Government.

Who would approve—who in this House—would approve the use of public moneys to pay towing charges and a parking fine for a public official. Yet, the New York Federal Reserve Bank paid out $50 of tax money for just such a charge. Who would vote to pay the baby-sitting fees of public officials? I doubt that anyone would approve of this expenditure of public moneys but the New York Federal Reserve Bank has paid out just such fees for its officials to attend dinners.

And who in this House of Representatives would vote money to pay caddy fees and the expenses of public officials on a ski trip? Yet, the Federal Reserve System has paid out public moneys for just such activities.

FEDERAL RESERVE PAID DUES TO BANK LOBBYING GROUPS

The Federal Reserve has paid out as much as $100,000 in a single year for membership dues in various banking organizations, including the American Bankers Association. This has been modified—because of earlier charges which I have brought against the Federal Reserve—but the system continues to pay huge sums in dues to some of these organizations.

GAO AUDIT WILL SAVE MILLIONS NOW SPENT IN SCANDALOUS WAYS

Mr. Chairman, these are figures that the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee and the General Accounting Office have been able to obtain even though the Federal Reserve System will not allow an independent audit. A full audit would—I am convinced—uncover millions and millions of dollars of misuse of public moneys through the years.

A full audit—carried out by the GAO—would undoubtedly uncover numerous incidents similar to the transfer expenses which we discovered in the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. In this instance, we found vouchers revealing $8,675.07 in public moneys were used in the transfer of a single employee from Minneapolis to Helena, Mont.

These expenditures are possible only because the Congress has not required an audit of the Federal Reserve System and because the Federal Reserve is not required to come to Congress for appropriations.

SOME $70 BILLION OF PAID-UP BONDS

How is this possible?

It is possible because $70 billion of the debt we are talking about here today consists of bonds that have been paid for once. These are bonds that reside in the portfolio of the Federal Open Market Committee in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These bonds have been paid for once and they should be retired and subtracted from the national debt.

Instead, the Treasury Department pays the Federal Reserve almost $4 billion annually in interest on these bonds. The Federal Reserve, in turn, uses these payments to finance the operations of the system and to avoid coming to Congress for appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no question that these bonds have been paid for in full, and in fact some have been paid for more than once.

U.S. GOVERNMENT BONDS PAID FOR BUT NOT CANCELED

For anyone who doubts this, let me use the former Federal Reserve Chairman, William McChesney Martin, as the source. Here is what Mr. Martin told me in a hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee on July 6, 1965:

Mr. MARTIN. The bonds were paid for in the normal course of business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN. And that is the only time they were paid for.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Just like we pay debts with checks and credit.

Mr. MARTIN. Exactly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. In the normal course of business they were paid for once. You will admit that, will you not? They were paid for once and that's all?

Mr. MARTIN. They were paid for once and that's all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That's right.

This is very clear. Surely the Congress does not need any more evidence that these bonds should be canceled and that Treasury relieved of its obligation to pay interest.

Without the income from these bonds, the Federal Reserve would be in the same boat with every major Federal agency. They would have to come to the U.S. Congress for appropriations. And should this happen, the members of the Appropriations Committees and the Members of Congress would have an opportunity—their first—to review the activities of the Federal Reserve and its expenditures.

If the Federal Reserve System were required to come to the Congress for appropriations and if it were subjected to an audit by the GAO, it might be more concerned about holding down interest rates and supporting the government bond market. In short, it might start operating in the public interest.

DEFICITS REQUIRE THAT FEDERAL RESERVE PERFORM IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

With the enormous deficits of the Nixon budgets, the need for the Federal Reserve System to operate in the public interest is ever the more paramount. It is time that the Congress abandoned its passive role on debt management and required specific standards and procedures of the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve. If we do not meet this responsibility, we will be opening the gates to another round of destructively high interest rates, higher unemployment, and further recession throughout the business community.

We cannot allow the Treasury Department to finance these Nixon deficits willy-nilly in the market without some specific assurances that they will not create higher interest rates and severe credit shortages for the domestic economy. If we are to have deficits of this size, we must require that the Federal Reserve System fully support the Government bond market and that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department fully coordinate their activities and peg the interest on Federal Government borrowings at a reasonable level.

In saying this, I am sure that there will be a chorus of voices contending that this is "unorthodox." I do not agree—and historical precedents do not agree—that such a procedure is unorthodox, but I do know—beyond a doubt—that the kind of deficits that are being put forward by the Nixon administration are unorthodox in the extreme.

There is no question of the power, the ability, and the responsibility of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department to work together to manage this debt in a manner which will protect the American people and which will reduce the tremendous interest burden borne by the taxpayers. The Federal Reserve can peg this interest rate at any point it so desires. This is an absolute fact that cannot be contraverted by anyone.

Mr. Chairman, this has been admitted time and time again and I want to quote from a hearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee way back in March of 1947 when Mike Monroney—then a U.S. Representative and later a U.S. Senator—questioned Marriner Eccles, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on this issue. I quote:

FEDERAL RESERVE CAN ESTABLISH ANY INTEREST RATE THEY WANT ON PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. ECCLES. Now, the fact that the interest is where it is, of course, is not just an accident. The interest is where it is because that is where the Federal Reserve System put it in conjunction with the Treasury—I mean with the approval of the Treasury. The rates during the twenties and during the last

war, had there been an open market committee—which there was not, in the Federal Reserve System—they could have financed the last war and financed the Government during the twenties at prevailing rates.

Mr. MONRONEY. Do you mean to say that with your present open-market committee, and the operation of the Federal Reserve, as it now stands, that, regardless of what the national income is, or other economic factors, that you can guarantee to us that our interest rate will remain around 2.06 per cent.

Mr. ECCLES. We certainly can. We can guarantee that the interest rate, so far as the public debt is concerned, is where the open market committee of the Federal Reserve desires to put it.

Mr. Eccles was not speaking about theory, but actual practices by the Federal Reserve. Until the Eisenhower administration, the Federal Reserve had maintained yields on long-term Government obligations at 2.5 percent and below. This was true during all kinds of economic conditions—during depression, during war, and during the postwar expansion.

Nothing illustrates the ability of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury to work together to maintain low interest rates better than the period 1939 through 1952. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD at this point a table showing the yields on long-term Government bonds from 1939 to 1952, and a second table showing how these yields increased from 1953 on:

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by years, 1939 to 1952

[Percent per annum]

Year:	Yield
1939	2.36
1940	2.21
1941	1.95
1942	2.46
1943	2.47
1944	2.48
1945	2.37
1946	2.19
1947	2.25
1948	2.44
1949	2.31
1950	2.32
1951	2.57
1952	2.68

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by years, 1953 to present

[Percent per annum]

Year:	Yield
1953	2.94
1954	2.56
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02
1961	3.90
1962	3.95
1963	4.00
1964	4.15
1965	4.12
1966	4.65
1967	4.85
1968	5.26
1969	6.12
1970	6.58
1971	5.74

Interest rates rose in all categories after the Federal Reserve weakened its support of the Government bond market. Since the inauguration of the Eisenhower administration, the American people have paid about $497.2 billion in excessive interest rates on the total public and private debt—sums above and beyond what would have been paid if interest rates had remained at the levels existing in 1952.

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD a table showing how the $497.2 billion in excessive interest charges on the public and private debt has been calculated:

EXCESSIVE INTEREST CHARGES ON THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBT, 1953 THROUGH 1971

[In billions]

Year	Net public and private debt	Interest paid	Interest costs figured at 1952 average	Excess interest paid
1953	$581.6	$21.7	$20.5	$1.2
1954	605.9	23.5	21.4	2.1
1955	664.9	25.8	23.5	2.3
1956	698.3	29.5	24.7	4.8
1957	728.3	33.6	25.8	7.8
1958	769.1	35.5	27.2	8.3
1959	831.4	40.3	29.4	10.9
1960	872.4	44.2	30.9	13.3
1961	929.8	46.8	32.9	13.9
1962	997.1	52.5	35.3	17.2
1963	1,071.7	58.7	37.9	20.8
1964	1,153.7	65.2	39.8	25.4
1965	1,245.6	72.4	44.1	28.3
1966	1,341.4	81.9	47.2	34.7
1967	1,442.7	89.9	50.8	39.1
1968	1,584.5	104.9	55.8	49.1
1969	1,722.7	120.6	60.6	60.0
1970	1,839.7	135.6	64.8	70.8
1971	[1] 1,950.0	[1] 156.0	68.8	87.2
Total				497.2

[1] Estimated.

Mr. Chairman, I also include in the RECORD a table showing how we have paid $103.8 billion in excessive interest charges on the Federal debt since 1951:

EXCESS INTEREST RATES ON FEDERAL DEBT, 1951–73

Fiscal year	Total Federal debt (billions)	Total interest paid (billions)	Computed annual interest rate	Computed interest cost at 1951 rate (billions)
1951	$255.3	$5.7	2.23	$5.7
1952	259.2	5.9	2.27	5.8
1953	266.1	6.6	2.48	5.9
1954	270.4	6.4	2.36	6.0
1955	274.4	6.4	2.33	6.1
1956	272.8	6.8	2.49	6.1
1957	272.4	7.3	2.67	6.1
1958	279.8	7.8	2.78	6.2
1959	287.8	7.8	2.71	6.4
1960	290.9	9.5	3.26	6.5
1961	292.9	9.3	3.17	6.5
1962	303.3	9.5	3.13	6.8
1963	310.8	10.3	3.31	6.9
1964	316.8	11.0	3.47	7.1
1965	323.2	11.8	3.65	7.2
1966	329.5	12.6	3.82	7.3
1967	341.3	14.2	4.16	7.6
1968	369.8	15.6	4.21	8.2
1969	367.1	17.7	4.82	8.2
1970	382.6	20.0	5.22	8.6
1971	409.5	21.6	5.27	9.1
1972 [1]	455.8	22.1	4.84	10.2
1973 [1]	493.2	23.4	4.74	11.0
Total		269.3		165.5

[1] Estimated.

Note: Excessive interest on national debt—$103,800,000,000.

Source: Budget of the United States for fiscal year 1973.

THE FICTION ABOUT CURRENT INTEREST RATES

Actually, much of the current deficit and the red ink projected for the new fiscal year can be traced back to the economic problems caused by an extended period of high interest rates. These extortionate rates which have existed over the past several years have stifled economic growth, cut personal income, and increased unemployment all over the Nation. The deadening effect of high interest rates is one of the prime reasons that the administration's projections of the expansion of the gross national product missed the mark so widely last year. It is one of the reasons that economic recovery is moving so slowly.

Unless interest rates are sharply reduced at all levels, the $25.5 billion deficit projected for fiscal year 1973 will grow tremendously. We cannot finance an economic recovery at the present level of interest rates notwithstanding the great propaganda that the administration has fostered concerning minor reductions in some money market rates.

For example, the very best corporate bonds are priced at between 7.25 and 7.50 percent today, while in the mid-1960's these same classes of bonds carried interest rates of below 4.50 percent. Today, home motrgages are ranging between 7½ and 8 percent across the Nation while in the mid-1960's, this rate was well below 5½ percent. High-grade municipal bonds are ranging between 5.30 and 5.50 percent today while in 1965, this same type of bond bore an interest rate around 3.25 percent. The rates in consumer areas are even more out of proportion with "normal" levels and in most areas of the country, people are paying 36 percent and more on small loans, and from 18 to 24 percent on a growing volume of installment credit. So, the fact that some interest rates are below the historic highs of 1969–70, does not translate into "reasonable" or "low" interest rates.

The administration is desperately running around the country denying that the huge deficits—nearly $65 billion over this and the next fiscal year—will create higher interest rates throughout the economy. They sound like medicine men wildy flailing their arms exhorting the money markets to behave in line with President Nixon's reelection campaign.

Under Secretary of the Treasury Charls Walker went to New York last Friday in one of these attempts to assure the public that the big deficits would not create higher interest rates. Again and again, he assured the American Management Association that this would not be the case.

When the bond markets reopened on Monday—after Dr. Walker's speech—the interest rates went up again on key corporate issues.

Analysts for the First Boston Corp., Kidder Peabody, and other banking and investment houses sharply disagree with the administration's forecast that this deficit can be handled without disruptions in the money markets. The economist for Kidder Peabody was quoted in the New York Times as saying:

> Large deficits point to rising interest rates. The huge red ink figure will have a significant impact on interest rates—both short and long—during the first half of 1972.

This is the same kind of analysis that is being made by virtually everyone ex-

cept the political forecasters in the administration. And, as this Congress well knows, this administration's economic forecasts—whether based in politics or not—have never come close to the mark in any area.

So, my colleagues, it is obvious that we are in for serious problems on the interest rate front unless the Federal Reserve decides—in coordination with the Treasury Department—to start operating in the public interest by supporting the bond market and driving down interest rates.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I want to urge my colleagues to support the efforts to require a full and complete audit of the Federal Reserve System by the GAO on a regular basis. In addition, I hope that my colleagues will throw their support behind the efforts to retire the bonds that have been paid for and which reside in the open market portfolio of the Federal Reserve System and thus require the Federal Reserve to come to the Congress for appropriations as do other Government agencies.

The American people are watching this Congress closely and the spotlight is even more intense when we are dealing with legislation involving a public debt of $450 billion. The people will not long tolerate policies which allow a huge Federal bureaucracy—such as the Federal Reserve System—to use the taxpayers money so loosely, without regard to public policy and without regard to the needs of the Nation. We cannot allow the power, the myth and the big banking interests which stand behind the Federal Reserve System to deter us from doing our duty in this area.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me an additional 10 minutes?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 7 minutes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is standing here crying about what has happened to him and to his committee by way of getting certain information. The gentleman and his committee gave the President standby powers, is that not true?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and, without the benefit of amending the Constitution of the United States, the President used those powers to devalue the currency. In other words, the Constitution specifies that the Congress shall fix the value of money, and the gentleman and his committee delegated that authority.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is overstating his facts a little.

Mr. GROSS. I have not overstated anything.

Mr. PATMAN. It is not exactly that way, but I do not care to go into that now.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is indicting the Federal Reserve Board. Knowing all of this, why did he bring a bill to turn over all of the credit of this country to the Federal Reserve Board? Why?

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is standing in the well of the House and indicting the Federal Reserve Board backward and forward, when he brought a bill to the House floor to turn over to the Federal Reserve Board control of every dollar of credit in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no, that is a mistake.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, you did.

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. It is on the statute books.

Mr. PATMAN. No; that was standby price and wage controls.

Mr. GROSS. You passed two bills, one providing for price and wage controls and another to turn over to the President and specified the Federal Reserve Board as being the administering agency——

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right, but the President failed to use that price and wage control legislation when we passed it. If he had we would not be in the situation we are in today.

Mr. GROSS. But you gave him the authority.

Mr. PATMAN. No, you are mistaken on it. Read up on this.

Mr. GROSS. I have read up on it. You read up on what you did.

Mr. PATMAN. So, today we have not only that, but let me tell you a new wrinkle I discovered just by chance. You know, you cannot see the minutes of the Federal Reserve Board. For 30 years I was unable to see them—for 30 years—because they were secret, deep, dark secret, and they did not want anyone to know what was going on. They stopped that practice and, finally, we got to see the records.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Why do you not bring in a bill to make them subject themselves to an audit?

Mr. PATMAN. I have attempted to do it, but in committee I have lacked two or three votes of doing it.

Mr. HAYS. Maybe the Rules Committee which is so interested in taking bills away from other committees you may prevail upon the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi to bring in such a bill and I will vote for it if the gentleman brings it in.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the minority party has too consistently been for high interest, big rich and big banks and the like. That is the reason for the last 44 years the minority party has only been in power 4 years in the Congress, because they want to cover up the economic issues. They never indulge in debate on economics and bread and butter issues.

If you will take the election returns since 1928 you will find that for 24 years the Republican Party was not in charge of the Government.

Now, under Mr. Hoover who received one of the biggest votes that any President ever received, after 2 years, they did not want any more of Hoover and they gave him a Democratic Senate. He had been in power 2 years but he was out of power for the last 2 years and the Republican Party was not in power any more until 1952 when General Eisenhower—and I say "General Eisenhower," because he was a national hero, because he was a general, because he was a great and fine man and a great hero and I have nothing to say against General Eisenhower, nothing but words of praise, but he received the biggest vote any President of the United States ever received. He went into office on January 20, 1953, and he had the House and Senate both with him. He was in charge of the Government. He was in charge 2 years. At the end of the 2 years when the first election was held after his inauguration we had a Democratic House and Senate and after the next two elections after that we had a Democratic House and Senate.

So, for the last 44 years the Republican Party has only been in power 4 years out of 44. In other words, they have not been in power long enough to have the expertise to know how to run the Government. I am not criticizing them for it, but I am criticizing the manner in which private financing and public financing has been carried on that has ruined our country.

But let me get back to the Federal Reserve. I discovered what they called a thrift plan in the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve System has about 20,000 employees. They all receive good wages and good salaries. They created a program at the Federal Reserve, without congressional approval, to start a mutual fund for their employees using taxpayers' money.

This is the way it works. Every time the employee puts up a dollar in the thrift fund, the Federal Reserve would give them a quarter, 25 percent added to it, every time, 25 percent of taxpayer's money. And at the end of the year that runs into millions.

Well, what right do they have to do that? Why do they not do it for all Federal employees? Why restrict it just to the 20,000 Federal Reserve employees? I asked that question, and I was told, "Oh, we expect eventually to expand it, make it flexible, and include all employees."

This is one of the things they are doing, that should convince you absolutely that they do not care anything about the use of the Government's money. They are taking every dime they can get, and using it for any purpose they want to. It is not only increasing our national debt, but it is doubling our debt.

Now, this $70 billion in bonds, when they sell bonds through the open market committee, why then of course, they are bought by banks and others.

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

Mr. PATMAN. May I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. May I have 5 minutes? I think I am entitled to have 5 minutes.

Well, anyway, these Government bond dealers, they have the right to buy Government bonds from the Federal Open Market Committee. Nobody else can buy them. They are exclusive. It is a most lucrative operation.

These bonds are purchased by these 20 dealers, and they get a cut on each one of them that comes through. When the bonds are sold they go through the dealers, and they get one toll, they get a cut on the incoming bonds, and then they get a cut on the other side for the outgoing bonds. They get a profit on them in 1 recent year of $738 million.

And these dealers—you talk about all the criticism of subsidies, and yet they received the biggest subsidy, these big dealers, the other day, by letting them not sell the bonds, but just put them up as security and get interest at 3 percent, in other words, at a subsidized rate. Nobody else gets interest at 3 percent except those 20 dealers. That runs into a lot of money.

In conclusion, let me say this. The Federal Reserve does not have to come to Congress for its funds. They have not come to Congress in the past, and they will not come to Congress in the future for any funds unless we mandate them by law.

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

Mr. PATMAN. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Vote for legislation to audit the Federal Reserve, and stop the Government from paying its debts twice.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12910 to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt.

At a time when the American taxpayer's back is terribly burdened by the load of Federal, State, and local taxation, and his purchasing power is vastly reduced by inflation largely caused by the failure of Government to hold spending in check, this is no time to make Federal borrowing the chief source for such easy spending. I therefore oppose any addition to Federal Government expenditures—especially those which will be financed by still more borrowing in the private money market. The President's major new programs call for additional spending in fiscal 1973 of $14 billion. Chairman MILLS has suggested here today that the add-on cost in the 1973 budget might create as much as $34 billion over last year's budget.

Since 1941 there has been a Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures in the Congress of the United States. The joint committee consists of such distinguished members as Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman GEORGE MAHON of the Appropriations Committee, and the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, and the Honorable FRANK BOW. Unfortunately, our House of Representatives has been negligent in paying attention to the warnings that this Joint Committee has sounded or the statistics they have reported. I firmly believe that the time has come to listen more closely to the voices of those who serve on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures and to the words of the distinguished House Committee on Appropriations' Chairman GEORGE MAHON who has stated:

> There seems to be a growing disposition on the part of Congress and the administration in considering Federal spending to brush aside the question of whether or not we have the money in hand or in sight to pay the bills. Whopping deficits do not seem to deeply disturb the administration or the Congress very much any more.... We take note of our needs and wants and tend to disregard the fact that we do not have the revenues to pay our bills. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 6, 1971.)

Mr. Speaker, the budget message does a masterful job of putting a rosy image on what in my judgment is a near-disastrous fiscal situation. We have been trying to buy ourselves out of inflation and huge deficits, but these efforts have failed. Inflation is receding a bit, but whopping deficits have increased markedly from year to year, and a whopping deficit is again projected for fiscal year 1973. As the fiscal year 1973 proceeds, it may very likely be much greater.

No one should believe that with whopping deficits in the $20 to $30 to $40 billion range that we can really win the fight against inflation adequately or stabilize the economy. This Government will have to borrow about $44 billion in the current fiscal year 1972—from the highway fund, the social security fund, and other trust funds, and from the private sector—mostly from the private sector.

When the Government goes to the money market and borrows in the magnitude of $38 billion to $40 billion from the private sector, this inevitably will have a marked effect upon the economy of our country. Among other things, such borrowing will put pressure on interest rates. Such a course, is of course, highly inflationary and will tend to create further economic dislocations.

DEFICITS ARE A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Let me say that I shall not speak in a partisan manner. No one administration is responsible for our plight. The administration and the Congress must share the responsibility for the dangerous fiscal situation which confronts the country. The point really I make today, Mr. Speaker, is that we are at the crossroads as a nation. As I see it, our way of life is threatened.

A further point I make—and we have made it here on many occasions—is that democracy will collapse without restraint, and this Government in both the executive and the legislative branches has not been using sufficient fiscal restraint. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 24, 1972.)

Let me summarize the points I wish to make here today:

First. The U.S. House of Representatives, together with the U.S. Senate, has not properly faced up to its responsibility to bring this irrational increase in Federal deficit under proper control. More important, we must urge the Congress to concern itself more directly in the control of expenditures so that they do not exceed Federal income. This must be done by deeds not just rhetoric.

Second. I am also asking you to give thoughtful consideration to a bill (H.R. 12195) that I have introduced and is now before the Ways and Means Committee. I believe H.R. 12195 establishes a constructive method of balancing the Federal budget, and sincerely feel that it is a positive alternative to aimlessly increasing the national debt.

The bill provides the Congress with regular reports by a taxpayers' advocate; establishes that clear notice be given the Congress and the American public of the current status of the gross public debt, with a statement of the cost to the taxpayers; and provides for the reduction of the Federal debt on an annual basis.

Third. Let us stop the ever-increasing unmanageable debt, which is proving to be an unconscionable burden on the American taxpayer. Since the Federal debt now creates an interest charge so great that it has become the third largest item in the U.S. Federal budget, I strongly appeal to this House to take the leadership now to change the direction of this dangerous course of Federal spending in excess of revenue.

I would like to quote from a letter by a constituent which is very typical of the kind of mail I have received since I returned to Congress in mid-1970. This housewife has presented it in direct, blunt terms:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSSELOT: I wish I could express adequately to you—and to anyone else who may be in a position to do something—my distress at what I have come to think of as the Great American Crime—the exploitation of the taxpayer.
>
> We people of middle class suburbia, who have not faulted in paying our taxes, who have voted into office those we think—or hope—will best represent not only our interest but those of the entire nation, who have taught our children the responsibilities of citizenship—We've been had!!!
>
> We are weary of footing the bill—and in return getting less than our share of "rights" . . . The fault is partly ours, I admit. Which of us from our comfortable middle class taxpaying home wants to rock the boat and bring upon his head all kinds of righteous and moral indignations. But we are getting too tired and too weak to carry on much longer—especially when we see so pitifully little in return. One of these days we'll have to organize—just to protect ourselves from this kind of exploitation. We need a spokesman—and whoever he is will get the ear *and* the vote of the greatest mass of people—the ones who carry the load.
>
> Mr. Rousselot, what are you going to do about this? Please don't waste time having one of your clerks answer this with a form letter. Instead do something!

Mr. Chairman, I intend to do something. I do not believe that I will be the only one who will come before this House to make comments about our national debt, and I believe that since we have been asked to come before you, this is the time to redirect and reorder our priorities on this important subject. This woman is not a lone voice. Chairman MILLS has consistently stated as he has brought bill after bill before the House of Representatives that someday we were simply going to have to come to grips with the debt. I quote the words of Chairman MILLS:

> I cannot for the life of me see how anyone can conceive, if he is aware of the situation, of allowing this great Government of ours to be placed in the position that during the early days of the depression some of our States were in; namely, not being able to meet its bills when they come due. Think of what

word would go out, not only to our people but throughout the world. It would be said that this great demonstration in democracy and free enterprise has finally come to its knees and is broken. What Khrushchev and others had said years ago they would do to us would have been accomplished. Do we want any such message as this to go out to the world; namely, that this Government is so hog tied that it cannot pay its own bills when they come due? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 19, 1969.)

Now let me briefly follow through on the above listed points which I urge this House to seriously consider:

First, this House of Representatives, and more particularly the Ways and Means Committee, has the clear responsibility under the Constitution to originate "all bills for raising revenue. To lay and collect taxes. To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Let me repeat, "To pay the debts." This is familiar to every Member of the Ways and Means Committee, it is my firm conviction that inherent with these powers is also implied the obligation to execute these delegated powers in a responsible manner. In my opinion, we are not presently doing this. To automatically increase the debt ceiling by rote just because we are asked by the executive branch of the Government, or even others, is not right. Many segments of our constituency—and for that matter the whole Nation—are beginning to sense this irresponsible trend and to ask us what we are doing to change the direction.

Let us review some of these comments.

Nation's Agriculture, January 1972 says in its column on farm marketing:

To be successful in curbing inflation, it is necessary for Congress to reduce inflationary pressures by cutting federal expenditures and for the Federal Reserve Board to keep a tight rein on monetary policy.

American Metal Market editorialized on December 8, 1971, in commenting about the huge deficit and kind of spending that we in Congress have allowed that—

In truth, such deficit spending could, if and when the economy picks up strength as it is expected to do by the second quarter of 1972, actually negate the effects of the freeze and the restraints of Phase II.

KNXT, a CBS television station in Los Angeles, editorialized on December 21, 1971:

In the first place, government is the biggest spender in our economy. Many economists say that inflation starts with government spending . . .

The United California Bank, in its 1972 forecast states:

A third factor behind the inflationary bias is the propensity for fiscal and monetary policies to be expansive for the purpose of aiding the economy to recover or to expand. The classical example of this type of inflationary bias was the excessive monetary ease and budget deficits in calendar 1970 and 1971 and their continuation into 1972.

The American Farm Bureau, an association with a membership of over 2 million farm families, adopted a resolution on Government spending and inflation which states in part:

Inflation is a serious threat to economic stability. Excessive federal government spending is the basic cause of our current problem of inflation. Deficit spending by the federal government and policies which expand the supply of money and credit faster than production clearly lead to inflation . . . we believe more attention should be given by both the Executive and Legislative Branches of government to the fact that federal budget deficits of the magnitude projected for 1972 will fuel inflation, rather than halt it, regardless of other actions.

The executive vice president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Oliver H. Jones, in an article in the Mortgage Banker, January 1972, entitled "The New Economic Program" states:

Concern over the large federal deficit must be more than expressed. Congress and the Administration must act to hold the line, if not reduce the deficit. Logic insists that we do not risk a situation where the monetary authorities are forced to expand the supply of money and credit in order to support an untenable volume of Treasury financing.

Publisher and executive editor of Publisher's Auxiliary, Theodore A. Serrill, in an article dated December 25, 1971, entitled "Our Depreciated Dollar" wrote:

Spend more than we take in, and we in business eventually go bankrupt. For a government to spend more than it takes in, the route is towards a depreciated currency . . .

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, writing in the St. Louis Globe Democrat, December 14, 1971, says:

Our political leaders have embraced the mythology that federal deficits are a stimulus to the economy and necessary for full employment. The myth could be plausibly argued in a dynamic, expanding economy. It satisfied the political impulse to provide benefits without paying the piper . . . Federal deficits are today depressing the economy. The most pervasive doubt, not only in this country but in the world, is that the U.S. Congress is capable of disciplining itself . . . A firm Congressional determination to balance the budget would dispel the prevailing uncertainty and restore confidence in the integrity of our government.

These above are but a very small and selected number out of a vast number of letters, articles, radio comments, and published words of people in all walks of life who have said, as the housewife in my district has said, "What are you going to do about it?" Let us say "now" to the American people, and to all branches of the Federal Government, "We have gone too far. We will not increase the deficit to accommodate massive spending. Let us say we will not increase the burden of debt and will instead start now to reduce expenditures."

Second, I am asking my colleagues to give serious consideration to H.R. 12195, a bill to provide for regular reports to Congress by a taxpayers' advocate; clear notice to Congress and the public of the current status of the gross public debt; and reduction of the Federal debt on an annual basis. Briefly, this bill would accomplish the following:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 12195

TITLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The policy of Congress is to pay the debts of the United States and to effect, by a reasoned and practical reduction of the Nation's public debt, the gradual elimination of the great burden on the American taxapayer caused by this debt and its enormous annual interest.

Terms defined in this Title are "outlays", "revenues", "Obligations", and "gross public debt", and it is noteworthy that obligations include "any guarantees explicit or implied" of the Federal government.

TITLE II. THE BUDGET AND PUBLIC DEBT

After January 1, 1973, the following would be required:

1. The annual Budget shall have Federal outlays balanced by Federal revenues with Trust funds not included.

2. Each monetary request shall be accompanied by the percentage of the total budget which that request equals.

3. A Federal trust fund account shall be submitted concurrently showing payments made, surpluses or deficits, and investments. Revenue measures shall be proposed to meet any imminent trust fund deficit.

4. No receipts earmarked for trust funds shall be invested or borrowed by any branch, department or agency of government to finance any operations or programs or to purchase government securities outstanding before that date, except that they may be invested in the securities regularly issued by those federally sponsored financial agencies which receive no Congressional appropriations.

5. Provision shall be made in the budget for the annual reduction of the gross public debt by an amount equal to 5% of Federal revenues for the preceding fiscal year, except that for the first three years that percentage shall be successively, 2%, 3%, and 4%.

6. No department or agency is authorized to issue any securities for any new financing whatsoever, or for refinancing purposes which would in sum put the total indebtedness of the Federal government above the limits set in No. 5 above, except for those agencies mentioned in No. 3 above.

7. The various committees of Congress shall neither authorize nor appropriate for any branch, department, or agency a total amount for the fiscal year in question in excess of its budgetary proportion of a sum four times the revenues reported by Treasury within the most recently completed quarter year.

8. Supplemental budget requests may be made at any time provided they are balanced by new revenue proposals.

9. The Act shall be inapplicable during war or Congressionally declared national emergency.

TITLE III.—JOINT CONGRESSIONAL SESSIONS ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Requires a monthly joint session of Congress, with television and radio broadcast permitted during which the Taxpayers' Advocate, who shall be the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures or any Congressional member of that Committee whom he designates, shall report to the Members and the American people on the current status of the gross public debt in full detail.

Also provides for the length of these sessions, seating of Members by State delegations, the procedure for their questioning of the Taxpayers' Advocate and the manner in which he shall make his report and recommendations.

It stipulates that the President of the United States may address any such joint session on measures he has taken or proposes to take which will reduce Federal expenditures.

This represents a brief review of H.R. 12195 which I realize will require a great deal of scrutiny.

Third, the most cruel part of increasing the debt to accommodate this unwarranted spending which we have not been willing to discipline ourselves to reduce is the fact that by our actions to constantly increase the debt we are passing the day of reckoning on to future generations. By

our actions to increase debt, we are also pirating money through the Treasury from the private money market; in other words, money that would normally be available for regular use of our constituents. The Federal Government is expected to have an add-on deficit of nearly $40 billion this year. This means that the U.S. Government has to go into the private financial market and borrow that amount of money to finance its expenditures. Therefore, this $40 billion of funds that will be needed by the Treasury will be derived from the private sector of the economy where it could otherwise be used to finance new business, construct homes, expand consumer buying, and generally stimulate business to generate employment activity. It is estimated that in fiscal year 1973 the U.S. Treasury will have absorbed approximately 40 percent of all the dollars that would normally have been available in the private market during that time period. The U.S. Treasury must be so consistently in the marketplace to refinance old debts that it is difficult to find new sources to finance additional debt. In turn, the Treasury must pay a high interest charge on this debt financing which is again charged to the working poor taxpayers.

Have we not learned from the economic tragedies of the past? Do our constituents have to go down to the marketplace with wheelbarrows of worthless paper money as the citizens of Germany did in the 1920's before we learn these obvious lessons of history?

ONE MEMBER'S OPINION ON HOW TO REDUCE DEBT

Now the argument is often made, by advocates of the debt ceiling increase, that the place to effectively begin in Congress to do something about the problem of debt increase is to cut appropriations. I agree.

Then the argument is raised, "But where would you recommend that we cut expenditures?" There are so many places that there should be no difficulty in beginning the task; so, I will make some specific recommendations.

The Joint Economic Committee's staff study released January 11, 1972, entitled "The Economics of Federal Subsidy Programs," indicates numerous programs which I believe should be eliminated—or, drastically reduced and ultimately eliminated. These basically are in the area of direct cash payment subsidies, one of the three major types of subsidy for which the study compiled statistics.

Second, there are numerous other programs which I believe should be eliminated—or, reduced and gradually eliminated—which the study detailed under the category of credit subsidies.

In this category, even if there were to be no elimination or reduction in programs, the taxpayers could be saved many hundreds of millions of dollars if the Federal credit recipients were required to repay their loans at rates equal to the rate Uncle Sam must pay to borrow the money which in turn is lent to these recipients.

It is my recommendation that until these programs are terminated, interest rates be charged equal to those rates the Government must pay to provide these services which we are told are unavailable from private lending agencies because of their policies or various limitations of the persons or groups seeking assistance.

At a very minimum, we can save at least $4.6 billion in credit subsidies alone by raising rates of interest to beneficiaries to what it costs the Federal Government to borrow the moneys it lends out to them. The actual credit subsidy figure for 1970 was $4.183 billion. Congressional staff economists I have checked with agree that for fiscal 1973 that figure will be at least 10 percent higher, or $.418 billion, for a total of some $4.601 billion.

Total subsidies that I would recommend reducing, with eventual elimination, including the credit subsidies just mentioned, come to $14.73 billion, in actual fiscal 1970 figures.

Federal grants to States and school districts for elementary and secondary education amounted to $2.35 billion in fiscal 1970.

Total grants and subsidies which I recommend cutting came to $17.08 billion in 1970.

With the 10-percent increase expected for these current programs in fiscal 1973, the total may be estimated at $18.788 billion.

This figure for existing Federal Government programs, together with the figure of $14.0 billion for fiscal 1973, and $22.6 billion for the first full year of operation as the costs of major new programs in the President's budget which should not be adopted, totals $32.788 billion that can be cut from the budget for fiscal year 1973, and for fiscal year 1974 $41.588 billion that can be cut from the total in the first full year of operations of the President's new programs.

Summation of budgetary reductions which I propose:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal 1970 actual figures for federal subsidies/grants to be reduced or eliminated	17,080
Estimated 10-percent increase for fiscal 1973 programs over 1970	1,708
Reduction or elimination urged in current programs for fiscal 1973	18,788
Elimination of President's new federal programs:	
Fiscal 1973 saving	14,000
Fiscal 1974 saving	22,600
Elimination of new budget programs plus current subsidies/grants reductions toward eliminations which I urge will save in fiscal year 1973	32,788
The total to be saved in fiscal year 1974	41,388

In further discussions on this floor, I will clearly detail specific areas where, in my judgment, we can reduce appropriations.

CONCLUSION

I believe this Congress can this year show the leadership and start the trend once again in the right direction. I ask and urge your consideration of these three points:

First. Stop the deficit financing here and now. The alternative is to reduce expenditures. We as a Congress are fully capable of undertaking that task even though it may seem unpleasant.

Second. Consider H.R. 12195. It is not totally original, but at least it should be considered.

Third. Let us not leave a debt legacy to our children and grandchildren who might well turn to us who are in Congress today and say: "Where were you when all this could have been changed?"

"Why did you not accept your constitutional responsibility to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States?"

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for providing the opportunity for me to appear before you to express my views.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say, at the outset, I am less concerned about the size of the public debt than I am concerned about the cause of that debt.

I would like to turn to an analysis of deficits that have led to the need for increases in the public debt ceiling. The table, which I shall ask unanimous consent at the proper time to introduce at this point, summarizes Federal revenues and expenditures for the 3 most recent fiscal years.

Now, what do those figures show? First, there was a marked difference between projected and actual revenues and expenditures for the last 3 fiscal years.

In the fiscal year 1970 the President projected a surplus of $5.8 billion. What we had instead was a deficit of $2.8 billion.

In the fiscal year 1971 we were presented with a projected surplus of $1.3 billion, but we wound up with a deficit of over $23 billion.

This year we were to anticipate a deficit of only $11.6 billion but we are now told that the deficit will be in the neighborhood of $38.8 billion.

The projected deficit for the fiscal year 1973 is, according to the President, $25.5 billion.

If we apply the average percentage of error in the estimates of budget surpluses and deficit to this projection, and that is 190 percent of $25.5 billion, we can expect an actual deficit in the neighborhood of $48.5 billion, which would be the second highest deficit in our history.

It is especially ironic that all of this comes under an administration that campaigned hard on a platform calling for a balanced budget.

Second, the figures in the table demonstrate the cause of these great deficits. Clearly, it has been the failure of the economy to generate taxes at the projected rate and the resultant vast overestimation of budget revenues rather than any profligate spending on the part of the Congress that has lead to these results.

In fact, a good part of the increased expenditures was the result of a drop in expected revenues.

Let me explain that most of the revenues come from the income tax; the amount of income taxes collected, and amount of income tax receipts is directly related to the state of the economy.

The administration has done a bad job in projecting Federal budget surpluses and deficits because it has not been candid or it has engaged in monstrous self-delusion in projecting the state of the economy.

The administration has grossly overestimated the magnitude of the gross national product and underestimated the level of unemployment because the gross national product, that is the GNP, was much less than the President said it would be and because so many more people have been out of work and the hence the total Federal revenues, have been far below administration estimates.

High unemployment means more unemployment insurance payments and more Federal welfare contributions, and these account for a good part of the increase in expenditures.

Sometimes certain administration sources and, indeed, some Members of Congress—for example, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) a moment ago—have tried to place the blame on Congress for the large deficits which necessitate raising the public debt ceiling. But I was pleased to see Secretary Connally admit to the Ways and Means Committee that the state of the economy was the essential crux of the matter that resulted in the giant deficit. And I must add that general mismanagement of the economy on the part of the Nixon administration—not failures in husbandry of Federal assets—has brought us to the present state of continuing high unemployment linked with inflation and to a morass of illogical and ineffective controls.

Mr. Chairman, there are deficits and there are deficits. An expansionary budget that directs its aid to those who are most in need and to those who would most likely spend their incomes and generate economic growth is one that I would favor. But a budget that skimps on people's programs and increases the budget authority for military programs by $6.3 billion is difficult to justify. A budget that has only an insignificant increase in expenditures for community development, housing, education, manpower training, and health care is not necessarily one which will prove to be directly helpful to the people.

When the unemployment rate is over 6 percent, does it make any sense to further cut back such programs as the Job Corps and Job Opportunities in the business sector? We all know how bad the situation has been for returning veterans, but the President proposes to raise outlays for veterans' benefits and services by about $600 million, one-tenth of the increase for military programs.

As Dr. DeBakey, the famed heart surgeon from Houston, pointed out the other day, the budget permits only a third as much money for hospital and medical services as has been authorized in the various bills that Congress has passed.

The kernel of the matter is this: The same just means that afford altruistic relief to returning veterans, the unemployed generally, and others with marginal means stimulate revenues by increasing buying power and the productive capacity of the economy. Inflation control is desirable but if it is done by means which are too insensitive to the major problem at the root of the budget imbalance, the faltering economy, it will do more harm than good. This is even more true of attempted economies which retard a necessary continuing growth of buying power.

Another matter that cannot be overlooked, Mr. Chairman, is that we could have the resources to fund the people's programs without raising the deficit beyond its present level. In fact, if we made a real effort to close the remaining loopholes in the income tax law, we could almost eliminate the deficit within the constraints of the present budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon has 36 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 1 hour and 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have only one speaker. So that the other Members can be acquainted with the possible time remaining, that one speaker, I would hope, would consume less than 2 or 3 minutes. Therefore, I hope the other side will use whatever time they desire to use in this debate.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not have to take 5 minutes. I just want to call to the attention of the House that we are allowing the precedent to be set that will guarantee at least one thing, that is, a built-in deficit every year.

I know nothing accountingwise more dishonest than to set a budget on something that is not only not in existence but also is unavailable and about which there are no plans made to make it available. The budget of this United States is being set on a full employment economy. The chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means said that the main fault for the deficit was $13.5 billion of a short fall in the income because of the loss in the gross national income. The deficit was built in under a false premise that the money would be there, yet we all know that unemployment has never been worse since the 1930's.

I have served on city council and as a county commissioner, and I have served in the State assembly and in the State senate. I do not know of any entity of government that sets its budget upon other than anticipated revenues.

Certainly we can build in a deficit even on that system, but somewhere along the line there has to be a reasonable estimate made of what the revenues will be.

Under this type of precedent, I do not want to hear any Member of this Congress crying about raising the debt limit.

When we accept full employment as a premise for the budget, for the appropriations, and we spend on that level, we build in the deficit, and there is no other way to say it. Should we say to an unemployed person, because he is unemployed and only receiving two-thirds of his normal wages as unemployment pay, and since his entire income is the basis for the spending of the Federal Government, he ought to have the same right to spend on the basis of the spending he used before he became unemployed. Every school board and every council and every State government and every county government will be able to establish, under the precedent set by the U.S. Government, their budgets based upon full employment.

We must realize that the dollar is finding a lower level. Can we imagine what level the dollar is going to find when the whole country and all organized governments of this country of ours, all the local and state governments and school boards and public spending bodies can establish their spending rate on what it would be if everybody in the community was making his full salary and wages, fully employed, and the taxes anticipated were based upon that kind of revenue? That is what we are doing.

I have been at this long enough to have voted for increases in the national debt and in the State debt for a great many years. I have felt maybe we authorized the spending and we should produce the funds. Now for the first time I am not going to do it. I will not vote for the $50 or the $28 billion increase. I am not going to give my vote of approval this time to a false system of accounting for the needs and the spending of this government, for fear that if I do, I will have no place upon which to stand for my opposition to my local governments doing it, to my school boards and my counties and State governments doing it.

I warn all the Members this is one issue that will come back to haunt every one of us.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, which would increase the national debt ceiling by $20 billion. I do so not because I disagree with increased Federal spending, which I do not, but because I think that we are going about raising funds for it in an extremely backward manner.

I note parenthetically my disappointment at the fact that this measure comes before us under a closed rule. I am generally opposed to such a rule on the ground that it is an insult to our intelligence as well as a violation of our constituents' right to have their representatives—even the ones not fortunate enough to be on the Ways and Means Committee—represent their interests in the process of formulating legislation.

As I stated at the outset, I am not opposed to additional Federal spending. I believe that we must be prepared to spend massive amounts for such programs as housing, child care, public serv-

ice employment, mass transit, and pollution abatement. We have for too long neglected these vital domestic needs in favor of wasteful military adventures, and if money alone is the price we eventually pay for that neglect, we will be fortunate indeed.

It is interesting to note, by the way, that the same administration which is asking us to let them engage in the wasteful device of borrowing additional funds recently put its full weight behind a bill to give corporate America a $10 billion-plus tax bonanza.

There are better and cheaper ways to raise the money we need so desperately. The maximum tax on long-term capital gains, for example, is 25 percent. This means that a wage earner making about $10,000 a year is in the same bracket as another individual whose investment gains are $100,000 or even a million dollars a year.

The interest on municipal bonds is exempt from taxation. Before the advent of the minimum tax, an individual enjoying an income of $100,000 a year from such bonds would pay not a penny of tax on that sum; even with the minimum tax, the maximum tax he will have to pay on it will be $7,000, or 7 percent.

These are but two of the many loopholes which make the Internal Revenue Code a play-gym for the rich and a prison for the poor. Taken together with our defense budget—which Mr. Nixon proposes to increase by another $10 billion this year—it is the shame of our Nation.

Our poor and middle-income citizens bear the lion's share of the tax burden and then see insult added to injury when the money is spent not on the domestic programs which they so desperately need, but to send their innocent sons abroad to kill and be killed.

This bill is but one more example of the need to reorder our national priorities. As we must spend our money differently, so must we seek it differently.

I hope that the defeat of this bill will be a clear sign to Mr. Nixon and his corporate friends that we mean business, and that he—or the individual who succeeds him next January 20—must make our tax system a progressive and equitable one.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, the inequities in the Federal income tax structure are nothing short of scandalous. What was supposed to be a progressive income tax has come to resemble instead a massive subsidy program to insure that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

A number of Members of this House have been calling in the dark for an end to some of the more egregious tax evasion loopholes which undermine the progressivity of the income tax, such as special percentage depletion allowances for producers of oil, gas, and minerals; subsidization of petroleum producers through deductions of intangible drilling costs; failure to tax appreciation in the value of property which is bequeathed by the original owner at his death; and most recently the incredible corporate giveaways contained in the Revenue Act of 1971 in the form of changes in the asset depreciation range system enabling actual useful life of assets to be ignored, and the reinstatement of the investment tax credit in spite of the evidence that this would not reduce unemployment but would only increase corporate profits.

As one of those Members who have been complaining about the level of tax unfairness, I was especially pleased by the timely intervention of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS.

Chairman MILLS has been the key figure in every meaningful tax reform effort in recent years, and his unmistakable warning to the President yesterday is a most hopeful indication to the taxpayers of America that some relief may be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, I fear we are perilously close to a taxpayer's revolt. The wage earners around the country are being forced to bear a disproportionate share of the cost of grappling with the urgent social problems we face. How can we ask them, and their children, to accept the heavy tax burden which is necessary if progress is to be made, when the same tax system permits 112 privileged moguls who are earning more than $200,000 a year to avoid taxation entirely?

I am hopeful that the President will respond positively to Chairman MILLS' request that meaningful tax reform legislation be proposed. I am delighted that Chairman MILLS has committed his efforts to undertake to bring about greater tax equity. Without tax reform, we are going to lose the public will necessary to meet the items on the urgent agenda of public business. At that point, the debt limit will be irrelevant, because the number of deficits will be unlimited.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have been up and down this road many times. I just reviewed the record, I am in my 28th year here and I voted during that period of time 24 times on the matter of raising the debt ceiling. Each time it has been an agonizing experience, and this one is no less agonizing than those of the past. Sometimes I voted for them and sometimes I have voted against them, but I have never said at any time that we did not have to pay our bills. My quarrel on any occasion when I voted against the legislation was on the basis that we were giving too much flexibility in borrowing authority or that we were extending the period for too long a period of time.

In this instance, Mr. Chairman, the committee has reduced both the amount of the increase that the administration requested and the period during which the additional borrowing authority is extended. That is an area, it seems to me, where differences of opinion may arise; as they have today between the committee and the administration. There has been a difference of opinion in the past sometimes between myself and what the committee has done as to the amount or duration of any change in the debt limit.

But, Mr. Chairman, on no occasion can we refuse to pay our bills and toy with financial crisis at home and abroad. That is what you face here if you turn down this bill this afternoon.

Increasing the statutory limit on the national debt is an unpleasant but necessary task, since we have made commitments and obligations that have to be met. We face the practical problem of paying our bills. The issue is simply the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government's finances. Let me briefly explain the existing situation and the proposed change.

The debt limit under existing law is $430 billion, consisting of a $400 billion permanent ceiling, and $30 billion in temporary borrowing authority that expires on June 30 of this year.

The administration requested an increase in the ceiling to $480 billion, consisting of the $400 billion permanent ceiling and an $80 billion temporary ceiling through June 30, 1972. It was clear from projections of receipts and expenditures for fiscal year 1973, that the additional $50 billion in temporary borowing authority requested would be sufficient only until February of next year, about 1 year from now.

The bill the committee reported provides a much smaller increase in temporary borrowing authority than the administration requested and for a much shorter period of time. The Ways and Means Committee recommendations would increase the existing temporary borrowing authority of $30 billion to $50 billion through June 30 of this year. When combined with the permanent ceiling of $400 billion, the administration would have authority to borrow $450 billion until June 30, when the debt ceiling would revert to the permanent ceiling of $400 billion.

When debt increases have been requested in the past, I have always recognized the necessity of providing an increase sufficient to maintain the fiscal integrity of the Government. The issue has not been whether to increase borrowing authority—we know this must be done—but the appropriateness of the total amount requested in order to provide some restraint—however minimal this may be—on Federal finances.

I believe the bill before the House is consistent with this criteria. Treasury indications are that the debt will be at the $450 billion ceiling provided by this bill on June 15, 1972, assuming a $6 billion cash balance but no margin for contingencies. We normally provide $3 billion for contingencies, but since we are nearing the end of the fiscal year and the ceiling is being extended for only a few months into the future, it is acceptable to dispense with the $3 billion margin of contingency under these circumstances. However, it is clear that the ceiling imposed will provide whatever restraint is inherent in the debt limit dur-

ing the period of extension while enabling the Treasury to responsibly conduct the Nation's fiscal affairs without employing tactics resulting in additional borrowing costs.

Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have a fiscal problem on a national basis in our States, and in our cities. I think it is time that we all—not just we politicians in the Congress of the United States or in the State houses or in the county courthouses or in the city halls—but all of our people come to a recognition that we are asking government at all levels to provide services in excess of what we are willing to pay for on a reasonably current basis. Until we face and resolve this problem, we cannot avoid the unpleasant task of periodically increasing the debt limit.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation increasing the debt ceiling comes to us today because of the administration's determination to incur huge budget deficits in this fiscal year and in fiscal year 1973. Just yesterday Herbert Stein, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was down at the National Press Club positively glorying in this year's projected $38.8 billion deficit. Mr. Stein boasted:

> We are running the biggest budget deficit ever, except for World War II.

Now I am not one of those who opposes huge budget deficits just because they are huge. The crucial issue is not the size of the deficit, but its composition. Since the purpose of large deficits is to stimulate the economy and to create jobs, the taxing and spending policies that create the deficit should zero in on job-creating. But the Nixon budget does not do this. Instead, billions of dollars in tax reductions have been granted to corporations in the form of the investment tax credit and rapid depreciation giveaways in the hope that they will be induced to buy capital equipment that they do not really need. This does a good job of creating budget deficits for the Federal Government and higher profits for corporations, but it is not much help in creating jobs for our 5 million unemployed.

Further billions of dollars slip through the loopholes in our Federal income, estate, and gift tax system. This money thus stays in the hands of well-to-do tax avoiders, who in turn use it to bid up the price of assets such as real estate or stocks, or for foreign investment and speculation—none of which does much to create jobs. Indeed, such activity is at least as likely to reduce jobs.

What is needed to create jobs and reduce our current intolerably high rate of unemployment is a program which deals directly with the problem rather than resorting to ineffective and wasteful trickle-down methods. Such a program is the "Jobs Now" legislation (H.R. 12011) introduced in the House by more than 60 Democrats and in the Senate by more than 20 Democrats. This legislation would create 500,000 public service jobs, while at the same time providing improved public services—education, police protection, cleaner streets, better parks and recreation areas, better health services, and so on. I regret that Mr. Stein saw fit to denounce this proposal as "a rediscovery of the WPA" at the National Press Club yesterday. It makes one wonder whether Mr. Stein has read the economic report which he presumably wrote: A more limited version of our "Jobs Now" program is there hailed as "a major step forward"—page 109.

On the tax side, what is needed is a full-scale effort, supported by the President, to close the loopholes in our income, estate, and gift tax system which now allow billions of dollars to escape taxation every year. These lost billions serve no real job-creating function, and they make it necessary for millions of average, middle-income taxpayers to pay more to the Treasury every year to make up for what the well-to-do fail to pay.

But here again the response of Mr. Stein and the rest of the administration has been disappointing. At the National Press Club yesterday, Mr. Stein dismissed proposals to close tax loopholes as ideas "that have been gathering dust in Congress for years." Indeed they have been gathering dust, due in large part to the failure of this administration to provide any support for them.

Budget Director George Shultz displayed much the same attitude before the Joint Economic Committee yesterday. Rebuffing a suggestion that the Congress might direct the President legislatively to submit tax reform proposals, Mr. Shultz said:

> Let the Congress stop telling the President how to do his job.

In light of this, therefore, I am delighted that Chairman MILLS has reminded the President of the President's promise last August to submit tax reform proposals to Congress. In a letter sent to the President 2 days ago, Chairman MILLS asked that "a program of further elimination of preferences and so-called loopholes in the Federal income, estate, and gift tax system" be sent to Congress by March 15, 1972. "There is," Mr. MILLS said, "question about support of continued increases in the debt ceiling unless such requests are coupled with tax reform."

This request by Chairman MILLS that the President show his commitment to plugging tax loopholes by delivering his own proposals is certainly not unreasonable. The Ways and Means Committee is the busiest committee on the Hill, and it would be difficult for them to move on tax reform unless it is clear that they have strong Presidential support and that their work would not be undone by a Presidential veto. Indeed, the past history of tax reform shows that Presidential support is absolutely crucial. And Mr. Nixon's record of vetoes on education, manpower, health, and other legislation shows that the possibility of a veto is always present.

I applaud Chairman MILLS' initiative, and in light of it I am withdrawing my proposal that the present debt ceiling legislation be amended to require the President to submit a comprehensive tax reform program by May 1. However, should the President not comply with Mr. MILLS' request, I am serving notice now that I shall not vote for further increases in the debt ceiling. Many of my colleagues share my view on this. Since there will have to be another vote on increasing the debt ceiling in June, I suggest that this is not an idle threat.

Here follows the full next of Chairman MILLS' letter:

FEBRUARY 7, 1972.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall in your address to the Congress following your action of August 15, 1971, establishing among other things an incomes policy, you advised the Congress that in the Second Session you would submit what you called a tax reform program. To me, and to most others, this term means a program of further elimination of preferences and so-called loopholes in the Federal income, estate, and gift tax system. If this is what you had in your mind, and I am sure it is, let me call your attention to the fact that in order for the Congress to complete action on any such proposal you should give us the benefit of your thinking in a Message either delivered in person to the Congress or submitted by messenger to the Congress not later than March 15, 1972. My suggestion is not with respect to any new type of a tax, such as the value-added tax, which I am sure you did not mean to include in your definition of tax reform in your appearance before the Congress.

Since your statement advising us of your intention, this matter has become all the more important because of developments in the House in recent days raising the question about support of continued increases in the debt ceiling unless such requests are coupled with tax reform ostensibly that would produce additional revenues.

To me this matter is most important if there is to be a debt ceiling increase to accompany borrowings required under the 1973 Budget. I hope you will give it your immediate attention.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, it is often said when a person fails to grasp the significance of an obvious situation or problem, it is because he cannot see the forest because of the trees.

I believe this is frequently true with our Federal Government, particularly when it comes to fiscal policies.

I believe the trees must be in the way of the Government's view if it can look at the $23 billion budget deficit last year, the anticipated $40 billion deficit this year, and the built-in one of $25 billion next year, and still suggest raising the national public debt by another $20 to $50 billion.

Certainly something is clouding its vision when it can preach price and wage controls to the public but continue to practice its own private charge account spending spree.

Mrs. Judith Schienle of 143 East 16th Avenue, Homestead, Pa., a constituent of mine, sees the problem very clearly. She also suggested a solution which hit the nail smack on the head. In a recent letter to me expressing her displeasure over the Nation's fiscal policies, Mrs. Schienle asked:

> Why can't the Government as a whole put a wage and price freeze on itself! Certainly, that's where the savings should start, budget-wise. . . . Is there any way the people of this country can stop this irresponsible spending of our tax money . . .

Mrs. Schienle reminded me our forefathers went to war against the King of England over oppressive taxes, then asked:

What would they do if they were alive in these times?

I cannot answer Mrs. Schienle. I have asked myself the same questions many times. I have found no comfort in the words of one of those forefathers she mentioned, a man who was perhaps the greatest of all American liberals, the author of our Nation's Declaration of Independence and our country's third President—Thomas Jefferson.

It was Jefferson who said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared . . . To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt . . . We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servititude. . . . If we run into such debts . . . we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and amusements. . . . If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy . . .

It is a known fact that no government produces wealth, it merely consumes it, existing only by taxing and consuming the wealth of individuals. Our Government, I believe, is perilously close to consuming its source of wealth through excessive taxation and reckless spending.

Somewhere along the line, it lost sight of the forest because of the trees.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I stand today against increasing the national debt by any amount that is being proposed. I have never supported increasing the debt ceiling and I never will.

It is preposterous for this free spending authority to continue, and the Members of the House of Representatives should all stand against it.

Mr. Chairman, an attempt should be made to balance the budget and reduce the national debt—not increase it again.

This current year, 1972, fiscal budget deficit is way out of step to the tune of a reported almost $40 billion. I do not believe in further saddling the citizens of tomorrow in this Nation, much less the American citizens of today, with a continued huge national debt which has been and will bring extinction to any chance of the United States attaining a good, solid, and balanced financial condition.

The financial condition of the United States is bad enough as it is today without adding further grief to the problem or to further taxloads on American citizens. If we do not wake up soon, we are going to have a catastrophic financial upheaval from sea to shining sea in the United States which, of course, will ruin world financial markets.

This national debt has to be pulled back into reality. Raising the debt limit again only gives the spenders of that money, which is an eventual due bill, even more money to play around with if this legislation is unwisely passed today. This has to be stopped, Mr. Chairman. I urge the House to vote it down.

I further will state that I believe it is high time that the Congress insist that the administration come before the appropriate House committees on a regularly scheduled quarterly or half-year basis with their requests to increase the debt so that each and every Member of the House will have a continued update as to the financial situation of the administration's fiscal requests and budgets.

Ten billion dollars a year could be spent on reducing the national debt instead of the giveaway program—foreign aid. This would please the people of the United States and especially the people I represent in Nevada.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against the proposed increase in the national debt. I am going to vote against it even in its reduced form of a $20 billion increase. I am going to vote against it even though I realize that mine will be a lonely vote; that this House seems to feel it has no other choice than meet the circumstances that face it.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against the debt increase just as I have 13 times during my 8 years in this House. I voted against an increase in 1963 when the public debt was $285 billion and the increase was $23 billion. I voted against these 13 debt increases during the succeeding 8 years—a period when the public debt went from $285 billion to the near $424 billion where it stood shortly after the beginning of this year.

I am not attempting to justify my consistency. I am voting against it because I have heard the same tune with the same lyrics 13 times and I now hear it for the 14th time. The men who are in charge of the legislation to increase the debt limit are also the men in charge of writing tax legislation.

My naive query is, What have these men done over the years to prevent this embarrassing spectacle taking place 14 times in 8 years? It is no answer, in my judgment, to gloss it over by blaming whatever administration is in power for its budget requests.

The answer lies in raising taxes to meet emergency costs, when indeed emergencies require sharply increased expenditures. The answer lies in paring expenditures for nonessentials that may be deferred or suspended or even cancelled. There are many such without denying the people of this country their rightful due.

The people of this country look toward the Congress—their representatives in the national Government—to watch out for their welfare. We are not doing so when we shoulder upon them this incredible, monstrous debt. This is a debt that generations yet unborn will be paying off, indeed paying its interest.

I am not going to lend my support and my vote to any such condition. I will vote "no" and will continue so to do until there is no evidence on this floor that commonsense and fiscal responsibility have been exercised.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12901 with no enthusiasm, but with an awareness that we have no choice but to enact it.

For many years now, the Congress has been going through this motion. In imposing a limit on the debt we have, of course, been attempting ostensibly to control Federal spending. But we have too often chosen to ignore the fact that it is the Congress, not the administration, which holds true control over expenditures. Regardless of what a President wants or ask, it is difficult for him to do anything unless the Congress chooses to vote the money.

Considering the amounts of money the Congress has voted over the years, frequently in excess of Presidential requests, it is no wonder that our attempt to control spending through a limitation on the debt has been an exercise in futility.

It is a necessary exercise, nevertheless.

The present temporary ceiling on the debt is $430 billion. And the Treasury has estimated that the actual debt already is crowding that figure. As of January 27 this year, it was at $427.3 billion, and by March 15 it is scheduled to crash the current barrier to $435.9 billion.

As the Treasury Secretary pointed out to the Committee on Ways and Means:

A failure to obtain an increase in the debt limit will in a very short time force us to move to costly and uneconomic expedients to meet our obligations, and then to abrupt cutting off of Government expenditures,

The bill before us would increase the debt limit to a point which will enable the Treasury to meet its obligations, but just barely, through the end of fiscal year.

By enacting H.R. 12910, we certainly would not be effectively controlling expenditures. But by failing to enact the bill, we clearly would be making a foolish decision, and we would be forcing the Treasury Department to do likewise

Mr. Chairman, the only useful purpose Congress ever can serve in an exercise such as this is in focusing attention more effectively on the operating factors behind the debt. Hopefully we can at least make some progress in that direction.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12910, to increase the public debt ceiling.

I am alarmed at the way that Federal Government expenditures have increased, and at the projects on which it has been spending money such as bailing out Lockheed, building an SST, and subsidizing Penn Central Railroad. Limiting the debt ceiling seems at this juncture to be the only effective way to hold down Federal spending.

Increasing the debt ceiling will only lead to further inflation and further weakening of the U.S. dollar abroad. It is time that Congress stops letting the executive branch run away with Federal spending.

I am casting my vote against this legislation as notice that at least one Member of Congress is going to try to apply discipline in the Federal budget.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 12910, a bill to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt ceiling.

At present the statutory permanent debt ceiling is $400 billion with a temporary additional increase of $30 billion, thus providing an overall debt limitation of $430 billion, effective through June 30,

1972. H.R. 12910 provides for a further temporary increase of $20 billion, effective through June 30, 1972.

I have described my support of this increase in the temporary debt ceiling as "reluctant." Indeed, I could not have supported the President's proposal to increase the temporary debt ceiling by $50 billion, effective through June 30, 1973, or an overall limitation of $480 billion. My qualified support of this requested increase in the debt ceiling is dependent on the important changes that are incorporated in the bill favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

First, the bill provides for a further increase in the temporary debt ceiling of $20 billion, as compared to the additional $50 billion requested by the President.

Second, as reported by the committee, the bill provides that this increase in the temporary ceiling will be effective through June 30 of this year, rather than through June 30, 1973.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment these are critical changes without which I could not have supported this legislation. It is apparent to all responsible Members, that the bills of the Federal Government must be paid. In contrast to others here who have so often opposed similar legislation in the past, it is equally apparent to the responsible members in this Chamber that this need exists regardless of which political party occupies the office of President.

I can remember, Mr. Chairman, just 4 short years ago, a different man and a different administration occupied the White House. At that time, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who today so strongly advocate the increase in the debt ceiling limitation, vehemently opposed increases far less than the one they wish to see today. Then, they spoke of the inflation and the lack of fiscal responsibility of any increase; today, they talk about the underestimates and the necessity for this increase.

But, the Government's need to pay its bills should not, and must not be construed as a rationale for the Congress to abandon its fiscal controls over the executive, or to place the exercise of those controls beyond timely review by the people.

It is particularly important at this time for the Congress to maintain close scrutiny over the fiscal management of the Federal Government. Throughout the country, there is increasing concern that the expenditures of the Government have somehow gotten out of control. Because of the magnitude of the errors in projected budget deficits in the past 3 years, the budget document itself provides questionable assurance that this control will be maintained.

In the past 2 fiscal years, the official projections of the deficit in the budget have been grossly in error. In the budget for fiscal 1971, the administration predicted a unified budget surplus of $1.3 billion. In 1971, the actual budget deficit was some $23 billion.

The administration's projections of the budget deficits in the current fiscal year have been equally unreliable. In the budget presented to the Congress last January, the administration projected a unified budget deficit of $11.6 billion for fiscal 1972. By July the administration estimated this deficit at $18.7 billion. By December its estimate had gone to $28 billion. In the budget submitted for fiscal 1973, the administration now estimates its fiscal 1972 deficit at some $39 billion. Thus, in the current fiscal year the administration's estimates of the actual deficit have risen to almost 3½ times the size of the deficit originally projected in the budget. Indeed, the amount of the error itself will even exceed the largest previous deficit since World War II.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would take issue with the statement, as reported in the press, of Director George P. Shultz of the Office of Management and Budget before the Joint Economic Committee, that Congress should "stop telling the President how to do his job." If the track record of the Office of Management and Budget in the last 2 years is any gage of its quality, then I suggest someone should offer guidance, if not to the President, then at least to Director Shultz.

Finally, I offer my support of this bill because of the assurance given this body by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS of Arkansas, that our committee will continue our work towards meaningful tax reform. You will recall that when the committee reported the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the administration promised that it would join with us in this endeavor as it had in that legislation. We are still waiting for the tax reform proposals of the administration. I join with the chairman in the hope that we will have those proposals soon enough in this session of Congress to make this long-sought goal a reality.

The increase in the temporary debt ceiling of $20 billion provided in H.R. 12910 should provide sufficient room for the Treasury to manage the public debt prudently until the end of this fiscal year. At that time, we will be in a much better position to evaluate this problem.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I am voting today for a temporary increase of $20 billion in the national debt limit. I want to make clear that I am doing so only for two reasons: The fact that this increase is only temporary, expiring with the end of the current fiscal year and enabling the Federal Government to meet its obligations; and because the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, responding to a strong movement for tax reform, has made clear to the administration that it must come up with a plan to close tax loopholes if any further debt limit increase is to be considered.

Had the Ways and Means Committee brought to the floor a bill merely carrying out the administration's proposal for a debt limit increase of $58 billion extending beyond this June, I would have voted against it. Such an increase, in my judgment, is totally unwarranted. It would serve only to perpetuate the distorted spending priorities of the Nixon administration—priorities which see billions squaundered to bail out Lockheed and the Penn Central, while refusing to spend a few millions to enable schoolchildren to have a decent lunch; which see billions more poured down an Asian rathole, destroying entire nations with our bombs, making innocent civilians refugees in their own land; and all while the Nixon budget office freezes desperately needed funds for housing and community facility programs—funds which Congress appropriated and without which the cities are staggering under a fiscal crisis.

I think it is clear that the overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress want to see a reordering of fiscal priorities. That must be accomplished before any further debt limit increase is considered. And it is my judgment that if we overhaul the administration budget and put our resources where America's needs really are, we will not need any further debt ceiling increase this year.

At the same time, we must enact legislation this year to close the loopholes left by the tax reform bill passed 2 years ago. I would like to see the administration work with Congress in this respect but if President Nixon chooses to ignore the need for tax reform, Congress should act on its own initiative. Further delay cannot be justified.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, for the fourth time the Nixon administration is requesting an increase in the debt limitation. Today the request is for an increase in the temporary public debt ceiling of $20 billion—from the present $430 billion to $450 billion through June 30, 1972. In fiscal year 1971 the budget was designed to produce a small surplus, but it ended with a $23 billion deficit. For the fiscal year 1972 the deficit will be an estimated $38.8 billion. And in fiscal year 1973 the estimated deficit is $25.5 billion. These deficits result from the failure of the administration's economic policies. The administration has succeeded in having inflation and unemployment at the same time. It has refused to spend sufficient money in the public sector for domestic social programs including a much needed program to create 500,000 public service jobs.

In addition to the tax revenues lost by failure of the administration to institute a full employment program, substantial tax revenues—at least $20 billion—are lost because of the glaring loopholes in the Federal tax system. It is imperative that these loopholes be plugged. These massive tax giveaways through the loophole-ridden Federal tax system can no longer be tolerated.

Some of the inequitable results of the Federal tax system include the following:

In 1970 112 taxpayers with earnings of more than $200,000 paid no taxes whatsoever.

In 1970 the largest oil companies paid an average of 8.7 percent of their net income for Federal income taxes. This is due mainly to the percentage depletion allowance which allows mineral producers to recover many times the actual depletion of their resources. This loophole costs the rest of us about $1¼ billion a year.

The capital gains on property which is passed on at an owner's death is not fully taxed, thereby costing the rest of us $3 billion a year.

Executive stock options are treated as capital gains instead of ordinary income. This particular loophole costs the rest of us $150 million each year.

The accelerated asset depreciation recently put into effect by the administration costs us $2 billion a year.

And the investment tax credit, which presupposes that giving an investment tax credit to business will encourage capital investment when industry is currently operating at less than 75 percent of capacity, costs $3½ billion a year.

In general it is estimated that meaningful tax reform would recover $20 billion to the treasury—precisely the amount of the debt ceiling increase before us today.

Not only the inequities in the Federal tax structure but also the way in which the administration's budget moneys are allocated to be spent are relevant considerations. Fully a third of the total budget, $83.2 billion, is devoted to the military. Substantial expenditures still go for the war in Vietnam, which has warped and continues to warp our priorities. In comparison with this enormous outlay for the military, less than $2 billion is devoted to pollution control and abatement, only $2 billion for low- and moderate-income housing assistance, about $6 billion for education, and only $1.1 million to provide public service jobs under the Emergency Employment Act.

In summary, not only is there a gross inequity in the way revenues are taken in, but the inequity is compounded by the way in which Federal funds are spent. All too much goes to wasteful, excessive arms procurement; all too little goes for dealing with problems of the environment, the poor, and the inner cities.

Until the administration understands the necessity to submit to Congress a comprehensive program to close existing tax loopholes, and until the administration reorders our misguided priorities, the conditions which compelled this request for an increase in the debt ceiling will persist. Already it is clear that the administration will ask for another increase in the debt limitation in June. I intend to vote against the increase today in order to protest the administration's fiscal and tax policy as well as its misguided budgetary priorities.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, on yet another occasion I must repeat the words I used on March 3, 1971, when we last considered an increase of the public debt limit. Then I said I reluctantly supported that increase. Today the same or even a stronger word could be used to express my feeling of displeasure to have to do what I know must be done if we are to avoid some real complications and disruptions by either failing to or delaying the enactment of an adequate debt ceiling.

In supporting H.R. 12910, I have reached the conclusion that it is the only vote that is responsible at this time. I do not share the view that this is any more of an emergency than some of the other increases of former years, but I do believe that it would be disastrous for the United States to come to a point that it could not honor its obligations.

If we fail to enact this bill today, the Treasury Department will be unable to issue any new securities. This means that such inability or prohibition to issue any new securities would apply to issues designed to replace maturing issues as well as securities representing new debt. If this bill does not pass, no more savings bonds can be issued and the payroll savings plan would be put into limbo. It would not be very long before the cash balance in the Treasury would be rapidly depleted. That is true because Treasury bills become due on a weekly basis. If new bills cannot be issued to replace those maturing issues, the cash balance in the Treasury would be exhausted immediately.

I believe we should think for a moment of the consequences at the time when the cash balance of our Treasury is exhausted. The Government would not only be compelled to delay payment of contract obligations but also could not pay any Government salaries or any loan or benefit programs because there would be no Federal personnel to administer the programs. All social security recipients would have to wait to receive their checks and veterans would not be paid their pensions. The State and local governments who have been allocated grants would not receive these grants. It is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive the economic hardship which would result from the failure to increase the debt limitation. In those areas where there is a large concentration of Federal employees, or large numbers of employees engaged in production under Government contracts, the result would be disastrous and chaotic.

It is my judgment that the committee has taken a wise course in refusing the request of the administration for an increase of $50 billion. As the law now stands there is a permanent debt limitation of $400 billion and an additional temporary limitation of $30 billion effective to June 30, 1972. This bill provides for further temporary increase in the amount of $20 billion also effective to June 30, 1972, which, with the existing temporary limitation of $30 billion and the new temporary limitation of $20 billion will give us an overall debt limitation of $450 billion. This should be contrasted with the $480 billion requested by the administration.

The wisdom of holding the line at this time, rather than going all the way to the $480 billion, is that the debt limitation needed after June 30 can only at best be estimated at the end of the fiscal year when more information as to future debt requirements is available. It was a wise and prudent action to provide only for the $20 billion temporary increase at this time.

We should all be deeply concerned with the size of the deficit both in the current fiscal year and also in the fiscal year 1973, which was indicated by an approximation in the new budget which was received only a short while ago. Put differently, any allowable debt must be kept under close control if for no other reason than to help inhibit the growth of deficit financing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not share the view of those who say that it would make sense to remove the debt ceiling altogether. I do believe that these ceilings serve as a restraint and a brake. Someone has said that this restraint, or brake, comes at the wrong end of the line when it is less useful than if we were required to act to raise the ceiling at the time the budget was submitted, based upon revenues and expenditures, rather than proceed with the budget which our Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee each consider in its own way, and there is no regard for the deficit until after the money has been spent.

There is an old adage that those who dance will have to pay the fiddler. I hope it does not happen today, that those who have voted for all spending programs will be the same ones who vote against this increase of the debt limitation. Such a course would be most irresponsible. At the end of the first session of the 92d Congress, some of my staff prepared a report showing that during the first session of the 92d Congress I had voted against over $24 billion of the authorizations and expenditures. Had I been joined by a majority of my colleagues, and these expenditures had not been approved, then this action to increase the debt limit today by $20 billion would not have been necessary.

I shall take only a moment or two to point out that we have reached a point in this country where there are so many items that are uncontrollable that we cannot blame the President for his failure to reduce the budget, at least for those items over which he has no control. The interest costs of our national debt are truly staggering. Almost 11 cents out of every tax dollar will be spent just to pay the interest on the national debt. At some future time I hope to be able to figure out how much interest each man, woman, and child in America pays every year in interest on the national debt. It is my understanding the figure is now over $40,700 a minute just to pay the interest. Some time in the future I hope to analyze what we could call contingent debt as distinguished from the $450 billion debt ceiling covered by this legislation. In some supplemental views attached to the report, one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee says that there is a larger debt obligation that overshadows the American economy of nearly $1 trillion of potential debt. Perhaps the time will come when we must limit the contingent debt as well as the cash debt.

Mr. Chairman, I support this small temporary increase at this time, but I wish to make it very clear and plain that it should not be considered any kind of a precedent for my support of other or larger increases hereafter in this session. Each and every increase will have to be justified on its own merits and in consideration of the situation at the time the request is made and the action proposed is taken.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. 12910

To provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on June 30, 1972, the public debt limit set forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as temporarily increased by section 2(a) of Public Law 92-5, shall be further temporarily increased by $20,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUNGATE, 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. 12910) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, pursuant to House Resolution 809, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 147, answered "present" 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—247

Adams	Burleson, Tex.	Duncan
Addabbo	Burton	Eckhardt
Alexander	Byrne, Pa.	Edmondson
Anderson, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, Ala.
Anderson, Tenn.	Carney	Eilberg
Annunzio	Carter	Erlenborn
Arends	Casey, Tex.	Esch
Ashley	Cederberg	Evans, Colo.
Aspin	Celler	Evins, Tenn.
Badillo	Chamberlain	Fascell
Barrett	Clay	Findley
Belcher	Collins, Ill.	Fish
Bergland	Conable	Flood
Betts	Conte	Foley
Biester	Conyers	Ford, Gerald R.
Bingham	Cotter	Ford, William D.
Blanton	Coughlin	Fraser
Boggs	Culver	Frelinghuysen
Boland	Curlin	Frenzel
Bolling	Daniels, N.J.	Fulton
Bow	Davis, Ga.	Fuqua
Brademas	Davis, S.C.	Gallagher
Brasco	Delaney	Gettys
Brooks	Dennis	Giaimo
Brotzman	Derwinski	Gonzalez
Brown, Mich.	Dingell	Grasso
Brown, Ohio	Donohue	Gray
Broyhill, N.C.	Dorn	Green, Oreg.
Broyhill, Va.	Dow	Green, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Downing	Griffiths
Burlison, Mo.	Dulski	Gubser
Byron	Duncan	Gude
Caffery	Eckhardt	Hamilton
Camp	Edmondson	Hammer-schmidt
Chappell	Edwards, Ala.	Hanley
Clancy	Eilberg	Hanna
Clark	Erlenborn	Hansen, Idaho
Clausen, Don H.	Esch	Harvey
Cleveland	Evans, Colo.	Hastings
Collins, Tex.	Evins, Tenn.	Hathaway
Colmer	Fascell	Hays
Crane	Findley	Hébert
Daniel, Va.	Fish	Heckler, Mass.
Danielson	Flood	Heinz
de la Garza	Foley	Hicks, Mass.
Dellenback	Ford, Gerald R.	Hicks, Wash.
Dellums	Ford, William D.	Holifield
Denholm	Fraser	Horton
Dent	Frelinghuysen	Hosmer
Devine	Frenzel	Howard
Diggs	Fulton	Hungate
Dowdy	Fuqua	Jarman
Drinan	Gallagher	Johnson, Calif.
du Pont	Gettys	Johnson, Pa.
Edwards, Calif.	Giaimo	Jonas
Eshleman	Gonzalez	Karth
Fisher	Grasso	Kazen
Flowers	Gray	Keating
Flynt	Green, Oreg.	Kee
Fountain	Green, Pa.	Keith
Frey	Griffiths	Kemp
Garmatz	Gubser	Kluczynski
Gaydos	Gude	Koch
Goldwater	Hamilton	Kuykendall
Goodling	Hammer-schmidt	Kyros
Gross	Hanley	Landrum
Grover	Hanna	Lent
Hagan	Hansen, Idaho	Lloyd
Haley	Harvey	McClory
Hall	Hastings	McCloskey
Halpern	Hathaway	McCollister
Harrington	Hays	McCulloch
Harsha	Hébert	McDade
Hechler, W. Va.	Heckler, Mass.	McDonald, Mich.
Henderson	Heinz	McEwen
Hogan	Hicks, Mass.	McFall
Hull	Hicks, Wash.	McKay
Hunt	Holifield	McKevitt
Hutchinson	Horton	McKinney
Jacobs	Hosmer	McMillan
Jones, N.C.	Howard	Madden
Jones, Tenn.	Hungate	Mahon
Kastenmeier	Jarman	Mailliard
King	Johnson, Calif.	Mallary
Kyl	Johnson, Pa.	Mathias, Calif.
Landgrebe	Jonas	Matsunaga
Latta	Karth	Mayne
Leggett	Kazen	Meeds
Lennon	Keating	Melcher
Link	Kee	Metcalfe
Long, La.	Keith	Mikva
Long, Md.	Kemp	Miller, Calif.
Lujan	Kluczynski	Mills, Ark.
McClure	Koch	Mills, Md.
McCormack	Kuykendall	Minish
Martin	Kyros	Mink
Mathis, Ga.	Landrum	Mollohan
Mazzoli	Lent	Monagan
Michel	Lloyd	Moorhead
Miller, Ohio	McClory	Morse
Minshall	McCloskey	Moss
Mitchell	McCollister	Murphy, Ill.
Mizell	McCulloch	Murphy, N.Y.
Montgomery	McDade	Natcher
Morgan	McDonald, Mich.	Nedzi
Mosher	McEwen	Nelsen
Myers	McFall	Obey
Nichols	McKay	O'Hara
Nix	McKevitt	O'Neill
Passman	McKinney	Patman
Pepper	McMillan	Patten
Perkins	Madden	Pepper
Pettis	Mahon	Perkins
Peyser	Mailliard	Pettis
Pickle	Mallary	Peyser
Pike	Mathias, Calif.	Pickle
Pirnie	Matsunaga	Pike
Poage	Mayne	Pirnie
Podell	Meeds	Poage
Poff	Melcher	Podell
Preyer, N.C.	Metcalfe	Poff
Price, Ill.	Mikva	Preyer, N.C.
Pucinski	Miller, Calif.	Price, Ill.
Purcell	Mills, Ark.	Pucinski
Quie	Mills, Md.	Purcell
Railsback	Minish	Quie
Randall	Mink	Railsback
Rangel	Mollohan	Randall
Rees	Monagan	Rangel
Reid	Moorhead	Rees
Reuss	Morse	Reid
Rhodes	Moss	Reuss
Robison, N.Y.	Murphy, Ill.	Rhodes
Rodino	Murphy, N.Y.	Robison, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.	Natcher	Rodino
Rooney, Pa.	Nedzi	Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski	Nelsen	Rooney, Pa.
Roush	Obey	Rostenkowski
St Germain	O'Hara	Roush
Sarbanes	O'Neill	St Germain
Shipley	Patman	Sarbanes
Shriver	Patten	Shipley
Sisk	Pepper	Shriver
Slack	Perkins	Sisk
Smith, Iowa	Pettis	Slack
Smith, N.Y.	Peyser	Smith, Iowa
Springer	Pickle	Smith, N.Y.
Staggers	Pike	Springer
Stanton, James V.	Pirnie	Staggers
Steed	Poage	Stanton, James V.
Steiger, Wis.	Podell	Steed
Stokes	Poff	Steiger, Wis.
Stratton	Preyer, N.C.	Stokes
Stuckey	Price, Ill.	Stratton
Sullivan	Pucinski	Stuckey
Symington	Purcell	Sullivan
Talcott	Quie	Symington
Teague, Calif.	Railsback	Talcott
Teague, Tex.	Randall	Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.	Rangel	Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.	Rees	Thompson, N.J.
Thone	Reid	Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan	Reuss	Thone
Udall	Rhodes	Tiernan
Ullman	Robison, N.Y.	Udall
Van Deerlin	Rodino	Ullman
Vander Jagt	Rooney, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Vanik	Rooney, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Veysey	Rostenkowski	Vanik
Vigorito	Roush	Veysey
Waggonner	St Germain	Vigorito
Ware	Sarbanes	Waggonner
Whalen	Shipley	Ware
Whalley	Shriver	Whalen
Whitehurst	Sisk	Whalley
Widnall	Slack	Whitehurst
Wiggins	Smith, Iowa	Widnall
Wilson, Bob	Smith, N.Y.	Wiggins
Winn	Springer	Wilson, Bob
Wright	Staggers	Winn
Wyatt	Stanton, James V.	Wright
Wydler	Steed	Wyatt
Yates	Steiger, Wis.	Wydler
Young, Tex.	Stokes	Yates
Zablocki	Stratton	Young, Tex.
	Stuckey	Zablocki
	Sullivan	
	Symington	
	Talcott	
	Teague, Calif.	
	Teague, Tex.	
	Thompson, N.J.	
	Thomson, Wis.	
	Thone	
	Tiernan	
	Udall	
	Ullman	
	Van Deerlin	
	Vander Jagt	
	Vanik	
	Veysey	
	Vigorito	
	Waggonner	
	Ware	
	Whalen	
	Whalley	
	Whitehurst	
	Widnall	
	Wiggins	
	Wilson, Bob	
	Winn	
	Wright	
	Wyatt	
	Wydler	
	Yates	
	Young, Tex.	
	Zablocki	

NAYS—147

Abbitt	Frey	Quillen
Abernethy	Garmatz	Rarick
Abourezk	Gaydos	Riegle
Abzug	Goldwater	Roberts
Anderson, Calif.	Goodling	Robinson, Va.
Archer	Gross	Roe
Ashbrook	Grover	Rogers
Aspinall	Hagan	Roncalio
Baker	Haley	Rosenthal
Baring	Hall	Rousselot
Begich	Halpern	Roy
Bennett	Harrington	Roybal
Bevill	Harsha	Runnels
Blackburn	Hechler, W. Va.	Ruth
Bray	Henderson	Ryan
Brinkley	Hogan	Sandman
Buchanan	Hull	Satterfield
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Saylor
Burlison, Mo.	Hutchinson	Scherle
Byron	Jacobs	Schmitz
Caffery	Jones, N.C.	Schwengel
Camp	Jones, Tenn.	Scott
Chappell	Kastenmeier	Sebelius
Clancy	King	Seiberling
Clark	Kyl	Shoup
Clausen, Don H.	Landgrebe	Sikes
Cleveland	Latta	Skubitz
Collins, Tex.	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Lennon	Snyder
Crane	Link	Spence
Daniel, Va.	Long, La.	Steele
Danielson	Long, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
de la Garza	Lujan	Stephens
Dellenback	McClure	Taylor
Dellums	McCormack	Terry
Denholm	Martin	Thompson, Ga.
Dent	Mathis, Ga.	Waldie
Devine	Mazzoli	Wampler
Diggs	Michel	White
Dowdy	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Drinan	Minshall	Williams
du Pont	Mitchell	Wilson, Charles H.
Edwards, Calif.	Mizell	Wolff
Eshleman	Montgomery	Wylie
Fisher	Morgan	Wyman
Flowers	Mosher	Yatron
Flynt	Myers	Young, Fla.
Fountain	Nichols	Zion
	Nix	Zwach
	Passman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ichord

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews	Dwyer	Mann
Bell	Edwards, La.	O'Konski
Biaggi	Forsythe	Pelly
Blatnik	Galifianakis	Powell
Broomfield	Gibbons	Price, Tex.
Cabell	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Ruppe
Chisholm	Hawkins	Scheuer
Clawson, Del	Helstoski	Schneebeli
Collier	Hillis	Stanton, J. William
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Macdonald, Mass.	
Dickinson		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Ichord against.

Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mr. Mann against.

Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Del Clawson, against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Griffin against.

Mr. Forsythe for, with Mr. Gibbons against.

Mr. Schneebeli for, with Mr. Galifianakis against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Hillis.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. William J. Stanton with Mr. Ruppe.

Messrs. BYRNE of Pennsylvania and KUYKENDALL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 7050, H.R. 12184, H.R. 12688, AND H.R. 12689 TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from the further consideration of the bills (H.R. 7050, H.R. 12184, H.R. 12688, H.R. 12689) to eliminate racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes

and to assist State and local governments in the enforcement of cigarette taxes, and that those bills be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3122, EXTENDING FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of California filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3122) to extend sections 5(n) and 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, until the end of fiscal year 1972:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-834)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3122) to extend sections 5(n) and 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, until the end of fiscal year 1972, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

SECTION 1. Section 5(n) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), is further amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $9,000,000 for the period commencing November 1, 1971, and ending June 30, 1972, for the purpose of salaries and related expenses incurred during that period under this section, in addition to funds made available under Public Law 92-50 and Public Law 92-137. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $30 million for the period commencing November 1, 1971, and ending April 30, 1972, for otherwise carrying out this section and such amount shall be in addition to any other funds authorized for this section."

SEC. 2. Section 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1157(a)) is amended by striking out "and for the four-month period ending October 31, 1971, $4,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $15,000,000,".

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 8(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1158(d)) is amended by striking out "$650,000,000 for the four-month period ending October 31, 1971." and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,650,000,000 for the period ending April 30, 1972.".

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: Amend the title so as to read: An Act to extend certain provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972, and others through April 30, 1972.

And the House agree to the same.

ROBERT E. JONES,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
W. J. BRYAN DORN,
WM. H. HARSHA,
JAMES R. GROVER, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3122) to extend sections 5(n) and 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, until the end of fiscal year 1972, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SECTION 1

Senate Bill: The Senate bill authorized $9 million for the period November 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972, for the payment of salaries and related expenses necessary in connection with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

House Amendment: The House amendment authorized an additional $45 million for the purposes of carrying out Section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which would include salaries as well as research activities.

Conference Substitute: The Conference substitute provides $9 million for salaries in the same manner as does the Senate bill. In addition, it authorizes $30 million for research and otherwise carrying out Section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through the period ending April 30, 1972.

SECTION 2

Senate Bill: The Senate bill authorized an additional $11 million for carrying out section 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the period ending June 30, 1972.

House Amendment: This is the same as the Senate bill.

Conference Substitute: Same as both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

SECTION 3

Senate Bill: The Senate bill contained no provision extending the authorizations for construction grants.

House Amendment: The House amendment provided an additional $1.350 billion for the construction grant program under Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the period ending June 30, 1972.

Conference Substitute: Conference substitute authorizes an additional $1 billion for the construction grant program under Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the period ending April 30, 1972.

TITLE

Senate Bill: The title of the Senate bill indicated Sections 5(n) and 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act were extended until the end of fiscal year 1972.

House Amendment: The House amendment provided that the title be amended so as to read "An Act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972."

Conference Substitute: The Conference substitute proposes a title which more accurately describes the text of the conference substitute.

ROBERT E. JONES,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
W. J. BRYAN DORN,
WM. H. HARSHA,
JAMES R. GROVER, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TO PROVIDE A PROCEDURE FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE ON THE PACIFIC COAST AND HAWAII

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 796 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 796

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall immediately resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1025) to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the word "*Resolved,*" and insert in lieu thereof:

"That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall immediately resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1025) to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the joint resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to the joint resolution except one amendment in the nature of a substitute therefor, the text of which shall be identical to that of House Joint Resolution 1054 as introduced in the House on February 7, 1972, and said substitute shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against said substitute are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1025), it shall then be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution of the Senate (S.J. Res. 197) and consider the same in the House."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the

usual 30 minutes to the able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the resolution makes it quite clear specifically what it does. It does actually four things. It reports House Joint Resolution 1025 to the floor under a closed rule with 2 hours of general debate. It makes in order as a substitute without any intervening point of order the so-called Matsunaga substitute, House Joint Resolution 1054, and finally it makes in order that upon the completion of that action that the Senate bill be taken from the Speaker's desk and immediately acted upon by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like very briefly to outline the background in connection with the introduction of House Resolution 796.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution was introduced on February 2 by myself and by my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), as a result of continuing problems in connection with our west coast ports.

As many of you recall, a strike developed and the west coast ports were closed back last summer. They continued locked up for 100 days, when finally the President saw fit to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act and the 80-day cooling off period. We went through the 80-day cooling off period and then again shortly after the first of the year, the docks again were closed by another strike call.

So actually we are in about the 125th day of a closure of the west coast docks.

There has been a lot of discussion whether this is a national emergency and to what extent this is a national impact strike as many of us have referred to it. Let me say certainly to those of us who are close to it, and I recognize and admit that I am to some extent parochial, because I come from an area that is being severely damaged—in fact, it is believed according to our last best estimate, that we have at least $1 billion damage in that area during the first 100 days. Let me say that that initial loss, that is the actual loss of sales, which were so disastrous to our balance-of-trade situation, were not just the part that we are so concerned about, but the fact that many of the Southeast and Asian countries and other countries of the world to whom we were exporting commodities and who were depending upon us for their supply and have depended upon us for supplies for many, many years were beginning to become discouraged with the situation and have gone seeking other sources of supply. In fact, in some cases they have sought and we recognize that they have located other sources.

Whether we will get this market back a year from now, 5 years from now or in some cases never get them back, represents a continuing loss which, frankly, the economy of this country cannot stand in its delicately balanced condition that it is in at the present time.

Because, as I say, because of the very serious impact that it was having not only on our area, but because of the rippling effect upon a much broader basis, I became determined and dedicated to try to get these ports reopened at the earliest possible moment.

Certainly, that is the reason for the introduction of the legislation. I recognize that it is serious medicine. I recognize that what we are doing here is done only very rarely, in fact, only one time during my 18 years in the Congress of the United States—although it has been done several times during the past 100 years or so.

So this is within the rules of the House and it is being done purely, as I say, as a matter of urgency and something that I think the Congress must give consideration to.

Mr. Speaker, if I can very briefly sum up, we will hear a great deal of discussion today about rights and freedom. I am one who believes very strongly in the right of collective bargaining. I have traditionally supported it and will continue to support it because I think it is an inherent right on the part of the laboring people of this country.

But in any of these situations that develop, after a period of time, there must come, it seems to me, to the Congress the responsibility of considering the rights of 200 million Americans somewhere caught in the crunch between continuing battles which go on and on, apparently where collective bargaining has broken down. There comes a time, in my opinion, that the rights and the privileges of other people have to, at some point, be considered. So to me that is the issue with which we are confronted here today.

I recognize, as I have said, the serious nature of the procedure in which we are here involved. I recognize the concern of many of my friends in organized labor as to its implications. But let me make clear that I sought, and fortunately obtained, a closed rule to make it absolutely certain that we were dealing here only with this particular emergency, and that it is not to be used as a vehicle for permanent legislation.

I know there is a desire for permanent legislation and that there probably is a need for something to be done on a long-range basis in connection with national impact strikes. I know many of my friends in labor agree that something must be done. Studies are being made. But in my opinion, in the urgency of the moment and in the short time we have to act, and certainly under the procedure we are using here today by the powers of the Rules Committee, this is not the time to settle the issue on a long-range basis. For that reason I sought a closed rule and, fortunately, that is what we are proposing here today to be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—and the employers' association, the Pacific Maritime Association—PMA—have been negotiating for a new collective-bargaining agreement since November 1970, in anticipation of the expiration of the then existing agreement, which would and now has expired as of July 1, 1971.

Last Friday, February 4, I attempted to put together some facts and figures on what I believe has taken place during that time. They will have to be, of course, updated a little bit for the period between Friday and today because several more days have passed. But in any event, as of last Friday, February 4, since November 1970, 15 months ago, there have been 90 bargaining sessions and 2 strikes, one lasting 100 days and the second one, as of today, lasting 24 days. The second strike is now in its 24th day.

There have been frequent, and sometimes protracted, mediation activities by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Personal intervention by the President, who met with both parties in Portland, Oreg., on September 25, 1971. The Taft-Hartley 80-day injunction began on October 6, 1971. Beginning on Wednesday of last week, there has been a use of a neutral party to try to mediate the dispute.

The Secretaries of Labor, Transportation, Agriculture, and the Acting Secretary of Commerce all testified before the Special Labor Subcommittee that the work stoppage is having a disastrous effect on large and important segments of our national economy. There was no testimony, as I understand it, challenging their statements, which I would like briefly to summarize as follows:

Now it is estimated that the American exports would have been $600 million higher during the 100-day period of the strike, which has now been resumed with further damage to our export trade. The strike was particularly hard on our farmers who have been exporting the products of one crop acre out of four.

During the June-September period, farm exports from the west coast dropped from $288 million in the same period in 1970 to $73 million in 1971. Wheat farmers have suffered the worst calamities of all as their sales to major Far Eastern markets fell off dramatically. Japan purchases over 50 percent of her wheat from the United States. Since April last year we lost sales to Japan of at least 25 million bushels of wheat valued at $40 million. Ominously, on the day after the strike resumed, 24 days ago, the Japanese purchased 8.7 million bushels of wheat for spring delivery, but only 1.6 million bushels were bought from the United States.

Our merchant marine fleet also suffered heavy losses, as did the exporters of vegetables, rice, cotton, wood products, livestock, and other related industries. The strike has thrust a spike in our progress toward and caused a dollar drop in the economic recovery, it has threatened the balance of payments, it has undermined the confidence of foreign buyers who need to depend upon dependable deliveries, but the most tragic costs are in human terms. There are tens of thousands who were not parties to the dispute but who have suffered because of it. They are suffering needlessly again as the costs of resuming the strike begin to mount. The Governors of California and Washington, whose States, along with Oregon,

have lost $23.5 million a day during the 100-day strike, reported the cost of its resumption is intolerable to their economy. The State of Hawaii is beginning to feel the punishment quite severely.

If this strike continues much longer, we can anticipate significant increases in the unemployment on the west coast and huge financial losses for many people across the country.

These figures are incomplete at the present time, because the strike is still going on, but once the strike is ended and these figures are added up, I am satisfied the losses in wages and lost jobs and profits and bankruptcies and exports will be much greater than the foregoing figures.

As I understand it, one of the difficulties in the subcommittee's consideration of the resolution was that of isolating the issues which have been most significant in keeping the parties from reaching agreement. That is, one of the problems has been that although the union asserts most of the issues have been settled, the PMA contends these are tentative rather than conclusive settlements, and all issues are open to negotiation until all have been wrapped up or included in a final agreement. The ILWU and the PMA are acting in this dispute as attorneys act to settle a dispute between a husband and wife or as conferees act on a bill. It is not final until the House approves the conferees' suggestions and the Senate approves them, and they are finally put into effect. The same situation arises as to the tentative settlement today.

Based on these problems, I discussed the matter with the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK). We decided to introduce a resolution, which we did on February 2, House Joint Resolution 796.

In its original form, it would have brought House Joint Resolution 1025 to the floor to settle the Pacific and Hawaii dispute among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees. In other words, both the Pacific dock strike and the Hawaii problem would have been included, and also it would have given the committee 2 hours to proceed, 1 hour for the chairman and 1 hour to be controlled by the minority to discuss House Joint Resolution 1025.

Subsequently thereto, last Friday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules (Mr. COLMER) sent out a notice stating he was calling a meeting of the Committee on Rules for 10 a.m. Tuesday morning, February 8, to consider a resolution to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 1025. We started hearings yesterday and were in hearings almost all day, from 10 a.m. until quite late in the afternoon.

During the time we were having our hearings, in the afternoon, notice came over the wire stating the negotiators announced a settlement today of the longest strike in American history, the 123-day walkout of the longshoremen in 24 ports on the west coast. It stated that all economic issues had been settled and that certain specified, noneconomic issues will be submitted to arbitration.

That came over the wire. Of course, that presented some problems to us.

I made certain telephone calls, including talking with Mr. Laurence Silberman, Under Secretary of Labor, and others. As best I could determine, they had reached a tentative settlement.

It was and it is, however, conditioned upon two certain provisions.

Now, 12 of the noneconomic issues which are unresolved will be submitted to compulsory arbitration. However, the tentative agreement is subject to approval of 110 union leaders who are scheduled to meet this coming Saturday. As I understand it, they represent the various unions. They will meet in San Francisco on Saturday to determine whether or not they will recommend to their members that this tentative agreement be ratified.

Then subsequent thereto, in accordance with the union regulations or their constitution, they will set a date to vote—I would assume next week; though I do not know the exact time they have to give their members notice. Then it will be submitted to the entire membership, to see if they desire to approve of this agreement.

There is no back-to-work at this time in this particular agreement. They will not go back to work until after this, except that I believe the 110 members who meet Saturday have the authority to order them back to work. I would hope they would. We might not be here today if they had done it yesterday.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield very briefly.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The 110 members, who constitute the caucus representing the various locals of the union, do have the authority and will have the authority if they ratify on Saturday to order all the others back to work pending the outcome of the referendum required under law.

Mr. SMITH of California. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

At the conclusion of my remarks I have a direct quotation from the President of the United States. I am going to quote his exact words.

I certainly suggest to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, come Saturday, if they are ordered back to work, it would be of great help.

Now, during the time of our consideration yesterday the other body passed its measure, Senate Joint Resolution 197, by a vote of 79 to 3.

In our executive session, we had a number of problems to decide. In any event, the final decision, as reported by a vote of 9 to 6 in the Rules Committee, was explained by the gentleman from California. It does provide, if this rule is adopted, for considering House Joint Resolution 1025, for having it heard in the House with 1 hour of debate controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and 1 hour by the minority member.

Then, in addition thereto, it makes House Joint Resolution 1054, the so-called Matsunaga resolution, in order as a substitute. That substitute, if we reach that stage, will be voted upon first.

There can be no amendments under the rule to the substitute, and no amendments to House Joint Resolution 1025. In the opinion of those of us who supported the rule, we felt there was a possibility, if amendments were permitted, that we might be here quite some time with various types of amendments, possibly of a delaying tactic.

House Joint Resolution 1054, was introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) on February 7, 1972.

Subsequent thereto, if the Matsunaga substitute is defeated, the vote will come on House Joint Resolution 1025.

If that is passed, then the rule makes it in order for the House to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 197, and consider the same in the House. There can be 1 hour of debate on that. The Speaker will recognize some Member for that particular purpose, for consideration of that resolution. At that particular time there can be 1 hour of debate on that.

This is an unusual situation. So far as I am concerned, I have participated in it only once before during my 16 years here in the House. It was in a Rules Committee hearing August 13, 1964, in connection with the so-called Tuck resolution.

Floor action was taken on August 19, 1964. My memory is that the bill passed by something like 242 to 148. I believe such distinguished individuals as the distinguished majority leader and our very, very distinguished Speaker supported and voted for the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to review these bills a little bit so that before we vote on the rule we will have an idea of what we are considering.

House Joint Resolution 1025, is the main bill we are considering. The purpose of this bill is to provide a procedure for the settlement of the dock strike on the west coast and Hawaii.

I want to make it very clear on Hawaii, which I will mention later, because they are not actually tied into this. They have always gone along and asked for the same contract which has been agreed upon by the ILWU and the PMA. So this particular resolution, if passed, would provide that because Hawaii is named in that.

More specifically, the joint resolution provides for a 3-man arbitration board to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor within 5 days of enactment of House Joint Resolution 1025. They will hear and settle all issues in dispute. I think the word "all" is very important, because I do not believe House Joint Resolution 1054 has the authority to settle all of the issues. I think it applies mainly to those that are unresolved. In any event, the determination of the board is to be effective for the period stated therein, which may not be less than 18 or more than 24 months.

The Secretary of Labor may terminate

provisions of this joint resolution before the issuance of a determination by the arbitration board if he finds that the parties have settled the disputes themselves.

From the date of enactment until the arbitration board makes its determination, work will go on under the old contract, which expired on June 30, 1971, and under which the parties have been operating since that time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the arbitration board is to begin its hearings no more than 15 days after enactment of the resolution and makes its determination not later than 40 days after that.

Any aggrieved party by the determination of the board may within 15 days after the issuance obtain review of the determination in the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia.

In addition to that, the Secretary of Labor is to appoint a special referee within 3 days of the enactment of this resolution who will settle all disputes before the determination goes into effect. Findings of the special referee, unless found to be arbitrary or capricious, shall be conclusive.

The jurisdiction of the U.S. district court and its judgments and decrees as to matters within its jurisdiction under this resolution shall be final and not subject to review.

The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to maintain any court action necessary to enforce the provisions of the legislation and moreover any strike, lockout, or other concerted activity in violation of the resolution shall be subject to a penalty of not to exceed $100,000 a day.

There is no penalty in House Joint Resolution 1054 in that regard.

The Matsunaga substitute, House Joint Resolution 1054, was introduced on February 7. It provides that the Attorney General shall petition the United States district court having jurisdiction over the parties to enjoin them in any strike or lockout arising out of a dispute for up to 30 days if it is found that the strike, first, affects an entire industry engaged in commerce and two will imperil the national safety if permitted to continue.

If no settlement is reached prior to 25 days after the issuance of the first injunction, the Attorney General shall petition the district court to extend it for 30 days. If no settlement is reached by the 31st day after the issuance of the original injunction, each party shall submit to the Secretary of Labor a final offer covering all issues and propose a contract period of not less than 18 months duration.

Next there is 5 days of collective bargaining on the final offers, and if no settlement is reached before the end of this period, the Secretary of Labor shall appoint a panel of three impartial members to select the most reasonable final offer within 30 days of the time that the Secretary orders submission of final offers.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of California. Can I finish? And then I will. I will save a minute and yield to you.

The determination of the panel shall be conclusive unless found arbitrary or capricious by the district court that granted the original injunction.

If any of the parties refuse to sign the final agreement selected by the panel, within 24 hours, the district court may enjoin further refusal by the party to sign.

Now, there are two issues involved here which I think are very important in the difference between House Joint Resolution 1054 and House Joint Resolution 1025, as I understand them to be. If I am wrong, I will stand corrected.

But in any event with reference to the Hawaiian problem, as I understand it, the union workers in Hawaii are members of the union but their employers are either not members of the PMA or are not part of the west coast bargaining unit, are not represented by PMA for bargaining purposes, and themselves bargain with the union in Hawaii, entirely separate from PMA. The union, however, as I further understand it—and I think they have had in the past a contract identical with any settlement arrived at by the PMA and the ILWU for the west coast—is demanding a contract identical with any settlement arrived at between PMA and the union for the west coast.

However, the Hawaiian employers have refused, and Mr. Bridges predicts a strike by the union in Hawaii, with which the union on the west coast will cooperate, if it does not secure its demands.

So, it seems to me in that respect, if we are going to take care of the serious problem which is developing in Hawaii, we should include all the things to be solved, as they will be solved in House Joint Resolution 1025, rather than, in my opinion, House Joint Resolution 1054.

The Teamsters Union has a jurisdictional dispute with the Longshoremen's Union over whose members do certain work connected with the stuffing of the containers. Much of it is now done by members of the Teamsters. The Teamsters Union wants all or a substantial part of this work for its members. Obviously, an agreement between PMA and the union on this issue will not bind the Teamsters who are not a party to the negotiations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of California. House Joint Resolution 1025 will establish the determination of all the issues involved and will include both the members in the Hawaiian dispute and the jurisdictional dispute between the Teamsters Union and the Longshoremen's Union

I do not believe House Joint Resolution 1054 will take care of those two things as I personally interpret them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 197 which was passed by the other body yesterday is substantially the same, I am advised by the Department of Labor, as House Joint Resolution 1025 and is acceptable to the administration.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. In just one moment and I will.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. SMITH of California. May I just finish my statement?

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has been finishing for 20 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I wonder if the gentleman might——

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 38]

Andrews	Gibbons	Minshall
Arends	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Green, Pa.	O'Konski
Bell	Griffin	Pelly
Biaggi	Grover	Powell
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Tex.
Broomfield	Harsha	Pryor, Ark.
Cabell	Harvey	Railsback
Carey, N.Y.	Hawkins	Roberts
Chisholm	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Clark	Hillis	Ruppe
Clawson, Del	Horton	Scheuer
Clay	Jarman	Schmitz
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Schneebeli
Corman	Kluczynski	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Stanton, J. William
Dickinson	Lujan	Stokes
Diggs	McCloskey	Stubblefield
Dwyer	McEwen	Stuckey
Edwards, La.	Macdonald, Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Forsythe	Mann	Tiernan
Fraser	Metcalfe	
Galifianakis		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO PROVIDE A PROCEDURE FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE ON THE PACIFIC COAST AND HAWAII

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 197, passed by the other body, is substantially the

same as House Joint Resolution 1025 and is acceptable to the administration. In connection with the President signing this legislation, I am authorized to state as follows, and I quote:

The President will watch carefully to see that the parties move expeditiously to consummate the agreement. The President will not sign the legislation immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule. I urge that the substitute House Joint Resolution 1054 be defeated. I urge that House Joint Resolution 1025 be passed and that subsequently Senate Joint Resolution 197, as passed by the Senate be then considered and passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from California.

I have just one question.

In your recitation of the Matsunaga joint resolution—relating to your discussion of it—does the Matsunaga joint resolution send the solution to the Pay Board, while the Dellenback bill does not?

Mr. SMITH of California. It says that the final offer of the selection board—is what—what you mean?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Whatever is agreed upon. Assuming that we do take the Matsunaga substitute, will that which has been agreed upon go to the Pay Board?

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not know whether it will or not.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It does not.

Mr. SMITH of California. I did not think it did, but I was not certain.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I listened to the statement by the President and I wonder if I am correct——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The President wants the legislative branch of Government to commit itself to compulsory arbitration but yet he reserves to himself the right not to do it if he so chooses.

Mr. SMITH of California. If they proceed expeditiously, I think the problem will be solved.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Rules Committee (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and believe it should be defeated for one purpose. Defeat of the rule would postpone action by the House in order to allow the collective bargaining process to proceed freely.

The gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) read a brief statement from the President which says exactly and precisely what he read, but the import of it, presumably, is that if the process proceeds expeditiously that has been initiated by the settlement, that the President will not sign the legislation. That is clearly the implication. If there is a settlement expeditiously, the President will not sign the legislation is at least the implication of those two sentences that I listened to twice.

Now, it happens that I consider this twofold, a wholly unprecedented action of the House of Representatives if it is pursued to a conclusion. It is unprecedented, No. 1, because there never has been a time, and that is in the history of the House of Representatives, when the House has passed legislation purporting to establish a method of settling a strike after it has been announced by the parties involved that they had arrived at a settlement.

The only reason that this settlement is not final, as best I can determine, is that the union involved has a procedure which is part of their constitutional procedure, part of their democratic process, which requires their negotiators to get approval of the membership before the agreement that they have proposed is final. As I say, it is part of the democratic process.

On this coming Saturday, as I understand it, the caucus of the Longshoremen meets and accepts or rejects the proposal of the negotiators. This is part of the process. I am told that if they accept it that then it is probable, very probable, that the membership will accept it, and the process that is under way now is the normal process of settlement that is announced as a settlement. And we are going to inject ourselves at this time, and say, "No, we are going to have this club over your head. We are going to act to force you to settle what you have already started to settle."

I submit that this is unprecedented, and that it is unwise.

What is the parliamentary situation? The bill that is sought to be passed by this resolution, the Senate bill, is on the Speaker's table. There was no attempt to obstruct action in the Committee on Rules on yesterday. I cannot say that I would vote for the resolution, but I can say that I could have delayed it, perhaps substantially, and I made no such attempt because I believe in an orderly legislative process. And this institution can, if the settlement breaks down, in a matter of moments, almost, on Wednesday next, bring up, if the Committee on Rules chooses to come back on Tuesday, if a settlement breaks down, bring up the same resolution or a different one. But there is no need for us to act tonight. We should not act. We should postpone—and you should know that while the particular resolution came out of the Committee on Rules by a vote of 9 to 6, and while the proposal recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor was defeated 10 to 5, that my motion to postpone was defeated by 8 to 7. There is very good reason not to take this unprecedented action. That is one reason.

The second reason is to me equally compelling. I do not think there is any mystery that I have suggested that we should reform some of the procedures of this institution and modify some of the habits, and I am hardly one to oppose change. But I do not know of any precedent in all the history of the Congress for the action proposed here under the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

This resolution makes in order the consideration of three resolutions, not one of which has been considered by a legislative committee of the House, and it does not provide for the consideration of the only resolution which has been considered by the appropriate legislative committee.

What is this? What does this mean in terms of precedent? I suggest that on occasion that the Committee on Rules ought to operate a little differently than it does.

This is so remarkably different, it makes me wonder what would happen if there existed a Rules Committee which, reading the mind of the majority of the House, decided every time it shows a militant majority, it would just ignore the legislative committee.

If we did that—why have the other committees? Why not just have one Rules Committee, and one House—it would really expedite things. Matters would not be very well considered. They would all come to the floor from people who are generalists and not experts—and there we would be.

That is the precedent that this resolution, if adopted, establishes. It is not so much that we take a bill or a resolution away from a committee. It is that we choose as the vehicle a resolution that was not acted upon by the committee and was not reported by the committee and leave out the one that was.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I would not, under ordinary circumstances, wish to have any dispute with him, but I think it ought to be clear to the House that the Dellenback resolution was, in fact, considered. It was the subject of the hearings in the subcommittee and voted on in the full committee and rejected. The bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) was, in fact, not even the subject of hearings.

It was introduced the day before it was considered by the full committee and the rules were waived, in effect, by the Committee on Education and Labor.

So I would not want the gentleman from Missouri to indicate to the House that this question was something that has not received the consideration of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BOLLING. I may have misspoken myself, but the fact remains that the bill that this resolution seeks to pass, was considered. If I said it was not considered, I misspoke myself. It was not acted favorably upon.

But the bill that this resolution seeks to pass, to the best of my knowledge, was not considered in the Committee on Education and Labor. The Senate bill was not considered.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The Senate bill was not considered.

Mr. BOLLING. All right—then the Senate bill is the bill that this resolution seeks to pass. All you have to do is look at the resolution. It makes it very clear that the intent of the resolution is not to pass the Dellenback bill or the Sisk bill—it is not to pass the Matsunaga bill. It is to pass the Senate bill, and send the whole thing to the President tonight and thus avoid a conference.

Perhaps I said "considered" too often. But I am quite clear in my mind that the purpose of this resolution is to pass a resolution that was not considered—and the one that was considered and reported out in the usual process was not made in order.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Is it not true that if we complete our recess and this bill has been passed, and the same bill is passed in the House and Senate, it becomes law without the President's signature after 10 days, if we are back in session, which we will be?

So is he going to veto this bill? I want to know if not, it is going to become law anyway. All this argument about his not signing is just baloney. There is no issue in terms of the President signing it or not.

Mr. BOLLING. We are talking of a bill that was not considered by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ADAMS. I am talking of the procedure you outlined at the beginning of your argument that if the Senate bill is passed and we take up the Senate bill, which this rule provides for, and we pass it, and send to the President a bill that has passed both Houses then it will become law. This is the same bill which will go to the President. I understand and I understood you and the gentleman from California to say that he would not sign it, if this has been settled, this will make no difference.

Mr. BOLLING. The statement of the gentleman was very precise—and it does not say he would not sign it. He said it more precisely than that.

But the point is—suppose it did become a law without his signature? I do not believe it would become operative, if I understand it, without some further action.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am quoting from page S 1446 of the proceedings in the Senate of February 8, 1972.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri so that this question may be answered if he wishes.

Mr. BOLLING. I hope the gentleman will yield me some time to comment on it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The date is February 8, 1972, and the provision in the Senate bill is as follows and I quote:

> Provided that proceedings under this joint resolution shall be terminated immediately upon certification in writing by the parties to the Secretary of Labor that they have reached complete agreement on the disposition of all the issues.

In other words, if there is a certification to the Secretary of Labor that the parties are in accord, which means ratification by the union, the legislation would not become operative.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman. The point remains precisely the same. We have the opportunity to postpone action on this matter and let the collective bargaining process take its course to settlement, or we can pass the buck. The way to postpone it is to vote down this rule. We will thus spare ourselves a remarkable set of precedents, which we really should not impose on ourselves, and we shall have allowed the collective bargaining process to proceed. The only way to postpone this matter for a few days is to vote down this rule, and that is what we should do.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the conclusion so ably and articulately stated by the gentleman from Missouri is precise and is the answer: It is to vote down this rule—not only because of this trespass, and I view it as a very serious trespass on the legislative process on the subcommittee of which I am chairman, the full committee on which I serve, and on all other committees and subcommittees from now on. Because, in substantive terms, it is a fact that we did hold hearings on the bill introduced by the gentleman from Oregon.

The legislation which I introduced and which was reported contains absolutely no subject matter which was not fully discussed in the hearings before the full committee. The Matsunaga bill was not discussed. It was not subject to inquiry. The Senate bill appeared before us—and I saw it first only as recently as a few minutes ago—and, as Mr. BOLLING said, the objective of this unique and unusual resolution, carrying with it, if you please—and I say this to those of you who are subcommittee chairmen, chairmen, and ranking members—this resolution is unique in that immediately upon the adoption of this rule, this body automatically would go into the Committee of the Whole House without the chairman of the legislative committee having the right to say, "Mr. Chairman, 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 following bill." The resolution avoids that process.

Those of you who are in trouble because of the strike—and, indeed, many of us are—you are not going to get any relief from this legislation if it is reported today. It is not going to affect in the faintest the impending strike or the possibility of an impending strike on the east and gulf coast ports of the United States. They are under an 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction now, which expires on February 14, with a voluntary agreement, which they can break at any time, to "hit the bricks," as they say. Are you going to deal with that on an ad hoc basis, or are you going to await the outcome, as promised in the other body yesterday, of the deliberations on the President's so-called crippling strikes emergency legislation, which would solve the problems, ostensibly at least, in the whole transportation industry by putting those parts of it which are now within the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee into the Committee on Education and Labor and under the National Labor Relations Act?

Members may think the employers want and the managers want compulsory arbitration. I assure the Members, they do not. Neither does labor. It would destroy both of them. And it does not bring them closer together, I can assure the House of that. In the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, both management and labor have come out foursquare against the President's emergency solution. These problems cannot be solved on an ad hoc basis, nor can every bill out of every one of the Members' committees and subcommittees reach the appropriate resolution by having some Member of the distinguished Committee on Rules introduce a resolution preempting it without hearing it.

I do not pretend to have an extraordinary knowledge of the contents of all this legislation, but I do claim this. I know more of the facets, of the involvements, of the implications, of the history of this dispute than does any member of the rules committee.

My resolution should have been the one before us today. I hope the rule will be defeated.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. For a question or for time or what?

I yield the gentleman from California 30 seconds. I have already yielded 2 or 3 minutes over there.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, out our way the major shippers and the union leaders believe that they have settled their strike. It was a long, tough negotiation between those two parties, who for some 22 years have not had a strike.

This terrible ordeal is over. I think we ought to let the parties who already believe they have solved it handle it. They are boggled at the notion that this new factor is going to be introduced, and no

one can predict what the result of an action like this is going to be.

Let us let them tend to their business, and let us stay out of it, and let us hope that when we come back, the strike will have been settled permanently.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from New Jersey, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 15, page 20213, in association with the so-called "Tuck resolution" it says, "shall immediately go into the House," and that is precisely where I got the language for this one.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I concede that is so, and also I think if the gentleman will examine the record for a longer period, he will find this is only the second time it has been used.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have heard that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say in response to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), who I think is one of the most brilliant technicians among the Members of the House, that this procedure may be unprecedented, but it is not unwise. The situation, like the procedure, is also unprecedented. We are facing crisis not only on the west coast, but also in the Nation. We have no settlement of this crisis at the present time. We have only a possibility of a settlement of this crisis.

May I say in response to the remarks about what the committee and subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee have, in fact, dealt with, the proper committee did, indeed, consider House Joint Resolution 1025, and that failed of passage after full deliberation by the subcommittee and relatively short deliberation by the full committee, by a very narrow vote, by a vote of 17 to 20. Had there been two votes changed, it would have, indeed, come out of the full committee instead of dying, as it did indeed. So also, both the full subject matter of the so-called Thompson resolution and Senate Joint Resolution 197 have been fully considered by our subcommittee.

As the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, pointed out, everything that was involved in his resolution was discussed and considered by our subcommittee. So also, I repeat, the subject matter of Senate Joint Resolution 197, which is also covered by the resolution of the Rules Committee, was fully discussed.

If Members will look at Senate Joint Resolution 197 and look at House Joint Resolution 1025, they will find a high degree of similarity between the two. The differences are not major. So we cannot say that our subcommittee and our committee have not dealt in full with both of these resolutions which are made in order by the resolution adopted by the Rules Committee.

Much of this proposed legislation rightfully deserves far greater discussion, and it is unfortunately the case that in the final, closing minutes a series of important comments need to be made, with no hope for consideration in full.

If the hoped-for vote occurs on Saturday on the west coast, and indeed approves the settlement, then any further action under this legislation will be moot, but we have no assurance that such approving action will take place. The issue is not settled.

Last September, the President himself talked with the leaders of the ILWU and with the leaders of the Maritime Association, and both of them expressed the hope that the matter was so close to settlement it could be settled within a week. That was last September. It has not been settled yet. In the meantime there has been great devastation, not only on the west coast but also inland.

There was no settlement on the series of occasions when we were very close. We are very close now. I hope the present strike will be settled—and soon.

Under the circumstances we now face it is imperative, my colleagues of the House, that there be action tonight before we dissolve and go off into the recess. It is imperative that this rule be adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I shall vote for the legislation to deal with the strike problem.

The people of our Nation have long been concerned with the inadequacies of our laws dealing with emergency transportation disputes. More recently there has been reason to show concern about the resumption of the west coast dock strike. As in the case of a national rail strike, these disputes tie up our Nation's transportation industries. They are economically devastating. They cannot be tolerated indefinitely. Ways must be found by which they can be effectively and speedily settled.

The dispute that closed the Pacific ports for 100 days last year and, after expiration of a Taft-Hartley injunction, shut down again on January 17, is the kind for which there should be laws to provide a method of fair and certain solution. While many shippers have made alternate arrangements, and port activity was speeded during the cooling-off period in anticipation of a resumption of the walkout, the prolongation of the current disruption poses a substantial threat of widespread economic harm. The Nation is struggling to recover from the first trade deficit in more than 80 years. Important agricultural exports have been curtailed. The west coast ports could lose business permanently to rivals in Canada and Mexico. Hawaii's major channel for supplies from the continent has been cut for a time since our military shipments were threatened.

The labor picture of today is far different than it was a few years ago when strikes were confined primarily to those directly involved in a labor dispute. Today, many innocent people are hurt. The taxpayers are hurt. Families are hurt. The economy of the United States is hurt. Small businesses fail through no fault of their own except that they are dependent on certain sources of raw material denied during a strike affecting the producer of that material. The economy of our Nation is balanced on the most delicate of factors. There is an interdependence of manufacturers far more critical than ever before.

In short, there is no such thing as an isolated strike in our modern and complicated society. A strike in any vital industry, such as steel, transportation, and automobiles, is in effect, a strike against the Nation. To keep men at work, goods flowing, and services functioning, is a matter of national interest. As such, it is the duty of elective and appointive officials to see that no disruption occurs. Work stoppages with nationwide impact no longer can be afforded. We must arrive at procedures to avoid strikes that are destructive to our Nation and it is imperative that we do so immediately. The Congress is the stumbling block. We have not acted. We must now find a way to prevent these prolonged walkouts while recognizing the legitimate demands of both labor and management. If we do not act now when the need is great, then it is unlikely that we will act later when the pressure is reduced. The most apparent need is to shorten negotiations leading up to an agreement on a contract.

The President has submitted a proposal to the Congress for ending the dock strike which calls for naming a three-member arbitration panel by the Secretary of Labor. The panel would be given 40 days to complete its task. The union would be ordered to end the strike as soon as the law was enacted. The suggested law would empower the panel to decide all issues in the dispute, which would include the jurisdictional fight between the Teamsters and Longshoremen over container jobs. The panel would be told to follow the rules of the Economic Stabilization Act, but the panel's decisions would be final, without requiring approval by the Pay Board. A court review could be obtained by either party to the dispute. The terms ordered by the arbitrators would remain in effect for at least 18 months, under this proposal.

I fully support the President in his efforts to bar such crises as the west coast dock strike. It is high time that the Congress face its responsibility to the American people by enacting permanent legislation to end nationwide work stoppages.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me confess—if I may have the attention of the gentlemen back there who have been critical of my committee about this action—that it is a rather unusual procedure. It is not one that is exercised regularly by the committee.

But when we hear these strong statements about it being "unprecedented," they are just not true. There is ample precedent for the exercise of this power, which the Committee on Rules has. It is exercised, I believe, not only rarely but also wisely.

I would not be an advocate of the com-

mittee using this power as a regular procedure. I do not believe it should.

But there comes a time, there comes an hour, when a situation has developed where a recalcitrant committee or a recalcitrant group of people refuse to budge when extraordinary measures must be resorted to.

I say to you here and now with regard to most of the speeches that have been made here against this procedure and the castigation of my committee that if they did not have that to rely upon, they would find some other excuse for delaying this long overdue settlement of this strike.

So what have we done here? Two members of this awful Committee on Rules, if you want to put it that way, one a Democrat, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), and one a Republican, the gentleman from California (Mr. ALLEN SMITH), joined in a resolution, both members of my committee, to bring this bill to the floor and give the House an opportunity to pass on this question.

Now, I do not have time to go into all of the details, but I do call your attention to the fact—and nobody can dispute this—that while there is a tentative agreement on most of the issues involved in this disastrous strike, it is not an accomplished fact. Who can say that some further delay will not occur?

Moreover, I call your attention to the fact that this strike has been dragging along for 123 days and no action to consummate it was taken.

I also want to call your attention to the fact when you castigate this committee that if it had not been for the action that was taken, the threat of action by the Committee on Rules, I seriously doubt there would have been any substantial progress made in the settlement of this strike. Because of the very fact that the Congress, the representatives of the people, the people suffering because of the blow to the economy of the country, wanted something done, some action was taken by our committee and we have had the progress which we have made in the settlement of the matter.

I hope this strike is settled and is settled on Saturday, and I hope it will not be necessary for the President to sign the legislation.

Just a few minor details now.

My friend Mr. BOLLING—and he is my friend and a good personal friend—we do not always, and that may be an understatement, agree on philosophies of government, but he talks about the Committee on Rules not reporting out the committee bill. The committee bill, with all due deference to my other friend, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, who opposes my position here today, the bill reported out by his subcommittee and then reported by the full committee, I understand, is, in my humble judgment, just so much eyewash. What did it do? It simply provided that the military cargoes should go ahead.

It is already going ahead, and that the agricultural products might go back and forth from Hawaii. What about Japan and the other sections of the world?

So, we have reached a situation here where something had to be done.

Now, I confess again to you that the wording of this rule possibly is the only thing that is unprecedented about it. It is, rather, an awkward approach to this matter. And, why? Because your Committee on Rules did not know that the other body had passed this joint resolution or a similar joint resolution until the Rules Committee had completed its hearings. And I call your attention to the fact that it passed the other body by the overwhelming majority of 79 to 3. And, yet my friends——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in that one-half minute I want to finish that one sentence. We have been asked now to go home on a recess and leave this thing hanging in a state of limbo, and I hope we will not do it. Time is of the essence. We cannot afford to go on a political excursion while our people, including our laboring people, are suffering.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 170, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—203

Alexander	Cleveland	Gude
Abernethy	Collins, Tex.	Hagan
Abbitt	Colmer	Haley
Arends	Conable	Hall
Anderson, Ill.	Coughlin	Hammer-schmidt
Archer	Daniel, Va.	Hanna
Belcher	de la Garza	Hansen, Idaho
Baker	Dellenback	Harsha
Bennett	Dennis	Hastings
Bergland	Derwinski	Heckler, Mass.
Betts	Devine	Henderson
Biester	Downing	Hogan
Blackburn	Duncan	Hosmer
Bow	du Pont	Hull
Bray	Edmondson	Hungate
Brinkley	Edwards, Ala.	Hunt
Brotzman	Erlenborn	Hutchinson
Brown, Mich.	Esch	Ichord
Brown, Ohio	Eshleman	Jarman
Broyhill, N.C.	Findley	Johnson, Pa.
Broyhill, Va.	Fish	Jonas
Buchanan	Fisher	Jones, N.C.
Burke, Fla.	Flowers	Kazen
Burleson, Tex.	Flynt	Keating
Burlison, Mo.	Foley	Keith
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford, Gerald R.	Kemp
Byron	Fountain	King
Caffery	Frelinghuysen	Kuykendall
Camp	Frenzel	Kyl
Carter	Frey	Landgrebe
Casey, Tex.	Fuqua	Landrum
Cederberg	Gettys	Latta
Chamberlain	Goldwater	Lennon
Chappell	Goodling	Lent
Clancy	Green, Oreg.	Link
Clausen, Don H.	Gross	Lloyd
	Gubser	
McClory	Pickle	Steiger, Ariz.
McClure	Pirnie	Steiger, Wis.
McCollister	Poage	Stephens
McCormack	Poff	Talcott
McDade	Preyer, N.C.	Taylor
McDonald, Mich.	Purcell	Teague, Calif.
McEwen	Quie	Terry
McKevitt	Quillen	Thompson, Ga.
McKinney	Railsback	Thomson, Wis.
McMillan	Randall	Thone
Mahon	Rhodes	Ullman
Mailliard	Robinson, Va.	Vander Jagt
Mallary	Robison, N.Y.	Veysey
Martin	Rogers	Waggonner
Mathias, Calif.	Roy	Ware
Mathis, Ga.	Ruth	Whalley
Matsunaga	Sandman	Whitehurst
Mayne	Satterfield	Whitten
Melcher	Scherle	Widnall
Michel	Schwengel	Wiggins
Miller, Ohio	Scott	Williams
Mills, Md.	Sebelius	Wilson, Bob
Minshall	Shoup	Winn
Mizell	Shriver	Wyatt
Montgomery	Sikes	Wydler
Mosher	Sisk	Wylie
Myers	Skubitz	Wyman
Nelsen	Smith, Calif.	Young, Fla.
Nichols	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Passman	Spence	Zion
Pettis	Springer	Zwach
	Steed	

NAYS—170

Abourezk	Fraser	Patten
Abzug	Fulton	Pepper
Adams	Gallagher	Perkins
Addabbo	Garmatz	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Gaydos	Podell
	Giaimo	Price, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.	Gonzalez	Pucinski
	Grasso	Rangel
Annunzio	Gray	Rarick
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Rees
Aspin	Griffiths	Reid
Aspinall	Halpern	Reuss
Badillo	Hamilton	Riegle
Barrett	Hanley	Rodino
Begich	Harrington	Roe
Bevill	Hathaway	Roncalio
Bingham	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Blanton	Hébert	Rooney, Pa.
Boggs	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Boland	Heinz	Rostenkowski
Bolling	Hicks, Mass.	Roush
Brademas	Hicks, Wash.	Roybal
Brasco	Holifield	Runnels
Brooks	Howard	Ryan
Burke, Mass.	Jacobs	St Germain
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Sarbanes
Byrne, Pa.	Karth	Saylor
Carney	Kastenmeier	Selberling
Celler	Kee	Shipley
Clark	Koch	Slack
Clay	Kyros	Snyder
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Staggers
Conte	Long, La.	Stanton, James V.
Conyers	Long, Md.	
Cotter	McFall	Stokes
Crane	McKay	Stratton
Culver	Madden	Stuckey
Curlin	Mazzoli	Sullivan
Daniels, N.J.	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Mikva	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	Miller, Calif.	Tiernan
Davis, S.C.	Mills, Ark.	Udall
Delaney	Minish	Van Deerlin
Dellums	Mink	Vanik
Denholm	Mitchell	Vigorito
Dent	Mollohan	Waldie
Dingell	Monagan	Whalen
Donohue	Moorhead	White
Dorn	Morgan	Wilson, Charles H.
Dow	Morse	
Drinan	Moss	Wolff
Dulski	Murphy, Ill.	Wright
Eckhardt	Murphy, N.Y.	Yates
Eilberg	Natcher	Yatron
Evans, Colo.	Nedzi	Zablocki
Evins, Tenn.	Nix	
Fascell	Obey	
Flood	O'Hara	
Ford, William D.	O'Neill	
	Patman	

NOT VOTING—58

Andrews	Clawson, Del	Forsythe
Ashbrook	Collier	Galifianakis
Baring	Corman	Gibbons
Bell	Davis, Wis.	Griffin
Biaggi	Dickinson	Grover
Blatnik	Diggs	Hansen, Wash.
Broomfield	Dowdy	Harvey
Cabell	Dwyer	Hawkins
Carey, N.Y.	Edwards, Calif.	Helstoski
Chisholm	Edwards, La.	Hillis

Horton	Metcalfe	Scheuer
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Schmitz
Jones, Tenn.	Pelly	Schneebeli
Kluczynski	Peyser	Smith, Iowa
Lujan	Powell	Stanton,
McCloskey	Price, Tex.	J. William
McCulloch	Pryor, Ark.	Steele
Macdonald,	Roberts	Stubblefield
Mass.	Rousselot	Symington
Mann	Ruppe	Wampler

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Metcalfe against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Rousselot for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Bloomfield for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Price of Texas for, with Mr. Biaggi against.

Mr. McCloskey for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Andrews for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. Schneebeli for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Lujan for, with Mr. Helstoski against.

Mr. Hillis for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Ruppe for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Mr. Grover for, with Mr. Symington against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Wampler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Baring with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Forsythe.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Steele.

Mr. J. William Stanton with Mr. Schmitz.

Messrs. TAYLOR, HANNA, and KEITH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 796, the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1025) to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees.

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 joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 1025, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret the procedure that has been adopted in connection with this resolution and the manner in which it was adopted.

If the House Committee on Education and Labor had been dilatory or had tried to stall, it would be another question.

The only thing that I can say is that it seems to me that we have just too much politics involved here. If we were going to get any results, it would be a horse of a different color.

Now, I do not know why the Rules Committee chose to take such a dictatorial stand, and it is nothing but a dictatorial stand.

One of these days some Members may think back with regret upon this occasion when they have usurped and run over a committee, a procedure that has never been followed and for which there was no precedent.

I regret to see the Rules Committee, chaired by a great Southern Democrat who believes in democratic principles, come before this body with a resolution of this type. The results obtained will be nil. I say that unhesitatingly.

We have had private parties engaged in the time-honored process of collective bargaining, and yet now, at the stage of the game when it is perfectly clear that it is not going to serve any useful purpose, the proponents of this measure are asking this body to circumvent its normal procedures and get the Federal Government involved in a dispute that no longer exists.

All the President of the United States is going to do in a few days is to call these people in and say, "This dispute has been settled, and I am not going to sign this resolution."

As for the resolution itself, there is nothing in it that will contribute to a settlement, because a voluntary settlement by the parties has already been reached without Federal Government interference.

I think the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) hit the nail on the head. Why should this Chamber be so gullible as to fall into a Republican political trap?

I know that some of my Republican colleagues will say that this committee has not acted expeditiously, and that we would not have taken any action. That is untrue. Let me say to my distinguished friends that we were taking action and that we took it much more rapidly than the President of the United States. He never intervened until the 80-day period had long since elapsed, and did not invoke the 80-day cooling-off period until long after the strike had been in effect.

As soon as we got this bill I referred the bill to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). It is true that not everyone agreed with the bill reported by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), but I do not know of any individual who worked harder to try to settle this strike than Congressman THOMPSON worked.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman is talking about his southern friends. I do not think he has any.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I certainly thank the gentleman from Florida for that statement. I know the gentleman from Florida very seldom votes for a southern friend, or anybody else.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am going to say that maybe you do not have some southern friends, but you do have quite a number of northern friends.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, since the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) got personal, I would say that I do not know of an occasion that he even votes for many of his other southern friends, let me put it that way.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I will not yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is nothing but a fraud upon this House at this time, and I certainly hope that the membership of this body will vote the resolution down.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I was going to say to the gentleman: Beware of the tyranny of the majority.

I think maybe what we are observing here is a good example of that tyranny in action, certainly, when the Committee on Rules can sweep aside all functions of a standing committee of the House, and bring a bill here on the floor and ram it through, and send it out to the President, because if they can do this with this piece of legislation then they can do it with every piece of legislation in this Congress from now on.

I agree with the gentleman in the well that the Committee on Rules has set a disastrous precedent here tonight.

Mr. PERKINS. They have set an example in my judgment that they are going to regret in the future.

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to stand in defense of the action of the Committee on Rules, because we waited here a long, long time for some type of action to bring about a settlement of this disastrous strike which was crippling this Nation and bringing this Nation to its knees, as far as its economy was concerned.

As far as my State is concerned, one of the 50 States, agriculture was slipping backward and farm products were not moving, and it was costing on the average of $1 million a day.

So, Mr. Chairman, I compliment the Committee on Rules for its action, and I would stand in defense of their action any time this type of legislation has to be brought out, and is necessary.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Iowa that we are not settling anything in this resolution, and there is no permanent remedy provided.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say—this was supposed to be a disastrous strike. But let us take the events as they occurred.

There was a strike—the first one in 22 years involving this union. The west coast workers are drawing from 15 to 20 percent less than workers in some other industries who have had numerous strikes. Right after the time limit, the President of the United States invoked the 80-day cooling-off period. I have never seen any negotiations in all my life taking place during the 80 days.

The 80 days never produced anything because they just postponed it. During those 100 days you are talking of, they work the 80 days. Then on top of that they made the offer voluntarily a two-way offer to haul all military equipment and to haul all agricultural products which was turned down, because the operators knew that the union was broke.

The unions lost so many employees and instead of hauling in the usual way, all they had to do was have the containerized merchandise and ship it out and haul it away 100 miles and take many of the dockworkers' jobs.

Now they had 40,000 or 50,000 container ships.

How many of the workers were out on strike? They are not striking for an economic wage, they were striking for something to put into an early retirement fund required because of the loss of jobs. When I talked to you last week, they were 2½ cents apart—not on account of the dollar—they accepted that—but 2½ cents was the difference they were trying to work out between putting into the retirement fund for themselves—or they had to go on relief, rather than putting it into a long-term retirement fund.

They hauled all of your agricultural products. But the operators said, "No—the union is broke and the economic pressure on the officers of this union will force a settlement."

What have you done? What are you trying to do? Let me say to you that without free enterprise labor, there can be no free enterprise industry. The treatment has to be the same for both.

I know of no industry in my area that wants to be tied down to compulsory arbitration under any conditions. Because this year they think, some of them, that they have an administration that might lean their way and might name commissions that would hand down a decision that would appeal to them and be worthwhile.

But we have a way of changing administrations in this country. We have a day coming when you will rue the day if you allow this action to take place.

You have another strike coming up very shortly—one that will chase 90 percent of the Members of this Congress into a corner, because it is going to be the kind of strike that will come from persons who will just say—not an organized strike.

You say—Well, now, that is leading into that. Let me tell you something. Why do you think there cannot be any settlement and there cannot be a commitment or an agreement reached? Because this House against my advice and against my judgment voted to tie into the Landrum-Griffin bill a proposition that every contract agreed upon between negotiating national bodies or international bodies had to go back to the local unions. Do you know how long it takes some local unions to agree on a nationally arrived at contract? We still have some steelworkers who have not ratified an agreement made 2 years ago in the steel industry.

We have today many local unions in the mines that have not agreed to a contract that was arrived at between the operators.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me say this to all of you—you are in a mood today in a sort of mood that you have to strike out at somebody, because we have failed as Members of this Congress to recognize the sickness gnawing away at the body politic of this Nation of ours and we are hiding behind this action and you are blaming it on one union on strike, one incident in labor.

The whole business and the whole trouble we are in in this great Congress in this legislation, we are talking about a cancer that none of us have the courage or the guts to reach out with a sharp knife and cut out, that cancer that is destroying this country and it is a cancer that is foreign made.

If you do not understand it, you will understand it, because it is my prediction that the local unions, the dock workers, may very well refuse to go to work, and none of you are going to make them work.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I say that all these people who have been crying about how much produce has not gone out of the United States, I have not heard a single one of them saying how much Japanese trash has not been coming into the United States, and with a $3 billion deficit in Japan's favor, it is probably 3 to 1, and we are 3 to 1 better off than we would have been. So, you know, when they start crying about that, it does not make much impression on me.

Another thing. I think this is a very arrogant, drastic usurpation of the powers of the leadership, and I want you to know that I was the swing vote in the Hansen committee that preserved the seniority system so that some of these very chairmen who defy the Speaker could have their jobs, and I am going to reconsider that vote, and maybe we can bring something into the democratic system, because next year we will get some chairmen who are responsive to the leadership and not a power unto themselves, at 80 or 90 years of age.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, there will be no resolution of the issues on the adoption of this resolution. I hope the resolution will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. RUTH).

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Chairman, I frequently find myself up here explaining what goes on in the Education and Labor Committee. Occasionally you are misinformed, and I believe it my duty to kind of get the thing straightened out.

I am really sorry to hear my chairman, for whom I have the utmost respect, say that this issue has taken on too much of a political implication. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that has more political implication than that glorious committee on which you and I serve.

This matter was lost in the subcommittee for a considerable time, and it looked like there was going to be no danger in finding it. But we found out that the Rules Committee was becoming a little active, and maybe they were going to do something that they felt was in the interest of the people of the United States. They are not really trying to get in the fight between the unions and management. They are trying to say, "If this thing is so big that it is hurting the people of the United States, the Congress should do something about it." And that includes us, Mr. Chairman.

When we found out that the Rules Committee was doing something, we found this bill and Mr. THOMPSON started working on it. We got it out of the subcommittee, and actually we got it to the full committee. Boy, if we did not bog that baby down there, I will quit. You know, our chairman did not help; he did not do a whole lot to push it and he did not do a whole lot to stop it. We had the bill read, we had the substitute read, we were kept looking at the clock and listening to the phone. If necessary, we had the necessary quorum call. We know how to do the whole job in that committee.

And we realized all of a sudden that the Rules Committee was going to bring out a bill and we said, "The heck with them. We will give them a bill," but in their judgment the Rules Committee decided to take their own bill.

I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Kentucky, or this humble gentleman from North Carolina in the well is going to change anybody's vote. I think the really expedient thing to do is to have the vote and let us vote our conviction. I do not think my good friend the chairman has said anything that did not happen in the committee. I am up here to tell you that he left out some things that did happen. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident from the earlier vote what the destiny of this

legislation is going to be, but I doubt that very many Members have fully understood or have had explained to them the chronology of events.

I would like to talk to the Members a moment about the genesis of this strike. The longshoremen's union has been working under two 5-year contracts with the Pacific Maritime Association. The second 5-year contract, during which there could be no negotiation for additional wages and during which time there was dramatic improvement in the shipping industry's economics, expired on July 1, 1971. There having been no agreement, they went on strike until, on October 6, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act bringing about an 80-day cooling-off period were invoked by the President.

Many, many weeks before those 100 days expired, a number of Members of this House, deeply concerned, wrote to the President and asked him to immediately invoke the 80-day cooling-off period.

On December 25, the cooling-off period expired. On January 17, the strike resumed. On January 21, we had a message from the President relating to this matter.

I might say parenthetically to my very good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) that had the President's then pending emergency strike legislation been passed, it would not have applied in this case because there is a third party, the Teamsters.

The ad hoc solution, which is proposed by each of these three resolutions before us today, will not have the slightest effect if the east and gulf port workers go down.

On January 21, Senators PACKWOOD and JAVITS introduced in the Senate a bill substantially the same as that introduced in the House on January 25, House Joint Resolution 1025, by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

On January 27, the Committee on Education and Labor had the matter referred to it, and it was referred to my subcommittee. Before the matter was actually in my hands from my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) two of my staff members were on their way to the west coast to talk to the principals in order to determine what the real issues were, and what the facts were.

The President in the meantime did not file, as required by section 210 of the Taft-Hartley Act, the required report of the five-member 80-day board outlining specifically and categorically and fully the issues in the dispute, the remaining issues, and the results of the required final offer ballot conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. We were working in a legislative vacuum.

On January 31, February 1, and February 3, the subcommittee held hearings. We heard first the Secretary of Labor and on the next day the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Under Secretary of Commerce. All were splendid witnesses. All were cooperative. All of them gave us information which we did not have before us until that time. We then heard testimony from the parties to the dispute: the ILWU, the PMA, and the Teamsters.

On Monday, February 6, my subcommittee reported House Joint Resolution 1056, and on February 7 it was reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor.

At 10 minutes of 12 on yesterday, when I was appearing before the Committee on Rules to ask them not to take the unusual action of depriving a legislative committee of this action, because in fact the committee was working on the legislation at the moment—at 10 minutes of 12—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules said to me:

> Mr. THOMPSON, can you give us any assurance that the Committee on Education and Labor is going to report a bill today?

I said:

> That would be impossible, Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that I am here and not there.

Three minutes later my subcommittee counsel, who was with me, slipped me a note that said:

> The Committee on Education and Labor has reported your resolution, 1056, with amendments to add Guam and Alaska.

From that point further there was no need for this usurpation. It has nevertheless taken place. I protested it yesterday. I protest it today, and I will protest it in the future, even if it applies to a bill which I am for or against.

Now, what do we have before us? Well, we have the Dellenback proposal first. It is a compulsory arbitration measure. Under it arbitrators will be appointed, and every single issue upon which the parties have bargained and agreed—and there are literally dozens of them—can be opened up completely and changed completely by that arbitrator. And they will not go to the wage board notwithstanding that they may well exceed 5.5 percent.

Violation of the resolution would mean a fine of $100,000 a day. It does not say who is going to pay it, whether it will be imposed civilly or whether it will be imposed criminally. The language says that any "strike, lockout, or other concerted activity," would result in a $100,000-a-day fine.

Does that include a wildcat strike? Does that include a sickout? Does that include a slowdown strike? The language is unexplained.

How about the Matsunaga measure? His joint resolution does not bypass the Pay Board. Oddly enough, it does not include Hawaii and the Teamsters, who have been deeply involved. They will be affected but unrepresented.

The Matsunaga proposal says that one can have a final offer solution. This is simply a different form of compulsory arbitration.

The Senate proposal is really the Dellenback joint resolution minus Hawaii and the Teamsters with a different method of picking the arbitrators.

Certainly I know we are going to have some legislation today, whether it is good or bad—and I think it is bad, and I am going to vote against it. It might be that it will impose an 18- to 24-month period during which the dock workers will go back.

But if you force them back to work with an unsatisfactory settlement, you just wait and see what happens 24 months from now.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will be glad to.

Mr. BURTON. You know, there are occasions when we are a little less proud to be Members of this body than others. On most occasions I believe we behave with a certain measure of rationality, but really the mood of the House strikes me more as one of vengeance than reason. I represent the district that is directly affected. I know the parties concerned, as does my distinguished colleague (Mr. MAILLIARD).

This dock workers union is a very effective labor organization and very responsible. They lost less time on labor-management differences than virtually any union in the country in the last 22 years. Dock workers also have a very special pride in chemistry. This may not be known to Members who do not have docks in their districts. I believe—and I shall say no more with reference to the vote on Saturday—there is no doubt at all that this settlement is going to be approved on Saturday. I am wise enough, I hope, not to speculate from this point on in the day's deliberations. I know these men obey the law, at least with as much reason as has been demonstrated up to this point, but they are willing dock workers, and in this particular industry and in our particular port, the productivity is higher than any in the land—the man-hour productivity increased some ten- to twenty- to thirtyfold. Let me repeat that. Some tenfold, twentyfold, or thirtyfold since 1958.

As a matter of principle the union decided they would not have an automatic wage escalation clause that reflects the cost of living in their contract, so when they negotiated some 5 years plus ago they had no such cost-of-living wage escalator clause in their contract. Every person on this floor knows there has been an enormous increase in the cost of living since then, but it is not reflected in the wages these men have been receiving. So this particular negotiation was a very delicate and a very difficult one.

For example, the man who is representing them through all of these years was not representing them. They had a new man in the game.

So I just thought at this point in the deliberations I would urge all of you to consider the wisdom of engaging in what at best will be an idle act and at worse what I hope will not be deemed to be a provocative one.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. What the gentleman has said is perfectly clear, as are the implications.

Mr. Chairman, I see no useful purpose to be served in going through a more detailed analysis at this time of either the Dellenback proposal or the Matsunaga proposal.

I doubt that many have read, or of

those who have read them, that many understand the implications and ramifications of these or the Senate-passed joint resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to yield later to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) in order to give the gentleman an opportunity to explain his bill.

I am fully aware of the fact that neither I nor those who think as I are going to stop this action. I hope and pray that this procedure used here today will not be used on legislation in which you personally have a deep interest and have spent such a great amount of time studying, with the full cooperation from the minority and the majority.

You should also consider very carefully when you go home—and if you have an opportunity to talk to your employers and your employees, or their employees, ask them how many of them would favor compulsory arbitration as a national policy to be taking you back beyond the Wagner Act and the collective bargaining process, and you will find—and I do not care how conservative or how liberal your district is—you will find that they do not want it and that it would be destructive of our collective bargaining system.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take any of the gentleman's time because I know his time is limited.

However, I have served in the House for 29 years. This is my 30th year. I have believed in the processes of this House and the committee system to sustain calm and judicious consideration of legislation.

I feel that this procedure that has been used today—and I must speak out against it although I am now the chairman of a committee and I must go before the Rules Committee and ask for rules, and if there be retaliation for something I say, and I do not think there will be because I do not cause any retaliation knowingly—but I want just to say this. This strikes at the very heart of the legislative procedure. It has within it the elements of destruction of the legislative process of this House.

I do not believe the Rules Committee has the authority to do this, although they have precedents for doing it. But I have searched every line of the charter in Jefferson's Manual on Rules and I find no place in that manual of rules where the Rules Committee can usurp the legislative function or the jurisdiction of the committees of this House that act under their charter.

Then Mr. Chairman, I want to say just one other thing before I cease. To bring to this House a rule which makes it impossible for the committee of jurisdiction to have the bill which it has reported out considered is a further travesty on the procedures of this House. I regret that it has happened on this day.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished colleague from California. I share his regret. The matter is a fait accompli. I think this procedure will be and must necessarily be discussed at another time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) has consumed 19 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to bring one other point to the attention of this body. The gentleman from New Jersey mentioned sending two staff members out to the west coast. I might also mention the fact that we sent a member of the minority staff, Mr. Bernstein, as well.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Indeed.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. LLOYD).

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the key vote is over—that vote was on the rule. With that "yes" vote, we are now free to work the will of the people.

For too long, Members of this House have considered legislation in the field of labor-management relations in the context of whether or not the legislation may be "pro-labor" or "anti-labor." As a result, a stalemate has occurred in the consideration of essential modern labor legislation. It is far past time that we leave the field of combat to labor and management and that we address ourselves solely to the public interest. This strike is now 125 days old.

I do not point the finger of blame at anyone. Some Members of this House receive contributions to their political campaigns from those engaged in business. Others receive political contributions from those engaged in organized labor. Obviously, we find ourselves bound to an individual interest. In my own case, while I have never received contributions from organized labor, it is my purpose to be objective. As a member of the legislature of my State, I was a chief sponsor and supporter of the so-called right-to-work legislation which was passed in Utah in 1955. While I would hope that other States would afford this free agency to the American worker, nevertheless I do not support compulsory nationwide application of right-to-work legislation upon those individual States which do not want the legislation.

While there are many strikes which I oppose, I have never voted to withhold food stamps from the families of men who have been called out on strikes or who have felt the voluntary necessity to strike in pursuit of an objective which I might individually oppose.

So I support compulsory arbitration in the case of the west coast dock strike, not because I am antilabor but because no voluntary arbitration has taken place and because I think it is clear beyond doubt that the needs of the Nation must take precedence over the desires of organized labor in that dispute. Certainly by this I do not mean to say that the employer position should be endorsed by this Congress. It is certainly unfortunate that we are called upon to end the strike, but Taft-Hartley has been invoked and has failed and the renewal of many months of bitter dispute and tieup of dock facilities may be resumed. Therefore, our responsibility to the Nation must be met. The welfare of the Nation must be the overriding issues in this emergency, and clearly we have no proper alternative now but to protect the public welfare against the possible continued inability of the bargaining parties to agree. Compulsory arbitration, which should be neither pro-labor nor pro-industry but rather must be propublic, must be invoked if this strike continues.

I am particularly disheartened that up to the present time this House has not been able to dispassionately discuss and evaluate the merits and demerits of permanent legislation which would protect the Nation in cases of strikes in the transportation industry seriously damaging to the Nation and which cannot be solved by the parties themselves. Again we are handicapped by this syndrome involving "pro-labor" and "anti-labor." It is time we applied the doctrine of the rule of reason to this great need of our day which is to work out of the jungle of seemingly insoluble labor-industry impasses. Let us pass this emergency legislation in the Nation's interest and then get on with the business of exercising this rule of reason and responsible evaluation of the Nation's need by considering permanent statutes governing such controversies.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and every one of us knows this. Far too few of us are present in the Chamber at this time.

Unfortunately, of those who are in the Chamber there are probably not a great many minds that will be changed by what we all say in the next few minutes. But it is still very important that certain things be said so that the record will be very clear on this matter.

Let me begin by expressing my personal regards for the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). He has been extremely courteous all the way through these procedures in the subcommittee, and in the full committee. We began and we ended by agreeing on the goal of settlement of the present controversy, but we strongly disagreed on both the proper procedures for bringing about that settlement and the manner of achieving that settlement. But all the way through, as I say, he has been a most courteous chairman, and I am appreciative of that.

Let us be absolutely clear, Members of the House, that there is no present settlement of the west coast dock strike. There is hope for a settlement. There is no return to work at this time. There is hope for an early return to work. But we must understand the procedures that have to be followed through before we get either a settlement of the present

controversy or even a return to the manning of the ports.

On Saturday there will be a caucus of the ILWU leadership, and this consists of a group of about 110 people. I have been informed by conversations with the west coast that it might be that that group will conclude its deliberations on Saturday, it might be that they will take 2 days, or it might be that they will take 3 days, or they might take as much as 4 days to conclude their deliberations.

Having concluded their deliberations, if they do, indeed, recommend that this settlement be approved, the issue then goes to a referendum of the members of the union. The members of the union are divided into eight groups: the four major ports on the west coast are involved; in addition to that the clerks are involved, and in addition to that there are three independent groups of small unions, small locals of the ILWU; their rules are extremely democratic, because any one of those eight, if it does not agree to the terms that are recommended by the caucus, can veto them. It is not a case of a majority of the groups agreeing to it, because any one of these can veto it. So we have the second major hurdle to be taken.

Now, if indeed one of those groups vetoes it there is a procedure available for a union-wide referendum of all the membership up and down the west coast, and they can override the veto—but it takes a two-thirds vote of the membership to override that veto.

So let there be no misunderstanding in anybody's mind that this settlement is already in hand, and we are merely awaiting a few formalities to get the issues settled.

There is, as I say, at the least, one meeting on Saturday, and I hope that is when it is settled. There is another meeting—another vote—beyond that, and possibly a third vote beyond that, and no certainty of what the outcome of all of this will be, and even a possible rejection of the settlement arrived at.

Now, with that as a background, let me talk about H.R. 1025. The economic impact of the present strike is great. Those of us who come from the west coast States know exactly how great it is. Those of you who come from gulf coast States or Atlantic States know what a tragedy it can be to many people, who have no way of protecting themselves against a dispute of this particular nature.

In most labor-management disputes the people who are most directly injured are the people who can do something about it, and the management and the workingmen can agree that they are the ones who are being hurt by walkouts, by lockouts, by strikes, and if they want to end it they can agree upon a solution.

But in this instance we are facing the unique situation that the people who are being most grievously hurt are not the people who can do anything about it except through us, the elected Representatives of the people.

The economic impact is great. The injury is great and growing greater.

We had before our subcommittee three Secretaries and an Under Secretary, Mr. Hodgson, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Volpe, Secretary Butz, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Under Secretary Lynn, the Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Every one of them made clear to us that the damage is severe and that the damage is immediate and the damage is national.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is quite accurate in saying that the respective Secretaries gave us their view of the economic impact. I do not think with respect to myself and some of my colleagues, I do not think they made clear the impact nor, indeed, did they establish it.

I do not mean to bicker, but we did refer, if you will remember, to former Secretary Shultz' study in 1970 in which the conclusion was that in earlier strikes the economic impact had been much, much less than was apparent.

I concede that there is an economic impact, and a large one in this strike. But I do not think it is national. That was not made clear to me.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I understand what my colleague and friend is saying. Let me merely make clear the testimony to which the gentleman just alluded was the testimony of Mr. Bridges. It was part of his testimony. He quoted from Mr. Shultz' statement. It is an extensive statement. In early 1970, before the 100-day strike, at that time some 24 years of harmony was still in existence on the west coast, and it was in a situation where there had not been a cooling off period.

If you will look at the testimony of the gentleman, you will find that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The study addressed itself to the longshore strikes generally, east and west and gulf coasts. There is one other.

Mr. DELLENBACK. As I say, if you look at the date of the study, you will understand that the date of it was preceding the situation which has recently erupted on the west coast. It was, as I say, at a time when we had a record of 24 years and the situation which was continuing.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The study is entitled "The Impact of Longshore Strikes on the National Economy," the Department of Labor, George Shultz, January 1970, and it relates to all such strikes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. My point remains, however.

May I point out that subsequent to that time the U.S. District Court for the northern district of California on October 6, 1971, dealing with this very issue of whether there was a national impact in this strike found, as under section 208 and 210 of the Taft-Hartley Act, required it to find, that the strike which was a west coast strike imperiled the national health and safety. That was the requirement the court had to find under the provisions of Taft-Hartley and, indeed, so found and issued an injunction.

So we have that subsequent to the Shultz statement. In the 100-day strike there was a situation where the court was sitting in judgment on this very issue and did indeed determine that it was imperiling the national health and safety and subsequently issued the injunction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Is it not true that the longshoremen's strike is the longest, the most protracted longshore strike in the history of the country and, therefore, the remarks and statements made by Mr. Shultz would not necessarily apply at this time?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am sorry that I do not know this specifically as to whether, indeed, that was the longest strike. It is my recollection that that is indeed the fact, Mr. SCHERLE, and certainly it is one of the very longest, and the results thereof were just never in the mind of Secretary Shultz at the time his report was issued.

Let me go on to another point. Let me point out that the Executive has no further tools at the present time available to it under any law that this Congress has enacted to deal with this particular situation which now exists.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He has spoken about the tools available to the Executive.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming, if he has a comment to make on that.

Mr. RONCALIO. I thank the gentleman.

We worked diligently on the committee together. I do not know that we changed the Republican Party in my section of the Nation but we upset tradition. We violated the chairmanship principle. We violated the Haley amendment in saying we are authorizing sums as may be needed or appropriated carte blanche. So we let emotion get the best of us.

We take a rigid position as between capital and labor in this Nation of ours.

I started 37 years ago as a young man listening to arguments that began setting up our labor law. There is available to us and the President, if we will be receptive to it, new machinery and new horizons by which we can outlaw forever the bestiality of man striking against his fellow man for the fruits of labor. We would allow labor on the boards of directors of every corporation in America, and if their efforts contribute to the net operating earnings of the company and are assisting the corporation toward a profit, labor

would share in proportion. If the corporation profits, then labor will share in the operating earnings of that particular corporation. This could be the new horizon that could eliminate strikes forever.

I think it is unfair to go back to the days of the robber barons when a man had to strike to get paid for doing a day's work. I do not think doing what we will do today will make an iota of difference in adding to a man's understanding of his fellow men, fighting over money. I wish we could look toward that horizon. We should have done so 15 or 20 years ago.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I respect the thinking of my colleague. Let me repeat the statement I made. I am not saying whether we should enact legislation providing new machinery or if, indeed, we should enact new legislation, or what its terms and conditions should be. I am saying that at the present time the executive has no further tools available to it under the existing laws to terminate the existing strike. The facts on this bill have been gone over by previous speakers. You know what 1025 does. It is an attempt to cure a situation, not to impose a settlement which will not be a settlement.

We discussed the present situation and the fact that there may be approval of an agreement reached by the parties. When the Secretary of Labor and the Solicitor were before us they made clear that if all issues were indeed settled, it was their intention to stop any further proceedings under this legislation. So that we have here a standby tool which will immediately put the men back to work and give them time, while the board of arbitration is meeting, to conclude voluntary settlement, and I hope they will conclude a voluntary settlement.

Understand, this is an ad hoc piece of legislation to deal with the unique, rare situation which is now existing. This is not permanent legislation. I happen personally to favor permanent legislation, but I recognize that Members may very well differ on details of what should be in the permanent legislation. We are not trying to put into the legislation tonight, in these few short minutes, and without any such discussion before our Labor Committee, such permanent legislation.

Let me, in connection with the permanent legislation proposed by the administration, however, make one point clear, to which the chairman of the subcommittee alluded. It is my recollection of what Secretary Hodgson said to us—when he was asked about the impact on the present situation of such proposed legislation of a permanent nature, he repiled:

> The permanent legislation proposed by the administration would have stopped this strike.

He went on and said it would not, however, have settled all of the issues involved.

So that distinction should be in the minds of all concerned. Now let me move rapidly along.

Understand, this bill as proposed would deal with all the issues. Hawaii is, in fact, an issue at the present time, although it is not involved in the negotiations. The Teamsters and the ILWU, and their relations with each other, involve some very real issues, and they are affected by this situation, but the Teamsters are not parties to the negotiations.

But this bill, if it is necessary for a board of arbitration to be appointed and start to act, would deal with all the issues involved, and it would cover all the interested parties involved. I here refer again to the Teamsters. Let there be no misunderstanding about the Teamsters' witnesses who appeared before us. They spoke against this legislation, but it is also clear from what was said then and from subsequent discussions that, if there is to be a bill, they would prefer to be officially covered and not left somewhere out on the periphery, because there is no misunderstanding about the fact that the Teamsters are deeply affected by what is here involved on the west coast.

Understand, the bill calls for an immediate return to work—something which is desperately needed. It provides for penalties on the part of either side if the orders of the board are not complied with.

This House Joint Resolution 1025 and Senate Joint Resolution 197 are quite similar. I will not go over all the details of them except to say that everything which is in Senate Joint Resolution 197 has been considered by our committee. There are some differences. I personally prefer House Joint Resolution 1025, but I understand Senate Joint Resolution 197 is basically the same thing. It has removed certain features. The House Joint Resolution 1025 provides for a different method of selection of the board of arbitration which is a perfectly good method.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by summing up and saying this: This strike must be settled for the national welfare and for the national health and safety. This strike must be settled and settled soon. It is my hope that the procedures now underway will lead to voluntary settlement, but, if not, then the Congress as the representative of the people of this Nation has an imperative obligation to act. We do not dare leave this body tonight to go off for a recess without having acted on this legislation.

It is my earnest hope, in view of the crisis, in view of the need, and in view of the terms of this legislation, that action will be swift and that action will be affirmative.

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

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, several times in my 3 years in Congress we have been asked to act on ad hoc emergency bills to resolve labor disputes. On each occasion the emergency has compelled congressional interference in collective bargaining. In each instance our deliberations were accompanied by a call for permanent machinery to rationally meet threats to the national health and safety. Yet these emergencies pass and so does the desire for legislation to provide the needed wide range of remedies which would obviate the present piecemeal approach.

The west coast dock strike should be settled equitably and quickly. The national interest demands no less. Unemployment, already too high, threatens to go higher. Our balance of trade suffers. We are starting to lose foreign markets. A gradually firming economy is in jeopardy.

It apears that labor and management have tentatively resolved their differences. Resolution has been near before in this 4-month-old dispute. The risk cannot be taken that matters may come apart. This emergency legislation is needed, but I hope it is not used.

The Senate bill reasonably and judiciously provides that proceedings under its terms terminate when the parties have reached complete agreement on the disposition of these issues. Settlement is contemplated. Settlement in short will preempt the bill's operation. This renders the measure only precautionary.

The President genuinely and wisely has stated he will delay signing emergency legislation while there is movement toward ratification.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the silver lining in this further exercise of our power in these emergencies is the pledge of the chairman of the Senate Labor Committee to promptly consider the various proposals for permanent machinery to deal with national interest strikes. Let us get on with this long delayed task.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that this body has been denied the opportunity to vote on a permanent solution to the intolerable transportation strikes which plague this Nation. My State of Iowa, for example, now ranks second in agricultural exports. Thirty thousand Iowans are employed in nonagricultural exports. As of last November, these dock strikes cost farmers 1.2 million tons in lost grain exports, most agricultural exports, their jobs were at stake. As of last November, these dock strikes cost farmers 1.2 million tons in lost grain exports, most of which can never be recovered. The value of the lost shipments of corn and soybeans alone were estimated at $75 million.

Even if the west coast strike is settled, any similar lengthy transportation strikes in the future will again damage our economy severely. This resolution has no bearing on resolving the inevitable situation which will resurface on the gulf coast on February 14 when that strike can resume. The contract between the Marine Association of Chicago and Independent Employers and the Longshoremen's Union will expire on March 31. The agreements between the major shipping companies on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts and the Masters, Mates and Pilots, the Marine Engineers, the Seafarers, the National Maritime Union, the Radio Officers and others will run out on June 15. On July 1, 1973, we face the possibility of nationwide rail and truck strikes because the contracts in these industries expire simultaneously.

Because of the parliamentary situation in the House and the narrow defeat by three votes of the Packwood rider in the other body, we can now vote only to solve this one labor dispute. The specter of future tie-ups in the transportation system still threatens the Nation's prosperity.

The climate and sentiment of the people of this country demands that we implement permanent legislation and not make piecemeal stop-gap attempts such as we are considering here today.

Mr. Chairman, the lengthy dock dispute, which has dragged on for 6 months and cost the American economy $1 billion, dramatically points up the deficiencies in current labor legislation. Once the limited resources of the Taft-Hartley Act have been exhausted—the court-ordered injunction has already expired on the west coast and is due to run out in the east coast and gulf ports next month—the President has no further recourse under present law, national emergency or no national emergency. All he can do is submit the case to Congress as a special crisis requiring a separate legislative solution. This solution is really none at all, for it bucks responsibility to the Federal Government which should not become embroiled in labor litigation. Repeated congressional intervention violates the principle of collective bargaining and is a costly and inefficient waste of congressional energies.

Nevertheless, protracted transportation work stoppages, of which the United States has suffered a veritable plague in recent years, cannot be allowed to cripple the economy indefinitely. Some way must be found to represent the interests of the American public in these disputes. Thousands, perhaps millions of people who have no direct connection with the longshoremen or their employers have suffered heavy losses as a result of the dock strike, yet no way now exists to make their voices heard in the bargaining session between labor and management. No one would deny the dockworkers their legitimate right to a reasonable return for their labors. At the same time, it must be realized that others are being denied the fruits of their labors because the longshoremen closed virtually every major port in the Nation to gain their ends.

Farmers have suffered perhaps most of all. But lost farm income, estimated at a million dollars a day during the strike, is not an isolated economic occurrence. Sympathy for the farmer's woes will rapidly turn to empathy as the impact of agriculture's shrunken dollar is felt in other sectors of the economy. Agricultural loans will have to be renegotiated, new purchases of farm machinery will be deferred and consumer purchasing patterns in farm States will decline sharply.

Nor are farmers the only exporters to feel the pinch. Other producers of goods for foreign markets not only sacrifice current sales; like the farmer, they also risk permanent loss of their overseas customers to competitors who can guarantee reliable delivery on a steady basis. Precautionary stockpiling can cushion the blow for manufacturers to some extent, as it cannot for farmers who are at the mercy of seasonal harvest and perishable commodities, but even these measures do not entirely compensate for the uncertainties of a long strike. Thus the businessman on Main Street, the worker in the factory—union and nonunion alike—and the farmer in the field are all penalized for work stoppages in the transportation industries.

In order to avert another such disaster for the economy, I plan to introduce a bill in the new session of Congress revising the Taft-Hartley Act to broaden its coverage to the entire transportation industry, including rail, air, maritime, longshore and trucking. My proposal would also extend the President's powers to deal with national emergencies in the industry, and would redefine "national emergency" to include regional strikes with national impact, a concept not now recognized under Taft-Hartley. When the present provisions of the law have been exhausted, my bill would give the President three additional options which could be exercised singly or in succession, as his judgement of the situation warranted.

First, he could extend the cooling-off period up to 30 days more. This option would be useful if a settlement appeared imminent. In the event that no end to the dispute seemed to be in sight, he could direct the workers to resume partial operations, just enough to insure essential transportation services. Finally, if the participants were unable to reach agreement, he could empanel three neutral parties to act as judges. Labor and management would each submit a final offer and the three would then select one of the two. No arbitration would be permitted. Whichever offer was chosen would become the binding contract between labor and management. This solution should induce the participants to submit reasonable and realistic proposals since the panel would obviously reject extreme demands in favor of a more moderate position. It is hoped that the "final offer selection" device will obviate the need for arbitration by providing the necessary incentive for compromise.

It is my belief that this bill represents a viable solution to the impasse provoked by protracted transportation strikes. Despite the demonstrated need for such legislation, however, Congress has so far been reluctant to act. President Nixon submitted similar legislation almost 2 years ago. It is still languishing in committees in the Senate and the House. AFL–CIO President George Meany rejected these proposals when they were introduced, contending that they nullify the principle of collective bargaining and impose compulsory arbitration under another name. This is both inaccurate and shortsighted. All three additional options provided in my bill are actually incentives to labor and management to settle their own disputes. The deficiencies of the present law, on the other hand, virtually insure Federal intervention because Congress is forced to step in with special legislation in default of any other procedure for resolving labor-management differences.

Hopefully, the majority of my colleagues will recognize the fallacy of this reasoning and its partisan motivation. We must act promptly in the public interest to forestall future recurrences of strangling strikes. My bill offers one way to accomplish this. Those who reject it should be prepared to furnish a better solution.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the motion to recommit, which will be the Senate measure.

However, I do so only very reluctantly. Basically I am very strongly opposed to compulsory arbitration as a means of settling any labor dispute, for compulsory arbitration violates the spirit and objective of free collective bargaining.

I vote for this measure only because I believe that the overriding national interest requires compulsory arbitration as a last resort in this particular case. The strike has lasted more than 7 months and has caused very serious economic harm not only to the parties involved, but also to tens of thousands of others who depend on the shipping industry for their livelihood. To date, we have lost about $40 million in trade with Japan, and 25 million bushels of wheat have been held up. Serious damage has been done to our export trade, to agriculture, and to the budgets of thousands of families who are now out of work. It is reported that the cost of this strike nationally is between $500 million and $1 billion.

In approving this legislation, the Congress has given the President flexibility. Should the tentative agreement reached between the parties be ratified by vote of the union, the President will not need to sign this bill into law, and I sincerely hope he will not need to do so, for none of us, I think, is enthusiastic about what we have had to do here.

There is some danger in this measure in that it takes the wage increase out of the jurisdiction of the Pay Board. I believe this is a mistake, and I, therefore, voted against the closed rule prohibiting amendments. It is important, in my view, that whatever settlement is reached is reasonably consistent with the phase II guidelines.

It is clear that the public is increasingly concerned and fed up with strikes affecting the national interest and economy. The public and responsible legislators will press for comprehensive legislation to deal with emergency strikes. I very much hope that both labor and management will join in framing such legislation consistent with the national interest and the principles of free collective bargaining, but involving mechanisms equitable in character that will resolve disputes which threaten our national economy or transportation systems.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress representing the people of Hawaii, I can assure you that no one in Washington was happier yesterday to hear that a tentative accord

had been reached in San Francisco on the terms of a contract to settle the dispute which has plagued Hawaii and the western United States for the past 7 months.

As announced, the negotiators have reached agreement on all economic issues, and will submit the several remaining noneconomic issues to voluntary binding arbitration.

Welcome as this news is, no contract has yet been signed, for the agreement has yet to be ratified by the membership of the ILWU. And if the accord arrived at yesterday collapses tomorrow or Saturday, Congress will not be in any position to legislate an end to the strike, for the Congress will be in recess.

So we find ourselves this evening hastily considering legislation which we hope will prove unnecessary. But even when Congress must legislate hastily, Mr. Chairman, Congress must legislate wisely.

That is why I shall offer today, under the rule just adopted, an amendment in the form of a substitute for House Joint Resolution 1025, the administration bill. My amendment, consisting of the text of House Joint Resolution 1054, would apply to the current west coast dock dispute the final offer selection device, but only as to those issues which remain unresolved, and only after a 30-day moratorium, during which period the parties would be free to negotiate their own settlement. The events within the last 24 hours definitely indicate that they will do this if only given a little more time.

Agreement between the parties has apparently been reached, Mr. Chairman, on all of the economic issues including wages and their retroactivity, guaranteed minimum income, the disposition of the $1 per ton royalty on container cargo not loaded by ILWU members, and provision of certain health benefits. In view of this substantial agreement, I believe that the amendment I will offer later today, providing that the final offer selector panel would decide only those issues which remain unresolved, offers the best solution. My amendment:

Would provide latitude for the parties to come to a voluntary agreement, while insuring that the shipping so desperately needed by much of America begins moving at once.

It would build on the substantial progress made in recent days from the ongoing negotiations between the parties.

It would draw the parties closer together on those issues still in disagreement.

And, of course, it provides for a definite and complete end to the dock strike.

Mr. Chairman, my resolution combines two of the three features that the President asked for in submitting his request for permanent legislation for settling transportation strikes. Yet he and his representatives have eschewed both of these features—an additional cooling-off period and final offer selection—while opting for compulsory arbitration, which is abhorrent to both labor and management.

Why this sudden change? In his latest dock strike message to Congress, President Nixon rejected another cooling-off period because it would increase "the uncertainties in foreign markets"; the final offer selection process, he argued, was unsatisfactory "because the parties have already been bargaining under different ground rules for many months." But it should be clear, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment, by coupling these two processes, eliminates the objections against both.

Under my proposal there would be an additional 30-day bargaining period under known and announced ground rules, and there would be no uncertainty about settling the strike. If the parties were unable to agree voluntarily during that period, the automatic invoking of final offer selection as to the unresolved issues would provide a definite settlement, without the possibility of a resumption of the strike.

Furthermore, because, under my amendment, the parties will have had a full month to negotiate freely in the knowledge that if they fail in negotiating a settlement, the ground rules provide for selection of the best final offer, they will have had ample opportunity to adjust their respective positions, if necessary.

Mr. Chairman, we must remember that what we are now debating might well be called contingency legislation. If the parties are, as they appear to be, very close to complete and final agreement, whatever bill we approve today must meet certain criteria: first, if the tentative voluntary accord breaks down, it must legislate an end to the strike. Second, we must take care that the measure we approve does not have the effect of destroying the agreement already reached.

I know that many Members were concerned that the administration bill, by submitting to compulsory arbitration all issues in the dispute, whether agreed to by the parties or not, would actually make at least one side intransigent. If a party felt it could "get a better deal" from the arbitrators than it had been able to negotiate on its own, that party would be more than willing to see the negotiated settlement collapse and a compulsory arbitration board convened.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, my substitute amendment would promote, rather than hinder, a voluntary agreement. The parties would realize that, if an impasse developed and the final offer selection process came into play, the bargains already struck on the issues would remain. Only those issues actually dividing the parties at that time would be put to the final offer selection panel.

It is regrettable, of course, that Congress must act to resolve a dispute which has been tentatively settled, and I fervently hope that voluntary agreement will make this legislation unnecessary. But once the decision is made to legislate, we must seek the legislative solution that adequately deals with the crisis at hand, does not undo the progress the parties have made to this point, and does the least damage to the free collective bargaining process. I believe that my substitute amendment meets these tests, and I will urge its adoption at the appropriate time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) for his efforts in the Committee on Rules. I acknowledge the need that he finds to offer this solution. I announce my opposition to it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the current progress toward resolution of the west coast dock strike is good news, indeed, especially to those farmers and businessmen whose products have not been moving into export channels.

Even though a negotiated settlement appears imminent, however, it is important that we go ahead with this legislation providing a mechanism for settlement. It will be, in effect, an insurance policy in the event that the existing tentative agreement goes sour.

Some have tried to downgrade the importance of the economic effects of this strike on American business and agriculture. This is an injustice especially to farmers, who have felt the impact of this and the other strikes perhaps harder than any other group. As one well-known farm publication said in an editorial recently, almost every farm producer in one way or another has lost or will lose some income he would have otherwise earned, if it had not been for crippling dock strikes.

Just a few days ago, Secretary of Agriculture Butz told the Congress that the west coast strike is reducing farm exports by almost $6 million every day that it remains in effect. If the east and gulf coast ports go on strike again, he said, this will reduce farm exports by $18 million a day.

But even more important than the immediate dollar loss is the problem of the farm export markets we may never regain because we cannot be depended upon as a supplier. Importing countries must have a reliable source of supply for an item so critical to national welfare as food. Even when our ports were operating we had to work hard to remain competitive and dependable in the world export market for agricultural products. Now, we are in danger of simply being "written off" by some importing countries as a food supplier.

Japan—one of our best customers in the past—purchased 8.7 million bushels of wheat on the day after the west coast dock strike resumed, but only 1.6 bushels were purchased from the United States. This is just one example.

In the Midwest, the Chicago grain elevator strike hit farmers hard, and combined with the east and gulf coast port closures, virtually stopped all grain movement from the Nation's heartland. The Agriculture Department estimates that this resulted in a cut of 10 cents a bushel from the price of corn and perhaps as much as 25 cents from soybean prices. And this may be a conservative estimate.

I am not going to belabor the point. We should all be well aware of these

statistics by now. But, more than that, we should all be aware that we are not just talking about figures on a sheet of paper. We are talking about people—people who are largely underpaid to begin with, trying to make a living by farming and watching their efforts go down the drain because of a dispute which they can do absolutely nothing about. To these people the question is not one of extra pay, but of whether or not they can even stay in the business of farming for another year.

Yes, it is that serious—not for all farmers, certainly, but for those many who were already running close to the financial edge, it may be a long drop.

I, for one, do not think we can or should tolerate this any longer. Congressional action is long overdue, not only on the west coast strike, but on a permanent, long-range mechanism for dealing with all transportation strikes that affect the national interest, whether they be national or local in scope. This must be placed at the top of our priority list.

The President's proposal has been before the House for nearly 2 years now, with no action. Many of us have introduced alternative bills in the hope of stirring the majority leadership in committee to move on this issue.

One such bill, which some of my colleagues and I introduced—H.R. 12692—differs from the administration's proposal in that it is especially designed to cover those strikes which deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services, even if the strike does not threaten the entire Nation, such as the situation last fall when the Justice Department was denied a Taft-Hartley injunction at Chicago because the grain elevator strike was a local one.

But, whatever approach is used, surely a way can be found to give the President the tools he needs to deal fairly with both labor and management while effectively protecting the broader national interest in critical transportation disputes.

It is time for Congress to face the facts and stop dragging its feet on this issue. We must meet this problem head-on, and we must do it now.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill passed by the Senate which is substantially identical with the emergency legislation requested by President Nixon in January. It has become vitally important that we pass this bill in exactly the same form as adopted by the Senate in order to avoid further delays which would arise if it became necessary to reconcile differences in the versions to be passed by the House and Senate. The American people have every right to expect that the Congress will agree upon this legislation in its final form tonight before we adjourn for the Lincoln Day recess. We must leave no uncertainty that every necessary legislative action to end this crippling strike on the west coast will be ended by the law we enact tonight if for any reason the tentative agreement between the parties announced yesterday falls through.

Mr. Chairman, the longshoremen's strike on the west coast has inflicted incalculable damage upon the farmers, businessmen, workers, and general public of the Midwest, and must not be permitted to continue. Many of these good people have written, wired, or telephoned me urging me to do whatever I can to insure prompt congressional action in this very real emergency. I have urged such action repeatedly in speeches in and outside this Chamber and have worked to that end with my colleagues on the House Republican Task Force on Labor Management Relations. On Tuesday January 25, I offered the following resolution which the Task Force unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the House Republican Task Force on Labor-Management Relations heartily commends President Nixon for his Message of January 21 to the Congress to end the West Coast dock strike. We enthusiastically support his ad hoc proposal and urge its immediate enactment by the Congress. Moreover, we strongly urge prompt Congressional consideration of a permanent solution to such national emergency disputes.

As Secretary of Agriculture Butz eloquently stated in his testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Labor on February 1:

As a result of the various dock strikes in 1971—the West Coast, the East and Gulf ports, and the Port of Chicago—the farmer's exports have been reduced by almost three quarters of a billion dollars below comparable period in the preceding year. That is a simple total of the reduced exports for the affected ports during the strike periods. . . .

Historically, exports make up a major part of the farmer's market. In recent years, a great deal of work has been done by farmers and their leaders to expand this outlet—so that our agriculture and our Nation may benefit from our farmers' tremendous productive ability. Now, this market—and these gains—are being cast away by a small group of men who care nothing for farmers—in a dispute where farmers are not a party and have no voice. . . .

Unless there is action by the Congress at this time, our agriculture is going to be hurt in the pocketbook every day that the strike continues. Moreover, the American farmer is going to be damaged further in terms of his future as an exporter—his reputation as a world supplier.

This is all very, very serious to an agriculture which has been exporting the product of one cropland acre out of every four. It is even more important to those farmers—soybeans and wheat, for example—who have been exporting one bushel out of every two that they produce. The export market is essential to the continuation of agriculture on the scale that we know it in this country. Let's make no mistake about that.

In order to maintain this export market, our agriculture must have a fair chance to compete. With work stoppages in all our deep-water ports, as occurred in 1971, our ability to compete is severely restricted. One of the United States' major advantages in foreign trade is its traditional reliability as an overseas supplier every month of the year.

Not only did last year's dock strikes jeopardize that reputation, but their effect continues into the current year as our competitors continue to fill contracts that were negotiated during those strikes. No wonder farmers are concerned by a renewal of the work stoppages at West Coast ports. No wonder they are looking to Washington for relief from this strike.

And it is not only agriculture which is suffering in the Midwest from the resumption of the west coast strike. It is impairing production and threatening the shutdown of Midwest manufacturing and transportation industries, including the Zenith radio plant, which is the largest industrial employer in my home community of Sioux City.

The distinguished Governor of the State of Iowa, the Honorable Robert D. Ray, has repeatedly expressed his deep concern about the devastating effect of the west coast, gulf and east coast dock strikes on the economy of our State. I have here in my hand and wish to read to the House the following telegram, which he has sent to all Members of the Iowa delegation in the Congress, expressing his strong support for the Senate bill which has passed that body and is now before us. The telegram states:

I would like to lend my support to Senate Joint Resolution 187, a joint resolution to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific Coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees.

The west coast dock strike is a dramatic example of the ability of a labor dispute to undermine the economic well-being of millions of people in a major region of this country. Thousands of innocent third parties such as the Iowa farmer are being penalized by the jurisdictional disputes of a narrow sector of the Nation's economy.

Although it is difficult to estimate the total economic impact of the west coast dock strike, we do know that agricultural exports are critical to the economy of Iowa and a substantial reduction in these exports can have a serious influence on the daily lives of the people of Iowa.

Iowa is the Nation's second leading exporter of agricultural products. In fiscal year 1972, Iowa exported almost $600 million in agricultural products or an amount roughly equivalent to one-eighth of the entire value of the State's agriculture production for that year.

While I strongly believe in our system of collective free bargaining, I feel the impact of this prolonged strike has had such a devastating effect upon the economic well-being of our farmers and agri-businesses that ad hoc legislation of this nature is imperative.

ROBERT D. RAY,
Governor of Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, many Members have taken the floor to say it is no longer necessary to pass this bill because the parties say they have reached an agreement which may be finalized in a few weeks if ratified by the union's executive board and general membership. They are so anxious not to offend the bosses of organized labor that they would irresponsibly have us take the risk of the settlement falling through and the shutdown continuing. I say we should not take that risk ourselves or inflict that risk on the country. Let us make sure this ruinous strike will end by voting against these stalling tactics from the Democratic side of this House and by voting decisively for the Senate adopted version tonight.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to these resolutions, which would break the strike of the dock workers on the west coast. What we are saying to working people is that they have the right to strike, so long as they use it ineffectively, but when management feels the pinch, the right must be taken away.

In addition to the fact that this legislation is substantively disgraceful, the

procedure under which it comes before us constitutes an unprecedented attack upon the process of thoughtful consideration through which bills are supposed to go in this body. Neither of the two measures before us—House Joint Resolution 1025 and House Joint Resolution 1054—was ever considered on the merits by the Committee on Education and Labor. Instead, the Committee on Rules—the same body which has refused even to look at the minimum wage bill for nearly 3 months—arrogated to itself the powers of the Education and Labor Committee and swiftly voted out this rule without any sort of public hearing on the merits of this legislation.

Substantively speaking, legislation such as this is unfair and unfortunate at any time. It is doubly so in this instance, for the parties have already reached agreement and ratification of the contract by the workers is almost certain. Given this fact, millions of working people all across this land can only view the enactment of this legislation as a vicious and punitive attack upon organized labor. I need not add that these millions of workers—and their families and friends—are also voters. They will remember in November how we vote tonight.

In 1935, after a century of struggle, Congress passed the Wagner Act, which recognized that free and unimpaired collective bargaining is the keystone of successful labor-management relations. The right to organize and to bargain collectively is utterly without meaning unless it includes the right not to work if satisfactory terms are not offered by the employer. This natural concomitant of collective bargaining is the only economic weapon which workers possess, and to remove it would leave practically no incentive for employers to bargain in good faith.

Proponents of strike-breaking legislation such as this invariably imply that labor, and labor alone, is responsible for strikes. The hard fact is that it takes "two to tango," and that a failure to agree on contract terms is as much the fault of management as of labor.

I note in this connection that the right to bargain collectively is a right of management as well as of labor, and both sides—not only in this dispute, but in future disputes between other parties—are injured by this arbitrary and capricious stripping of that right.

Nobody likes a strike. In point of fact, it usually hurts workers more than their employers, for the employers merely have their orders delayed for a time, while the lost wages of a striking worker are lost forever. Nevertheless, employees, recognizing it as their only weapon, are prepared to suffer some immediate hardship in order to obtain long-term gains for themselves and their families.

I am very much concerned at the effect which strikes such as this one have on commerce and the economy and I am pleased that it has been settled. I do not believe, however, that Congress should interfere in the collective-bargaining process—of which a strike is an integral part—and I urge the defeat of these resolutions.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the situation, nothing constructive in the ways of legislation to amicably settle national labor disputes has been set forth since the country has been undergoing regular transportation strikes; and we are now being asked to legislate antistrike legislation for a strike that does not exist.

This kind of legislative strikebreaking activity has almost become standard operating procedure. We Members are herded into the Chamber at the last minute and under the emotions of prolabor, probusiness, and propolitics, are in reality given but one alternative—that as a quasi-court of last resort we are asked to support the President in a nonexisting labor dispute because he has promised the American people that he was going to end national transportation strikes.

I think that my record here in Congress is one of consistent opposition to nationalization and Federal intervention whether it be with regard to the private sector or the public sector. I am somewhat suspicious that the present legislation if enacted will become a precedent, especially in the President's future efforts to try to make wage and price controls work. Neither free enterprise nor free labor can long function under national socialism—complete Federal regulations. Centralization of power is again the cause of the problem which we are ordered to solve by a majority vote rather than on the equities—the rights and wrongs of a situation.

Neither compulsory arbitration by the force of law nor the greater evil of Government-enforced work agreements is in the American tradition. These are Communist-Fascist solutions. We should avoid them like the poison they are.

Freedom of the individual is still the law of our land. This should include the right of men to be just as free to bargain for wages and working conditions as for profits. When freedom of collective bargaining is denied or abolished, American workers must either become slaves or they starve.

Because I do not believe that Congress is the proper office for writing labor contracts, nor that this Chamber is the proper courtroom to deny freedom of collective bargaining, nor that the House of Representatives was intended to enforce laws and solutions written by unelected bureaucrats, I find myself in the position of having to oppose this legislation and to cast my people's vote in the negative.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending bill, House Joint Resolution 1025, and similar bills.

Tentative agreement was reached Tuesday in the long west coast dispute between longshoremen and shippers. Collective bargaining, of course, is the proper way to settle labor disputes.

I have opposed congressional intervention from the outset and my opposition is fortified by the fact that tentative agreement now has been reached through the normal bargaining process.

Mr. Chairman, we have laws on the books to deal with labor disputes. These include the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley law, and more recently Landrum-Griffin.

Why should Congress have to take special action when a deadlock occurs in a dock strike or a railroad strike? The labor laws were enacted to provide the means for reaching a settlement of these disputes—national or local.

If these laws were not working, then we should scrap them. We could save a lot of money by abolishing the labor board, the panels, and all the related governmental machinery.

If those laws were eliminated, then as each labor crisis developed, it could be sent up to Congress to settle. This is not very practical, of course, but I would be willing to stand up and be counted on individual labor disputes if that was to become part of a Congressman's job.

So that there will be no question on my position, it is simply that I am against bailing out the existing system from time to time in so-called exceptional cases, such as the current dock strike.

If we in Congress are going to have to deal with these matters, then let us deal with all of them, not just the occasional exception. It should be a case of all or none.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced the pending bill is bad legislation—and unnecessary. I am vigorously opposed to the entire concept.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the joint resolution is considered as having been read.

The joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1025

Whereas there is a dispute between employers (or associations by which such employers are represented in collective bargaining conferences) who are (1) steamship companies operating ships or employed as agents for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States, (2) contracting stevedores, (3) contracting marine carpenters, (4) lighterage operators, or (5) other employers engaged in related or associated pier activities for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States (hereafter called employers), and certain of the employees of such employers represented by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (hereafter called Longshoremen's Union); and

Whereas the order enjoining a strike in this dispute granted by the United States District Court, Northern District of California in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971, expired on December 25, 1971, pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 as amended (29 U.S.C. 176–178); and

Whereas all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas a settlement has not been reached despite intensive mediation efforts; and

Whereas there is a dispute, involving members of the International Brotherhood of teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America (hereafter called the Teamsters Union) employed by some of the above employers and by other employers

engaged in activities related to the maritime, stevedoring, and pier work described above, concerning the assignment and performance of such work; and

Whereas a dispute in Hawaii, involving certain employers engaged in activities related to maritime, stevedoring, and pier work described above and certain of their employees represented by the Longshoremen's Union and the Teamsters Union, threatens to disrupt essential transportation services for that State and to endanger the health and safety of its citizens; and

Whereas these disputes are closely related to and a portion of the dispute on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas it is vital to the national interest, including the national health and safety, that essential transporation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to continuity of essential transportation services affected by this dispute: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an arbitration board shall be established herein to hear and settle all issues in this dispute, and to issue a determination which shall be deemed a final and binding resolution, understanding, and agreement among the parties and shall also be deemed to supersede to the extent inconsistent therewith all other agreements or understandings in which these parties are involved: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Labor may terminate the procedures of this resolution before issuance of a determination by the arbitration board if he finds that all the labor organizations and employers involved in the dispute have reached complete agreement on all the issues. The determination of the arbitration board shall be effective for the period stated therein, which may not be less than eighteen nor more than twenty-four months. During such period, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout and the parties thereto shall be bound by the terms of the determination notwithstanding any agreements they may conclude among themselves.

From the date of enactment until the arbitration board makes its determination, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout, and no change, except by agreement of the parties, in the terms and conditions of employment as prescribed in the court order in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971, the agreement between the Longshoremen's Union and certain employers in Hawaii, which expired June 30, 1971, under which they have been operating from that time, and the collective bargaining agreements, interpretations, rulings, and practices governing assignment and performance of work involved in the dispute by members of the Longshoremen's Union and the Teamsters Union.

For the purposes of this resolution, the term "parties" shall mean the parties who were under the jurisdiction of the court in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971, in the Pacific coast portion of this dispute who have not settled prior to the enactment of this resolution, and the parties in section 6 of this resolution. In addition, any employer of employees involved in this dispute who are represented by Teamster Union locals listed in section 6, not otherwise made a party, may elect to place itself voluntarily under the jurisdiction of the arbitration board created by section 2 of this resolution as a party by giving notice of such election by certified mail within seven days of the enactment of this resolution to the board in care of the Secretary of Labor, Washington, District of Columbia 20210, and to the Teamsters Union local involved at its local address and to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America at 25 Louisiana Avenue Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia 20001.

SEC. 2. (a) There is established an arbitration board (hereafter called the board) consisting of three members, to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor within five days of enactment of this resolution. The members shall then elect a chairman.

(b) The board shall make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings and giving the parties to the controversy a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by other representative as they may select.

(c) For the purpose of hearings conducted by the board, it shall have authority conferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

(d) The board shall begin its hearings no more than fifteen days after enactment. The board shall make its determination no later than forty days after enactment.

(e) In its determination the board shall resolve all the issues in the dispute.

(f) The board's determination shall be retroactive to the date of enactment of this resolution. The board may make such further provisions for retroactivity to a date prior to the enactment of this resolution, if any, as it finds appropriate and consistent with the terms of this resolution.

(g) The board shall make its determination consistent with the policy of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1971, and such determination shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(h).

(h) Any party, as defined in section 1, aggrieved by a determination of the board may, within fifteen days after its issuance, obtain review of the determination in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The decision of the court of appeals may be reviewed in the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari or upon certification as provided for in section 1254 (1) and (3), title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the determination of the board. A determination of the board shall be conclusive unless found to be arbitrary or capricious.

(i) Members of the board shall receive compensation at a rate of per diem equivalent to the rate of a GS–18 when engaged in the work of the board as prescribed by this section, including traveltime, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis.

For the purposes of carrying out its functions under this Act, the board is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and allow them while away from their home or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed. The board is also authorized to employ such support services as are necessary for its operation.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall appoint a special referee within 3 days of enactment of this resolution who shall have the responsibility provided herein and shall receive the same compensation as a member of the board.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, the special referee shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any disagreement occurring after the enactment of this resolution but before the arbitration determination has gone into effect which involves collective-bargaining agreements, interpretations, rulings, and practices governing assignment and performance of work between the Longshoremen's Union and the Teamsters Union, and which may lead to violation of this resolution. The special referee may also during this period consider other disagreements which may lead to violation of this resolution if he finds it would effectuate the purposes of the resolution to do so rather than to defer to other procedures, and if he does so he shall assume exclusive jurisdiction over such disagreements. The special referee shall have the same authority provided in section 2(c) relating to attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents. The special referee is authorized to issue orders to obtain compliance by the parties with the requirements of this resolution. The Attorney General shall have power to petition the district court of the United States wherein the violation or threatened violation occurs or having jurisdiction of the parties for enforcement of such orders and for appropriate relief or restraining orders.

The findings of the special referee, unless found to be arbitrary or capricious, shall be conclusive. The jurisdiction of the United States district court, and its judgment and decree as to matters within its jurisdiction under this section shall be final and not subject to review.

SEC. 4. (a) The Attorney General of the United States shall be authorized to maintain any civil action necessary to obtain compliance with any provision of this resolution.

(b) Any strike, lockout, or other concerted activity in violation of this resolution shall be subject to a penalty not to exceed $100,000. Each calendar day in which such a violation occurs shall be considered a separate violation.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the implementation of this resolution.

SEC. 6. The following employers and labor organizations are parties to the dispute in addition to those parties described in section 1:

(a) Castle and Cooke Terminals, Limited, 965 North Nimitz Highway, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817.

Hilo Transportation and Terminal Company, Post Office Box 455, Hilo, Hawaii 96720.

Theo H. Davies and Company, 800 Fort, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

Honolulu Terminals Company, Limited, Pier 19, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817.

Kawaihae Terminals, Post Office Box 818, Hamuela, Hawaii 96743.

Kauai Sugar Storage Corporation, Post Office Box 1743, Lihue, Hawaii 96766.

Matson Terminals, Incorporated, 521 Ala Moana Boulevard, Honolulu, Hawaii 96803.

McCabe, Hamilton, and Renny Company, Limited, 224 Mokauea, Honolulu, Hawaii; Lihue, Hawaii; Kahului, Hawaii 96819.

Oahu Transport Company (Highway and Terminal Warehousing Company, Limited), Post Office Box 3288, Honolulu, Hawaii 96801.

Seatrain Lines, California, San Island Access Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96819.

Pacific Container Service, Honolulu, Hawaii.

International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Locals 142 and 160, 451 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Kahului Trucking and Storage, Kahului, Hawaii.

(b) The International Brotherhood of

Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America.

The following Teamsters Union locals of:

State of Washington

City of Seattle, Local Unions 174, 741, 44, and 117.
City of Takoma, Local Unions 313 and 461.
City of Aberdeen, Local Union 599.

State of Oregon

City of Portland, Local 162 and 81, Coos Bay 689, Hoquin Local 58.
Vancouver, Washington, Local 501.
Astoria Local 569.

State of California

Long Beach, Local 692.
San Diego, Local 542.
Oakland, Local 70.
San Francisco, Local 85.
Stockton, Local 439.
Sacramento, Local 150.
Oakland, Locals 85 and 853.

State of Alaska

Anchorage, Alaska, Local 959.

State of Hawaii

Honolulu, Local 996.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment is in order to the joint resolution except an amendment identical to the text of House Joint Resolution 1054, and such amendment shall not be subject to amendment.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MATSUNAGA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MATSUNAGA: Strike out all after the title of House Joint Resolution 1025 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Joint Resolution 1054, as follows:

Whereas there is a dispute between employers (or associations by which such employers are represented in collective-bargaining conferences) who are (1) steamship companies operating ships or employed as agents for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States, (2) contracting stevedores, (3) contracting marine carpenters, (4) lighterage operators, or (5) other employers engaged in related or associated pier activities for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States (hereafter called employers), and certain of the employees of such employers represented by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (hereafter called Longshoremen's Union); and

Whereas the order enjoining a strike in this dispute granted by the United States District Court, Northern District of California, in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971, expired on December 25, 1971, pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 176–178); and

Whereas all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas a settlement has not been reached despite intensive mediation efforts; and

Whereas there is a dispute, involving members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America (hereafter called the Teamsters Union) employed by some of the above employers and by other employers engaged in activities related to the maritime, stevedoring, and pier work described above, concerning the assignment and performance of such work; and

Whereas a dispute in Hawaii, involving certain employers engaged in activities related to maritime, stevedoring, and pier work described above and certain of their employees represented by the Longshoremen's Union and the Teamsters Union, threatens to disrupt essential transportation services for that State and to endanger the health and safety of its citizens; and

Whereas these disputes are closely related to and a portion of the dispute on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas it is vital to the national interest, including the national health and safety, that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to continuity of essential transportation services affected by this dispute: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That immediately upon the enactment of this resolution the Attorney General shall petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin the continuation of any strike or lockout arising out of a dispute between the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. The court shall have jurisdiction to issue such an injunction, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate, if it determines such strike or lockout meets the criteria set forth in section 208(a) (i) and (ii) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947. Such injunction may be issued for a period not to exceed thirty days. Upon the settlement of such dispute, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged.

SEC. 2. If no settlement is reached prior to the twenty-fifth day after the issuance of an injunction obtained pursuant to section 1 of this resolution, the Attorney General shall petition the district court involved to extend the injunction then in effect for an additional thirty days following its original expiration date. Upon settlement of the dispute, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged.

SEC. 3. (a) (1) If no settlement has been reached by the thirty-first day following the issuance of the original injunction, the Secretary of Labor shall direct each party to submit to him within three days a final offer as to all unresolved issues and a full and complete statement covering all issues upon which agreement has been reached.

(2) If any of the parties refuses to submit a final offer, as described in subsection (a) (1) of this section, the last offer, if any, as to each unresolved issue made by such party during previous bargaining shall be deemed that party's final offer.

(3) Any offer submitted by a party pursuant to this section, together with those issues with respect to which agreement has been reached by the parties, must constitute a complete collective-bargaining agreement and resolve all the issues involved in the dispute, and must propose a contract period of not less than eighteen months' duration.

(b) The Secretary, upon receipt of such final offers from both parties, shall transmit them, one to the other, at the same time, and parties shall bargain collectively for a period of five consecutive days after they receive the other party's final offer as to unresolved issues. The Secretary may act as mediator during the period of the final offer selection proceedings.

(c) If no settlement has been reached before the end of the period described in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall appoint a special panel of three impartial members to act as the final offer selector.

(d) No person who has a pecuniary or other interest in any organization of employees or employers or employers' organizations which are involved in the dispute shall be appointed to such panel.

(e) If a settlement is reached by the parties to the dispute at any time prior to the panel's selection of a final offer as prescribed below, the panel shall adjourn its proceedings and report to the Secretary within five days the fact that a settlement has been reached and the terms of such settlement.

(f) The panel shall at no time engage in an effort to mediate or otherwise settle the dispute in any manner other than that prescribed by this section.

(g) From the time of appointment by the Secretary until such time as the panel makes its selection, there shall be no communication by the members of the panel with third parties concerning recommendations for settlement of the dispute.

(h) Beginning with the direction of the Secretary to submit final offers as to unresolved issues and until the panel makes its selection and the final agreement is signed, there shall be no change, except by agreement of the parties, in the terms and conditions of employment. In no instance shall such period exceed thirty days.

(i) The panel shall not compromise or alter the final offer that it selects. Selection of a final offer shall be based on the content of the final offer and no consideration shall be given to, nor shall any evidence be received concerning, the collective bargaining as to the unresolved issues in this dispute, including offers of settlement not contained in the final offers. The panel shall, however, in order to ascertain the completeness of the final offers submitted for selection, determine which of the issues have been agreed upon by the parties, and are therefore outside the scope of such final offers.

(j) The panel shall, upon concurrence of two or more of its members, select what it deems to be the most reasonable of the final offers submitted by the parties. The panel may, in reaching its decision, take into account the following factors:

(1) past collective-bargaining contracts between the parties including the bargaining that led up to such contracts;

(2) comparison of wages, hours, and conditions of employment of the employees involved, with wages, hours, and conditions of employment of other employees doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the industry involved;

(3) comparison of wages, hours, and conditions of employment as reflected in industries in general, and in the same or similar industry;

(4) security and tenure of employment with due regard for the effect of technological changes on manning practices or on the utilization of particular occupations; and

(5) the public interest, and any other factors normally considered in the determination of wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

(k) The final offer selected by the panel, together with its findings as to issues on which agreement had been reached by the parties, shall be transmitted immediately to the Secretary, who shall issue an order requiring the parties to accept and sign as the final contract between them the selected offer as to the unresolved issues, together with the agreement previously reached on all other issues. The Secretary shall immediately transmit a copy of such order, together with the final contract to each of the parties.

(l) The determination by the panel shall be conclusive unless found arbitrary and capricious by the district court which

granted the injunction pursuant to section 1 of this resolution.

(m) If any of the parties refuse to sign the final agreement as selected by the panel within twenty-four hours after the issuance of the Secretary's order, the Attorney General shall immediately petition the district court which issued the injunction pursuant to section 1 of this resolution to enjoin the further refusal by the party or parties to sign the agreement as provided in the Secretary's order. The court shall have jurisdiction to issue such an injunction, if it determines that the strike or lockout still meets the criteria set forth in section 208(a) (i) and (ii) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

(n) The following rules of procedures shall be applicable to the panel's functions under this subsection:

(1) NOTICE OF HEARING.—Upon appointment by the Secretary, the panel shall promptly notify and inform the parties of the time, place, and nature of the hearings, and the matters to be covered therein.

(2) HEARINGS TO BE PUBLIC.—The panel shall hold public hearings, unless it determines private hearings are necessary in the interest of national security, or unless the parties agree to present their positions in writing. The record made at such hearings shall include all documents, statements, exhibits, and briefs which may be submitted, together with the stenographic record. The panel shall have authority for the conduct of an orderly public hearing. The panel may exclude persons other than the parties at any time when in its judgment the expeditious inquiry into the dispute so requires.

(3) PARTICIPATION BY THE PANEL IN THE HEARING.—The panel, or any members thereof, may, on its own initiative at such hearing, call witnesses and introduce documentary evidence, and may participate in the examination of witnesses for the purpose of expediting the hearing or eliciting material facts.

(4) PARTICIPATION BY THE PARTIES IN HEARING.—The parties or their representatives shall be given reasonable opportunity (A) to be present in person at every stage of the hearing; (B) to be represented adequately; (C) to present orally or otherwise any material evidence relevant to the issues; (D) to ask questions of the opposing party or witness relating to evidence offered or statements made by the party or witness at the hearing, unless it is clear that the questions have no material bearing on the credibility of that party or witness on the issues in the case; and (E) to present to the panel oral or written argument on the issues.

(5) STENOGRAPHIC RECORDS.—An official stenographic record of the proceedings shall be made. A copy of the record shall be available for inspection by the parties.

(6) RULES OF EVIDENCE.—The hearing may be conducted informally. The receipt of evidence at the hearing need not be governed by the common law rules of evidence.

(7) REQUESTS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE.—The panel shall have the power to subpena. It shall request the parties to produce any evidence it deems revelant to the issues. Such evidence should be obtained through the voluntary compliance of the parties, if possible.

SEC. 4. (a) The panel established under section 3 of this resolution may act by majority vote.

(b) A vacancy on the panel shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the panel. In case of vacancy due to death or resignation, the Secretary may appoint a successor to fill such vacancy.

(c) Members of the panel shall receive compensation at a rate of up to the per diem equivalent of the rate for GS–18 when engaged in the work of the panel as prescribed by this resolution, including traveltime, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Federal Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem, when actually employed, basis.

(d) For the purposes of carrying out its functions under this resolution the panel is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Federal Government service employed intermittently, while so employed.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.—(a) The term "Secretary" when used in this resolution refers to the Secretary of Labor.

(b) The term "parties" wherever used in this resolution shall mean the parties who were under the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Northern District of California, in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971, who have not settled their dispute prior to the enactment of this resolution.

SEC. 6. APPROPRIATIONS.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this resolution, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, then the remainder of this resolution, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby, but shall remain valid and in full force.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its enactment and the legality of any action authorized herein and taken thereafter shall be governed by the Act regardless of when such action is initiated.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we have so few Members on the floor. I was hoping that I would be able to explain the difference between my resolution and the Dellenback resolution so that in all wisdom my resolution would be adopted.

The principal difference between my resolution and the Dellenback resolution is that the Dellenback resolution would impose compulsory arbitration on the parties on all of the issues involved whether resolved or not, while my resolution would adopt all issues on which there has been agreement as part of the imposed agreement and put into mediation only those issues remaining unresolved. We have already heard the announcement of the tentative settlement and the agreement only needs to be ratified by the membership of the ILWU which is forthcoming on Saturday. If the Dellenback resolution is adopted, all the issues agreed to would be thrown wide open for renegotiation. This would be truly unfortunate.

If the actual signing of the contract does not come about because of lack of ratification on the part of the ILWU, then we would want legislation which would cause the least disruption in the bargaining process. My resolution provides that all the issues already agreed to—and I will remind the Members that all of the economic issues have already been agreed to—would be a part of the contract which will be ordered by the Secretary of Labor, and only those issues which remain unresolved would be resolved by the final offer selection method.

My bill provides that for the first 30 days after it is enacted into law the parties would be allowed to negotiate freely and arrive at their own voluntary settlement.

If the parties fail to arrive at a voluntary settlement within the first 30 days—and all indications signify they will arrive at a voluntary settlement because they have in fact announced a tentative settlement—then the Secretary of Labor is authorized to ask each of the parties to submit their final offer. The Secretary of Labor would then get the two parties together, and present the offers of one to the other simultaneously, and then try to mediate a settlement. He will do this for 5 days. If that fails, then the Secretary of Labor will appoint a panel of three who would be authorized to select the final offer of either one of the parties which was made during the negotiations, during the 30 days, or even before, and the offer selected would become the contract—only on those issues which remain unsettled.

My proposal, therefore, would be closer to the collective bargaining process than the compulsory arbitration which would be imposed by the Dellenback bill.

I urge, therefore, to those of you who believe in preserving the collective bargaining process, that you support my amendment. And for those who felt earlier today in voting against the rule that this matter should not even be considered this evening, adoption of my amendment will afford a little time for the Senate and the House to go into conference. The parties in dispute could possibly arrive at a final settlement during this period. Adoption of the Dellenback bill would be tantamount to adoption of the Senate bill, and there would be no need for going into conference. The parties would have no time to finalize their tentative agreement, and we would in effect be swinging a club over their heads. This, I believe, would not promote true collective bargaining.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Matsunaga amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a chance to look at the Matsunaga bill. It essentially, as our colleague pointed out, does two things:

First. Two sequential 30-day injunctions, and

Second. The so-called final offer procedure.

If you will look beyond this and look carefully at what it does, you will see a series of fundamental weaknesses:

First. The simple extension of time is ineffective.

We have express testimony on that by Secretary Hodgson. It will merely continue the present uncertainty, which is a serious part of the present trouble.

Second. There is the ambiguity as to what issues are unresolved and thereby what is to be covered by the final offer.

All tentative agreements are really unresolved until the total agreement has been accepted by all parties.

The Senate hearings showed very clearly that the parties were not in agreement and what was still unresolved.

If the ILWU votes in the days ahead to reject the proposed agreement or settlement, then it is extremely uncertain as to what issues are unresolved.

Third. The value of the final offer procedure lies in its existence during negotiations.

We have testimony again from Secretary Hodgson—and this is a part of the administration bill.

I understand the laws are in existence for full negotiation. That is not here the case.

Fourth. There will be at least two court suits required under the Matsunaga amendment with possible delays required before any possible effective injunctions can be gained, possibly two more suits beyond that in connection with any final order.

The bill deals with at least one problem and its solution.

Fifth. There are no express penalties in the Matsunaga amendment for noncompliance with the order to sign an agreement. Only contempt procedures are available to the court. This presents a real question as to how effective this would be.

Sixth. It does not cover issues covering Hawaii.

Seventh. There is serious ambiguity as to whether the panel has only 30 days to act or whether there is no limit at all. There is at least that ambiguity in the legislation proposed.

Eighth. There is grave ambiguity as to who the parties are. There is the question whether the Teamsters are covered because the Teamsters are referred to in one section of the bill and they are not referred to in two other sections.

Ninth. There is an open question as to whether this issue would have to go to the Pay Board under the Matsunaga bill. If indeed it does have to go to the Pay Board there is no requirement for compliance with the policy of the Economic Stabilization Act, as indeed there is in my proposal.

So for at least these nine reasons of ambiguity and inconsistencies, I say to you that these uncertainties and ambiguities make this proposal fundamentally ineffective. We would be dealing with cosmetology and only cosmetology if we were to adopt this particular proposal tonight.

It should be defeated and I am pleased that the chairman of the subcommittee and I agree on this point.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MATSUNAGA) there were—ayes 13, noes 64.

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1025) to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees, pursuant to House Resolution 796, he reported the House joint resolution back to the House.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. QUIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. QUIE moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 1025 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to that committee to report it back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after title of the joint resolution and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas there is a dispute between employers (or associations by which such employers are represented in collective bargaining conferences) who are (1) steamship companies operating ships or employed as agents for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States, (2) contracting stevedores, (3) contracting marine carpenters, (4) lighterage operators, or (5) other employers engaged in related or associated pier activities for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States (hereafter called employers), and certain of the employees of such employers represented by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; and

Whereas the order enjoining a strike in this dispute granted by the United States District Court, Northern District of California, in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935 WTS, October 6, 1971, expired on December 25, 1971, pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 176–178); and

Whereas all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas a settlement has not been reached despite intensive mediation efforts and transportation services essential to the national interest are not being maintained; and

Whereas it is vital to the national interest that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to continuity of essential transportation services affected by this dispute: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) an arbitration board shall be established herein to hear and settle all issues in this dispute, and to issue a determination which shall be deemed a final and binding resolution, understanding and agreement between the parties and shall also be deemed to supersede to the extent inconsistent therewith all other agreements or understandings between the parties: *Provided,* That proceedings under this joint resolution shall be terminated immediately upon certification, in writing, by the parties to the Secretary of Labor that they have reached complete agreement on the disposition of all the issues. The determination of the arbitration board shall be effective for the period stated therein, which may not be less than eighteen months. During such period, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout as between the parties.

(b) From the date of enactment of this joint resolution until the arbitration board makes its determination, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout as between the parties, and no change, except by agreement of the parties, in the terms and conditions of employment as prescribed in the court order in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution the term "parties" means (1) the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and (2) the Pacific Maritime Association, and all employers who are members of that association.

SEC. 2. (a) There is established an arbitration board (hereinafter referred to as the "board") which shall be constituted in the following manner:

(1) Within three days after the enactment of this joint resolution, both parties to the dispute, by agreement, may designate one individual to perform the functions and exercise the powers of the board.

(2) In the event that the parties do not agree upon an individual under paragraph (1) of this section, each party shall within three days immediately following the expiration of the three-day period under paragraph (1), designate an individual to serve on the board. The two members of the board so designated shall select, within three days after their appointment, a third individual to be a member and act as chairman of the board. In the event that the two members of the board designated by the parties cannot agree on the selection of the third member as chairman under this paragraph, within three days after their appointment, the third member who shall be the chairman shall be selected by the chief judge of the United States district court for the Northern District of California.

(3) In the event that either party does not designate a member under paragraph (2) of this subsection, then the chief judge of the United States district court for the Northern District of California shall designate one individual to exercise the powers of the board.

(b) The board shall make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings and giving to the parties and all other persons it determines may be directly affected by the board's determination notice and a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by other representative as they may select.

(c) For the purpose of hearings conducted by the board, it shall have authority con-

ferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

(d) The board shall begin its hearings no more than fifteen days after enactment. The board shall make its determination no later than forty days after enactment.

(e) In its determination the board shall resolve all the issues in the dispute.

(f) The board's determination shall be retroactive to the date of enactment of this resolution. The board may make such further provisions for retroactivity to a date prior to the enactment of this resolution, if any, as it finds appropriate and consistent with the terms of this resolution.

(g) The board shall make its determination consistent with the policy of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1971, and such determination shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(i).

(h) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the board, or as to the terms of all the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination, with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the board, be made with or without a further hearing, and shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(i).

(i) Any party, as defined in section 1, aggrieved by a determination of the board may, within fifteen days after its issuance, obtain review of the determination in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The decision of the court of appeals may be reviewed in the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari or upon certification as provided for in section 1254(1) and (3), title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the determination of the board. A determination of the board shall be conclusive unless found to be arbitrary or capricious.

(j) Members of the board shall receive compensation at a rate of $250 per day when engaged in the work of the board as prescribed by this section, including traveltime, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis.

(k) For the purposes of carrying out its functions under this Act, the board is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and allow them while away from their home or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed. The board is also authorized to employ such support services as are necessary for its operation.

SEC. 3. (a) The Attorney General of the United States shall be authorized to maintain any civil action necessary to obtain compliance with any provision of this resolution.

(b) Any strike, lockout, or other concerted activity in violation of this resolution shall be subject to a penalty not to exceed $100,000. Each calendar day in which such a violation occurs shall be considered a separate violation.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the implementation of this resolution.

Mr. QUIE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. QUIE. Does not the rule provide 5 minutes to speak in favor of such a motion?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman seeks the time to do so, he will be recognized.

Mr. QUIE. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the administration bill as introduced, since, at this time, it would only muddy the water. It would require a House-Senate conference and another separate vote in each body. This would be near impossible with the Congress going on a recess this evening. Senate Joint Resolution 197 is a good bill and in some ways preferable as well. It is different from the administration's bill in two regards.

Under the provisions of the motion to recommit, the Arbitration Board will be selected by the parties, the Pacific Maritime Association and the ILWU. They can pick one person to do the arbitrating for them, or if they do not agree on one person, they can pick one each and then the other two individuals pick the third person to be chairman. If they cannot agree, then the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California will designate the third member. If any of the parties cannot agree on a designated member, the same judge can select that member also to the Arbitration Board.

Another significant difference is that the administration bill includes all employers in Hawaii and includes the Teamsters. They are not included in this bill. It is only the ILWU and the PMA that are included in the bill. However, the Teamsters or the employers who are not members of the PMA, but whose employees are represented by the ILWU, if they want to, can be included in the Board's decision. They can participate and agree to be bound by it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question so the Members understand clearly that the motion to recommit is the Senate-passed bill of yesterday. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. The motion to recommit involves the Senate-passed bill that was passed yesterday, and the two significant differences from the administration bill were previously pointed out.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I wish to reiterate that this motion to recommit is verbatim the bill passed by the other body yesterday, and under the motion to recommit, it would send the Senate version back to the Committee on Education and Labor and they would report back forthwith to the House the Senate bill instead of House Joint Resolution 1025.

So if Members are in favor of avoiding a conference and putting this legislation into law, they should vote for the motion to recommit, thereby avoiding the conference.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. It now having been made—to use a word from Pennsylvania Avenue—perfectly clear that the motion to recommit is simply verbatim, the Senate-passed resolution, it is not the intention of the gentleman from New Jersey, who opposes this, to demand a rollcall on the motion to recommit, since following that, the gentleman from Kentucky will make a motion which would have the effect of bringing before us the verbatim Senate joint resolution for final passage, at which time the gentleman from New Jersey intends to demand the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the motion to recommit prevails, then we have to vote on final passage of that version in the House. Will the gentleman ask for a rollcall at that time, or will he ask for a rollcall at the time that the gentleman from Kentucky asks to substitute as the final action?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I really see no need to have two rollcalls unless the gentleman from Michigan so desires.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I agree.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Strike out all after the title of House Joint Resolution 1025 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas there is a dispute between em-

ployers (or associations by which such employers are represented in collective bargaining conferences) who are (1) steamship companies operating ships or employed as agents for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States, (2) contracting stevedores, (3) contracting marine carpenters, (4) lighterage operators, or (5) other employers engaged in related or associated pier activities for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States (hereafter called employers), and certain of the employees of such employers represented by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; and

Whereas the order enjoining a strike in this dispute granted by the United States District Court, Northern District of California, in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935 WTS, October 6, 1971, expired on December 25, 1971, pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 176–178); and

Whereas all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas a settlement has not been reached despite intensive mediation efforts and transportation services essential to the national interest are not being maintained; and

Whereas it is vital to the national interest that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to continuity of essential transportation services affected by this dispute: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) an arbitration board shall be established herein to hear and settle all issues in this dispute, and to issue a determination which shall be deemed a final and binding resolution, understanding, and agreement between the parties and shall also be deemed to supersede to the extent inconsistent therewith all other agreements or understandings between the parties: *Provided,* That proceedings under this joint resolution shall be terminated immediately upon certification, in writing, by the parties to the Secretary of Labor that they have reached complete agreement on the disposition of all the issues. The determination of the arbitration board shall be effective for the period stated therein, which may not be less than eighteen months. During such period, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout as between the parties.

(b) From the date of enactment of this joint resolution until the arbitration board makes its determination, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout as between the parties, and no change, except by agreement of the parties, in the terms and conditions of employment as prescribed in the court order in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution the term "parties" means (1) the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and (2) the Pacific Maritime Association, and all employers who are members of that association.

SEC. 2. (a) There is established on arbitration board (hereinafter referred to as the "board") which shall be constituted in the following manner:

(1) Within three days after the enactment of this joint resolution, both parties to the dispute, by agreement, may designate one individual to perform the functions and exercise the powers of the board.

(2) In the event that the parties do not agree upon an individual under paragraph (1) of this section, each party shall within three days immediately following the expiration of the three-day period under paragraph (1), designate an individual to serve on the board. The two members of the board so designated shall select, within three days after their appointment, a third individual to be a member and act as chairman of the board. In the event that the two members of the board designated by the parties cannot agree on the selection of the third member as chairman under this paragraph, within three days after their appointment, the third member who shall be the chairman shall be selected by the chief judge of the United States district court for the Northern District of California.

(3) In the event that either party does not designate a member under paragraph (2) of this subsection, then the chief judge of the United States district court for the Northern District of California shall designate one individual to exercise the powers of the board.

(b) The board shall make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings and giving to the parties and all other persons it determines may be directly affected by the board's determination notice and a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by other representative as they may select.

(c) For the purpose of hearings conducted by the board, it shall have authority conferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

(d) The board shall begin its hearings no more than fifteen days after enactment. The board shall make its determination no later than forty days after enactment.

(e) In its determination the board shall resolve all the issues in the dispute.

(f) The board's determination shall be retroactive to the date of enactment of this resolution. The board may make such further provisions for retroactivity to a date prior to the enactment of this resolution, if any, as it finds appropriate and consistent with the terms of this resolution.

(g) The board shall make its determination consistent with the policy of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1971, and such determination shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(i).

(h) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the board, or as to the terms of all the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination, with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the board, be made with or without a further hearing, and shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(i).

(i) Any party, as defined in section 1, aggrieved by a determination of the board may, within fifteen days after its issuance, obtain review of the determination in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The decision of the court of appeals may be reviewed in the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari or upon certification as provided for in section 1254 (1) and (3), title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the determination of the board. A determination of the board shall be conclusive unless found to be arbitrary or capricious.

(j) Members of the board shall receive compensation at a rate of $250 per day when engaged in the work of the board as prescribed by this section, including travel-time, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis.

(k) For the purposes of carrying out its functions under this Act, the board is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and allow them while away from their home or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed. The board is also authorized to employ such support services as are necessary for its operation.

SEC. 3. (a) The Attorney General of the United States shall be authorized to maintain any civil action necessary to obtain compliance with any provision of this resolution.

(b) Any strike, lockout, or other concerted activity in violation of this resolution shall be subject to a penalty not to exceed $100,000. Each calendar day in which such a violation occurs shall be considered a separate violation.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the implementation of this resolution.

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution, as amended.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 139, answered "present" 3, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—214

Abbitt	Byron	Duncan
Abernethy	Caffery	du Pont
Alexander	Camp	Edmondson
Anderson, Ill.	Carter	Edwards, Ala.
Archer	Casey, Tex.	Erlenborn
Arends	Cederberg	Esch
Baker	Chamberlain	Eshleman
Belcher	Chappell	Findley
Bennett	Clancy	Fish
Bergland	Clausen,	Fisher
Betts	Don H.	Flowers
Bevill	Cleveland	Flynt
Biester	Collins, Tex.	Foley
Blackburn	Colmer	Ford, Gerald R.
Bow	Conable	Fountain
Bray	Coughlin	Frenzel
Brinkley	Curlin	Frey
Brotzman	Daniel, Va.	Fuqua
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Gettys
Brown, Ohio	de la Garza	Goodling
Broyhill, N.C.	Dellenback	Green, Oreg.
Broyhill, Va.	Denholm	Gross
Buchanan	Dennis	Gubser
Burke, Fla.	Derwinski	Hagan
Burleson, Tex.	Devine	Haley
Burlison, Mo.	Dorn	Hall
Byrnes, Wis.	Downing	Hamilton

Hammer-schmidt	Mallary	Shoup
Hanley	Martin	Shriver
Hansen, Idaho	Mathias, Calif.	Sikes
Harsha	Mathis, Ga.	Sisk
Hastings	Matsunaga	Skubitz
Heinz	Mayne	Smith, Calif.
Henderson	Mazzoli	Smith, N.Y.
Hogan	Melcher	Spence
Hosmer	Michel	Steed
Hull	Miller, Ohio	Steiger, Ariz.
Hungate	Mills, Md.	Steiger, Wis.
Hunt	Minshall	Stephens
Hutchinson	Mizell	Stratton
Ichord	Montgomery	Talcott
Jarman	Mosher	Taylor
Johnson, Pa.	Myers	Teague, Calif.
Jonas	Natcher	Teague, Tex.
Jones, N.C.	Nelsen	Terry
Jones, Tenn.	Nichols	Thompson, Ga.
Kazen	Passman	Thomson, Wis.
Keating	Pettis	Thone
Keith	Peyser	Ullman
Kemp	Pickle	Vander Jagt
King	Pike	Veysey
Kuykendall	Pirnie	Waggonner
Kyl	Poage	Ware
Landgrebe	Poff	Whalley
Landrum	Preyer, N.C.	White
Latta	Purcell	Whitehurst
Lennon	Quie	Whitten
Lent	Quillen	Wiggins
Link	Railsback	Williams
Lloyd	Randall	Wilson, Bob
Long, La.	Reid	Wilson, Charles H.
McClory	Rhodes	Winn
McClure	Robinson, Va.	Wright
McCollister	Robison, N.Y.	Wyatt
McCormack	Rogers	Wydler
McDonald, Mich.	Roy	Wylie
McEwen	Ruth	Wyman
McKay	Sandman	Young, Fla.
McKevitt	Satterfield	Young, Tex.
McKinney	Scherle	Zion
Mahon	Schwengel	Zwach
	Scott	
	Sebelius	

NAYS—139

Abourezk	Flood	O'Neill
Abzug	Ford, William D.	Patman
Adams	Fulton	Patten
Addabbo	Gallagher	Pepper
Anderson, Calif.	Garmatz	Perkins
Annunzio	Gaydos	Podell
Ashley	Giaimo	Price, Ill.
Aspin	Gonzalez	Pucinski
Aspinall	Grasso	Rangel
Badillo	Gray	Rarick
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Rees
Bingham	Gude	Reuss
Boggs	Halpern	Rodino
Boland	Harrington	Roe
Bolling	Hathaway	Roncalio
Brademas	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Brasco	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, Pa.
Brooks	Hicks, Mass.	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Hicks, Wash.	Rostenkowski
Burton	Holifield	Roush
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Roybal
Carney	Jacobs	Runnels
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Ryan
Clark	Karth	St Germain
Clay	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Collins, Ill.	Kee	Saylor
Conte	Koch	Seiberling
Conyers	Kyros	Shipley
Cotter	Long, Md.	Slack
Crane	McDade	Staggers
Culver	Madden	Stanton, James V.
Daniels, N.J.	Meeds	Stokes
Danielson	Mikva	Stuckey
Davis, S.C.	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Delaney	Minish	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Mink	Udall
Dent	Mitchell	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Mollohan	Vanik
Donohue	Monagan	Vigorito
Dow	Morgan	Waldie
Drinan	Morse	Whalen
Dulski	Moss	Wolff
Eckhardt	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Eilberg	Nedzi	Zablocki
Evans, Colo.	Obey	
Fascell	O'Hara	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Hanna	Leggett	Riegle

NOT VOTING—75

Anderson, Tenn.	Baring	Blanton
Andrews	Begich	Blatnik
Ashbrook	Bell	Broomfield
	Biaggi	Cabell
Carey, N.Y.	Harvey	O'Konski
Chisholm	Hawkins	Pelly
Clawson, Del	Hébert	Powell
Collier	Heckler, Mass.	Price, Tex.
Corman	Helstoski	Pryor, Ark.
Davis, Wis.	Hillis	Roberts
Dickinson	Horton	Rousselot
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Ruppe
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Dwyer	Lujan	Schmitz
Edwards, La.	McCloskey	Schneebeli
Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch	Smith, Iowa
Forsythe	McFall	Snyder
Fraser	McMillan	Springer
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald, Mass.	Stanton, J. William
Galifianakis	Mailliard	Steele
Gibbons	Mann	Stubblefield
Goldwater	Metcalfe	Symington
Griffin	Mills, Ark.	Tiernan
Griffiths	Moorhead	Wampler
Grover	Nix	Widnall
Hansen, Wash.		

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Rousselot for, with Mr. Riegle against.

Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Snyder against.

Mr. Andrews for, with Mr. McFall against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Goldwater for, with Mr. Begich against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Biaggi against.

Mr. Forsythe for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. Price of Texas for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. McCloskey for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Metcalfe against.

Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Helstoski against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Schneebeli for, with Mr. Fraser against.

Mr. Grover for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Lujan for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Ruppe for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Tiernan against.

Mr. Hillis for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Symington with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Wampler.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Galafianakis with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Schmitz.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. J. William Stanton.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Steele.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." 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.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 796, I call up from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 197, to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast between certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees, for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 197

Joint resolution to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast between certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees

Whereas there is a dispute between employers (or associations by which such employers are represented in collective bargaining conferences) who are (1) steamship companies operating ships or employed as agents for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States, (2) contracting stevedores, (3) contracting marine carpenters, (4) lighterage operators, or (5) other employers engaged in related or associated pier activities for ships engaged in service from or to Pacific coast or Hawaiian ports of the United States (hereafter called employers), and certain of the employees of such employers represented by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; and

Whereas the order enjoining a strike in this dispute granted by the United States District Court, Northern District of California, in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C-17-1935 WTS, October 6, 1971, expired on December 25, 1971, pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 176-178); and

Whereas all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas a settlement has not been reached despite intensive mediation efforts and transportation services essential to the national interest are not being maintained; and

Whereas it is vital to the national interest that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to continuity of essential transportation services affected by this dispute: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) an arbitration board shall be established herein to hear and settle all issues in this dispute, and to issue a determination which shall be deemed a final and binding resolution, understanding, and agreement between the parties and shall also be deemed to supersede to the extent inconsistent therewith all other agreements or understandings between the parties: *Provided,* That proceedings under this joint resolution shall be terminated immediately upon certification, in writing, by the parties to the Secretary of Labor that they have reached complete agreement on the disposition of all the issues. The determination of the arbitration board shall be effective for the period stated therein, which may not be less than eighteen months. During such period, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout as between the parties.

(b) From the date of enactment of this joint resolution until the arbitration board makes its determination, there shall be no resort to strike or lockout as between the parties, and no change, except by agreement of the parties, in the terms and conditions of employment as prescribed in the court

order in United States against International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union et al., docket numbered C–17–1935–WTS, October 6, 1971.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution the term "parties" means (1) the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and (2) the Pacific Maritime Association, and all employers who are members of that association.

SEC. 2. (a) There is established an arbitration board (hereinafter referred to as the "board") which shall be constituted in the following manner:

(1) Within three days after the enactment of this joint resolution, both parties to the dispute, by agreement, may designate one individual to perform the functions and exercise the powers of the board.

(2) In the event that the parties do not agree upon an individual under paragraph (1) of this section, each party shall within three days immediately following the expiration of the three-day period under paragraph (1), designate an individual to serve on the board. The two members of the board so designated shall select, within three days after their appointment, a third individual to be a member and act as chairman of the board. In the event that the two members of the board designated by the parties cannot agree on the selection of the third member as chairman under this paragraph, within three days after their appointment, the third member who shall be the chairman shall be selected by the chief judge of the United States district court for the Northern District of California.

(3) In the event that either party does not designate a member under paragraph (2) of this subsection, then the chief judge of the United States district court for the Northern District of California shall designate one individual to exercise the powers of the board.

(b) The board shall make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings and giving to the parties and all other persons it determines may be directly affected by the board's determination notice and a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by other representative as they may select.

(c) For the purpose of hearings conducted by the board, it shall have authority conferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

(d) The board shall begin its hearings no more than fifteen days after enactment. The board shall make its determination no later than forty days after enactment.

(e) In its determination the board shall resolve all the issues in the dispute.

(f) the board's determination shall be retroactive to the date of enactment of this resolution. The board may make such further provisions for retroactivity to a date prior to the enactment of this resolution, if any, as it finds appropriate and consistent with the terms of this resolution.

(g) The board shall make its determination consistent with the policy of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1971, and such determination shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(i).

(h) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the board, or as to the terms of all the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination, with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the board, be made with or without a further hearing, and shall be final and binding in every respect, subject only to review as provided in section 2(i).

(i) Any party, as defined in section 1, aggrieved by a determination of the board may, within fifteen days after its issuance, obtain review of the determination in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The decision of the court of appeals may be reviewed in the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari or upon certification as provided for in section 1254 (1) and (3), title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the determination of the board. A determination of the board shall be conclusive unless found to be arbitrary or capricious.

(j) Members of the board shall receive compensation at a rate of $250 per day when engaged in the work of the board as prescribed by this section, including traveltime, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis.

(k) For the purposes of carrying out its functions under this Act, the board is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and allow them while away from their home or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed. The board is also authorized to employ such support services as are necessary for its operation.

SEC. 3. (a) The Attorney General of the United States shall be authorized to maintain any civil action necessary to obtain compliance with any provision of this resolution.

(b) Any strike, lockout, or other concerted activity in violation of this resolution shall be subject to a penalty not to exceed $100,000. Each calendar day in which such a violation occurs shall be considered a separate violation.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the implementation of this resolution.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1025) was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 7. An act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 671) entitled "An act to provide for division and for the disposition of the funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and the Gros Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 279–A, and for other purposes" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. HANSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the Senate from the close of business on Wednesday, February 9, 1972, until noon, Monday, February 14, 1972, and the House of Representatives from close of business on Wednesday, February 9, 1972, until 12 o'clock meridian on February 16, 1972.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61).

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, February 9, 1972, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 14, 1972, and the House of Representatives until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday, February 16, 1972.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the week, if any, and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the work of this week, except for some printing resolutions which will be considered in a few minutes.

Then, as Members know, the adjournment resolution has been agreed to for

the Lincoln Day recess, which will bring us back on Wednesday next.

There is no program, of course, for Monday or Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we have scheduled the following conference reports on:

S. 748, Inter-American Development Bank;

S. 749, Asian Development Bank;

S. 2010, International Development Association; and

S. 3122, Water Pollution Control Act extension to June 30, 1972.

We have also scheduled H.R. 12350, the Economic Opportunity Act amendments, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate, with general debate only on Wednesday.

On Thursday and the balance of the week, we plan to read the bill for amendments and to vote on amendments and to vote on the bill.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday, February 16, 1972, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY HOUSE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until February 16, 1972, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND IN EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until February 16, 1972, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such Extensions of Remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the said adjournment.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Business in Order on Calendar Wednesday, February 16, 1972, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall on House Resolution 796, rollcall No. 39, I voted "nay." My colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) was going to vote "yea" and had requested me to make a live pair with him. After voting, I was called off the floor and was not able to get back in time to withdraw my vote on the rollcall, and I want the RECORD to reflect that he would have voted "yea" had he been here.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 242) authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 9 over to and including line 5 on page 2.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 365) to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 2. There shall be printed fifty-one thousand five hundred additional copies of the document authorized by section 1 of this concurrent resolution for the use of the Senate."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF POCKET-SIZE EDITION OF "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 367) authorizing the printing of the pocket-size edition of "The Constitution of the United States of America" as a House document, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out all after "that" down to and including line 6 and insert: "there be printed one hundred thirty-five thousand seven hundred and fifty additional copies of such document, of which one hundred and ten thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and twenty-five thousand seven hundred and fifty shall be for the use of the Senate."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROBLEM OF RADIATION EXPOSURE

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide the authority for the Atomic Energy Commission to assist financially the State of Colorado in alleviating a vexing problem in my State and district. I am referring to radiation exposure resulting from the use of uranium mill tailings as a construction material in the area of Grand Junction, Colo.

Many of my colleagues are undoubtedly familiar with the issue through reports in the press. Unfortunately, they also may very well be misinformed based on much of the material that has been written. The Subcommittee on Raw Materials of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which I have the pleasure of chairing, held hearings in October of last year to explore this matter in depth. We heard from the AEC, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Surgeon General of the United States, and from the State

and local agencies as well as independent sources.

Several factors emerged clearly from those hearings. All agencies—Federal and State—eschew responsibility because of lack of legal authority over the mill tailings when they were used in the 1950's and early 1960's. Moreover, they currently lack authority to take action which will limit future exposure to the low levels of radiation which result. While it appears clear that there is no immediate health hazard present, it is equally obvious that prudence dictates reasonable efforts be made to limit future exposure.

Accordingly, this bill authorized the AEC to cooperate with the State of Colorado by providing up to 75 percent of the cost of a State program of remedial action. The commission will have the decisionmaking authority as to the appropriate action after consultation with the State and others as appropriate. Both will be governed by guidelines promulgated by the Surgeon General of the United States. Study and data collection, much of which has been accomplished, will be continued with the assistance of the Environmental Protection Agency.

This bill is neither a reflection of legal liability nor responsibility for the existing condition on the part of either the AEC or the State of Colorado. It constitutes recognition that at times undesirable situations develop without the legal concept of "fault" being applicable and seeks to provide a remedy to those affected where no other remedy at law is apparent. Thus the Federal funding is in the nature of a grant similar to that authorized by the Congress for the remediless victims of the Texas City disaster though clearly the condition being addressed here does not approach disaster proportions.

A viable, thriving community has found itself the innocent victim of scare publicity and sensationalism which has thrown a cloud of doubt and frustration over it. Business from tourism and real estate transactions have been adversely affected. The origin of these events was a program of the Federal Government to assure the availability of materials necessary for our national defense and security. Legal liability aside, I consider it appropriate that the Federal Government recognize this role and assist in remedying the adverse consequences which resulted.

I am confident that the Colorado Legislature will respond appropriately to provide the necessary authority and additional funding for the program to be initiated. I urge my colleagues here to support this bill in providing the necessary Federal participation.

CITY OF RICHMOND AND HENRICO AND CHESTERFIELD COUNTIES—SCHOOL REFORM

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

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals has granted a stay in the decision by the U.S. district court regarding the schools of the city of Richmond and Henrico and Chesterfield Counties. By this action, the circuit court has at least recognized this as a matter of major importance to the entire country and, at best, has taken the initial step in curbing flagrant usurpation of power by an arm of the judiciary.

The Richmond school decision, announced last month, is a great example of arrogant judicial tyranny, conceived in premeditated favoritism, clothed in usurpation of power and enunciated without regard for the ultimate consequences. It is bereft of compassion for the public good, bathed in illogical philosophy and aimed at placating a few at the expense of many.

From all over America have come cries of disbelief over the scope of the Richmond decision. Nothing like it has yet been forced on the people of this Nation and hopefully, the higher courts will realize that to travel the road chartered by the district court would be disastrous for school districts all across the country.

The stay ordered by the circuit court, however, must not deter us from proceeding with Congressional action on the antibusing issue. It is vitally important that we secure the required 218 signatures on discharge petition No. 9, so that this matter can be brought to the House floor as quickly as possible. Hearings have been called by the House Judiciary Committee, but we must also not allow this to become a distraction. Such hearings can be long and drawn out and they were, in fact, called only after it became obvious that considerable progress was being made on the discharge petition.

Certainly, it must be obvious by this time to the overwhelming majority in Congress that the intrusion by the Federal Government into the area of school assignments is the most controversial domestic issue before our people today. Our people are incensed over the harassment which our school officials have endured at the hands of HEW bureaucrats and the usurpation of school prerogatives by certain of the Federal courts. In my opinion, we have already waited much too long and allowed far too much authority to be shifted from local school systems to the Federal bureaucracy and judicial oligarchy. We cannot wait much longer—or else that which we seek to protect will be so diluted it is no longer worth saving. We have long felt that our educational system in America is one of the prides of our governmental achievement. Free public education is a landmark of our democratic system and it is nothing short of disgraceful that we have sat back and allowed this system to deteriorate at the hands of theorists, sociologists, and misguided reformers.

The Brown decision in 1954 never envisioned the situation we face today. The actions now being taken go far beyond the concept of racial integration in the schools and even the issue of overcoming racial imbalance. We have entered upon an era in which courts now seek to force the combination of school districts in order to achieve what could not be accomplished within an independent school district. If this can be done in the area of school assignments, who is to say that it cannot be accomplished in all other functions of Government. It is frightening and preposterous to view the possibility that forced integration of the schools might eventually become a sledgehammer to remold our entire governmental system in America.

For the sake of education at all levels, it is vital that the Congress immediately consider the many ramifications involved in the current trend of HEW directives and court edicts. The combination of school districts in order to achieve a racial balance in public schools transcends any concept we have known heretofore. This raises questions which disrupt the orderly functions of Government and undermines the confidence of all Americans.

I would strongly urge members of the House to respond to the discharge petition so that we can speedily obtain the remaining 88 signatures which are needed in order to bring this matter to the House for discussion. There seems to be no question but the overwhelming majority of the members of this body are opposed to busing as the instrument for achieving racial balance in the public schools. This body has on several occasions expressed itself forcefully on this issue. It is also obvious that the Federal courts are going to pay little attention to the expressed will of Congress unless and until we make it unmistakably clear that we are opposed to busing students far and wide in order to achieve some artificial percentage of racial balance. Unless and until this is done—and perhaps even because of our inaction—the courts and HEW will continue to whittle away at the basic foundations of our education system. It is futile and foolish for this Congress to continue to pour Federal funds into programs to aid education when the substance of the education programs is being diminished daily by the preoccupation with percentage assignments.

The courts and HEW have long shown clearly that they are far more concerned about the mechanics of getting a child into school than in what he learns after he arrives. If we are to expend all of our efforts on maintaining an equal balance in every school in America, then we may admit now that education is no longer an individual inspiration but a statistical folly.

COTTER CALLS FOR INVESTIGATION OF FOOD PRICES

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am increasingly concerned over the efficacy of the President's economic program. I was among the Members who urged the President to use the wage-price powers to end the inflation and unemployment which continue to afflict our Nation.

In urging the President to use these wage-price powers, I was concerned, and

I am still concerned, that the effort in curtailing prices would not be effective. The administration of the price guidelines has been increasingly difficult to understand for the average taxpayer. The use of the overburdened Internal Revenue Service to police prices was, and is, of questionable merit.

Yet I do not wish to go into a detailed critique of the administration of the program, but to take issue with the result.

Specifically, I am concerned with the price of food.

As every housewife knows, the price of food has risen drastically in the last few months. All indications from the Department of Agriculture suggest that food prices will continue to increase in the future. Now is the time to investigate these great increases.

A comparison of prices in a Connecticut grocery chain during the August freeze and the prices on the same articles now shows drastic increases.

For example, California chuck roast sold for 78 cents a pound in August and now is $1.10 a pound. A package of hotdogs increased from 79 cents a pound to 95 cents a pound. Bacon increased from 69 cents per pound to $1.08 per pound. Frozen vegetables increased from 4 for 89 cents to 2 for 53 cents, frozen french fries from 4 for $1 to 3 for 89 cents. These increases can be seen in other products as well.

Even the national economic indicators demonstrate that food prices lead all other factors in the cost-of-living index. Based on the experience of the last 2 months, food prices are increasing at a rate of 13 percent per year. The administration must begin an investigation of this entire area. A family must continue to eat, but with restrictions on wages, the food money continues to shrink.

I have written to the Cost of Living Council, the agency responsible for coordination of the President's economic program, demanding investigation and action on food prices.

I have had housewives and food store owners tell me that the prices are skyrocketing, yet there is little action by the administration to attack this problem. The ineffective policing by the Price Commission, the increasing loopholes in price regulation and the lack of significant reduction in food prices all support my view that the problem of food prices requires action now.

The administration cannot remain callous and ineffective on the cost-of-living problems that affect all Americans. No longer can we have so-called consumer advocates saying to the housewife shop better. The point is that there is not enough food money to buy the weekly groceries. Something must be done now.

Therefore, I have written to the Cost of Living Council requesting them to study the reasons for the increased food prices and then take action to lower these prices. The purpose of this request is not to have a study for the sake of a study. This study is to force the price of food to come down.

I believe that without action now food prices will continue to soar and this will have a disastrous effect on working men and women.

I will end by reading a copy of the letter I have sent to the Cost of Living Council requesting immediate action:

FEBRUARY 8, 1972.

The Honorable DONALD RUMSFELD,
Director of the Cost of Living Council,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUMSFELD: I am extremely concerned over rapid increases in the price of food. As you are undoubtedly aware, the cost of food was in large measure responsible for the drastic increase in the cost of living index in December.

I have contacted the Department of Agriculture and that Agency's preliminary information suggested that food prices will continue to increase significantly.

Many of my constituents—both homemakers and food retailers—have given a human dimension to these abstract statistics. Briefly put, the food dollar continues to shrink in purchasing power.

I, along with my constituents, find the current situation incomprehensible and intolerable. While most citizens have accepted restraint in wages, there is a tremendous increase in the price of food.

We can no longer be satisfied with the simple solution to "shop better". Even the most discretionary shopper cannot avoid these price increases.

A comparison of prices in a Connecticut grocery chain during the August freeze and the prices on the same articles now shows drastic increases.

For example, California chuck roast sold for 78c a pound in August and now is $1.10 a pound. A package of hotdogs increased from 79c a pound to 95c a pound. Bacon increased from 69c per pound to $1.08 per pound. Frozen vegetables increased from 4 for 89c to 2 for 53c, frozen french fries from 4/$1.00 to 3/89c. These increases can be seen in other products as well.

Therefore, it is imperative that the Cost of Living Council, which has overall administrative authority for the economic program, undertake a detailed investigation into the current food prices. My constituents and, I believe, the American people will not be satisfied with a token gesture. They want, and deserve, actions that effect in lower food costs.

I am hopeful that you will undertake such an investigation immediately, and not allow these great price increases to be borne by the working men and women who have accepted wage restraints because they believed prices would be held in check. I would appreciate your early response to this request.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. COTTER,
Member of Congress.

EXPANDING RIGHT TO VOTE FOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three major pieces of legislation designed to expand the right to vote for our citizens. We in America have always cherished the right to vote. A major responsibility of citizenship is participation in the decision of who shall govern. Civics classes, citizenship education programs, voter registration drives, public service advertisements on radio and television—all exhort us to register and vote for the candidates of our choice, to make our voices heard in the democratic process of Government.

Unfortunately, rhetoric overshadows reality in the electoral process in the United States. Instead of knocking down the barriers that lock millions of citizens out of the voting booth, we have silently accepted a system which unfairly denies many of our people their right to vote. It is imperative that Congress acts to reverse this hypocritical situation, a situation which leaves countless voters out in the cold on election day.

THE ABSENTEE VOTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972

My first bill, the Absentee Voter Assistance Act of 1972, would prohibit the imposition of inequitable residency requirements as a condition of voting for Senator, Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner. In our highly mobile age, it is anachronistic to disenfranchise those citizens who choose to move from one community to another. Each election year, voters who are otherwise eligible are unable to cast their ballots in congressional contests simply because they cannot comply with the hodgepodge of State and local residency requirements.

The Absentee Voter Assistance Act would do for congressional elections what the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 did for Presidential elections—open up the polling place to more citizens.

This legislation would guarantee that no citizen otherwise eligible to vote would be denied his fundamental right to vote in a congressional election if he registers and has resided in the State or congressional district for the 30 days preceding the election. At the same time, the States would be permitted to enact less stringent residency requirements.

THE UNIVERSAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1972

The Universal Voter Registration Act of 1972, my second voting rights bill, would establish a system of universal voter registration for Federal elections. Registration forms would be prepared by a universal voter registration administration. Other Federal agencies such as the Post Office, Selective Service System, Department of Defense, and Veterans' Administration would help distribute the registration forms, along with the aid of the State Department operating overseas and with the cooperation of State and local elections officials within their jurisdictions. The States would be permitted to treat those registered for Federal elections under this Act as also registered for their own elections.

The administration, in addition to returning completed registration forms to the appropriate State or local officials, would also be charged with other responsibilities, including compiling and providing voting information and making recommendations to the President and Congress to increase voter registration and participation.

The right to privacy for those registered under this act is guaranteed by a provision barring the use of voter registration lists maintained under this legislation for commercial purposes.

THE REENFRANCHISEMENT ACT OF 1972

Finally, the Reenfranchisement Act of 1972 would correct an historic injustice which was created when we—who profess to believe in the importance of the ballot box—deny the very basic right to vote to those who have been convicted

of a crime and have fulfilled the sentence of the court.

Only a small handful of States permit these individuals who have lost their right to vote as a result of criminal conviction to be automatically reenfranchised after satisfying the legal obligations imposed by the court. This means that tens of thousands of law-abiding citizens across the United States continue to be punished for their offenses of the past by finding part of their right and duty of citizenship abridged.

My bill would provide that any citizen otherwise qualified to register and vote in a Federal election could not be denied the right to vote as of the date he:

First, completes every period of imprisonment imposed upon him as a result of each conviction for which he lost that right;

Second, completes every period of parole or probation granted him in connection with each such conviction;

Third, pays all fines levied or otherwise satisfies any other penalties imposed upon him as a result of each such conviction; or

Fourth, receives a pardon with respect to such conviction; whichever last occurs.

This legislation would not infringe on the right of the States to establish their own voter registration or election procedures for those disenfranchised due to criminal convictions for State and local elections.

Just as importantly, this legislation provides that no citizen otherwise qualified to vote in a Federal election would be denied that right on account of imprisonment or confinement prior to conviction for any criminal offense. In my own State of New York, for example, thousands of prisoners awaiting trial but otherwise eligible to vote cannot vote in a primary election for Federal officers by absentee ballot—despite the axiom that a man is innocent until proven guilty. If we do not want this traditional belief in the presumption of innocence to become a sanctimonious myth or empty illusion, it is imperative that we assure these unconvicted prisoners the same registration and voting rights in Federal elections as any other citizen.

Mr. Speaker, if we in Congress are truly committed to the concept of full participation in government by our citizens, these three bills are logical and, indeed, necessary steps for us to take.

FACTS ABOUT EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in this election year we will undoubtedly be treated to a flood of distortions and partisan rhetoric about unemployment. Therefore, I would like to share with my colleagues some facts about employment and unemployment which were highlighted in a recent "Wall Street Journal" article.

Total employment in this country has increased by nearly 8 million jobs in the last 5 years. There were 1½ million more people employed last month than in January 1971 even though the unemployment rate stayed at about the same level. Further, this unemployment statistic can be misleading. For example, fewer than half of the people counted as unemployed are without jobs because they have been laid off from work. As the Journal suggests, if a man is fired, he becomes one of the unemployed. If his previously nonworking wife also starts to look for work, she is added to the ranks of the unemployed. And if their son, still in school, now looks for part-time work, he too is counted. The net result of this example is that employment drops by one person while unempolyment increases by three.

Another important point is that the steady growth of our employment pattern in the last 5 years does not bespeak a recession. In a real recession the total number of employed persons either stops rising or falls. In January 1972, by comparison, there were almost 8 million more workers than in January 1966, an increase of about 11 percent over the 6-year period. With the 6 percent real growth in GNP during 1972 expected by both public and private forecasters, I think we may expect this pattern of growth to continue.

I am inserting the article from the January 17, 1972, edition of the Wall Street Journal at this point.

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Unemployment. Of all the economic numbers tossed about with minimal understanding these days, the one representing the unemployment rate probably tops the list of the most-used and least-comprehended. Few political speeches can do without it. Reformers trumpet it. Talk about it is heard from the pulpit and in the seminar. It besprinkles the chitchat of the cocktail hour. Even school kids refer to it. But there is, withal, much more talk than clear thought on the subject. And maybe another try at keeping it in perspective is warranted.

Fluctuating within a fraction of a point for more than a year, the much-mouthed figure now stands at 6.1%. Contrasting this with manpower-tight wartime rates (more men in the armed services, more workers in defense plants), most commentators seem to take it for granted that this represents a very bad situation indeed.

But others are beginning to wonder. Looking about them for other evidences of really large-scale joblessness, they find themselves confused. The following paragraph reflects this confusion. It is excerpted from a letter among those flowing across this writer's desk.

"There is something wrong—radically wrong—with the unemployment figures. With all the unemployed reported, it would be reasonable to assume that you could get a car washed, that you could get a house painted, that an electrical contractor could hire helpers, that it would be possible to employ people for clerical positions such as bank clerks . . . But I have checked many sections of the country and they all report the difficulty in finding people *to take jobs.*"

The letter writer may be guilty of exaggeration. And his cross-country survey may have been less than scientific. But he has a point. And it is this: Sure, there are people out of work today—there always are. But is the situation now anything like as bad as it is commonly painted? And if it is indeed so bad, why is it that would-be employers so often find it hard to hire people?

These questions aren't easy to answer. But an honest effort can be made.

The best starting point is a look behind the 6.1% figure at the total number of people classified as unemployed, and a breakdown as to who they are. The Labor Department's estimates for December are as follows.

Age-Sex Groups	*Jobless*
Males, 20 yrs. and over	2,141,000
Females, 20 yrs. and over	1,710,000
All Teenagers (16–19 yrs.)	1,365,000
Total	5,216,000

As a source of public befuddlement on the overall unemployment picture, the most important figure by far in the above table is the one for teenagers. The teenagers, of working manpower in the nation, but it will course, represent only a tiny fraction of the be noted that they account for more than a fourth—26 out of every 100—of the "unemployed."

Over half of all employed teenagers quite logically only work part-time—on after-school jobs and such. But if any one of these kids is looking for even an after-school job and can't find it, he counts just as much in the overall unemployment total as an out-of-work head of a family.

Under this system of calculation, the teenage unemployment rate, now above 17 percent, gives a boost to the overall unemployment rate drastically out of line with the teenager's working role in the economy. The December jobless rate for adult men was actually only 4.4 percent—and for married men only 3.3 percent.

Teenage unemployment heavily concentrated in big-city slums is a serious thing. Hundreds of thousands of deprived youths, oppressed by grinding poverty, frustrated by idleness, tempted by drugs—their plight adds up to a dangerous, crime-breeding rash of sores on the social body. Only the blind can fail to see the evil in it and be concerned about finding a remedy. But to use this situation to help paint a picture of massive joblessness among bread-winning adults is plainly misleading.

Now note the womenfolk in the unemployment breakdown. Women play a far greater role in today's payroll working force than they did just a few years ago. Wage-earning females have increased by nearly 10 million in the past decade—a gigantic leap of some 50 percent. And just as they have increased their role in the work force, they have increased as a factor in the unemployed totals.

It will be noted in the table above that more than 1.7 million, or roughly a third of the total unemployed, are adult women. And, more important, they account for 44 of every 100 adults classified as unemployed.

But there are not many women electrical workers. Or house painters. Or car washers. Or TV repair technicians. Or auto mechanics. The list of jobs where womanpower, swollen as it is today, just doesn't fit importantly into the picture goes on and on.

Thus when you remove from the unemployed the largely unskilled and largely part-time-available teenagers, plus the women, who are not trained for so many occupations, you begin to get at least a partial answer to the man who wonders why, "with all the unemployed reported," it is often so hard to hire people.

It should be noted that adult women, as a source of family income, are not to be compared with the teenagers. Many women today provide the sole support for their families. And many more provide a sizable part of it.

But as a group (a now big group, remember) they are still to a much greater degree in-and-outers in the labor market than are the men. Far less than half of the women labeled unemployed are so classified because they lost jobs. A recent (November) Labor Department estimate figured 15% of the jobless adult women were thus listed because they had quit their last jobs voluntarily. And another whopping 44% had actually been out of the labor market for some time, and,

deciding to work again, hadn't found jobs to their liking.

No, the "6.1% unemployed" figure is not one to be happy about. But the public misconception it engenders is probably too big to measure.

JOHN O'RILEY.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER AND FIRST STRIKE CAPABILITY

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, today, along with six of my colleagues, I am submitting new legislation to clearly clarify and define presidential power to order the first use of nuclear weapons in declared or undeclared war.

In the present context of continued commitment to progress in the SALT talks, it seems appropriate for Congress to show at this time in a concrete way our Nation's strong determination to avoid the disaster of nuclear war. I am therefore submitting this joint resolution that would require congressional authorization for any first-strike use of nuclear weapons. This would insure that if we ever contemplated taking this step, it would only be after full and careful deliberation.

On December 9, 1971, the Federation of American Scientists suggested similar legislation, and in their January Newsletter added the following remarks:

> We should be clear about what such a requirement would do, and what it would not do. It would not—and this is critically important—tie the hands of the President in the event that the United States or its allies are attacked with nuclear weapons. This is because it does not affect our nuclear *retaliation* power . . . We repeat the all-important point we wish to emphasize: *no* conventional conflict demands an immediate nuclear response. There *will* be time for Congress to share with the President the responsibility for nuclear escalation, if escalation is being considered. And the nuclear escalation warrants the broadest possible deliberation.

I am sure that this step would increase the security of our country. Anxious uncertainty is one great cause of fear and recklessness. Under the proposed legislation, other countries would know both when he had no intention of taking this fatal step and when we felt a specific situation was serious enough to warrant consideration of a nuclear response.

This legislation would further emphasize the collective responsibility in a democracy for the executive and legislative branches of government to work together in making the life-or-death decisions of war and peace. With this legislation, I hope to decrease tensions both at home and abroad, by decreasing the distrust and suspicion that result when basic decisions are felt to depend on the whims of only a few men, no matter how much we may admire these men. Some decisions we can delegate, but some must come from the whole community, and I hope my colleagues will realize that the question of the first use of nuclear weapons should fall into the latter category.

Following is the language of this important resolution:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO CLARIFY PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO ORDER USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, IN DECLARED OR UNDECLARED WAR

Whereas since nuclear weapons have not been used in war for twenty-six years, a desirable precedent has been established and ought to be protected, and

Whereas the difference between the use of non-nuclear and nuclear weapons is so great as to fall outside a commander-in-chief's sole responsibility, and

Whereas a United States unilateral escalation from non-nuclear to nuclear conflict would be a political act of the greatest consequence that would involve the security of the whole nation and would increase the likelihood of other nations using nuclear weapons, immediately or thereafter, and

Whereas the security of this nation would be strengthened if allies, enemies and neutrals were reassured of the seriousness with which this nation views the distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, and

Whereas no non-nuclear conflict could demand a nuclear response so immediate as to preclude consultation with Congress, and

Whereas the Congress deems it necessary and proper to clarify the exact nature of the authority delegated to the President:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Sec. 1: The President shall not order the first use of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world, except in response to the use of nuclear weapons by others, without prior authorization by Congress. No declaration of war shall be deemed sufficient authorization for this purpose unless such authorization is specifically included therein.

Sec. 2: In asking for such authorization, the President will provide the Congress with such material as will allow the Congress to judge of the necessity of granting this power, and will carefully describe the circumstances in which this power would be used. No such authorization shall extend beyond the circumstances for which it was specifically intended.

Sec. 3: Nothing in this legislation shall prejudice the right of the President to respond to nuclear attack, including the irrevocable launch of nuclear weapons by others, with United States nuclear weapons.

BOMBINGS

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, recently a bombing at the office of New York impresario Sol Hurok aroused major attention in the news media. It did so, presumably, because Hurok is a nationally known figure and because an innocent receptionist in the office was killed.

Police are investigating the possibility of a link between the bombing and the fact that Hurok books talent from the Soviet Union for appearances in the United States and this might have caused him to arouse the wrath of some far-right hate group.

This brainless act of fatal violence was, of course, frightening. But it was far from being an unusual occurrence. In fact, bombings in this country are becoming rather routine—they occur between one and five a day. That is right: from one to five daily.

This chilling fact is recorded in a publication researched and compiled by the National Bomb Data Center, an operation of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The NBDC report reveals that about half of these destructive devices are of an incendiary nature—like the one that killed receptionist Iris Kones, a 27-year-old woman whose crime for which she drew the death penalty was, according to friends, a deep appreciation for fine art and good music, hence her employment in Hurok's agency.

The rest are explosive devices ranging from little more than firecracker size to ones with the capability of wrecking entire apartment buildings—like one that caused the deaths of suspected, so-called Weather People in New York sometime ago.

The House Committee on Internal Security, which I chair, had occasion to study one of the larger explosive bombings during our investigation of and hearings into the Black Panther Party. The incident occurred in August of 1970 in Omaha, Nebr., when eight policemen investigated the report of a disturbance. At the address, officers noticed a green suitcase on the floor. One officer started to pick it up and it exploded with a shattering blast, killing him and injuring the others. For further details on that incident one can check the committee's report: "Gun-barrel Politics: The Black Panther Party, 1966–71," House Report No. 92–470.

The NBDC study shows that there is no clear picture of those who employ explosive or incendiary devices in order to further their aims, no such things as the "mad bomber" of cartoon and fictional fame.

Bombers are children and revolutionaries of the right and left; political protesters of the extreme ends of the spectrum; racial protestors—both white and black—Jewish protesters and anti-Semites; juvenile delinquents and criminals using explosion or fire as a diversionary tactic; and simply people engaging in experiments aimed at satisfying simple curiosity—often resulting in their own death or dismemberment.

Thompson S. Crockett, research director of the IACP and the man instrumental in compiling the study says:

> The public image of the bomber is the radical, the Weatherman, the Black Panther, but that is not the bomber at all. Their notoriety just activates other activities.
>
> It begins with the young, not the radical but the youth with a high level of curiosity. They hear of bombings. They read about how to make bombs in the underground press. They get to exploring. The excitement of explosion leads to experimentation. They move from the experimenting steps in the woods to putting bombs in front of a school.
>
> It's easy to say that that is a socially motivated bombing, but who knows.

Although there has definitely been a marked increase in bombing, according to the NBDC, use of bombs as a weapon of terrorism has been a fact of life in this country for almost a century. Some

of the more famous examples: An anarchist's bomb killed seven police officers in Chicago's Haymarket Square in 1886. Ten persons were killed by a fragmentation device thrown at a San Francisco parade in 1916. A bomb killed 11 persons when it exploded in Milwaukee's Central Police Station in 1917.

And a bomb on Wall Street killed 33 persons and injured 200 during an incident in 1930.

Some interesting facts about modern bombings developed by the center:

California leads all other States in bombings and the Pacific region has more than any other. Last October, for example, California had 25 of the 111 bomb incidents that month in this country.

The bombers were at work in every month, although they increased their attacks from 90 in December of 1970 to 346 the following June.

Bombs are being made from material that can be bought in a neighborhood shopping area to those which are required to be created in a sophisticated laboratory.

Besides information furnished through the underground press, there is a 95-cent book of instructions on the subject available at many bookstands and for those who wish to pursue the subject to the ultimate, there is the "Anarchist's Cookbook," sold at $25 in hardcover and $6 in paperback.

The IACP opened its center in July of 1970 with the LEAA grant. It has about 18 employees, including five expert bomb technicians. The center collects data and the devices themselves; analyzes the information and distributes it to IACP's 8,500 members as well as to the general public.

The information it furnishes is becoming more valuable to authorities daily. At one time, bombings used to be limited almost entirely to cities such as New York, Chicago, Miami, and Montreal—they are still most frequent in cities of more than 250,000 population. However, bombers have achieved more mobility and information collected by the center from one location can help in others.

Recently, you may recall, bombs were found in eight bank safety deposit boxes and a ninth exploded prematurely. Through gathering information from each bank, compiling it swiftly and analyzing it, the center found that:

Each bomb cost $40.27, box rental averaged $6 a year, costs of letters informing news media of the bombs and trips to San Francisco, Chicago and New York raised the total cost of each to roughly $785. Therefore, it was reasonable to assume that the bomber had been rather well financed.

At least one potential tragedy was averted through use of the center's information. A police sergeant in San Francisco read its report on the Omaha incident, remembered what he read and was extremely cautious while leading fellow officers in answer to a similar call. The officers went in through a window. They discovered that the door had been fitted up as a bomb.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover had this to say recently about a new menace to our society, the urban guerrillas, and their use of violence to destroy:

Today's urban guerrilla is a new type of criminal, considerably different from the old-line, traditional hoodlum, thief and robber. His aims are not primarily loot or selfish gain . . . but revolution, that is the overthrow of our democratic institutions.

The power which the urban guerrilla can wield (and an occasions has wielded) is terrifying. An anonymous bomb threat can disrupt industrial production, close down airports, schools and public buildings and disrupt the lives of thousands of citizens. In fact the urban guerrilla, whether he be a New Leftist, Weatherman, a member of the Black Panther Party or the Pro-Maoist Revolutionary Union, or some other extremist from either the right or the left, highlights a basic fact of society which we simply cannot overlook; namely the destructive potential of the fanatical few.

The urban guerrilla is a clear and present danger—not to law enforcement alone, which must directly face his bitter and diabolic violence, but to the entire Nation. If this mentality of extremism continues to grow, the future of our society based on law will be gravely injured.

Mr. Speaker, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has, in this case, funded what I consider a most useful tool in combating the urban guerrilla and others who would disrupt our society through incendiary and explosive bombing.

The danger remains, but at least now we have the facts to become ever more aware and informed of it and perhaps the means to turn aside and blunt the impact of this threat to our society.

If all Federal aid funds were spent as usefully as this particular grant, we would indeed be getting our money's worth.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR NEGOTIATION

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as one who sought over the past several years in my capacity as a legislator to hasten the end of the war in Vietnam; and as one who has constantly supported amendments to relevant legislation which were designed to terminate U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia; and as one who has been called by some a critic of President Nixon's efforts to end the hostilities in Vietnam, I feel it would be less than honest of me not to acknowledge that I am convinced of the President's commitment to end the war. I am convinced that what he proposed last Tuesday, understood and supported by a people united in their commitment to peace, can best and most expeditiously lead us not only to an end of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, but, even more important, to an end to the war itself.

The President's comprehensive plan for negotiation is, I feel, a sound basis for unified support by the American people, and I am pleased that many, like myself, who may have once been critical of the administration's policies in Vietnam in the past, have now put aside their differences and have begun to underscore their areas of agreement with the President.

In this regard, I welcome the opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent articles, written by commentators not often supportive of the administration's policies in Vietnam, which emphasize the necessity of cooperation with the President, in what, I feel, can be a successful framework for negotiations. The first is a column by William Raspberry in the Washington Post of January 31, and the second, the lead article in the New Republic of February 5. I ask unanimous consent that they include them at this point in the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENT'S BLOCKBUSTER

For nearly a decade, through three successive administrations, this journal has repeatedly, bitterly, opposed the policies and practices of our government in Indochina. We condemned the Kennedy administration for opening the door to US military intervention, the Johnson administration for monstrously widening the war, and the Nixon administration for not acting promptly when it first took office to make peace. What was done could not be justified by any moral imperative, specific congressional declaration, treaty obligation, or threat to the national security, and the consequences of our commitment to the survival of a series of "governments" in Saigon have been murderous for the peoples of Indochina, destructive of the good repute of the United States in the world, and subversive of domestic tranquility. That history can't be erased or excused. The most that can be hoped is, in Senator Muskie's words, "a new beginning." That is what the President's proposal of last week promises—the beginning of the end. Mr. Nixon's first step in that direction was his decision to set up a schedule for troop withdrawals. But those bit-by-bit wtihdrawals were primarily a response to growing voter unrest at high American casualties; they dulled the pain at home but did not go to the root of the disease abroad. Moreover, coupled with "Vietnamization," partial disengagement could be read, and was, as signifying merely a tactical shift by the administration, which henceforth would fight the war by proxy: the dead would not be our dead, or at least not so many of them. Now, the President has gone beyond that. For the first time, publicly, he seems to be seeking realistically not only to get foreign troops out, but to set in motion political forces in South Vietnam which may make possible a cease-fire and a settlement of conflicting interests.

Item by item, there is little in the plan that has not been suggested before in some manner. It is the assembling of the items in this particular package, and the conciliatory tone of the whole that are noteworthy. Two key points ought to find favor among non-Communist Vietnamese critics of President Thieu, and in Hanoi and the National Liberation Front. The first is the categorical character of Nixon's offer to pull out. The threat, indeed the seeming inevitability, of a US residual force remaining in Vietnam for an indeterminate period is absent. Hanoi has been intransigent on this point, understandably so; for how, short of surrender, could it tolerate not only America's continuing provision of Hanoi's political enemy, but the support of that enemy by US air and naval power? The President has confronted that objection:

"There will be total withdrawal from South Vietnam of all US forces and other foreign forces allied with the government of South Vietnam within six months of an agreement." The awkward question of how

and when North Vietnamese forces are to pull back is wisely finessed both in the President's proposal and Mr. Kissinger's briefing of newsmen last week. As to whether any future government in South Vietnam might receive US military assistance, the President pledges nothing: obviously there will be no such aid if the then government does not want it—and there may not even be if it does. At any rate, "the political future of South Vietnam," Mr. Nixon says, "will be left for the people of South Vietnam to decide for themselves, free from outside interference." And that leads us to the second key point. Mr. Nixon is prepared to accept something other than the status quo in Saigon. No, he will not "overthrow our ally." But in effect, the President, as we read him, is ready to negotiate. Thieu's exit and a transition toward a more acommodating coalition in Saigon. Thieu's willingness to resign prior to an internationally supervised new election is, as Henry Kissinger observes, "an important political fact." The US, Mr. Nixon says, "will support no candidate and will remain completely neutral in [that] election." The exact composition and effectiveness of the international monitoring he has in mind is a matter for further exploration, and it is vital. Certainly Hanoi will not put its faith in any election controlled by a Thieu apparatus without Thieu. It might, however, discern opportunities in Mr. Nixon's reference to representation in the election of "all political forces in South Vietnam, *including the National Liberation Front.*" (Italics added)

There are two other parts of the package which deserve comment. The first is the recognition that any coming together of the two Vietnams is a matter for the Vietnamese alone to work out. Second, the President through Mr. Kissinger suggests that his six months' timetable for the withdrawal of US and allied forces and the release of all prisoners can be set in motion once "agreement in principle is signed."

In the light of past misdeeds and misrepresentations, we do not blame Hanoi for approaching any such peace initiative with suspicion. And if it finally rejects the plan as a basis for negotiations, the administration would still not be justified in prolonging the war or keeping up the savage bombardment of recent months, which is useless as blackmail and counter-productive if you're trying to get a settlement. Much depends on how specific proposals are interpreted at the bargaining table, and on the general attitude of the negotiators as they work their way through a complex agenda. Nevertheless, the President has produced a blockbuster that just might unblock the impasse in Paris. He is not serving an ultimatum; he offers a compromise to get the United States out, free the prisoners, and make way for new political alignments in South Vietnam. He will consider "alternatives to make it even more flexible." He's on the right track.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1972]

A SICK REACTION TO NIXON

(By William Raspberry)

Two of the three primary reactions to the President's recent revelation of his secret Vietnam negotiations are fairly easy to talk about. They are more or less clearcut and have more or less articulate spokesmen.

First is the reaction of triumph (or chagrin, depending on your point of view) that for the past several months Mr. Nixon was doing precisely what his most respected critics were accusing him of refusing to do: Offering American withdrawal—even by a "certain date"—in exchange for the return of American POWs.

The President's announcement embarrassed those (particularly the Democratic presidential hopefuls among them) who had been demanding just that sort of proposition.

It vindicated those whose faith was that the President really did want to extricate his country from the war and was sparing no effort to do so. In either case, it must be counted a political plus for Mr. Nixon for the time being, although it may blow up in his face between now and November.

The second reaction is that the President's eight-point proposal, whether sincerely offered or not, cannot work—for the simple reason that Hanoi can gain more heavily by not agreeing to anything.

America clearly is getting out of Vietnam without the benefit of negotiation, the argument goes. In light of that irrevocable trend, Hanoi could only lose by entering into serious negotiation. The smart thing from Hanoi's point of view would be to avoid anything drastic—either at the bargaining table or on the battlefield—and simply permit the continuing withdrawal of the American forces.

The first two reactions are essentially practical, and have to do with whether this plan or that can work.

There is a third, more troubling position that is difficult to document because it has no respected spokesman. It is that America does not deserve a graceful exit from the war and must not be permitted to have one.

The American involvement in Vietnam was immoral from the very beginning, the feeling seems to be, and it is immoral for immorality to go unpunished.

It is the same reaction some of us have to "liberal" talk about prison reform or rehabilitation of criminals. It is the same feeling some of us would have had if Hitler had been able to negotiate an honorable end to World War II.

Someone (maybe it was Sam Smith of the D.C. Gazette) once said that the notion of America getting out of Vietnam with honor is like a prostitute getting out of her profession with her virginity intact.

Nor is it a new feeling. Its most blatant manifestation came in the chants of "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, NFL is gonna win" that used to mark the big peace demonstrations.

But it also showed up in some of the reactions to such military initiatives as the Cambodian and Laotian "incursions"; not merely that the initiative couldn't work for this or that military reason, nor even that the initiative amounted to an immoral widening of the war.

Those reactions were there of course. But also there was the feeling—the fear—that these gross actions *might work*, and since their success would be vindication for immorality, they must be opposed.

I suppose it is the psychological equivalent of those sick people who keep finding new ways to fail because they subconsciously feel that they don't deserve success.

But you can treat sick people who insist on punishing themselves. A nation cannot afford to indulge in that sort of self-destruction.

I don't argue with those who say the war was—is—wrong, nor even with those who say a proper comeuppance for our folly might be a good thing.

But it is sick to work at delivering your own comeuppance, and that is what some of those who oppose the war and Richard Nixon's handling of it are proposing.

Extrication from the war—even *without* honor—is going to be difficult enough under any circumstance. The moralistic posturing of self-righteous critics won't make it any easier.

LEAD POISONING AND THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning is a devastating disease, afflicting thousands of young children each year. The striking aspect of this dread illness, however, is that it is totally preventable.

We know how to identify lead poisoning. We know how to treat its victims. And we know how to eliminate its causes. All that has been lacking is the commitment to do so.

For far too long, this Government has closed its eyes to the fate of the thousands of inner-city youngsters who have been subjected to this disease. Therefore, it was encouraging that in his message to the Congress on Environmental Awakening yesterday, the President, recognizing mounting public concern, underscored the desperate need to prevent the unnecessary loss of life and health from the hazard of childhood lead poisoning. Hopefully, now that the President has spoken out, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will allocate the meager $7.5 million which the Congress appropriated for fiscal year 1972 to combat this disease and which is yet to be committed. There must be a national commitment to the eradication of the blight of childhood lead poisoning.

A major stride in that direction would be prompt action on the legislation—H.R. 12466 and companion bills—which I have introduced with 61 cosponsors to broaden the scope of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act and to increase funding under that act to $50 million for fiscal year 1973 and each fiscal year thereafter. Similar legislation (S. 3080) has been introduced in the other body by Senator KENNEDY on behalf of himself and 27 Senators.

It is essential that this country undertake every possible effort to safeguard its children from the hazards of lead poisoning. We know what must be done. Now we must do it.

SENIOR CITIZENS SHOULD NOT BE PENALIZED FOR WORKING—RAISING THE EARNINGS LIMIT FROM $1,680 TO $3,000

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to allow older Americans to earn up to $3,000 a year without any reduction in their social security benefits. This legislation is designed to implement one of the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging.

The present earnings limitation of $1,680 means that many Americans who have reached the age of 65 and are still working cannot collect the social security benefits that they have been contributing to for so long. In my opinion, people should not be penalized for working. At the very least the outside earnings limitation is unrealistically low. It should be raised substantially. H.R. 1 raises the limitation of $1,680 to $2,000 with a $1 reduction in social security benefits for every $2 earned over that, but this, too, is inadequate.

The White House Conference on Aging, held here November 28 to December 2 was attended by 3,400 delegates

and made many suggestions for improving the quality of life of senior citizens. Among these suggestions was a specific recommendation by the section on income that the exempt amount of earnings under the social security retirement test should be increased to $3,000 a year. The National Council of Senior Citizens also endorses this position.

The legislative proposals adopted by the conference were drawn up by older Americans who know firsthand what is needed to assure a decent life for our senior citizens. Of the recommendations made at the 1961 White House Conference, many have been enacted and have proved successful. These include medicare, medicaid, and the Older Americans Act to establish the U.S. Administration on Aging. The resolutions adopted by the 1971 conference delegates should be regarded not as a basis for further study but as a mandate for action. It is a pleasure for me to introduce this bill and thereby forward one of the goals of the Conference on Aging.

Perhaps a time will come when people will be able to live decently and comfortably on social security alone, but today social security benefits are still woefully inadequate. Many older persons want the self-respect and dignity which comes from supporting themselves and not living off others. How can we in good conscience take away half of man's social security check because he does some part-time work to keep his rent paid and some clothes on his back? A substantial across-the-board increase in social security benefits is needed, but until a decent minimum retirement income is established, senior citizens should be given the chance to help themselves.

Much of the wages earned by individuals past the age of 65 is derived from part-time, temporary, or seasonal employment. In so many cases it enables an older couple getting by on a subsistence level social security income to live a little more comfortably. Raising the earning limitation or the retirement test, as it is also known, will permit people to better supplement their retirement income with at least part-time work without giving up social security benefits.

Under the present law, individuals earning over $1,680 lose $1 of social security benefits for every $2 they earn up to $2,880 and a dollar for every dollar earned over that. My bill raises the limitation to $3,000 with a $1 reduction for every two earned up to $4,200 and a dollar-for-dollar reduction over that.

In my opinion it is imperative that the Congress act expeditiously on this measure and the other proposals of the White House conference that would make economic security a reality for our senior citizens.

WE SHOULD BUY AMERICA

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed to learn today that one of my distinguished colleagues in the House was dining in the House restaurant and happened to look at the label on one of the new napkins provided by that establishment. The label read "100% Cotton, Made in Hong Kong."

Mr. Speaker, this House has gone on record as favoring legislation to regulate textile imports in order to protect our domestic textile industry and the jobs of American textile workers. This House has also bemoaned at length the decline in balance of payments and the trade deficit of this country. We now find that the House of Representatives itself is contributing to this unfortunate situation by its purchases of napkins from abroad.

I, for one, would rather see paper napkins used in the House of Representatives restaurant than napkins which are "100% Cotton, Made in Hong Kong."

THE DEATH OF THE GREAT LAKES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are being poisoned. Slowly but surely, they are dying off—losing their oxygen and their vitality—and slowly but surely, the quality of life for the people who live around them is deteriorating. Together the five lakes cover 95,000 square miles, comprising an area often described as the world's largest body of "fresh" water. Today, at least part of that description is no longer accurate. Every year, more beaches are closed because there is too much bacteria in the water. Every month, the water is stained and fouled with new pollutants and sewage and, every day, the lakes yield a bit more to the pollution of progress. Lake Erie already is a dead sea where there is no recreation, no fishing, and virtually no life—except perhaps for the scavenger fish, the sludge worms and the algae which seem to thrive on the municipal and industrial waste. Lake Michigan and Lake Ontario are not far behind.

The last few years have seen the beginning of a new national awareness on the problems of the environment. But despite that, the Great Lakes have lost ground in their struggle with the pollution of man and industry, because every hour another billion gallons of waste is dumped into them. Every one of the Great Lakes is more polluted today than it was 5 years ago. It is almost futile to discuss "progress" in the fight against pollution—we have not even been able to keep up with it. As a nation, we still are spending more time and money polluting the Great Lakes than we are spending to revitalize them. It is simply a losing battle.

On February 8, 1971—almost precisely 1 year ago today—the President sent Congress a message on the environment. In it, he outlined a sweeping program that covered water pollution, air pollution, the recycling of wastes, pesticides, and national parks. The President emphasized that sacrifices would have to be made to meet the national commitment to saving the environment because, he said:

> As we strive to expand our national effort, we must also keep in mind the greater cost of not pressing ahead.

The battle for a better environment can be won, the President said, "and we are winning it." Now, 1 year after that Presidential message, there is evidence that we are not trying to expand our national effort, evidence that we are not winning the battle for a better environment, evidence that the Great Lakes and all of us are the losers.

It is a sad and troubling story. The Environmental Protection Agency recently asked the administration for $141.3 million to support a proposal which assigned "national priority" to the fight against pollution in the Great Lakes. It was a comprehensive proposal—bold and innovative with a clear-cut goal and a good chance of meeting it—but the Office of Management and Budget rejected the request and the proposal. With a national budget of $246.3 billion, and a deficit of more than $25 billion, it seemed that $141 million to fight pollution in the Great Lakes was too much a fiscal burden for the country to bear. As a result, the battle against pollution will continue to be a losing battle.

I am not alone in my concern over the administration's failure to provide the money. Only last weekend, the distinguished Senator from Michigan and assistant minority leader ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, wrote the director of OMB urging the administration to adopt EPA's proposal for the Great Lakes. Senator GRIFFIN said he was aware of the problems with the budget but, he went on—

> I believe it is vital to at least begin action this year.

Senator GRIFFIN also said he hoped the President would include a comprehensive Great Lakes program in his new environmental message. That message was delivered to Congress yesterday. It contained a great many ideas and proposals, but there was not a single word about the Great Lakes.

One year ago, in his environmental report to Congress, the President said:

> We have the technology to deal with most forms of water pollution. We must make sure it is used.

Somehow, that desire—that promise of commitment—lost its way in the last 12 months. We are not making sure the anti-pollution technology is being used in the Great Lakes, and I am afraid that the results of the gap between promise and performance will become clear in the next 5 or 10 years. By then, Lake Michigan and Lake Ontario may have joined Lake Erie on the list of dead seas, and Lake Erie will not be the only body of "fresh" water in this country which has, in the words of the EPA report:

> A mat of algae two feet thick and a few hundred square miles in extent that floats in the middle of the lake in mid-summer.

That is the prospect for the other four Great Lakes, and I simply cannot understand the refusal of this administration to set aside $141 million to help save them. The 30 million people who live in the Great Lakes Basin are going to find it difficult to understand too. They

realize that when the quality of the environment—and the quality of their lives—is at stake, $141 million is only the minimum amount necessary, especially compared with a national budget that comes close to one quarter of a trillion dollars. It is like refusing to spend 6 cents after just spending $100. That extra $141 million would only have increased the total budget for natural resources and environmental programs by 2 percent. It is not the item that would have bankrupted the Republic.

It all comes down to a matter of priorities—in short, what comes first, what things does this country value the most. The failure of the administration to allocate $141 million to fight Great Lakes pollution is even more disturbing when compared with other budget items in the same price range; $141 million is less than this country is going to spend just doing the research on the proposed space shuttle; $141 million is less than the cost of the new B–1 jet bomber, and this country spends $141 million every 3 days to fight the war in Southeast Asia. No one disputes the need to spend part of the national budget on defense. But it is rather ironic that this country can afford to spend so much on military defense yet spend so little on ecological defense—to fight a very real, very dangerous enemy that threatens our very well-being. That enemy is pollution, and it does not take an environmental expert to understand its threat—especially to the Great Lakes.

The EPA realizes the danger. It realizes that Lake Michigan and Lake Ontario will not die suddenly. Rather, it will be death from a long and lingering illness, an illness that might have been cured had it not been for the indifference and inactivity of people and government. In its report to the President which justified the $141 million request, the agency pointed out that many communities and industries in the Great Lakes region are not meeting the deadlines for improved water quality, and EPA criticized the piecemeal approach to the problem of municipal and industrial waste which is doing more harm than good.

To regain the initiative, the EPA report suggested "special attention" be given 12 specific areas in the Great Lakes region "to demonstrate positive cleanup results." At one point in the 34-page document, the EPA summarized its conclusions, emphasizing that the $141 million program could make real progress in the fight against Great Lakes pollution. It said:

> Most of the actions called for under this proposal will be required in any event, to implement pending water pollution legislation. The difference lies in focusing priority, manpower, and management attention on the Great Lakes to assure better and quicker results. In doing so, we will be demonstrating a positive Administrative initiative, rather than allowing our actions to be dictated by events. We will also be demonstrating a positive and sensible strategy for implementing the pending water pollution legislation.

This is the proposal, the program and the reasoning that the administration rejected. This is the proposal it found too costly. In the long run, rejecting it will prove even more costly.

The Office of Management and Budget said it turned down the request from EPA because the projected deficit in the budget would not allow the commitment of funds over many years to separate local sanitary and storm sewer systems. In most areas, the systems are combined, and the combination generates a great deal of pollution, dumping untreated sewage into the lakes after a heavy rain. The total cost of controlling this would be between $8 and $13 billion—certainly a substantial amount even spread over many years. This is what OMB used as an excuse to turn down the request, and it was nothing more than an excuse. EPA did not ask for $8 billion. The agency did ask for $141 million to begin a creative and concrete program to stop pollution in the Great Lakes. The request was turned down.

We are not talking about a Democratic cause here, or a Republican cause. Every person in this country must have an interest in this because every person in this country owns a small part of its natural resources. No one has a right to foul the air or pollute the water because they belong to all of us. One out of every seven Americans lives in the Great Lakes Basin, and they depend on the lakes—not just for recreation—but for the water they drink. The poisoning of the Great Lakes then is nothing less than a national tragedy, and we are not doing very much to stop it. With the magnitude of the problem as great as it is, there is more than enough blame to go around—blame for the individuals who throw trash in the lake, blame for the industries that dump billions of gallons of waste and noxious chemicals into the lake, and blame for the local, State, and Federal Governments that watch it all happen.

I am not quite sure where we stand now. Many of us are troubled and disappointed by the administration's failure to approve the funds. Saving the Great Lakes is no "pork barrel" political project. Rather, it is an urgent national problem that deserves a national priority. These proposals were not offered by ignorant people without benefit of research and experience. Rather, they came from the Environmental Protection Agency—one of the most innovative and productive agencies in the Federal Government. When one considers what is at stake here, it is almost incredible that the administration would ignore the advice of its own environmental experts—that the administration would ignore the threat to the health of the Great Lakes and the people who live near them.

I have a particular interest in the Great Lakes. My home is perhaps half a mile from Lake Michigan, and I represent half a million people who can use the Lake and its shoreline for recreation and pleasure. They can see the handwriting on the wall. Almost every week, there is a new threat to the Lake—another proposal to build an airport in it, another report on how the bacteria count has risen, another announcement that beaches will have to be closed, another decision not to fight pollution. Already, the pesticide levels in Lake Michigan are the highest in any of the Great Lakes, and the EPA report noted another danger. The flushing action and currents, the natural antipollution process, present in all "fresh" water bodies are very slow in Lake Michigan, requiring about 100 years compared with 3 years for Lake Erie. There is a very real concern among the people about the future of Lake Michigan. Many parents remember swimming there, and now they are afraid their children will never have that opportunity. The value of Lake Michigan, the value of all the Great Lakes, cannot be measured. It is certainly more than $141 million.

The most telling characteristic of the Nixon administration has been the gap between words and action, between promises and performance. The President himself told the country early in his term, "Watch what I do, not what I say."

Nowhere is the gap between what is said and what is done larger than in the area of environmental protection. The recent Presidential message on environment is the latest move in a public relations game which the White House is playing in hopes of masking the lack of any serious commitment to environmental protection in the only place where commitments really count—the national budget.

Let the White House know that the Nation is taking the President's earlier advice to heart—we are watching what the administration is doing, and what it is not doing. We are ignoring the rhetoric of environmental messages which are not backed up with money.

Budgets do not lie. When all is said and done, it is the national budget which calls the country to judgment, for there is no explaining away the ranking of priorities it reveals.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1973 contains less funds for environmental programs than last year's budget, and less even than the year before that. In terms of the percentage of the entire budget which is devoted to environmental concerns, the fiscal 1973 budget is the lowest in 4 years—a mere 1 percent.

The people of the Great Lakes region cannot swim in a sea of words. They will not be content fishing in their polluted lakes for words instead of fish. Most importantly, they cannot drink the rhetoric of the President. Environmental messages are no substitute for environmental action. The message which comes clearly through is that there will be no action this year to restore life to the dying Great Lakes.

The algae can rest easy for another year, courtesy of the Nixon administration.

I would like to quote once more from the President's 1971 environmental message. He said:

> As our Nation comes to grips with our environmental problems, we will find that difficult choices have to be made, that substantial costs have to be met, and that sacrifices have to be made. Environmental quality cannot be achieved cheaply or easily. But, I believe the American people are ready to do what is necessary.

The question today is not whether the American people are ready to do what

is necessary—but whether this administration is ready to do what is necessary. There has been a great deal of rhetoric about difficult choices and hard sacrifices. The words have not been followed by action. One thing is certain: If we are not willing to make those choices and sacrifices now—if we are not willing to provide $141 million to start saving the Great Lakes—then it will not make any difference what we are willing to do 10 years from now.

Reporter Tom Littlewood of the Chicago Sun-Times has done a series of articles on the EPA request and the problems generated by OMB's refusal to grant it. I would like to insert the complete text of the articles in the RECORD, along with an article that appeared in today's Christian Science Monitor which details the inability of the Nixon administration to match its rhetoric with action in the environmental field:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 19, 1972]

FUNDING TO CLEAN UP GREAT LAKES DENIED

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—A recommendation by Environmental Protection Agency Administrator William D. Ruckelshaus that funds be allocated for a crash program to clean up the Great Lakes has been rejected by White House budget officials, it was learned Tuesday.

Ruckelshaus had ordered a cost and feasibility study by his agency of a massive concentrated effort to reverse the contamination of Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes.

EPA then forwarded a proposal to President Nixon's Office of Management and Budget calling for an expenditure in the next fiscal year of at least $112 million.

The program would have focused special attention on grants for improved municipal sewage treatment and for the elimination of industrial pollution. Ruckelshaus suggested that the project would dramatize the necessity of saving the other lakes from the desperate condition that has already befallen Lake Erie.

Other officials in the agency reasoned that the program would have appeal in Midwestern industrial states that are important to Mr. Nixon's re-election prospects. The administration will be engaged in the House in an attempt to trim the $20 billion long-range water pollution bill that passed the Senate last year under the sponsorship of Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.).

But EPA sources reported Tuesday that the President's budget office would not approve the request because of the large deficit facing the 1972–73 budget.

Mr. Nixon's budget for the fiscal year beginning in July went to the printer Tuesday and will be presented to Congress next Monday.

The White House disclosed, meanwhile, that his written State-of-the-Union message will be much longer than the half-hour televised speech before Congress on Thursday. Mr. Nixon's speech at the Capitol will be a condensed version of a lengthy and much more detailed document dealing with pollution control and many other problems.

Traditionally, the election year State of the Union address by a President seeking re-election serves as the platform of the party in power. And that apparently is to be the case this year, with the shorter form aimed more at the home television audience than at members of Congress.

The official message will be a recital of the unfinished business before the House and Senate, as the administration sees it, plus whatever pre-election additions the President cares to make in his legislative program.

Thursday's address from the chamber of the House of Representatives will be televised live beginning at 11:30 a.m. Chicago time.

According to the information furnished reporters, Mr. Nixon has been devoting more than the customary attention to the preparation of the dual presentations. Ronald L. Ziegler, the presidential press secretary, said the chief Executive was working Tuesday on the eighth draft of the message.

Thursday's message will deal with foreign policy only in general terms, Ziegler explained, with a more detailed report on that subject planned for Feb. 8.

Besides revenue sharing, welfare reform and government reorganization—the unfilled ingredients of his previous program—Mr. Nixon is expected to treat in some fashion Thursday the pressing social issues: desegregation of schools, school finance, suburban integration, drug addiction and health insurance.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 6, 1972]

POLLUTION WORSENING IN GREAT LAKES: EPA

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—The battle to turn back the worsening pollution of the Great Lakes is being lost, the Environmental Protection Agency has warned.

In a request for funds to assign special priority this year to an accelerated and systematic attack on the growing contamination of the Great Lakes, the federal agency reported that:

(1) Many communities and industries are lagging well behind established deadlines for compliance with clean water standards. Permits specifying precise waste discharge limits have yet to be issued for industries.

(2) A piecemeal approach to the problem of controlling municipal and industrial wastes had "impeded achievement" of clean water objectives in metropolitan areas.

(3) A three-year program by the Army Corps of Engineers to find an alternative to open-lake dumping of polluted harbor dredging spoils is behind schedule. The main reasons are that cities are not following the implementation plans and have generally been unwilling to commit the 25 per cent nonfederal share of the cost of constructing diked disposal areas on land.

(4) A positive program is needed to attack the problems of agricultural runoff and sedimentation. The existing soil conservation and rural environmental protection programs provide financial assistance but "are not focused on critical problem areas."

(5) Less than half of 1 per cent of the region's labor force would be displaced if industries were required to carry out pollution abatement procedures. This would probably be offset by employment in pollution abatement industries.

EPA's report on the Great Lakes was presented last month to the Office of Management and Budget, the President's budget-screening agency, to justify a request for $141.3 million for the accelerated program.

However, OMB rejected the proposal and the budget sent to Congress by President Nixon Jan. 24 did not include funds for the proposed national priority program. A copy of the report was obtained later by Rep. Abner J. Mikva (D–Ill.).

William D. Ruckelshaus, administrator of EPA, said in an interview later that he was satisfied OMB had withheld its approval for a legitimate reason: namely, the huge projected deficit in the federal budget would not allow the federal government to commit construction funds over many years for the enormously costly separation of local sanitary and storm systems.

He said he thought the solution to the overflow problem would have to be some method of stormwater retention less expensive than separation of the sewer systems.

It was estimated in EPA's report that the cost of controlling sewer overflows into the Great Lakes would range between $8 billion and $13 billion, depending on the methods used. Few cities have any plans to prevent sewage from entering the lakes along with stormwater overflows. Existing regulatory requirements generally call for control of combined sewer overflows by 1977.

The agency's preliminary budget proposal asked for $100 million to fund "a limited number of individual high payoff construction projects . . . demonstrating how (the problem can be handled) in the most logical and cost-effective way." The water pollution control legislation that has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House would authorize grants for dealing with the problem of combined sewer overflows.

"Some positive address to this problem is a necessary elemen. of the program," the report stated, pointing out that the overflows significantly affect recreational use and public water supplies in the Great Lakes.

By focusing enforcement attention and financial assistance on 12 selected "special attention areas" in the Great Lakes region, the proposal by Ruckelshaus' agency was "designed to overcome lagging compliance and to demonstrate positive clean-up results."

In the interview Ruckelshaus added he believes that the pollution-control movement needs a vivid success story that would demonstrate how dirty water can be cleaned up by concentrating attention and resources. He said OMB and the White House might approve the plan at a later date after the pending legislation has clarified what Congress wants done about the combined sewer systems.

Two other special-attention targets were in Lake Michigan, where the report said pesticide levels in fish already are the highest in the Great Lakes.

One would have been the Calumet area at the southern tip of the lake, where municipal and industrial discharges were said to be in excess of 3,500 million gallons daily, and where the discharge of detergents and other phosphorus compounds is a growing problem.

The other would have been the Fox River and the southern tip of Green Bay in Wisconsin, where pulp and paper mill wastes are among the most serious industrial problems.

EPA warned in the report that "any serious build-up of pollution in Lake Michigan will be slow to reverse because of the very slow currents and flushing action (100 years in contrast to Lake Erie's three years).

The report repeated the warning that "the zone of zero oxygen is spreading in Lake Erie, bringing the threat that eutrophication (absence of oxygen in the lower levels) will soon become self-sustaining unless adequate phosphorus reduction programs can be implemented."

It is possible to slow and perhaps turn back the eutrophication process by reducing phosphorus discharges. Explained EPA: "With earlier funding of some needed facilities, more assistance during construction and installation and closer surveillance of operation and maintenance over the next few years, many tons of phosphorus can be prevented from reaching the lakes or their tributaries."

Present regulations call for treatment to remove 80 to 90 per cent of the detergents from municipal and industrial treatment plants. The Fox River carries 2.5 million pounds of phosphorus compounds into Green Bay each year, most of it from municipal sewage treatment plant discharges.

Part of the accelerated program proposal was for additional federal personnel in Chicago and the other midwestern regional offices of EPA.

Federal authority would be "applied systematically to secure areawide cleanup of municipal and industrial waste sources," the report explained, aimed at securing "a greater degree of co-ordination and follow-up of both regulatory and assistance actions to assure that established requirements are met. Current regulatory programs in the Great Lakes call for communities to proceed faster than federal grant monies have been allocated to the states."

For better control of agricultural runoff, EPA recommended funds for the creation of a Great Lakes conservation district, similar to the existing Great Plains conservation district, and for a river basin demonstration project.

The Maumee River, for example, which was selected as a special attention area at Lake Erie, is heavily polluted its entire length, the report said, from its source in Fort Wayne, Ind., to its mouth in Toledo. EPA reported that the river passes on more than 4 million pounds of phosphorus and 2 million tons of silt into the lake annually.

(Agriculture Sec. Earl L. Butz boasted recently that a half-billion dollars of previously unavailable federal funds had been released by OMB, including $55.5 million of rural environmental protection funds that had been held back. He said the decision had been "cyclical," indicating the administration's interest in pouring money into the farm economy as the presidential election draws closer. The environmental money is for programs that EPA described in the report to OMB as "not focused on critical problem areas" from its point of view.)

Although EPA predicted the major economic impact of strict pollution abatement in the Great Lakes would be limited mainly to older and smaller firms, the agency recommended that plans be made for a program of assistance to impacted industries. Suggested were business and technical assistance to development of the cheapest methods of pollution control; re-employment and relocation assistance to displaced workers, and programs to identify firms and areas that are likely to be hurt.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 7, 1972]

FAILURE TO BUDGET FUNDS SLOWS LAKE CLEANUP TALKS

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's decision to defer budgeting of funds for an accelerated program to clean up the Great Lakes has complicated negotiations with Canada leading to an already overdue water-pollution-control agreement between the two governments.

Discussions that started in the spring of 1970 dragged on past the originally agreed upon deadline of the end of 1971. And now U.S. officials are anxious to have the Great Lakes agreement concluded so Mr. Nixon can sign it on his planned visit to Canada this spring.

Canadian representatives contend that the bulk of the contamination originates on the more populated and industrialized U.S. side of the lakes, and that the Americans are lagging in their enforcement of water cleanliness regulations.

That was one of the reasons given by the federal Environmental Protection Agency for requesting $141.3 million this year for accelerated and systematic attack on pollution in 12 "special attention areas."

FUNDS NOT APPROVED

However, the President's Office of Management and Budget failed to approve the program for inclusion in the federal budget for the new fiscal year.

A report prepared by EPA noted that many communities and industries were not meeting established deadlines for controlling discharges that are contaminating the lakes.

The current "piecemeal approach" to the problem "calls for communities to proceed faster than federal grant monies have been allocated to the states," the report said.

Lake Erie is the most polluted of the Great Lakes, according to the federal agency, followed by Lake Ontario and Lake Michigan.

"Positive programs" will be needed to control eutrophication (lack of oxygen) caused by discharges of phosphorus compounds; combined sewer system overflows; the disposal of polluted harbor dredging spoils; the problems of agricultural runoff and sedimentation; and possibly to offset economic disruptions to industries stemming from regulatory action, EPA warned.

PROPOSED PACT

An earlier draft of the U.S.-Canadian agreement on the Great Lakes provided for compatible water-quality objectives. The compatible regulations would cover phosphorus, oil and thermal (heated) discharges, plus joint regulations for disposal of dredging spoils and vessel wastes, and joint oil-spill-contingency plans.

The International Joint Commission, which now has jurisdiction over the border waters separating the two nations, would have an independent surveillance function. Thus, the Canadian members could lodge complaint if they believed the agreed-upon rules were being violated.

RHETORIC OUTSTRIPS POLLUTION-CONTROL PACE

(By Peter C. Stuart)

"A cause as fundamental as life itself" (1970).

"Together we hold this good earth in trust" (1971).

"Our destiny is one" (1972).

The language has never lacked inspiration, but President Nixon's three annual environmental messages and budgets—the latest message issued Feb. 8—suggest the painful slowness of restoring a polluted nation.

The 1972 message proposes 18 separate initiatives, mostly nuts-and-bolts items: curbing muddy runoff from construction sites, controlling on-land dumping of poisons, writing tax incentives to protect wetlands from development.

But a glance at the record of the preceding three years tempers expectations. Mr. Nixon impatiently urges that the nation "move on from intention to accomplishment."

PROPOSALS BOTTLENECKED

The environmental "intentions" of the three annual messages, add up to 75 major initiatives. Less than 20 of them have matured into "accomplishments."

Congress has bottlenecked many proposals, such as the clean-water program which has occupied lawmakers since the President's very first environmental message.

But the White House itself may share some responsibility. Mr. Nixon proposed a tax on sulfur oxide (a dangerous contaminant discharged from many factory smokestacks) in his message one year ago, but did not draft legislation until now. The new tax would begin in 1976.

The dollars-and-cents side of the federal environmental commitment appeared 10 days earlier—underscoring, for many, Washington's measured pace.

In its budget for the coming fiscal year, the Nixon administration proposes an environmental outlay smaller than any in the preceding three years:

[In billions of dollars]

1970	2.48
1971	2.72
1972	4.38
1973	2.45

SLIMMER RATIO NOTED

Environmental activities in fiscal 1973 also would consume the slimmest percentage of a federal budget in four years:

[In percent]

1970	1.3
1971	1.2
1972	1.9
1973	1.0

The largest single item in the outlay for natural resources and environment—pollution control and abatement—increases moderately over last year, from $1.19 billion to $1.54 billion (more than doubling in two years).

But this doesn't deter one disappointed environmental group, the Sierra Club, from charging that the budget "holds the line on environmental protection while escalating amounts going toward 'pork-barrel projects'" (a reference to healthy increases in some public-works items).

Of the 18 initiatives in the President's environmental message, the sulfur-oxide tax may be most significant—and most controversial.

A phase out of high-sulfur coal and oil fuels is intended to protect Americans' health, trees and shrubs, even house paint. But consumers may wind up helping pay the tax (10 to 15 cents a pound of sulfur) in higher prices. The power industry probably would be hit hardest, as well as refiners and smelters.

OTHER CONTROLS PLANNED

Other proposals would clamp new environmental controls on builders and land developers:

"Economic disincentives" would be written into six laws to steer developers away from the nation's fast-dwindling wetlands. Russell E. Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, told newsmen these areas are "ecologically fragile and under the most development pressure" of all U.S. lands.

Federal guidelines would seek to control sediment from construction activities. Mr. Nixon calls sediment "the most pervasive water-pollution problem" outside of municipal sewage and industrial discharges. But action on the largest source of unnatural sedimentation—agriculture, especially feedlots—is postponed.

States would be not-so-gently prodded to control the location of highways and airports as part of an environmentally aware land-use plan. Failure to comply by 1975 could cost a state 7 cents of its coveted federal aid for roads, airports, and conservation.

The President also proposes 19 new federal wilderness sanctuaries, encompassing 1.3 million acres, and orders an end to poisoning predators (mostly coyotes) on the public lands.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT GOVERNMENTS PETITIONS THE PRESIDENT TO SUPPORT THE CAUSE OF SOVIET JEWS

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with a group of representatives of the National Conference of Campus Action for Soviet Jewry. This group of college students was formed last December at the convention of the National Association of Student Governments, held at Loyola University in Chicago.

The delegates to that conference consisted of student government presidents, vice presidents, and student senators from almost every major campus in the United States.

The delegates reflected the entire panoply of ethnic and religious backgrounds which are found in our country, and they came from denominational schools of all

kinds, in addition to nondenominational colleges.

It was not out of parochial concern that 1,870 delegates to that convention of student government representatives signed their names to petitions addressed to Premier Kosygin, calling on him to honor the provision of his nation's constitution respecting freedom of religion.

Those petitions have been sent to President Nixon, in the hope that he will convey them to Mr. Kosygin during his trip to the Soviet Union, and that the President will bring to bear the influence of his office in support of religious freedom for the Jewish people of the Soviet Union.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the students involved for their unselfish efforts to bring relief to the oppressed Jews of the Soviet Union, and I join them in their plea to the President that this be made a part of the agenda of matters to be discussed during his forthcoming good will trip to Moscow.

To give my colleagues a better idea of the breadth and depth of concern among college students for the plight of Soviet Jews, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter to Mr. Kosygin which accompanies the petitions. It contains a listing of more than 60 colleges and universities in the United States whose delegates signed the petition. The letter follows:

DEAR MR. KOSYGIN: These petitions contain the names of 1,870 delegates to the 1971 National Association of Student Government's convention, held at Loyola University of Chicago last December 3–5.

The delegates consisted of student government presidents, vice-presidents, and various student senators from most every major campus across the United States.

Various interest groups, ranging from the National Student Lobby to Concerned Clergy and Laymen, are also contained in the petitions.

The widespread representation of these petitions shows the vast extent of student concern for the plight of Soviet Jewry and other Soviet minorities.

A partial list of universities and colleges represented follows:

U. of Alaska, American U., Auburn U., Barnard College, Boston U., U. of California at Santa Cruz, U. of Chicago.

Columbia U., U. of Detroit, U. of Florida, Fordham U., Georgetown U., Georgia Tech U., George Washington U.

Grinnel College, Harvard U., U. of Illinois, Illinois Institute of Technology, Indiana State U., Indiana U., U. of Iowa.

Johns Hopkins U., U. of Kansas, Kent State U., Knox College, Loyola U. of Chicago, Marquette U., U. of Maryland, U. of Massachusetts.

U. of Michigan, Michigan State U., U. of Minnesota, U. of Missouri, Montana State U., U. of Nebraska, U. of New Mexico, U. of North Carolina, U. of North Dakota.

Northwestern U., Notre Dame U., Oberlin College, Ohio State U., Ohio U., Penn State U., Princeton U., Purdue U.

U. of Rhode Island, U. of South Carolina, U. of Southern California, Southern Methodist U., Stanford U., U. of Tennessee, U. of Texas, U. of Toronto.

U. of California at Los Angeles, U. of Utah, Vanderbilt U., Vassar College, Villanova U., William and Mary College, U. of Wisconsin, Yale U.

In addition to the above well-known schools, numerous smaller and less prominent universities and colleges from across the country are represented in the petitions.

The names contained in these petitions are not representative of one interest group or one ethnic community. But of hundreds of college level student government leaders with varied backgrounds and beliefs. But on the question of oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union, their convictions are unanimously alike. We urge you to consider their opinions.

Respectfully Yours,

DAN TRACY,
Vice-President, Loyola Student Government Association, Loyola University of Chicago.

LEX GREEN: A STUDY IN PUBLIC SERVICE

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Calvin Coolidge was President of these United States when a young man named R. A.—Lex—Green came to Congress.

One of those young men who are elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, he was to serve for 20 years. In that time he lived through the great depression and the challenging period of World War II. He knew the great and near-great in this period in American history—as a matter of fact, he was very much a part of it.

Lex Green was known for his oratory and colorful dress. He was a great campaigner in a day gone by where the candidate made those personal contacts and speeches on the corner.

I rise today to wish this fine gentleman very best wishes as he approaches another milestone—his 80th birthday is tomorrow.

His has been a great life.

Few men are privileged to have known such success, to have the honors which have been bestowed upon him, and then have the time to sit back and reflect after a quarter of a century on the results of the actions taken in that time.

He has been blessed with a fine family, and not too long ago I was privileged to have the opportunity to welcome my predecessor and friend in my office. Today, at 80, he is still of keen mind and famous wit.

The Gainesville Sun of January 30, printed an excellent tribute by Sam McGarvey to Lex Green which I saved for today. I know that I speak for those Members here who knew him in wishing him a happy birthday and our very best wishes for many more years of good health and happiness.

The article follows:

TRIBUTE TO LEX GREEN

(By Sam McGarvey)

STARKE.—With his 80th birthday coming up Feb. 10, former congressman R. A. "Lex" Green is still keeping up his law practice here and attending to his other business interests.

During the course of his career, which started in 1908 when he passed an examination to become a teacher, he served for many years in the education field and later was elected Bradford County judge, state legislator from the county, and congressman from the Second District.

And down through the political years, his flowing Windsor tie has been his badge of office, and he has been noted for unfailing courtesy extended to friends and foes alike.

But his story can best be told in chronological order.

He was born Feb. 10, 1892, three miles southwest of Lake Butler, son of William Henry and Emma Andreu Green. His great-grandfather fought in the Seminole Indian Wars and was given a grant of 40 acres, located on Madison Street in Starke, about a half-mile west of the old Bradford County courthouse.

His family moved east of New River when Lex was only two, and he attended schools in the New River area and later enrolled at Bradford High School. After graduation, he took and passed a teacher examination test when he was 16.

Young Lex taught school then at Rosier, Rising, Long Bridge, Little Springs (Worthington), Brooker and Webster in Sumter County. He attended the University of Florida, and in 1916 was graduated with a bachelor's degree in education. (He earned the degree in two and a half years.)

Green then taught at Hampton, Raiford and Lake Butler and later served as principal at Live Oak and at Brooksville.

In 1913, young Lex had served as a messenger in the House of Representatives in Tallahassee and in 1915 was appointed as assistant clerk of the House. In 1917, he was made clerk.

With that background, Green ran for state representative from Bradford County and was elected to that office in 1918. During that term, Green said he introduced a bill, later passed, which became Florida's first law on compulsory school attendance. He said he also was instrumental in getting the state to furnish free cholera vaccine to farmers.

In 1920, Green was elected county judge and that year went north and took a special course in law at Yale University.

And in 1921, he took an examination on law and was admitted as a member of the Florida Bar. (Last June he was honored as a 50-year member of the organization.)

Three years later, Green ran for Congress from the Second District and was elected. He served for 18 years from this district, and an additional two years when, in 1942, he was elected as a congressman-at-large.

In reviewing his term in Congress, Green said he worked hard on getting the cross-state canal project launched in 1942, and that he took part in getting the Naval Air Station located at Jacksonville, as well as two shipyards.

Another project he was instrumental in getting through, he said, was the location of an Army training station at what is now Camp Blanding. He said he worked with the site selection committee on it and that when the site near Starke was chosen, it resulted in employment opportunities for many persons in this area.

In recalling past events, Green said with a twinkle in his eye, "I thought that in 1944 the time was right for me to run for governor, but it wasn't."

He referred to the gubernatorial race in that year when there were six candidates, and he finished second by a margin of only one per cent behind Millard F. Caldwell to get into a run-off.

Green lost that bid for the highest office in the state, and as matters turned out, he was fated to lose subsequent contests, in which he ran for U.S. Senate and a seat on the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, as well as a race for Bradford County judge.

Getting back to 1944, Green was accepted for service in the Navy, due, he said, to the fact that the Navy was then very liberal in their tests. He served as a lieutenant commander, attached to the 14th Naval District and was stationed for about a year in Pearl Harbor as a legal assistance officer.

On returning home, he set up his law

practice here and took on a motor car dealership. And, as mentioned, he took several more cracks at political offices.

In that connection, he has served as county- and state-member of the Executive Democratic Committee and has taken an active interest in the welfare of his party.

On the personal side, Green married Bessie Lucille Harris of Gainesville in 1935 and they have four children. They are: R. A. "Buzzy" Green, public defender of the 8th Judicial Circuit; Mrs. Curtis (Sandra Lucille) Sanders of Starke; William Harris Green of Washington, D.C., who has a doctorate in chemistry; and Michael Andreau Green of Starke.

Green said that he donated the land on which the Bradford County Health Clinic is located, and that he also gave a part of the land used as a site for the First Baptist Church.

As to hobbies, he said he used to hunt and fish but has had to give up those activities. Today, he said, he reads a lot and spends time looking at television.

When questioned on the proposed judicial amendment coming up for a vote on Mar. 14, he said he has mixed feelings on it but will vote for it nevertheless.

When talking politics around here, whenever the subject of Lex Green comes up, one of the speakers will invariably refer to one thing.

"The thing I think helped Lex get elected so many times," the speaker will say, "is that at every fish fry or political rally, old Lex had the ability to seek out the country folks and greet each by name, and how he ever did it is beyond me."

In any event, his many friends will be saying happy birthday to Lex Green when his 80th anniversary rolls around in a few days.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, today Robert Alexis Green is 80—and still active. This is not surprising. Lex Green has throughout his life been a vigorous and active individual, a man of vision, and a man to inspire a strong following.

Mr. Green was a senior Congressman when I came to the House in 1941. At that time in the Florida House Delegation there were five Members. Now there are 12 and next year there will be 15. Thirty-one years later, amazingly, all of the five survived except one—Pat Cannon of Miami. The other Members were J. Hardin Peterson of Lakeland and Joe Hendricks of DeLand. I learned from all of them. Each was a leader in his own way. But Lex Green among other accomplishments was a polished speaker whose style was highly impressive to me.

He possessed other characteristics which I appreciated. He was colorful, but he was also the kindliest of individuals and he was always helpful to a young Congressman trying to find his way about in the complicated maze of government. I used his stories, and now and then I ressurect one and get additional mileage from it. And it was Lex who cautioned me always to be just a little late at meetings. That is when your presence will be appreciated most. Lex said:

Don't go too soon. You will be in the way and they won't know what to do with you. If you go to late, they will fall out with you.

And maybe I should not tell it, but Lex also cautioned me:

Don't finish a project too soon. Let the people know what you are doing for them.

Yes, Lex was a colorful leader in the House. He represented an era, a good era when an officeholder maintained close contact with his people and knew them by their first names and enjoyed their trust because he was one of them. Passing times have changed that concept of public trust, and Lex Green lives on with memories of another age, but with the same abiding faith in America, to which he contributed so much.

I join my colleagues in extending best wishes to Lex, to his beloved wife, Lucille, and to all his family.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) and the distinguished dean of the Florida delegation in the House (Mr. SIKES) and others of his colleagues in honoring an old and great friend and one of the outstanding political leaders of the State of Florida, former leader of that House, the Honorable Robert Alexis "Lex" Green. Lex Green is known throughout the length and breadth of Florida for his long public service, his warm and friendly personality, and his deep dedication to the service of the people. His rich life on February 10 will have spanned 80 years—a period dynamic in the history of the United States and of the world. Lex Green has been eminent in every field in which he labored—teacher, lawyer, Florida Legislator, and Member of this House. His legislative career is filled with many legislative accomplishments and many achievements for the benefit of his district, his State, and his country. A summary that touches upon the highlights of his illustrious career is found in the Biographical Directory ofthe American Congress 1774–1971, as follows:

GREEN, ROBERT ALEXIS, a Representative from Florida; born near Lake Butler, Bradford County (now Union County), Fla., February 10, 1892; attended the rural schools; commenced teaching Liberty Public School at the age of 16; was graduated from the high school at Lake Butler in 1913; messenger in the State house of representatives 1913–1915; assistant chief clerk of the State house of representatives 1915–1917 and chief clerk in 1917 and 1918; University of Florida at Gainesville, B.S., 1916; studied accounting and business administration at Howard University; principal of Suwannee High School in 1916 and 1917; vice president of the Florida Educational Association in 1918; member of the State house of representatives 1918–1920, serving as speaker pro tempore in 1918; studied law at Yale University; was admitted to the bar in 1921 and commenced practice in Starke, Fla.; elected judge of Bradford County, Fla., in 1921 and served until 1924, when he resigned, having been elected to Congress; elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-ninth and to the nine succeeding Congresses and served from March 4, 1925, until his resignation on November 25, 1944, to enter the United States Navy; was not a candidate for renomination in 1944, but was an unsuccessful candidate for the Florida gubernatorial nomination; served as a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy from November 25, 1944, to November 2, 1945; resumed the practice of law at Starke, Fla., and served as county prosecuting attorney and as city attorney for the city of Starke; member Democratic Executive Committee, Bradford County, and State Democratic Executive Committee; operates an automobile agency; is a resident of Starke, Fla.

Lex Green rendered able and patriotic service in the Armed Forces of his country and has always been one diligent in the service of the veterans of our wars, indeed, in the support of every worthy cause.

Lex has fought many political battles but he has always been as Roosevelt said Al Smith was "a happy warrior." People like Lex Green because he is a likable man of warm heart, generous spirit, and a deep capacity for abiding friendship.

Lex Green has rendered great service to his State and country and I am proud to join with my colleagues in congratulating him upon his 80th birthday and wishing for him many more years of healthy, satisfying, and useful life. My wife joins me in extending warmest felicitations to him.

GUN CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. SHOUP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years we have had a gun control law on the books which was described as a panacea to our crime in the streets problem; to violent crime around the land. It was intended to reduce or eliminate the use of firearms against the citizenry of the United States.

All available reports indicate that this law has been a dismal failure. In fact, armed robbery and murder are the two crimes that have shown the greatest increases in the United States.

It should be obvious, to all who will see, that the position held by many of our responsible citizens is a valid one; that the most effective method of attacking armed crime is to vigorously attack the criminal. Every one of us must be concerned with the restraint of those who would put firearms to unlawful use not merely possess them.

I am today introducing a bill that will do just that. I must warn you that my bill is not a timid approach to the problem, but takes a firm position on the assessment of punishment to those who show an utter disregard for the property and lives of others.

In our present day society we are concerned with the rights of the individual. I suggest that my bill strikes at the heart of this problem: The protection of the rights of innocent law-abiding citizens.

I hope that each Member will give honest consideration to this bill, the text of which is as follows:

H.R. 13129

A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions, to lower certain age limits from twenty-one years to eighteen, and to eliminate certain record-keeping provisions with respect to ammunition

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 924(c) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whoever—

"(1) uses any firearm to commit a felony with respect to which the district court of

the United States have original and exclusive jurisdiction under section 3231 of this title, or carries a firearm during the commission of any such felony, or

"(2) uses any firearm transported in interstate or foreign commerce or affecting such commerce to commit, or carries such a firearm unlawfully during the commission of any crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, and is convicted of such crime in a court of any State,

shall, in addition to the punishment provided for the commission of such felony or crime, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not less than five years, nor more than ten years. In the case of his second or subsequent conviction under this subsection, such person shall be sentenced to imprisonment for any term of years not less than ten, or to life imprisonment. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend the sentence in the case of any person convicted under this subsection, or give him a probationary sentence, nor shall the term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection run concurrently with any term of imprisonment imposed for the commission of such felony or crime."

SEC. 2. Title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) in section 922(c)(1) by striking out all after "I swear that" up to, but not including "I am eighteen years or more of age.";

(2) by striking out, "twenty-one years" wherever it appears in such chapter, and inserting in lieu thereof, "eighteen years"; and

(3) in section 922(b)(5) by striking out "or ammunition".

THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY $2 BILL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 15 marks the 152d anniversary of the birth of one of this Nation's leading civil rights and voting rights advocates, Susan B. Anthony. This occasion is an excellent opportunity for us to reflect on the status of women's rights and sex discrimination today.

In the more than 70 years since this century began, American women have achieved new life styles and have gained a significant improvement in status. As late as the turn of the century, a bride was treated by law as little more than a possession of her husband. She could not vote, run for office or, in many cases, buy property, own a business, or even inherit anything of value. American women combined fieldwork, grueling housework, and childbearing. It was not uncommon for a man to bury two or three wives in a lifetime, such was the mortality rate of women.

In the 20th century, however, women began to enroll in college in large numbers, began to work outside the home, and won the vote. Women had been exploited for years in the infamous sweatshops. Doors to white-collar employment did not open to the female sex until the world wars, when women were needed to fill the jobs at home left vacant when our boys were sent abroad. Women learned, nevertheless, that they would be paid less than men for the same work, and that women were the last hired and the first fired, particularly in times of economic stress.

Despite the breakthroughs made by women in the field of employment during World War II, the aftermath of that war discouraged the working wife and mother. The "good life," after which everyone strived, was devoted to the family, and the new household appliances were supposed to make woman's home her castle. Betty Friedan's book, "The Feminine Mystique," made headlines with its bold premise that the American woman was not happy trapped in the glory of her role of mother and homemaker.

Perhaps the Nation would not have become sympathetic to the plight of American women if the 1960's had not brought us a new awareness of discrimination of all kinds. The civil rights movement and efforts to bring the opportunities and achievements of all our citizens into more equal balance, as well as the publicizing of minority group problems, all contributed to this awareness and perhaps paved the way for the rise of the new women's movement.

Despite this new awareness, and regardless of legislation passed in the 1960's to eliminate sex discrimination—the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and several Presidential orders—there is no question that sex discrimination continues to poison this most free of nations.

In 1968, the average annual earnings of women was 58.2 percent that of men. The fact that this was less than in 1955, when women earned 63.9 percent, demonstrates that we must not only push forward for greater equality for women, but we must keep watch, lest the condition of women should grow worse.

A recent census report shows that in full-time year-round employment, women's median earnings are only three-fifths of those of men—$4,977 and $8,227, respectively, in 1969. A comparison of wage or salary incomes of year-round full-time workers of all ages in 1969 in selected major occupation groups showed the greatest pay differences between the sexes appearing in the sales field, where women's salaries were only 41 percent of men's. More comparable salaries occurred among clerical workers where women made 65 percent as much as men.

Statistics show that sex discrimination pervades all areas of modern American life. Although the 1970 census revealed that the number of women with some college education rose 160 percent in the sixties, compared with 100 percent for men, the U.S. Office of Education has revealed that of all first-year, full time students studying toward L.L.D. or J.D. degrees, 27,352 are men, and 2,575 are women. In other words, only 8 percent of new law students are women. About 5 percent, or 1,144 women out of a total of 23,014, are beginning graduate students in business and commerce. In the United States Congress, our population, more than 50 percent of which is female, is represented in the Senate by one woman, and in the House of Representatives by 11 women.

The women's liberation movement in its extremes is unattractive to some people, but we must admit that it has served a very useful purpose. It has pointed out to us a fact that in retrospect seems so very obvious we may well wonder at our blindness and insensitivity to it. For all our devotion to the great American ideals of justice and equality of opportunity, we have not been fair to more than half our population. We have not recognized the potential and the ability of American women.

This is one reason why I think it is most important that we pass the bill that I have introduced to provide congressional recognition of the American woman's role in our Nation's history. H.R. 11515 calls for the issuance of a new Federal Reserve note to be graced with the portrait of Susan B. Anthony, an abolistionist and one of the great champions of the women's rights movement. The fact that only one other woman—Mrs. Martha Washington—has ever been honored formally by having her portrait on the Nation's currency serves as a further reminder to us of our insensitivity in the past. Passage of H.R. 11515 will not raise women's pay to parity with men's—it cannot eliminate sexist jokes, or encourage more women to strive for admission to law school. But it can honor one woman who made a significant contribution to the building of this Nation, and give to Susan B. Anthony recognition that has been due her for many, many years.

A list of my colleagues who support H.R. 11515 follows:

COSPONSORS IN THE HOUSE

Alaska: Nick Begich.
Arkansas: Bill Alexander, David Pryor.
California: Phillip Burton, Augustus Hawkins, Peter McCloskey, Edward Roybal, Victor Veysey, Charles Wilson.
Florida: Claude Pepper.
Hawaii: Spark Matsunaga, Patsy Mink.
Illinois: George Collins.
Indiana: Ray Madden.
Kansas: William Roy.
Kentucky: Romano Mazzoli.
Maine: William Hathaway.
Maryland: Edward Garmatz, Gilbert Gude, Parren Mitchell.
Massachusetts: Edward Boland, James Burke, Michael Harrington, Margaret Heckler, Louise Day Hicks, Brad Morse.
Michigan: Martha Griffiths.
Minnesota: Donald Fraser, Bill Frenzel.
Missouri: Jim Symington.
Nebraska: John McCollister.
New Jersey: Dominick Daniels, Henry Helstoski, Peter Rodino.
New York: Bella Abzug, Joseph Addabbo, Herman Badillo, Mario Biaggi, Shirley Chisholm, John Dow, Thaddeus Dulski, Seymour Halpern, Frank Horton, Jack Kemp, Ed Koch, Norman Lent, Ogden Reid, Bill Ryan, Benjamin Rosenthal, James Scheuer.
North Carolina: Walter Jones.
Pennsylvania: Larry Coughlin, Robert Nix, John Ware.
South Carolina: James Mann.
Tennessee: William Anderson, John Duncan, Dan Kuykendall.
Washington: Julia Butler Hansen.
Wisconsin: Les Aspin.

SENATORS IN SUPPORT OF $2 BILL

Margaret Chase Smith (R-Maine).
Birch Bayh (D-Ind.)
Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.)
Glenn Beall (R-Md.)
Alan Cranston (D-Calif.)
Walter Mondale (D-Minn.)
Bill Brock (R-Tenn.)
Charles Mathias (R-Md.)
George McGovern (D-S.D.)
Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.)
Thomas McIntyre (D-N.H.)

Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii)
Fred Harris (D-Okla.)

GOVERNORS IN SUPPORT OF $2 BILL

Dale Bumpers of Arkansas.
John Burns of Hawaii.
Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania.
Stanley Hathaway of Wyoming.
Kenneth Curtis of Maine.
Robert Docking of Kansas.
Wendell Anderson of Minnesota.
William G. Milliken of Michigan.
Francis W. Sargent of Massachusetts.
Russell W. Peterson of Delaware.
Preston Smith of Texas.
Jimmy Carter of Georgia.
Calvin Rampton of Utah.
John C. West of South Carolina.
Patrick Lucey of Wisconsin.
Arch A. Moore, Jr. of West Virginia.
Nelson Rockefeller of New York.
Edgar D. Whitcomb of Indiana.
Richard Ogilvie of Illinois.
Tom Meskill of Connecticut.
Reubin O'D. Askew of Florida.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF $2 BILL

National Council of Women (23 million women).
American Business Women's Association.
National Federation of Republic Women.
Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations.
National Council of Catholic Women.
American Baptist Women.
National Association of Women Artists.
Women United for the United Nations.
American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation.
National Council of Administrative Women in Education.
Women World War Veterans (2nd).
Association for Women's Active Return to Education.
International Association of Women Police.
Chinese Women's Association, Inc.
American Mothers' Committee, Inc.
Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business.
Women Strike For Peace.
National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Club, Inc.
B'nai B'rith Women.
American Medical Women's Association, Inc.
Association of American Women Dentists.
Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation.
Women's Overseas Service League.
National Women's Conference of the American Ethical Union.
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.
Women's Veterinary Medical Association.
Women's International League For Peace and Freedom.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club.

TWO RECENT EDITORIALS IN SUPPORT OF THE $2 BILL

[From the Washington Daily News]

THE SUSAN B. BILL?

Rep. Seymour Halpern's proposal to reissue the $2 bill and put suffragette Susan B. Anthony's picture on it seems to us to have a lot going for it.

The $2 denomination, discontinued in 1966, makes even more sense today when the buck doesn't go nearly as far as it used to. And it would save the government an estimated $2.1 million a year in printing costs by replacing half of the ones with bills of twice that value.

True, Founding Father Thomas Jefferson, whose serenely handsome face used to grace the $2 bill, would be replaced by the rather grim visage Susan B. presented to a male chauvinist society.

But richly honored Tom already is represented on the nickel. And, Virginia gentleman that he was, we can't believe he'd mind a bit stepping aside for a lady whose company he might have found tedious but whose zeal for social progress he certainly would have admired.

One hitch seen by New York Republican Halpern and cosponsors of his proposal is that Women's Libbers will view it as an insulting sop to their ambition to innumerable high offices. Their suspicion might be merited if he had proposed putting Susan B. on a $3 bill.

But, given the economic temper of the times, Susan B. Anthony on a $2 bill might become even more familiar to the citizenry than two famous males popularized by our coinage. The Indian on the old penny. And the buffalo on nickles when nickles used to buy a good cigar.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio]

PASS THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY $2 BUCK

The accomplishments of Susan B. Anthony have a contemporary currency that altogether justify honoring her by reactivating the $2 bill and putting her picture on it.

This American feminist and reformer (1820–1906) was a prime leader in temperance work, abolition of slavery, the women's rights movement. No present-day women's libber would have amounted to anything without her trail blazing.

When she died on March 13, 1906, woman suffrage had been won only in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Idaho, New Zealand and Australia. But her efforts led to adoption of the 19th Amendment in 1920 granting woman suffrage in the United States.

There are bills now in both House and Senate to feature this suffragette's picture on a new $2 bill. Twenty-five women's groups are behind the plan, according to the sponsors, U.S. Rep. Seymour Halpern, R-N.Y., and U.S. Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif.

It is appropriate that Susan B. Anthony should be the first woman on U.S. currency. Soon, we hope, a prominent black person also will distinguish U.S. money, either coin or paper.

GREAT LAKES POLLUTION

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my keen disappointment that the Office of Management and Budget did not take a positive stand on EPA's proposal to fight Great Lakes pollution, thereby realistically precluding any possibility of the President, including a Great Lakes protection plan in his environmental message. I, therefore, call for some assurance from the White House that the massive, crash program has not been totally rejected and I also think it is imperative that the President convey words of encouragement to our Canadian neighbors that the United States will meet the challenge.

The Great Lakes are a national concern. The pollution of the Great Lakes, and particularly Lake Erie, have been an environmental focal point for more than a decade. As early as 1960 the Secretary of the Interior declared that Lake Erie had the highest priority with respect to cleanup over any other river or lake in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the actions of the OMB this body can stand fast on the Water Pollution Control Continuing Resolution—H.R. 12741—which we passed on Monday including an increase of $1.35 billion in grant funds which are not included in the Senate version. By doing so, it is my understanding that at least $20 million of the grant money in the House resolution could be earmarked as seed money for a major, crash program to clean up the Great Lakes. As I expressed during the debate on the resolution, I am disappointed the Senate did not include a grant section, but I am hopeful the House conferees will insist on the House version.

The distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, our colleague from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) is fully aware of the situation as it applies to the Great Lakes since he is not only chairman of the authorizing committee, he is also chairman of the Conference of Great Lakes Congressman. I have the greatest confidence in the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) to take this opportunity to correct the mistakes of the OMB. In fact, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, control the key committees and the conference and could even earmark in the conference report that $20 million of the $1.350 billion increase in grant funds must go to beginning a program to restore the Great Lakes.

ASPIN: 300,000 VIETNAMESE MAY BE FORCED TO MOVE

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the United States and South Vietnam are still planning to move as many as 300,000 refugees from South Vietnam's northernmost province to southern districts 450 miles away. I am releasing to the public today, a series of documents that reveal that the opposition of the Vietnamese peasants to relocation has not slowed down this secret United States-South Vietnamese plan.

These documents indicate that the movement surely will not be voluntary. Surveys among the local population, conducted by the Agency for International Development itself, indicate that the vast majority of the peasants are opposed to moving 450 miles. The survey found:

> The people oppose to any move outside of MR–I (South Vietnamese northern region) . . . practically everyone whose relocation is necessary prefer a move to a place close to native villages and hamlets.

Despite the obvious opposition of the local peasants, the United States and South Vietnam are pressing ahead with this plan of massive relocation.

The United States has been planning such a massive relocation of refugees since 1968 despite official denials. When news of this plan first leaked to the press in January 1971, AID denied that they had a specific plan for movement at the time. These plans, however, were never dropped, only shelved because of the glare of publicity. Now the plans have been revised and the United States still plans to move 300,000 people 450 miles

away from their native villages and hamlets.

The South Vietnamese Government is particularly enthusiastic about the move because they hope to convert much of the area into a free fire zone. One Vietnamese cabinet member, Dr. Dan, has asserted:

When refugees are moved out of their camps the government will turn much of the land into a free fire zone.

I have called upon AID Director Dr. John A. Hannah to drop this ill-advised and poorly conceived plan. I believe that this kind of mass relocation only plays into the hands of our Vietcong enemies. The VC are able to exploit the resentment of the peasants who are forced to move by Saigon and the Americans. The very people we are supposedly defending and helping can become our worst enemy when they are forced to leave their traditional homelands. It is this kind of stupid and often inhumane policy that has prevented the allies from winning the war.

The United States has charged many times that the North Vietnamese are in violation of the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war. Those charges are certainly true. But this forced movement of 300,000 Vietnamese refugees leaves America open to the charge of violating article 49 of the Geneva Convention that prohibits individual or mass forcible transfers. If we expect the North Vietnamese to live up to the Geneva Convention, we must also strictly adhere to the rules of that international treaty.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the movement of 300,000 refugees has already begun. At least 14,000 peasants have already been transfered from South Vietnam's northernmost province 450 miles away from their homes.

The American people deserve a full explanation of AID's policy of forced transfer that appears to be a mere repetition of policies that have failed for years and cost America so much in lives and money.

The documents and my letter to Director Hannah follows:

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM,
September 20, 1971.

Memorandum for record:

The attached chronology of events on the proposed relocation of refugees raises a number of serious questions that must be faced by CORDS and the War Victims Directorate. I am afraid that a careful reading of the events, plus a long discussion I had with Dr. Dan September 17 on a visit to proposed relocation sites, indicates that CORDS is getting into a large-scale project with potentially disastrous results.

Dr. Phan Quang Dan is a brilliant man, very affable, fluent in both English and French and, most important, a man with a reputation for getting things done. He proved his resourcefulness in the handling of 200,000 repatriates from Cambodia with little advance notice.

Considering precisely these fine attributes, I believe that CORDS must be wary of the man Dr. Dan and his potential plans that he hopes to carry out. He has grand ideas for relocating people which may lead to the movement of hundreds of thousands of refugees. Dr. Dan himself admitted as much.

In my conversation with him last week, Dr. Dan indicated that any movement will move slowly this year, beginning perhaps by mid-October with 8,450 people at Ha Thanh and Dai An in Quang Tri Province and then moving Cam Lo before the end of the year. Perhaps, Dr. Dan feels, 30,000 people could be moved this year.

Next year, Dr. Dan hopes, as many as 300,000 in all may be moved from Quang Nam and Quang Ngai Provinces. In short, a much larger plan is envisioned that the mere voluntary movements of some people from Ha Thanh and Dai An.

More important, what may start out as a voluntary movement may wind up getting entangled with political considerations. Dr. Dan stressed as one of the advantages of the movement that the area from which refugees are brought can be turned into a free-fire zone. Again, I am afraid that any refugees who get in the way of plans for fighting the war, including a possible abandonment of parts of I Corps, will get moved. There is no proof on this score; I only wish to point out potential problems with which this movement may get involved.

There are a number of questions which must be raised and answered before anyone is moved. What follows is a partial listing:

1. Do the 8,200 in Ha Thanh, perhaps 20,000 in Cam Lo, and up to 300,000 people in Quang Nam and Quang Ngai really want to move? This is the crucial question which must be determined before any relocation is carried out.

2. Why is there such a great change in attitudes from February to July of the people in Ha Thanh? On February 1, 1971, Mr. James Ready, Acting Chief of the War Victims Division, Da Nang, wrote about the people of Ha Thanh that, "The people are opposed to any move outside of MR 1 but some would be disposed to a move to Thua Thien Province. . . . Practically everyone, if relocation is necessary, prefer a move to a place close to their native villages and hamlets. This will facilitate future, possible RTV movement." These sentiments were confirmed for the entire region in the I Corps Site Survey of March 30, 1971. By July the villagers were requesting to move.

3. On September 8, a memorandum was written to Mr. Stewart stating that the requests from Dai An and Ha Thanh "were strictly voluntary and in no way solicited by Dr. Dan." Yet I question the voluntary nature when I read the following sentence in a letter from the Ha Thanh representatives addressed to Dr. Dan which goes as follows: "On 3 July 1971, when you paid a visit to Ha Thanh resettlement center. you witnessed the miserable life of the inhabitants and *told us that the Government has intention to move the people* living in Ha Thanh resettlement center to MR 2 because the soil over there is very fertile." (emphasis added) Was the letter solicited or was it voluntary?

4. How was Dr. Dan so sure that people would move when on July 15 he told Phuoc Long and Binh Long to prepare resettlement plans for 5,000 people each, considering the fact that the letter from the Ha Thanh representatives was written on July 21, six days later?

5. After the trip of Dr. Dan and Raymond Fontaine to several provinces in I Corps August 24–26, it was reported that the Province Chief in Quang Tri wanted the people of Cam Lo to be relocated. Were the people of Cam Lo consulted on the desires of the Province Chief?

6. In a memorandum of conversation dated 3 September 1971, one part of the conversation with Ron Moreau of the Washington Post went this way: "Mr. Fontaine firmly stated that the Ha Thanh resettlement will be undertaken as a special project, and does not constitute a part of a major MR 1 resettlement program." Yet about two weeks later, Dr. Dan suggested that as many as 300,000 refugees may be moved. Has there been any attempt to mislead CORDS about the nature of the Ha Thanh movement?

7. The Province Chief of Phuoc Tuy has refused to approve three return-to-village projects this year because of uncertain security in the province. Why, then, is he suddenly willing to take in 8,450 new refugees, especially in light of the withdrawal of the Australian troops in the province before the end of the year?

8. Dr. Dan suggested that refugees could be placed along the railroad possibly planned for next year through Binh Tuy in order to help secure the railroad. In this situation, wouldn't the relocated refugees be made guinea pigs to protect the railroad?

9. Why is this idea of relocating refugees from I Corps raised year after year? What hidden pressures are behind the moves? What are the possible political implications which brings the idea to the fore so often?

I do not have answers to the questions that I raise. But I remain skeptical enough about the inconsistencies that I am willing to predict the proposed relocation will be a major mistake. We have had agrovilles, we have had strategic hamlets, we have had New Life Hamlets, we have had forced relocations of Montagnards. And now we may have another movement to add to the long series, this time entitled Don Dien.

There is another statement from Dr. Dan made in January which disturbs me. When the relocations were being considered at that time, Dr. Dan stated, "The Vietnamese peasants are like sheep. They'll go wherever they are told to go."

In light of these considerations, I propose that all support for the proposed relocation of refugees from I Corps be dropped by CORDS. CORDS should not offer to transport any refugees nor provide any money to pay allowances. Even if the moves begin in a voluntary fashion, it is all too predictable that other refugees will be coerced into moving. It has happened before, as it is clear that the Vietnamese will not let any refugees get in the way of larger political considerations.

The refugee situation in I Corps remains serious. Too many people are living in untenable conditions. I have no solution. But the very American tendency to do something, anything, may well end up with a much worse solution. I recommend the immediate cancellation of any plans by CORDS to support the relocation.

JOHN ISAACS,
Operations Officer, War Victims Directorate, CORDS.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN PROPOSED I CORPS RELOCATIONS

The idea of relocating refugees from the I Corps provinces of Central Vietnam is being raised once again. Plans are once more being made to relocate perhaps hundreds of thousands of people to the more secure areas of II, III and IV Corps.

The scheme is not at all new in history of the war in Vietnam. As a matter of fact, it seems to be a recurring theme that has not yet been brought to fruition, yet keeps being revived. I was first made aware of the idea in December 1970 when it was announced at a refugee conference by Mr. Franklin Stewart, Director of the War Victims Directorate in Saigon, that from 200,000 to 400,000 people might be moved from the northern most provinces of South Vietnam to various provinces further south.

Premature publicity about the movement, especially an article appearing in the New York Times on January 11, 1971, appeared to have the effect of killing the movement then. At least nothing was heard again for several months.

At a later time, I found out while reading through old files that the idea was not new in December. For instance, I stumbled upon

a trip report from 17, 18 and 19 January 1968 by two refugee advisors whose purpose was "To survey proposed routes and areas being considered for possible refugee re-settlement and to discuss with Province Officials the pros and cons of such a movement of additional people into III CTZ ((the area around Saigon))." The report began by stating, "There is a very good possibility that a large number of refugees from I CTZ and II CTZ may be re-settled in Phaoc Tuy, Binh Tuy and Long Khanh Provinces. These refugees may number from 20,000 to 200,000 persons."

It is evident that in spite of the number of times the proposal to resettle the refugees has been brought up, something has prevented the implementation of the plan. It is very possible that the present plan will not ever come about either; yet a series of actions over the last three months leads me to be wary once again.

The most recent chain of events began on July 3, 1971, when Minister of State Phan Quang Dan, formerly in charge of the resettlement of the 200,000 refugees from Cambodia and now in charge of a new agency entitled Land Development and Hamlet Building, visited the Ha Thanh refugees site in Gia An Village, Go Linh District, Quang Tri Province. At that time, Dr. Dan, an official, who has proved himself highly capable of getting things done, suggested that the people of Ha Thanh might consider moving to another area.

This visit was promptly followed up by a letter of the Chairman of the Village Council and the Village Chief of Ha Thanh dated July 21, 1971, requesting to move to another area, probably in II Corps as Dr. Dan had suggested. The letter also suggested that all the 8,200 refugees in the area, not merely a certain number, would like to move if conditions are right. I have no evidence to indicate one way or the other if the letter was coerced or entirely voluntary.

The people in Ha Thanh have been living crowded into a sandy area near the DMZ in Vietnam after having been forcibly relocated by American and Vietnamese forces. With the land unfit for cultivation, the refugees have been able to scrape out only the barest existence.

Interesting enough, six days before the letter was written by Ha Thanh representatives, or July 15, 1971, the provinces of Binh Long and Phuoc Long in III Corps were both requested to prepare within two weeks resettlement plans for the possible reception of 5,000 people each. Plans were requested to include possible locations, security in the area, access, water supply, amount of land available, and other details necessary for planning.

On July 23, 1971, Binh Long sent in its plan for 5,000, and Phuoc Long followed on July 29, 1971. Binh Long suggested five potential sites while Phuoc Long proposed to settle 5,000 people in one place only.

While the move from Ha Thanh was under consideration, another move of 250 people from Dai An Hamlet, Dong Ha District, Quang Tri Province, was being considered by Dr. Dan after representatives of that hamlet requested back in February 15, 1971, for permission to move. On July 17, 1971, Dr. Dan gave permission for these people to move to a new location, with Lam Dong Province being considered as the potential new location. Thus, by the end of July, two separate movements were being discussed.

August and September have proved to be months for visiting new sites and meetings of various officials. On August 13, Dr. Dan, accompanied by members of his cabinet as well as Ray Fontaine and Ken Anderson of the War Victims Directorate, went to Binh Long for the day to meet with province officials and to see the potential refuge sites. Dr. Dan felt that three of the sites had good potential while he rejected two as inadequate. Binh Long at this time seemed to be the most likely reception center for new refugees.

Plans had progressed far enough by August 18 that Blaine A. Revis of the War Victims Directorate was requested by Raymond Fontaine to begin checking into procedures to be followed and possible means of transportation to bring the people of Ha Thanh south. At that time Mr. Revis found out that the use of LST's was the best means of transportation, although in the next week George Jacobson, Acting Deputy for CORDS, who was now made aware of the plan, suggested the possible use of airplanes.

Another indication of the state of preparations came in the August 23, 1971 "Weekly Report to AID/W on USAID/Funded Activities (August 8–14)" from USAID in Saigon which stated one of the highlights of the week as "Quang Tri Refugees to be resettled." (Unclassified)

The next day, August 24, Dr. Dan and Raymond Fontaine flew up to I Corps for a three day visit to Quang Nam, Quang Ngai, Quang Tin and Quang Tri Provinces. One of the purposes of the trip was to establish emergency flood relief plans in I Corps. In addition, Dr. Dan had three facets of the refugee movement to check into. One, Dr. Dan wished to assess the attitudes of the Province Chiefs and the Province Senior Advisors of those provinces on the moving of refugees south, and what kind of cooperation Dr. Dan could expect. Two, Dr. Dan wanted to find out if the refugees moved south, would male members of the refugee families in the Regional and Popular Forces be released to go with their families. Three, representatives of Ha Thanh and Dai An were to be picked up to be brought to Saigon for visits to potential sites so they could make a final decision themselves.

From this trip, the report confirmed that all 8,200 people at Ha Thanh wanted to move, and not just one part. In addition, the Province Chief of Quang Tri said that he wanted perhaps 20,000 people of Cam Lo refugee site to move as well (although it was not clear if the people had been consulted first). The Province Chief of Quang Ngai said that he is willing to let 25,000 people go and he thought that number of people would want to move. In addition, it is probable that close relatives of families that move who are in the RF and PF would be released to move south with their families.

The next three weeks were spent by the refugee representatives visiting the suggested provinces in II and III Corps, including Long Khanh, Phuoc Tuy, Binh Tuy, Lam Dong and Ninh Thuan. In the process, the sites in Binh Long and Phuoc Long were dropped from favor, reportedly because Gen. Cao Hao Hon, the Chairman of the Central Pacification and Development Council who was now involved in the preparations, felt that security was not strong enough and agriculture possibilities were not good enough in those two provinces.

At the present time, a place in Xuyen Moc in Phuoc Tuy Province is considered the most likely site for both groups of refugees, primarily because it has much good land available. A report was submitted for Xuyen Moc by Mr. Tran Luyen, Deputy Chief of Cabinet, September 11. However, the representatives of Ha Thanh, who went back to Quang Tri September 20, and those of Dai An, who returned earlier, have to discuss the visits with residents of their hamlets before a final decision is made.

During the visit of September 17 to sites in Binh Tuy and Ninh Thuan, I had the chance to question Dr. Dan about the movements. His comments on the movements added new dimensions to the plans. Among other things, Dr. Dan said that he felt that 30,000 people would be moved this year, mostly from Ha Thanh and Cam Lo in Quang Tri. He expects the move to begin by mid-October, although if any advance planning is to be done to assure a successful move, such an early date seems optimistic.

And next year? Dr. Dan replied that a total of 300,000 in all would be moved, mostly from Quang Nam and Quang Ngai.

I then asked why so many people would move. Dr. Dan gave several reasons. The refuges are presently in an "embarrassing" situation in I Corps, where they frequently have little or no land to farm and are caught in the fighting still raging there. In the provinces visited in II and III Corps, there is much free land available, much better security, and good supplies of water. Besides, the unemployment situation will only get worse in I Corps as the Americans pull out of their bases.

Any other reasons? "When the refugees are moved out of their camps, the Government can turn much of the land into a free-fire zone. Then it will be much easier to fight the Communists."

Could this movement be tied with the periodic suggestion that parts of I Corps may have to be abandoned to the Communists? "Ah, strictly rumors floating around," replied Dr. Dan.

When I questioned if the refugees really want to leave the land of their fathers and the graves of their ancestors, Dr. Dan pointed out that the British also loved their homeland, yet many have emigrated to Australia and New Zealand.

Dr. Dan also pointed to the traditional southward movement of the South Vietnamese. When I said that I thought that while Vietnamese have moved south, one generation has usually moved a mere 20 or 25 miles, Dr. Dan said that now the Government has better resources to move people farther, and that before people moved on bare feet carrying their possessions on their back.

Later on Dr. Dan pointed out that South Vietnam will be easily capable of moving large numbers of people, as it was only last year that the Government resettled the 200,000 refugees who arrived with virtually no warning from Cambodia. That movement will provide a good example.

After the visits to the two provinces, Dr. Dan said that Binh Tuy could easily take 10,000 new refugees, and that Ninh Thuan could eventually take 50,000. In addition, the refugees could be settled along the railroad in Binh Tuy if it is re-built next year, with the railroad helping to guarantee their security and the refugees helping to secure the railroad.

As one final point, the comments of Iris Roser on Phuoc Tuy Province after being told that the site is being considered for refugees are very interesting. Iris expressed some amazement that the site is being considered in light of the present security situation in the area, especially with the scheduled withdrawal of all the Australians from the area by the end of the year. The Province has been a traditional Viet Cong stronghold, and the Province Chief is wary enough about the situation that he has refused to permit three return-to-village programs to get started this year.

This chronology of events includes the latest factual developments on the proposed relocations up to September 20.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1971.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Dr. Hannah has asked me to respond to your letter of January 12, 1971, inquiring about recent press reports from Saigon that a decision has been made by USAID officials to support a massive Vietnamese relocation scheme for refugees in the Northern Provinces of South Vietnam. I

assume that you are referring to the dispatch from Saigon published in The New York Times on January 11, 1971, under the headline "Saigon Plans Vast Peasant Shift."

Let me assure you that to the extent it creates an impression that the Government of Vietnam (GVN) has decided to relocate large parts of the refugee population from the Northern to the Central and Southern regions of South Vietnam, and that implementation of such a decision is imminent, The New York Times article is inaccurate and misleading. Our Mission in Saigon informs us it is likely that The New York Times' correspondent has erred in combining the elements of two quite separate programs and concluding that massive refugee relocation is about to take place.

For several years the GVN has considered the possibility of opening new parts of the country for development and encouraging Vietnamese to move to areas of greater economic opportunity. As security throughout the country has improved, the prospects for launching such an effort have become considerably enhanced, and active planning for such a program has begun. As a first step, the GVN is establishing, under Minister of State Dr. Phan Quang Dan, an organization to assess the possibilities of land development and resettlement. Dr. Dan is now organizing a staff and consulting with the Ministries which would be involved in the planning effort, to be known as the "Land Development and Hamlet Building Program." Thus far, deliberations have been mainly within the GVN, but with some consultation with U.S. officials. According to our Mission, there have been no detailed planning estimates as to how many people and how much land might be involved, for this proposed program is still in the very early stages of discussion.

Dr. Dan has stated that a fundamental principle will be that every movement of population must be voluntary. Village leaders will be given the opportunity to see the proposed site and on this basis recommend to the people whether or not to accept resettlement. Although the quotations of Dr. Dan in *The New York Times'* story suggest that his organization will be concerned primarily with reclaiming land for the resettlement of refugees in Military Region I, it has been clear from his conversations with CORDS officials that the organization's purposes are much broader, and that beneficiaries would come from any part of the country and include many people other than refugees, e.g., veterans, repatriates, wartime urban dwellers, and others who might wish to avail themselves of this potentially significant economic opportunity.

Quite distinct from the still embryonic "Land Development and Hamlet Building Program" is the on-going program of assistance to refugee return-to-village and resettlement. The emphasis of the program has always been, and continues to be, on return-to-village, since this is generally the first choice of the refugees, themselves. For those unable to return to still insecure areas, the development of their resettlement sites has been the next best answer, pending return to their home villages. However, experience has shown that some sites offer little potential for adequate development, and the idea that the refugees residing in them might be helped to resettle elsewhere has gained ground. For example, already over half of the 14,000 population of the Ha Thanh Rufegee Site in Quang Tri has been relocated in secure areas near their original homes. This possibility has always been and continues to be seen in terms of the minimum move necessary. Inter-regional movement may in some cases turn out eventually to be the best solution, but there is no specific plan for such movements at the present time.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW J. HARVEY,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 27, 1972.*

Congressman LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I am writing to you about a new relocation of refugees being carried out in Vietnam which is another in a long line of outrages in that war. It is likely, Congressman Aspin, that tens or hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese will be moved from their present homes in northern South Vietnam to an area southeast of Saigon which is 450 miles away.

I have recently returned from Vietnam after spending 13½ months there as a Foreign Service Officer detailed to the pacification program. While in Vietnam, I worked with refugees at the province level, at the regional level and in Saigon. As a matter of fact, I spent some time while in Vietnam working on the very movement that is now being carried out.

Proposals for moving people out of I Corps have a long history. I saw memos in Vietnam indicating that back in 1968 the Americans and the South Vietnamese wanted to move up to 200,000 refugees out of I Corps. Only a year ago, the Director of the War Victims Directorate in Saigon, Mr. Franklin Stewart, announced that 200,000 to 400,000 refugees would be relocated, although plans had to be shelved because of premature publicity and the resulting outcry.

While plans were kept under cover for a while after that publicity, I saw the old proposals being revived during the summer of 1971 even after the American government denied that any moves were being planned. Sure enough, now I see that since the first of the year, 1,500 people have been moved in what probably will be a much larger relocation in the future.

As evidence of larger shifts intended, Dr. Phan Quan Dan, the Vietnamese minister in charge of the program, confirmed to me shortly before I left Vietnam that he hoped to move 330,000 people by the end of this year from Quang Tri, Quang Nam and Quang Ngai provinces in the northernmost region of South Vietnam.

I expect the American government to disclaim all responsibility for the latest relocation, saying that it is a Vietnamese program. I know this claim to be false. I personally worked on preparations for the relocation many times, saw plans and project agreements being drawn up by the Americans, saw and went on trips to inspect possible resettlement sites with the Vietnamese, and know of the deep American involvement in the move. Moreover, it is the American government which is supplying the airplanes for the move and which is paying for it as well.

I suspect that more than humanitarian reasons to help the refugees to a better life are involved in this new movement. Dr. Dan himself talked of turning parts of I Corps into a free-fire zone after the refugees are moved out. There are too many political and military factors involved in the whole I Corps situation to ignore them. Consider the following:

In I Corps, the South Vietnamese government is very weak and still can't guarantee the security in the area.

The refugees being moved have long been considered to be Viet Cong sympathizers.

The letter of the refugees requesting to move clearly indicates that South Vietnamese government officials asked the people to move.

All previous American-sponsored surveys have indicated that the Vietnamese peasants in I Corps don't want to move out of the region.

The province to which the refugees are being moved is the same area where, when I was in Vietnam, the Vietnamese province chief refused to let some refugees return home because he couldn't guarantee their security.

In short, there is all too much about this relocation that is highly suspicious. If this larger movement planned for the future comes about, the Americans will be forced to share responsibility for another horror perpetrated on the Vietnamese people. The result of another large-scale movement will be even more rootless people drifting to the cities as the Vietnamese people are pulled far from their homes. Congressman Aspin, what these poor refugees want is simply to return home, to grow rice and to raise families. I urge you to help stop this new relocation.

Yours truly,

JOHN ISAACS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1972.

Dr. JOHN A. HANNAH,
Agency for International Development,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HANNAH: It has come to my attention that the government of the United States and the government of South Vietnam are planning to relocate as many as 300,000 Vietnamese refugees during 1972. Surveys taken by our own Agency for International Development reveal that the vast majority of the Vietnamese oppose a move that would force them to relocate far away from their native villages.

Many of these peasants, I believe, do not desire to make such a move. The U.S. is clearly responsible for this forced relocation that our own surveys indicate is opposed by the vast majority of the local population.

I hope that the Agency for International Development will cancel this ill-advised and poorly conceived program. The movement of 300,000 Vietnamese only helps the Viet Cong exploit the resentment of the peasants who are forced by Saigon and the Americans to move.

These stupid and often inhumane policies are one of the principal reasons we are not winning the war. Frankly I am amazed that we plan to carry out a policy that has so often been a failure in the past.

As you know Article 49 of the Geneva Convention prohibits individual or mass forcible transfers. Is it possible that our enemies could accuse us of violating the Geneva agreement?

In the past when the possibility of this move was reported by the press, the AID denied that any such plan existed. I have learned that these plans have been under consideration since 1968 and were only temporarily shelved because of a public outcry in January 1971. The earlier denials by AID were simply a twisting of the facts.

I believe the American people deserve a full explanation of AID's policy of forced transfer that causes unnecessary human suffering and undoubtedly aids the Viet Cong.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

NEW YORK TIMES NEWSSTORY ON PANAMA TREATY NEGOTIATIONS TIMELY AND REVEALING

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a 15-minute address to the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 1, 1971, under the title of "New York Times Distorts Plan for Panama Canal Giveaway," I quoted a newsstory in the New York Times of October 19 by Benjamin Welles. That address included a commentary on the indicated newsstory in which some of its distortions and

other inadequacies were corrected or clarified.

In what appeared as a followup newsstory on the Panama situation in the New York Times of January 24, 1972, Mr. Welles correctly quotes excerpts from articles II and III of the 1903 Hay Bunau-Varilla Treaty relating to the grants by Panama to the United States in perpetuity of sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone.

In addition, the January 24 newsstory gives much new information concerning the status of the current treaty negotiations and makes the assertion that the administration seeks to wind them up and to submit a draft treaty to the Senate "by March at the latest," that a major aim of the State Department is to end our so-called colonialist image in Panama and in Latin America, which is Communist phraseology, and that our policymakers are negotiating for the right to continue operating the existing canal and to construct a new set of larger locks.

Mr. President, I wish to stress that existing treaty provisions give the United States these powers now. Why should we be negotiating for rights already possessed? The best thing that the President could do would be to terminate the present negotiations for the reason that there is nothing to negotiate. The simple fact is that the United States cannot operate the canal in an efficient manner without continued sovereignty over the Canal Zone and canal.

Because of the timeliness and pertinence of the revelations in the January 24 Welles newsstory, I issued a press release on it, which I quote along with the article:

PANAMA'S LEADER WORRIES UNITED STATES WITH WARNING ON CANAL TALKS

(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera, the National Guard commander who controls Panama, has privately warned the United States that he intends to publish in the next few days details of the deadlocked negotiations on a new canal treaty.

His warning—transmitted last week by Panamanian negotiators to their United States counterparts—has created puzzled concern. Such an act, United States officials say, would violate a standing agreement not to discuss the sensitive talks publicly and might also jeopardize their success.

Negotiations have been under way here since June 29 on a new treaty to supersede that of 1903, which granted the United States "in perpetuity . . . all the power and authority which the United States would exercise if it were sovereign to the entire exclusion [of such rights] by the Republic of Panama."

The new treaty, while preserving the right of the United States to operate and to defend the present canal well into the next century and to improve it or to build a new sea-level canal, would make political, financial, commercial and land concessions to Panama. A major United States aim would be to end its present "colonialist" image both in Panama and throughout much of Latin America.

NEW INSTRUCTIONS DUE

The warning by General Torrijos has been doubly puzzling to the United States because it adds that the Panamanian negotiating team here will get "necessary instructions to continue negotiations" within the next week or so.

The United States Administration is aware of the emotional opposition in Congress to any diminution of United States authority over the Canal Zone, 10 miles wide and 50 miles long, which bisects Panama. Hoping to avoid the political buffetings of a Presidential election year, it has been seeking to wind up the negotiations and to submit a draft treaty to the Senate by March at the latest.

However, General Torrijos, commander of the Panamanian National Guard, which seized power in October, 1968, also has scheduled nationwide elections in August for "corregidores," the equivalent of county executives. Those elected will form a Constituent Assembly and draft a new constitution returning to civilian rule. It is generally assumed that General Torrijos will be elected next President.

"Torrijos is the only man who can get the draft treaty accepted in Panama," observed a well-informed Latin diplomat. "He has two options: what we call a 'salida estadista,' a statesmanlike approval of the present treaty draft, or a 'salida politica,' defiant rejection for domestic political advantage. No one knows which he'll choose."

The duration of the new treaty is considered by United States and Latin-American sources to be the key to agreement. The United States has agreed in principle to relinquish the "perpetuity" clause so disliked in Panama and while insisting on ironclad, long-term treaty rights, to recognize Panamanian "sovereignty" over the Canal Zone. Panama is reported willing to concede the United States treaty rights to operate and defend the canal—but it wants the duration of the treaty as short as possible.

However, the United States is said to be insisting on a quarter-century option in case it decides to do any of three things: build a new sea-level canal for $3-billion, build a new set of locks for the existing canal at $1.8-billion or merely keep the present canal operating.

The United States is said to be insisting also on additional long-term rights stretching into the next century if it builds new locks or a new canal.

"I suppose we'd settle for around 35 years more use of the present canal," said one United States source not directly connected with the talks. "I don't see Congress going for any major expenditures in Panama in the foreseeable future given the general political situation throughout Latin America."

U.S. BASES AN ISSUE

The future of United States military installations is another sensitive issue. The United States, which maintains 12,000 troops and 27,000 military dependents on 11 bases, opposes relinquishing any bases. Panama is said to want "joint" defense of the canal. Both agree on the need for a "status of forces" agreement similar to that covering United States forces in Spain and other countries.

The United States is offering to relinquish to Panama about 30,000 acres of land in the Canal Zone, mostly jungle and water along the outer edges of the zone but also including commercial piers and some housing at Colon on the Atlantic side and land near Balboa on the Pacific.

It is also reported willing gradually to cede to Panama jurisdiction over courts and jails now under complete United States jurisdiction and to turn over commercial activities—construction, movies, laundries, bowling alleys and so forth—in the zone to Panamanian businessmen. It is insisting, however, on the right to license those whom it admits. Panama wants the right to issue her own licenses.

DANGEROUS SITUATION ARISING FROM PRO-COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT OF PANAMA REQUIRES PROTECTIVE ACTION BY SOVEREIGN PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

1. A newsstory by Benjamin Welles in the January 24, 1972, issue of the *New York Times* (p. 21) makes startling disclosures about current treaty negotiations with the unstable, anti-democratic and pro-communist revolutionary Government of Panama for the surrender of United States sovereignty over the strategic Canal Zone, substantial parts of which were obviously leaked from official sources in Washington.

2. The Zone territory was acquired in 1904 by land grant in perpetuity from Panama with full sovereign powers for $10,000,000 as part of the inducement to construct and operate the Panama Canal, which, with cost of defense, represents an investment of more than $5,000,000,000 of our taxpayer's money. The United States obtained title to all privately owned land and property in the Zone by purchase from individual owners making it our most costly territorial acquisition.

3. The present objectives of the U.S. Administration as reported are:

(a) To submit a draft treaty to the Senate by March 1972 "at the latest."

(b) To relinguish the "perpetuity" provisions of the 1903 Treaty, recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, set a definite period for the duration of the new treaty, gradually cede to Panama jurisdiction over all civil functions of the Canal Zone Government, including police, courts, customs and other powers, and to end the so-called "colonialist" image of the United States alleged to exist in Panama and much of Latin America.

(c) To obtain a 25 year option on these matters: construction of a new canal of sea level design, construction of a new set of locks, and the continued operation of the existing canal.

(d) To relinguish not only land in the Canal Zone but also commercial piers and other installations.

4. Existing treaty provisions authorize not only the continued operation of the present canal but also its "expansion and new construction." The sea level proposal will probably never be constructed because of the danger of infesting the Atlantic Ocean with poisonous Pacific sea snakes and many other reasons. Under such circumstances why should there be any negotiations at all?

5. The Administration characterizes the mounting opposition in the Congress to the proposed surrenders as "emotional."

6. The program of the Administration, as of its recent predecessors, violates Art. IV, Sect. 3, Cl. 2, of the U.S. Constitution that vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress, which body (both houses) has not authorized the contemplated surrenders, and the President is bound by oath to "preserve, protect and defend the constitution of the United States."

7. The chief Panamanian aims include:

(a) Complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

(b) Control of all business activities in the Zone.

(c) Joint defense of the Canal.

(d) Short duration of treaty.

(e) Adoption of a status of forces agreement.

(f) Gradual subjection to all U.S. citizens in the Zone to Panamanian law and government.

8. Because the pro-communist Government of Panama has liquidated its National Assembly, the agency charged with the approval or rejection of treaties, a treaty made with the present government would be null and void and certain to be repudiated when it is overthrown.

9. The Subcommittee on Inter American Affairs under Chairman Dante B. Fascell conducted hearings on 22-23 September 1971 on pending Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions that have been widely distributed but, as yet, has not made its report thereon.

10. The Subcommittee under Chairman John M. Murphy started comprehensive hearings on 29 November 1971 and plans to continue the investigations about Febru-

ary 10 in the Canal Zone, which will enable it to obtain a realistic picture of Isthmian conditions from witnesses who have first hand knowledge of the situation and bear the burden of responsibility for operating and protecting the canal.

11. Soviet agents are already in the pro-Red Government of Panama and its leaders are strongly opposing the hearings in the Canal Zone stating that the Subcommittee "better bring a division of marines," for its protection.

12. Bluntly stated, the current negotiations clearly aim at wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States and its surrender to communist power. This objective has been facilitated by the formal display of Panama flags in the Canal Zone equal with those of the United States, which has served to stimulate hostile agitation against the United States and will continue to do so until they are hauled down.

13. Accordingly, I urge all citizens of our country to write their Senators and Representatives and the President opposing any surrender of our rights, power and authority at Panama, demanding the formal display of no flag in the U.S. owned Canal Zone except that of the United States, and urging termination of the negotiations.

ROSTENKOWSKI COMMENDS CHICAGO SUN-TIMES AND CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Chicago Sun Times and the Chicago Daily News joined, in what is my opinion, a small but hopefully growing, group of newspapers who have set a standard of acceptability in deciding what entertainment advertising they will run in their publications. I do not feel that the action by these papers constitutes censorship of any kind—rather, I believe that it represents a commendable voluntary effort on their part to upgrade the quality of their product.

These newspapers have chosen to sacrifice a potential profit for the sake of good taste—a trend which is both unusual and highly praiseworthy. As many of my colleagues are well aware, Mr. Speaker, I have long supported the individual efforts of newspapers to curtail the advertising of tasteless entertainment—entertainment which, in the words once used by the Supreme Court, "* * * is totally without redeeming social value." In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 21, 1971, I commended the Boston Herald Traveler for adopting the policy for refusing advertising for "X" rated movies. This was a policy decision which I am sure has brought them much criticism, but one which I believe was proper to make.

This morning, I was in contact with Mr. Charles Fegert, the advertising manager of the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily News, who explained the papers' new policy. I would like to congratulate Mr. Fegert as well as Mr. Marshall Field, the publisher of the two newspapers, for making the decision to draw the line on offensive advertising. It was a courageous action which, I am sure, will make these already excellent publications even more of a service to their community in the years ahead.

RICHARD NIXON: AN H. R. HALDEMAN IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Monday, Presidential Chief of Staff H. R. Haldeman, in a display of a sort not seen in Washington since the days of Joseph McCarthy, charged that Democratic presidential candidates who criticize President Nixon's Vietnam policy are "consciously aiding and abetting the enemy of the United States."

What Mr. Haldeman was talking about was the rather widespread and telling criticism of the President's recent "peace initiative," a move in which the Chief Executive failed to set a date certain for withdrawal from Indochina, failed to condition such a withdrawal solely upon the return of American POW's—insisting in addition that we continue to prop up President Thieu—and failed to halt the massive bombing of North Vietnam.

This morning, in what one local newspaper termed an effort to offset the controversy generated by the Haldeman remarks, Mr. Nixon stated that he welcomed free debate and criticism of his policies. At the same time, however, he suggested that statements made by other presidential candidates—and let us not forget the fact that he too is a candidate—might work to our disadvantage in negotiations, and that these other candidates should therefore take care not to criticize his inept and deceitful handling of the situation.

The sham of this position is the fact that he is not negotiating in good faith. His "new" proposals are little more than a rehash of proposals considered as far back as 1966, and no flood of rhetoric can mask the fact that he has not taken even one of the steps necessary to get us out of this war once and for all:

He has failed to set a date certain for the withdrawal of our troops from Indochina and the end of American involvement there.

He has declined to make the release of our prisoners of war the sole condition for that withdrawal, insisting in addition that the puppet dictatorship of President Thieu be retained as a withdrawal condition.

He has failed to stop the bombing.

Four years ago, candidate Nixon boasted of his secret plan for ending American involvement. Today, this very minute, our troops are still killing and being killed there. In addition to being contrary to the interests of humanity, the President's behavior is contrary to the best interests of our own country, for what we most need is an end to this bloody adventure and a return to the unfinished work on our needs here at home.

ELI ISENBERG, NOTED PUBLISHER-EDITOR OF MONTEREY PARK PROGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, the Monterey Park Progress is a newspaper that truly serves its community, and this is due in large measure to the guiding policies of its editor and publisher, Mr. Eli Isenberg. The Progress celebrated its 50th year in 1969, and accolades at that time emphasized its role as a community conscious, cohesive, and progressive force in the city of Monterey Park. On March 1, 1972, Eli Isenberg will mark his silver anniversary as publisher-editor of the Progress and all agree that the paper's responsible role in the community has increased in the last 25 years under his leadership.

The Monterey Park Progress is a weekly newspaper, sustained by paid circulation, serving a city of just over 50,000 persons in the Metropolitan Los Angeles area. The Progress was the first community newspaper in California to publish a complete, local, editorial page. When people wanted to know how the Progress stood on an issue, they turned to the editorial page. The paper led in a number of community struggles, one of which was to prevent establishing in the city the largest dump in California. A result of that victory was the passage of a State home-rule law to prevent a larger government entity from forcing a smaller entity to accept a dump or jail without its consent.

Other Progress advocacies included the establishment of a civic center, public swimming pool, retirement program for municipal employees, the organization of a coordinating council, city manager form of government, better housing, an industrial zone, and a Monterey Park unified school district.

In the words of Publisher Isenberg 2 years ago in his weekly column:

> During the past 23 years, the Progress and its editor have made friends, some of whom we still have. Nobody, and especially newspapers, should try to please all of the people all of the time.

This is indicative of Eli Isenberg's kind of leadership, and his feeling of responsibility to a community he loves. His work is more than a business, for he has wrapped his life and his heart in the community he serves. And he encourages his fellow citizens to be doers, to be among the committed persons, to make a difference in the life of the community.

In the 25 years Mr. Isenberg has published the Progress the paper has grown, along with the community. From a staff of five and a circulation of 1,500, the paper now employs more than 35 on the staff and the circulation is above 35,000. While most individually owned newspapers in metropolitan suburban areas are declining, the Progress enjoys continued support. A host of young newsboys are employed, and they contract their own paper routes.

Mr. Isenberg is providing educational opportunities and actual experience for high school youth—"stringers"—who do freelance news reporting from each of the three high schools in the area.

Unafraid of new ideas, Eli Isenberg has supported since its beginning a gang-youth center in East Los Angeles called Casa Maravilla. This center has been working with gangs in redirecting their efforts along constructive lines.

Mr. Isenberg has shown a special feel-

ing for Monterey Park and its people. He has written that—

Community newspapering is people business. Most families in this town live their lives without getting their name, or the names of their kinfolks, in a newspaper other than the Progress. We keep a historical record of a community and its people . . . Scrap books in Monterey Park are filled with clippings from the Progress: important events in the life of an individual and a family.

The Progress is a community newspaper in the finest sense.

Monterey Park Progress is an award-winning newspaper. The editorial pages were accorded California Newspaper Publishers Association's first award in 1957. In 1969, the highest award for editorial excellence came from the Pacific Coast Press Club. The editorial staff swept five of seven awards from the Pacific Coast Press Club in 1970. Also in 1970, the Suburban News Foundation—comprised of 500 newspapers in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, including suburban dailies—gave the Progress staff awards in editorial and in feature writing.

Awards during the past year include the California Newspaper Advertising Executives' top spot in the State for general excellence, announced last July, and also the best editorial page award for the State.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Eli Isenberg on his forthcoming 25th anniversary as publisher-editor of the Monterey Park Progress and to pay tribute to his newspapering and his civic spirit. He is a fine man, and the city is, indeed, fortunate to have such a fine paper.

STUDY OF EFFECTS OF TELEVISION VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the administration leaked copies of its study of the effect of television violence on human beings on January 11, 1972, to a few selected newspaper reporters. Headlines across the country blazed, "TV Violence Is Held Unharmful to Youth." I issued a statement on January 12 indicating that I was not surprised at this finding inasmuch as the networks had been given the opportunity to blackball from the Surgeon General's Commission some of the major researchers whose work had already indicated the strong relationship between filmed violence and human behavior.

The entire report was released on January 18, 1972, and at a press conference Surg. Gen. Jesse Steinfeld admitted that the networks were given the opportunity to eliminate seven researchers because they felt their findings might be inimical to the industry. Dr. Steinfeld pointed out that CBS had declined the opportunity to engage in the selection process and that the seven had been eliminated by the National Broadcasting Co. and the American Broadcasting Co.

This again came as no surprise to me as one who has followed congressional investigations into this subject for the past 10 years. NBC and ABC have always been the advocates of television violence, brutality, mayhem, and sadism.

Eleven years ago a Senate investigating committee monitored television programs and found that in the 7-year period from 1954 to 1961 television violence had significantly increased. A third survey made by this subcommittee in 1964 found no decrease in the high levels of televised violence during prime time viewing hours when millions upon millions of children are glued to their television sets.

The Senate findings in 1964 do have significance for Dr. Steinfeld's admissions. The percentage of programs devoted to violence by the three networks was as follows:

NBC: 55.1 percent.
ABC: 55.3 percent.
CBS: 26.5 percent.

In its interim report of 1968, the Senate committee concluded:

A relationship has been conclusively established between televised crime and violence and antisocial attitudes and behavior among juvenile viewers. Television programs which feature excessive violence can and do adversely influence children. Further, such adverse effects may be experienced by normal as well as by the emotionally disturbed viewers.

This conclusion was in direct contradiction of Dr. Steinfeld's statements of January 18; that television violence may influence children with aggressive tendencies, but that it does not affect normal children.

This conclusion was also in direct contradiction to studies conducted by Dr. Albert Bandura of Stanford University and Dr. Leonard Berkowitz of Wisconsin University whose classic studies in this area showed that normal persons who see violent films exhibit violent behavior, and that violent presentations can induce aggressive behavior on the part of anyone. And of greatest importance, violence in films is most dangerous to young children.

Doctors Bandura and Berkowitz were two of the researchers blackballed by the television industry.

I would also point to the report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence which conducted an in-depth investigation of violence on TV. While the TV industry tried to influence this prestigious commission by getting them to adopt the theory that televised violence drains off aggressive tendencies of viewers, the Commission concluded:

The preponderance of the available evidence strongly suggests, however, that violence in television programs can and does have adverse effects upon audiences—particularly child audiences. Television enters powerfully into the learning process of children and teaches them a set of moral and social values about violence which are inconsistent with the standards of a civilized society.

Another example of industry influence in this area was provided subsequent to the 1964 hearings of the Dodd committee when then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, established a blue-ribbon panel to study the problem. The progress of this study was so impeded and hampered by the TV industry that Dr. Ralph Garry, one of the outstanding experts in the field of the effects of filmed aggression and a member of the Ribicoff group, resigned in disgust.

Dr. Garry was also blackballed from the most recent Commission.

The penchant for violence by television executives was well established in subpenaed documents spread on the record in investigations by both the U.S. Senate and by the Federal Communications Commission.

There was actual testimony that when "Lassie" was failing in the ratings the TV moguls ordered Hollywood producers and writers to beef up the show with more violence to "draw the kiddies back to the set."

It is a matter of record that in order to attract a large teenage audience to one of its shows, the American Broadcasting Co. hired Fabian, a teenage idol, to play in an episode of the "Bustop" series, that featured murder, rape, assault, and other endearing forms of juvenile behavior. The ploy worked, and the child audience rating increased by 1½ million teenagers for that particular show.

Television's ability to influence the behavior of its viewers can hardly be disputed. Advertising firms spend $2½ billion a year on that assumption. The high-paid corporate officers of the networks enthusiastically agree with them; yet, they react with feigned surprise when anyone suggests that their programs of violence influence young people.

It does not take a scientist to conclude that violence and crime shown every night of the week can influence the attitudes and behavior of its viewers. By the time the average American child reaches the age of 15 he has witnessed 18,000 individual murders on the television set. This does not include the beatings, stabbings, muggings, rapes, and other forms of mayhem concocted by our "imagemakers" in the television film factories.

The fact that the television industry has bullheadedly violated its own codes in spite of a 20-year succession of congressional and FCC investigations can easily be proven by watching a week's television fare.

Members of my staff—who were formerly with the Senate committee investigating TV violence—have recently conducted studies of violence on network programs for the months of December and January which are comparable to those of the Senate committee.

The results are quite revealing.

Films and network series featuring themes of crime, violence, and brutality during prime time by the three major networks are as follows:

NBC: 60.6 percent.
ABC: 53.3 percent.
CBS: 46.2 percent.

In my judgment this callous disregard by the TV networks of the findings of the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, the Federal Communications Commission, and the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence is only surpassed in audacity by the blatant influencing of the recent study issued by the Surgeon General. I have, therefore, decided to embark on

two courses of action in order to guarantee that the American people and the Congress have not been hookwinked and that America's TV screens will not be saturated in even greater blood and gore, with the Surgeon General's report serving as the excuse.

And this is not just speculation. Is it a coincidence that during the 2 weeks since the release of the Surgeon General's report the percentage of prime-time hours devoted to themes of crime and violence on ABC increased to 65.4 percent?

I have already requested hearings by Chairman STAGGERS of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and Chairman JOHN PASTORE of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee into the shenanigans that went into the instant report.

Second, I am reintroducing today my legislation which calls for the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the effects of the display of violence in television programs. More than 50 Members joined me in sponsoring this legislation in the last Congress. When I reintroduced this joint resolution in the second session of the 92d Congress, I was joined by more than 60 Members in cosponsoring the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that when the shabby machinations of the TV moguls on the latest study are exposed there will be even greater support for this legislation than ever before. In this legislation I have asked that the FCC look at all relevant research and not that which has the approval of the TV networks.

I include my statement of January 12, 1972, and my letter of January 27, 1972, to Hon. HARLEY STAGGERS at the end of my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1972.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to call your attention to a matter that has come up during the past few weeks, the release of the Surgeon General's report on the impact of television violence on young people.

As you know, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and especially during my years on the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, I have had a vital interest in this particular subject. During this time I also worked closely with the Senate Committee that conducted lengthy hearings and studies on those responsible for violence on television and the psychological and social impact of such content on youthful viewers.

I initially viewed with great apprehension the development of the Surgeon General's study commission because of the influence of the television industry on the selection of members of that commission, and the incredible procedure used by the then Surgeon General in allowing the industry to "blackball" some of the outstanding scientists in the field of the influence of the mass media on human behavior. My fears appear to have been well founded. Since its release on January 17, 1972, the report has increasingly been subjected to criticism by the press, by social scientists, and by members of the Federal Communications Commission. Not only has it been branded a "whitewash," the caliber of the research has been questioned. This again is not surprising in view of the fact that the most experienced researchers in this field were denied the opportunity to participate in the research or the compilation of the report.

In view of the fact that the study cost the taxpayers one million dollars and that objective scientists and criminologists have long held the view that violence saturated T.V. does have an impact on America's youth, I ask that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee or its Subcommittee on Communications and Power conduct a full scale investigation of the history, make-up, methodology, and reporting of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior.

As a member of the Committee I would be happy to become personally involved and to provide the services of my office in such an endeavor. I feel the children of the United States deserve this measure of protection from what I consider to be the culmination of an 18 year effort by the television industry to prevent an impartial scientific appraisal of the impact of their product on the nation's youth. I have attached for your information statements I have made since the release of the Surgeon General's report and an article from Science magazine dated May 22, 1970, entitled "Study of T.V. Violence: Seven Top Researchers Blackballed from Panel," which sets forth the methods by which this commission was constructed.

I hope you will agree that this is a project worthy of immediate and serious intention and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ON THE RELEASE OF THE REPORT OF THE SURGEON GENERAL'S SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR, JANUARY 11, 1972

During my nine years in Congress, I have taken a deep interest in the massive display of violence on television and its possible consequences on the tranquility of this nation.

When the Congress first investigated this problem between June 1961 and June 1964, there were numbers of experts who testified that they were deeply convinced that the constant display of violence on the news medium has serious effects on the young; that children and teenagers become convinced of the proposition that might constitutes right; that law can best be enforced by a pointed gun, a knife or a fist.

The television industry, of course, did not agree with the views expressed by physicians, psychiatrists, and sociologists. Violence depicted vividly on television, Congress was told, served as a catharsis for young people; made them adjust better to every day exigencies, and generally quieted their nerves.

However, they did agree that much of what was on television violated their own codes of ethics and good taste. Further, they agreed to do better, especially if "doing better" meant they could keep the Congress from taking action to remove the gore from the Nation's picture tubes.

For a season or two after these hearings which were widely discussed in the national press, there seemed to be some abatement in the display of violence on television. True, the implication of violence still persisted; but at least people were shot or mutilated out of sight of the cameras. Eventually, of course, violence returned full force to the medium, and to this very hour occupies much of prime viewing time.

Ten years have passed since the Department of Health, Education and Welfare promised the Congress to look at this situation. It finally created the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior.

One might have assumed that this new advisory group would make a thorough and objective inquiry into the question whether, in fact, television violence causes actual violence in the streets, and if so, to what extent.

To undertake such an inquiry, it would be only reasonable to have the television industry represented on the panel just as prominent social scientists should be. The fact that the industry has through the years denied any deleterious influence of television, while the social scientists continually affirmed it, made such an inquiry mandatory if we were to resolve the issue. There was never any question that both sides should have been represented in such research.

But it is quite another proposition when the list of prospective committee members was submitted to the moguls of the television industry for their approval. Given such golden opportunity to demolish their possible critics even before the commission had been formed, one cannot blame the industry if it eliminated every one of the major potential critics.

And that is exactly what they did. According to "Science" magazine of May 22, 1970, seven top researchers, some of whom testified before the Congress on television violence, were blackballed by the industry.

As the direct result of the almost incredible procedure of allowing the television industry to prune the list of committee members, prominent behavioral scientists charged that the committee was loaded in favor of the broadcasting industry, and even the committee's own research coordinator expressed doubt about the objectivity of the panel.

In an unpublished letter dated June 18, 1970, Dr. Jesse L. Steinfeld explained that, "Surgeon General William Stewart chose to select the members for service on this advisory committee from those candidates to whom there were no objections raised by members of the industry."

If it was remarkable that the industry should be given such veto powers over the committee's membership, it is not so remarkable that they eliminated the names of many prominent scientists who had pointed to the serious dangers of the violence so constantly depicted on the television screen.

The industry vetoed seven out of forty proposed commission members. Most of these seven, through major university research, had published scientific papers indicating the grave social dangers of television violence.

Dr. Ralph Garry, one of the outstanding people in this field who spent the last 20 years studying the effects of television on children, was vetoed by the industry. Dr. Garry was professor of educational psychology at Boston University and is currently at the University of Toronto in Canada. He was for many years a consultant to the Senate subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency in its study of the relationship between TV violence and delinquent behavior. He was also a consultant to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency on filmed violence, and has written a highly regarded book on television and children.

The industry also vetoed Dr. Albert Bandura, who had published research indicating that children become more aggressive after watching violent films.

Leonard Berkowitz, professor of psychology at the University of Wisconsin, was proposed as a committee member and promptly pencilled out by the industry.

The television industry, attempting to weigh the scale in its favor, had, of course, good reason to veto Doctors Bandura and Berkowitz, who made comprehensive studies of the behavior patterns of young people exposed to television violence. Both made definitive studies which were supplemented by other researchers. I have prepared a résumé

of the findings of these university experiments and a reading of them will indicate why the T.V. industry objected to the inclusion of these experts on the advisory committee:

1. It has been found that normal persons who see a violent film subsequently exhibit nearly twice as much violence as persons who have not seen such a film. This is true of children, of adolescents, of adult males, and of adult females.

2. When the experiments involved the infliction of pain on other human beings, men who had seen a violent film did not hesitate to inflict excessive pain on other men or even upon women and vice versa.

3. A violent film can induce aggressive behavior on the part of anyone in the audience but particularly on the part of those who have been angered shortly before seeing the film.

4. Violent films may have persistent effects and the responses learned from them can be expected to retain their original strength and reappear on later occasions in the presence of frustration, anger or other appropriate stimuli.

5. Violence shown on film can effect anyone in any case but it is most dangerous to younger people. Furthermore, it is most likely to be imitated if it seems justified by the prevalent social values; for example, if the established "hero" is committing the aggression. If the model is rewarded for his or her aggression, the impulse to copy that aggression is even greater.

6. The effects of seeing violence are similar to the effects of testing food without consuming it; one's appetite is increased rather than decreased.

I feel the reason these researchers were disapproved by the television industry becomes crystal clear in view of these findings.

Other prospective members of the committee vetoed by the industry included:

Otto Larsen, professor of psychology at the University of Washington and editor of a book on violence and the mass media;

Percy H. Tannenbaum, professor of communication and psychology at the University of Pennsylvania. (Tannebaum, although excluded from the commission by fiat of the industry, is slated to perform the largest single research project under the committee's $1 million research budget. But he was picked for this assignment by the staff, not the committee itself.);

Leo Bogart, executive vice president of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, who represents a rival medium and has published a book about television; and

Leon Eisenberg, professor of child psychiatry at Johns Hopkins University.

As the direct result of the remarkable procedure to submit names to the television industry for their approval, it not only allowed the elimination of some potential critics, but resulted in five of the twelve members of the committee having close ties with the industry, assuring them a reasonable margin of safety.

There is Thomas E. Coffin, vice president of the National Broadcasting Company. Is it possible to conceive that he would, under any circumstances, condemn his industry and his company?

And, even more interesting is Joseph T. Klapper, director of social research for Columbia Broadcasting System.

Dr. Klapper has had a remarkable career.

Years ago, when he was a scientific researcher, (before we went on the CBS payroll) he wrote that if only one percent of the children watching violent television shows were adversely influenced by these shows, that was enough reason to ban them.

But Dr. Klapper meanwhile prostituted himself to the profit motive. He would gladly eat those words spoken so many years ago. With a five figure salary, stock options and other goodies, could we seriously expect him to bite the hand that feeds him so generously? Could we really expect him to do anything on that committee except whitewash the industry? I do not make this statement lightly as this is exactly what Dr. Klapper tried to do before congressional committees on several occasions.

I am drawing attention to the scandalous methods employed in the appointment of the commission members for a number of reasons.

First, I believe that this inquiry into television violence was so heavily loaded in favor of the industry that an objective study could not have possibly come out of it.

Second, the findings of that committee will be of no possible use—except to excuse more violence than ever on T.V.—and constitutes arrant waste of the taxpayers' money.

Third, that an inevitable outcome of this so-called study will be the massive continuation and escalation of the display of violence on the television screens of the Nation.

There are now almost 85 million television sets in the country, as compared with 55 and a half million in 1961. This means an increase of almost 30 million television sets in ten years. This means that more children will be viewing more violence than ever before in our history.

It has been said that there is crime and violence on television because that's what people want, and the ratings prove it.

We don't need ratings to prove that millions of people want to gamble and support prostitution and the rackets directly or indirectly through their active support of these pursuits.

The violence on our television screens day after day may well play on other human weaknesses and bring out responses that are dangerous to the common good. To place the television industry in a position where it can judge its own predilection to violence is tantamount to asking the Mafia to be its own law enforcement agency.

The television stations do not own the airwaves; they are merely permitted to use them if they provide a balanced service of news, education, and entertainment.

There is nothing wrong with the proposition that they are in the business of making money. But if it can be shown through an objective study that they are making money at the expense of social conditions in this country; if it can be proven that the violence displayed on television produces violence in our children and young people, then the time has arrived when we must take a hard look at the industry and seriously ponder the question whether or not we are forced to regulate an industry contributing substantially to the violence in this country that is aggravated and escalated almost every week.

I do not believe that the Surgeon General's committee as constituted could possibly have come to such a conclusion. Violence, we are told over and over again, is a best-selling product, and the moguls in the television industry are not about to give up their frantic devotion to fast and easy profits.

That is why I plan to seek a thorough investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the make-up and history of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior during the next session of Congress.

A FAREWELL TO JIM HENNESSY

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised and regretful to learn upon returning to Washington for the second session of the Congress that Mr. James L. Hennessy, Executive Assistant to the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service had retired from Government service.

Jim Hennessy was no less than outstanding throughout his career with the Immigration and Naturalization Service which began in May 1941 at Boston, Mass. His intelligence, perception, inexhaustible knowledge of law, his candor, his understanding, and his reasonableness insured that whatever he did was done with perfection. In the immigration field, Jim Hennessy stood very tall and he cast a wide shadow that permeated every enactment of law in the field since he became Executive Assistant on August 1, 1954. Yet, Jim Hennessy continuously maintained a low profile; he was a man of few words, but you could be assured that his words were precise, well thought out, and to the point.

Jim Hennessy appeared before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, Committee on the Judiciary, on numerous occasions over the years. He was always welcomed to the subcommittee as the true expert on immigration matters. In fact, whenever a complex question arose in the immigration field, the cry was always "call Hennessy" and immediately he would give you an answer.

Jim Hennessy is one of those unique persons with such outstanding ability that others always seek his counsel. Jim needs no one to advance his cause or promote his career. His ability speaks for him. Not only that, but Jim's excellent dry wit made personal contact with him delightful and entertaining, as well as informative.

I do not know what Jim Hennessy's future plans are, but I personally wish him every happiness. I will miss him, I know that Members of Congress will likewise miss his invaluable guidance.

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisana (Mr. CAFFERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, with the hearings begun yesterday by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the complex and often emotional issue of home rule for our Nation's Capital has again moved into the limelight.

Although I do not serve on that committee, I have taken a special interest in this issue, and have given considerable thought and study to it. Because the District of Columbia is our Capital and does house our Federal Government, I believe it is essential that all of us, regardless of our constituencies, examine the governmental structure of an area that is as well home to three-quarters of a million people.

Over a period of time I have studied the various home-rule proposals that have come before the Congress. And I am frank to say that even at this point I am not certain in my mind just what machinery would best serve the interest of the people of Washington, while at the same time protecting the interests of the Federal Government.

But I do believe in the simple premise that the District of Columbia is entitled

to far more representation than it has been accorded in the past. To those who charge that the District of Columbia is unworthy of being represented in the high councils of Government, I would say two things:

First of all, I might say that representation and political self-expression, while old hat to most of us, are relative luxuries for the people of the Nation's Capital. They could not vote even in a presidential election until 1964, and even now elect only a school board and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

Second, I find a bit strange that reasoning which holds that, unlike the rest of America, the District of Columbia must somehow earn enfranchisement. And it seems equally strange to me that any American should be deprived of representation merely because he happens to live in the District of Columbia.

I believe it would not be particularly difficult to increase this representation without placing in jeopardy the Federal Establishment which does and should continue to operate this Federal City.

I believe the people of the District of Columbia are entitled to have, proportionate to their population, Representatives in the House who have not only the right to speak, but to vote as well.

The people of the District of Columbia should be given a voice and a vote in the Congress. The Representative in Congress, in order to speak fully and effectively for the people he represents, must be given the power to vote as well as the privilege of voice. To the extent that the residents of the District of Columbia have, through the years, had no vote with which to imprint their hopes, aspirations and desires upon the affairs of this country, they have been the stepchildren of the American democracy and we must afford a remedy.

As I have said, I do not at this point know in my own mind whether some of the home-rule proposals—if, indeed, any of them—are workable. The District of Columbia is home to the vast machinery of the Federal Government, and it is imperative for our national security that this machinery operate outside the jurisdiction of any purely local government. I would believe this just as strongly if the Congress and the rest of the government sat in, say, Louisiana or Vermont.

I have been saddened to see the issue of race injected into these considerations. That issue should be of no consequence. The question of whether there is a black or a white population majority in the District is irrelevant.

If our words are to mean anything we know that the law is and must be colorblind and that if we are to have a viable multiracial society in this country, we must never again look to the color of a man's skin in order to assess right and wrong.

Emotionalism will provide no good solution. Action by men of harmony and good will may provide a solution.

THE DEBT CEILING

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this is the table referred to in my statement in the Committee of the Whole House on the debt ceiling. Permission to insert was made by special order.

The table follows:

FEDERAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS 1970–72

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated [1]	Actual	Quantitative error	Percentage error
Revenues:				
1970	198,686	193,743	−4,943	−2.5
1971	202,103	188,392	−13,711	−6.8
1972	217,593	[2] 197,827	−19,766	−9.1
Expenditures:				
1970	192,899	196,588	+3,689	+1.9
1971	200,771	211,425	+10,654	+5.3
1972	229,232	[2] 236,610	+7,378	+3.2

[1] Administration budget.
[2] Estimate.

PEACE CORPS APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table dealing with appropriations for the Peace Corps.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I say without fear of contradiction or any factual statistics to the contrary that the so-called misnamed Peace Corps is the most useless and, in all probability, most detrimental to our foreign policy of any agency in our Federal Government.

The Peace Corps was never organized on the basis of any established need for it. It came into being by the activities of a man who used a con man's tactics and his family connections to sell each Member of Congress, individually, as to its virtues and what it would accomplish. From the time of its organization, it has operated on a pressure basis, exaggerating its needs and its accomplishments. Unfortunately, the type of propaganda poured out by the Peace Corps doubtless has prompted some Members to endorse it, not with facts, but purely from a standpoint of propaganda and pressure. Now let me establish the facts as they are.

Endeavoring to get along with the members of my subcommittee, the full committee and Members of the House, I have permitted myself to be pressured into recommending more funds almost every year than the Peace Corps could possibly obligate, even when they moved over into the waste category. I shall place in the RECORD at this point a table showing the operation of this outfit from its inception. May I comment briefly on the most recent fiscal year, and that is fiscal 1971. The Peace Corps requested in the original budget, $98,800,000. The Congress appropriated $90 million. They hollered, bloody murder.

But the facts are they were only able to obligate, according to estimates given to us, $85 million. In other years, the amount of appropriated funds unused and unneeded were much higher.

The original budget request for fiscal 1972 covering the bill that is now in conference between the Committee on Appropriations in the House and the Senate called for $71,200,000. When it was learned that the Congress intended to slash hell out of foreign aid for fiscal 1972, the Peace Corps resorted to the same tricky tactics that had been used often before and that is increasing their request so that it may head off any adjustments made by the committee. In other instances, the Peace Corps has greatly overestimated their needs and a few hours before coming before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations they would adjust it downward so as to try to impress the committee that they were holier-than-thou. One example was fiscal 1965. They asked for $115 million and amended the budget downward to $106 million. The Congress appropriated $104 million, but they could only waste $85 million, which left them overfunded $18 million.

I shall never purposely underfund any agency for legitimate purposes. I shall never purposely recommend underfunding any agency when their cause is just. But the Peace Corps' record of being overfunded, of exaggeration and manipulation should place it in ill-repute with all Members of Congress, and even the 18-year-old voters back home, whom some Members fear.

The Peace Corps reminds me of the family with two children, one is spoiled, and the other well-disciplined. The spoiled child not only gets his candy but the disciplined brother's candy because of his loud crying and hell-raising. The Peace Corps cannot justify their request on the basis of facts but only on the basis of unsubstantiated claims of accomplishment.

Few Members realize that for various reasons the Peace Corps has been ordered out of 14 countries. Now contrast this with their counterpart in bilateral technical aid which shows that not one person in 25 years has ever been asked to leave a country. Now why is there such a variation between the Peace Corps technicians and our bilateral technicians. Here are the facts. Peace Corps personnel go abroad as free agents to espouse or embrace any philosophy of their choosing, to condemn our Government, to curse our President, to castigate our foreign policy whereas bilateral technical aid technicians must support our foreign policy, defend our Government and that is also true of the military.

The present so-called Director of the Peace Corps is so much in violation of good legislative ethics that he has been called down by top people in the White House. In fact, I suspect that he will be called down again because he has actually disgusted many Members of Congress with his unorthodox and unreasonable exaggerations. He has brought pressure that may place him in violation of the antilobbying law.

Mr. Speaker, I have been and will continue to be fair. I will recommend in all probability more funds than this outfit can use, but I am told that there have been some bets placed at the Peace Corps headquarters that the present Director will have his way with Congress and succeed in pressuring Members of both bodies into yielding to his will even though his exaggerated request is un-

reliable and not substantiated with facts but with propaganda. Please keep in mind that it is this Agency that spends around 35 percent of its total budget on administrative and propaganda expenses. Fantastic, but true. I shall be anxiously awaiting the GAO's report to see how much the so-called pressure boy is in violation of the antilobbying law.

PEACE CORPS—STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Fiscal year	Original budget request	Appropriated	Obligated	Funds unobligated	Percent of unobligated funds to amounts appropriated
1962	40,000	30,000	29,496	504	1.7
1963	63,750	59,000	54,692	3,864	6.6
1964	108,000	95,964	76,164	19,800	20.6
1965	115,000	104,100	85,449	18,644	17.9
1966	125,200	114,100	113,173	927	.8
1967	110,500	110,000	104,525	5,371	4.9
1968	124,400	107,500	106,846	654	0.6
1969	112,800	102,000	100,301	1,650	1.6
1970	109,800	98,450	90,776	7,674	7.8
1971	98,800	90,000	85,024	4,976	5.4
1972	71,200				

THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH MEINDERS, 1878–1971

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the indifference with which we treat our aging is reflected in the lack of emphasis we place on health and medical care when medical care is a must.

On Sunday last, Mr. Gary Potter for for the Washington Post, wrote a moving commentary entitled "The Death of Elizabeth Meinders, 1878–1971." Mr. Potter recalled that:

> The doctors at the hospital had failed to detect a massive internal abscess which burst in the evening soon after Grandma's return. I was later appalled to learn that small Iowa cities of 30,000 population are apparently no different than New York or Washington on one score: Despite all the pleas of Virginia and my mother-in-law, no doctor would come to the house. All through the night the two women carried on as best they could.

Finally, when a doctor did appear, his recommendation was to move the 93-year-old woman to a hospital for proper treatment and care.

The rest of Mr. Potter's article recounts the callous, insensitive, and shameful way persons intrusted with human life contributed to the lonely and painful final days of an old woman's life.

Hospital care in this country is a critical problem—indeed a matter of life and death—especially for the aged and the poor. It is incredible that it took decades to enact Federal legislation to provide the beginnings of proper medical care for the elderly under the medicare program.

There is still much that needs to be done when you consider that America ranks among the highest of developed nations in infant mortality and when we can tolerate hospitals which expell sick people because, as Mr. Potter so poignantly describes, fails to "slip away on schedule" before their medicare payments are exhausted.

Mr. Potter's article raises questions which should be considered by doctors, hospital administrators, and legislators who should be committed to the goal of making the American system of medical care the finest in the world.

The article follows:

THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH MEINDERS, 1878–1971

(By Gary Potter)

Last Nov. 6 a 5-megaton nuclear warhead was exploded at Amchitka Island, Alaska. The same day, my wife's grandmother was killed in a nursing home in Iowa. Opponents of the Amchitka test were, generally speaking, persons who believe that the number of technical interventions made in the environment during recent times has reached such a dangerous level that irreparable harm is about to be done to the world. I think some of them must have expected dramatic consequences from the Amchitka test; a few might actually have hoped for them. But the earth did not crack. California did not sink. There were no tidal waves.

I think the expected signals can be read in the death of Elizabeth Meinders.

Mrs. Meinders was born in Iowa and lived there her whole life. The Iowa and the United States where she was born were rather different from the state and nation of today. When Mrs. Meinders was born, Rutherford B. Hayes was President of the United States (of which there were then 38); Queen Victoria would reign for two more decades over a vast and mighty empire; the last Russian tsar, still a boy of 10, was years away from ascending his throne; Kaiser Wilhelm II, the last German emperor, was not yet even crown prince. Since 1878, a very great deal has changed in the world.

Mrs. Meinders was fully aware of the changes. Until the onset of the troubles which led to her death, she read a newspaper every day. Her view of affairs was remarkably detached. It was not that she was unresponsive to the world; the world simply no longer shocked her.

What great issue or event agitating us in recent days had she not already had occasion to consider? The war? Already a lady of 40 at the end of the first World War, Mrs. Meinders had witnessed six of the seven foreign wars waged by the United States. Racial conflict? She could remember being scooped up and bundled into the house by her mother when some Indians suddenly appeared nearby—Little Big Horn had happened only a couple years before, Wounded Knee was years in the future. Presidential assassination? Could the one in 1963 seem as momentous to her as it did to many when she could personally recall two of the three others in our history?

Born as she was before the advent of electric lighting, the automobile, the telephone, radio, the newer prodigies of science and technology did not impress her overmuch. I once asked her what she thought of seeing men on the moon, live, in color. "Oh," she said, "I suppose it's all right." Her many years had clearly made her extremely tolerant.

Intact as were her mental and spiritual faculties, the sheer weight of her 90-plus years did bear on her body. Though far from being bedridden (merely two summers ago she was capable of the long car trip from Iowa to Washington), she did have difficulty at times walking and she recently made frequent use of a wheelchair. If you asked her how she felt, she would reply, "I'm all right, but I used to be able to run like a deer." There was wistfulness in the remark, and resignation, but also a subdued note of anger, as if she felt she had been betrayed—by her own body—and who could doubt her word? Yet there was no one still living who remembered her running.

From the fact that so many she'd known and loved had already passed on and from her religious devotion was derived another characteristic: prudence. She deemed it prudent to devote much of her energy these last years to preparing for the inevitable. This, also, must have accounted for her apparent detachment. She was preparing to put behind her the things of this world she was detaching herself from them. In her 93 years she'd seen a great deal of death and she must have acquired an understanding of it. It surely seemed that death, no more than anything else, would not surprise her. Yet it did, it did.

Dying was once something accomplished at home. That was the case for even the poorest of men. In 1878, say, there simply was no place else to die, no more than there was another place, besides the open field, to give birth. Also, dying being part of life, home seemed a suitable place to do it since that is where one had done the rest of one's living. Unless he were caught fatally by hazard far from home, every man could expect to die there—in the bosom of the family, as the expression went. Loved ones actually held your hand, they wiped your brow. You were going anyway; they tried to ease it for you.

I've said Mrs. Meinders was as aware of the world from which she died as the one into which she was born, but she must have expected, must have prayed, that her death would be the sort she knew best and which she had schooled herself to accept, if perhaps with ever so slightly rebellious a spirit, as she accepted the infirmity of an aged body. By rights, such a death ought to have been hers.

Like all really wise persons, Mrs. Meinders had made it a lifelong policy to avoid doctors, except in direst need, and to stay completely away from hospitals or any other institution purporting to care for the unwell or infirm. She was not alone in her feeling about such places. Her daughter, my mother-in-law, had her in her home, as she had for a number of years, when her final difficulties began in August. That is, unlike many others who, by virtue merely of years, find themselves in "nursing" homes at a certain point in their lives. Mrs. Meinders was not in one. Inasmuch as she required no "nursing," was not unwell, never truly infirm, why should she have been? Also unlike many others, of course, she had a daughter who was willing to have her at home and to see after her wants, which were always limited.

In August, Mrs. Meinders complained of some pains. My wife, who was visiting her mother and grandmother at the time, told me on the phone that the family doctor was away, that others had been consulted, and they recommended that Mrs. Meinders be taken to a local hospital for an examination, one more thorough than could be done at

home. There should have been nothing alarming in the idea of hospitalization for no more reason than a thorough physical. Surely the reason for Grandma's pain could be more easily and accurately discovered in a hospital than at home. Yet Virginia (my wife) and I were both uneasy at the idea. She was herself less than enthusiastic.

As Virginia and her mother left her on the first evening of her first hospital stay, my mother-in-law said, "Well, we're going."

"And leave me in the presence of mine enemies?" said Mrs Meinders. It was a line from the best known, and Mrs. Meinders' favorite, of all the Psalms.

She was in the place for merely a few days. Because Virginia and her mother thought they discerned a casualness, even a certain callousness, in the institution's treatment of Mrs. Meinders, they were quite pleased when the doctors told them there was no need to worry, Grandma could go back home.

The doctor at the hospital had failed to detect a massive internal abscess which burst in the evening soon after Grandma's return. I was later appalled to learn that small Iowa cities of 30,000 population are apparently no different than New York or Washington on one score: Despite all the pleas of Virginia and my mother-in-law, no doctor would come to the house. All through the night the two women carried on as best they could. The blood and matter was coming in prodigious quantities. Every convenient receptacle—basins, bowls, pans, even a kitty litter box—was put to use; Veronica, our 15-month-old daughter, upset by the turmoil, began to cry but could not be coped with—there was no time even to empty the pans as Virginia and her mother worked in tandem; the gory containers overflowed the bathroom and kitchen floors, had to be set out in the garage.

Finally, at dawn, a doctor agreed to a house call. This gentleman's professional contribution to the situation, seeing the pans spread before him on the garage floor: "That's imposisble. If she lost that much blood she'd be dead."

She was in fact so weakened that the doctor would not advise what doctors today always automatically advise, what the doctors a few days before advised: he would not recommend her being moved to the hospital, not then.

Yet, weak as she was, she was also strong. Anyone, it seems when you consider it, must be marvelously strong simply to live 93 years. It was her strength that undid her. Why couldn't the end have been that night? It would have been far better. There were moments when Grandma actually cried out for it to be. She was too strong, however. Her God had made her so strong she was yet to endure a death unlike any she had ever expected.

The members of my wife's family are not numerous. For several generations the family's children have been born at 30-year intervals, rather than the common 20. Thus, Mrs. Meinders, though already past 90, had no great-grandchild until the birth of Veronica, my daughter. The two of them, the old lady and the infant girl, had a close and warm relationship.

In the morning after that first crisis, after the doctor had left, before anyone could stop her, Veronica climbed onto Mrs. Meinder's bed. She grabbed a crumpled Kleenex lying there and with it wiped some sweat from her great-grandmother's forehead. My wife has told me that it wasn't until days later that she saw Veronica's gesture in the light of the act once performed by her namesake.

During those days, as Mrs. Meinders recovered something of herself, there were countless games of peck-a-boo, the child standing at the foot of the bed, Mrs. Meinders frequently racked by pain nobody nearly a century old is meant to bear. How did she bear hers? Her heart, her lungs, all her organs were extraordinarily fit, we were told. It was necessary, however, finally to readmit her to the hospital.

It surely was necessary, wasn't it? The abscess had to be completely cleaned, it had to be healed. The doctors wouldn't treat Mrs. Meinders at home, no more than they'd do anything else there, even examine her.

It was in the hospital that I last saw her. She had been there, in bed, for two or three weeks. I was deeply distressed after seeing her. Never had I seen her so enervated, so listless. Never before had I seen her listless, period. And her eyes! A 93-year-old junkie, was that possible?

My wife explained that the nurses gave Mrs. Meinders drugs, "to keep her quiet."

"Quiet! How noisy can a bedridden 93-year-old woman be?"

"No, it's just that if she asks for anything when it's not scheduled it disturbs the routine. They're busy."

"Oh, c'mon. What? A glass of water?"

"I know. But what can we do?"

What indeed?

Her low morale was not the only thing troubling about Mrs. Meinders' condition. We noted a vicious bruise, actually an open wound, on one elbow (an old person's skin can be exceedingly tender). There were similar bruises elsewhere on her body. We inquired of the nurses how the bruises had been inflicted. Blithely, we were told she bruised herself trying to get out of bed. The bed in question had high railings all around it. An old lady who's lately needed a wheelchair to get around tried by herself, in a drugged state, to climb over those barriers? That's what we asked. We were told: Yes!

Mrs. Meinders was clearly not popular with the staff. She was a nuisance; so it seemed. But, as Virginia asked, what could we do? We didn't want to take her home simply to die. We wanted her to live comfortably and well. For that she needed healing. The alleged healers said the only place for the healing was here, in the hospital.

Mrs. Meinders was most of all a nuisance about the catheter. My mother-in-law, who'd cared for her for years, knew she was not, had never been, incontinent, yet a catheter had been inserted in her urethra. This did spare the nurses having to attend to a bed-pan but it created another problem. Mrs. Meinders was evidently offended by the plastic tubing, especially inserted as it was in a part of her body she probably regarded as not merely private but inviolate (nothing could more accurately reflect her 19th-century upbringing). When she was sufficiently undrugged, she pulled the catheter out. Not once. At least three times. Incredible. I flinched whenever I imagined the pain her action must have caused. I don't know if the nurses considered the pain, but they were furious. When Virgina and I discovered the catheter removed on one of our visits and foolishly reported it ("Please don't make trouble for them, Grandma. You'll only make them mad.") we were banished from the room, saw nurses, faces rigid with anger, rush into it. We heard Grandma scream as they jammed the damned thing back in, but the first nurse out the door met our gaze with equanimity, even smiling. What to do? We felt trapped.

The last time I saw my wife's grandmother alive was with my mother-in-law. When we reached the floor, we found no one at the floor desk. We went straight to Grandma's room. She wasn't there. Wondering where to look, we heard Grandma's voice from the room down the corridor where sitz baths were given. My mother-in-law pulled me back as I was about to step through the door; she wanted to hear what was being said.

Grandma was saying, "Why can't I talk?

"Because I want to read the paper," the nurse replied.

When we did go into the room, I saw the nurse's paper was turned to the funnies page.

I returned to Washington, leaving Virginia with her family. Mrs. Meinders was in the hospital a while longer. The hospital then asked that she be removed.

I couldn't believe it when Virginia told it to me on the phone.

There had been a letter to the hospital from Medicare, it seemed. Formerly, hospitals might keep patients indefinitely, as long as necessary to get the job done, the job that needed doing; that's why the patient was there. Today, the Medicare "benefits" are exhausted, and that's it. Out. Unless maybe you're actually dying. Ginny quoted a doctor at the hospital, speaking of Mrs. Meinders' case: "Hopefully, we'd thought that she'd have slipped away by now." Those were his exact words. Since she hadn't "slipped away" as scheduled by Medicare, she'd have to leave. I was speechless.

Even as Mrs. Meinders was expelled from the hospital, the doctors expressed the view that if she were taken home she'd require the attention there of two full-time nurses. That was out of the question. Accordingly, Virginia's mother and aunt surveyed most of the nursing homes in the area and finally settled on one; it was going to cost the family $1,000 a month. As it happened, Mrs. Meinders was there but a few weeks.

After helping her mother and aunt install Mrs. Meinders in the place, Virginia came home to Washington. She told me all about the home. It was clean and bright, the newest built and supposedly best equipped home in the vicinity, but she'd found the same routine use of drugs as at the hospital. Every evening everyone got his stupor pill; undisturbed quiet would reign for the rest of the night; no one would be any trouble for anyone else, particularly the staff (in addition to professional staff there was considerable volunteer help—Girl Scouts earning badge points, that sort of thing).

I was struck by one detail; persons feeling badly often must be encouraged to eat; that is as true as of old persons as anyone else. At this "nursing" home where Mrs. Meinders now lived, no one did anything to encourage eating; food, I gathered, was simply left with the inmates: there it is if you want it. The result was that the relatives or friends of many inmates, including my mother-in-law, visited the establishment twice a day to feed the inmates. A thousand dollars doesn't buy much anymore, I reflected.

Three weeks after Virginia got home the phone rang at 3 o'clock one morning. It was Virginia's mother. Grandma had been killed. She was scalded to death in the bathtub. In a sitz bath. I wondered what nurse this time had been busy reading the funnies.

No one had actually been reading the paper. It might as well have been the case, however. Beyond the fact that someone had been grossly negligent we shall perhaps never know exactly what happened. Either someone had simply put Grandma into water already scalding hot and abandoned her despite her protests, or she was left unattended while a malfunctioning electrical device heated up the water. As chance had it, both my mother-in-law and her sister arrived at the "nursing" home, for a visit, within minutes of the event. The place was in turmoil. In the moment's excitement, one nurse was extremely candid. She blurted: "We heard her screaming but we were all too busy to go in." When the remark was reported to us, Virginia and I recollected the scream we'd heard in the hospital corridor, and the satisfied look of the nurse afterwards.

Grandma lingered, in agony, for twelve hours. She was back in one of those beds with the high metal barriers; both her daughters were with her. She complained very little about the pain she was feeling, but it had to be great. Her boiled flesh had turned black and was falling away. A curious thing

happened in those hours. Though Grandma was Iowa-born, her first language was German, until the age of 8. No one living had ever heard her speak it. Now at the end, it was suddenly the language in which she prayed. Then, her very last words were: "Give me a kiss." Neither of her daughters could reach over the barriers of the hospital bed to give it. That was all.

When we buried Grandma her pastor said that everything he knew about her indicated that she was now with God. It is hardly possible to believe otherwise. All signs, her devotion and piety, her prudence, indicated that she understood her very long life to be a gift from God, which He meant her to use in preparing to meet Him. Not everyone receives such a gift. Consider the case of a young man wiped out driving to work. Yet Grandma's death was more nearly akin to the young man's than it surely was to that of, say, her grandfather. But Grandma's case was not unique, you know that. That most of us will have her institutional kind of dying, or the young man's violent death, and almost no one of us the older kind of demise, an 1878 death—there is the material for meditation.

Death has always been the ultimate correction of men's lives: it is the wages of sin; but unless all accounts of past dyings have been falsified, it does seem that death, the process of having one's sins corrected, was once easier to bear. It seems to have involved some tears and sincere repentance, and that was about it. Did its relative ease correspond to the sins it corrected?

That young man driving to work, is he aware his life is in God's hands? Chances are that if he has any thoughts at all about his life being in anyone's hands he thinks it is in those of the General Motors engineers.

And if so wretched a death as Grandma's can be visited even on that dear, amiable, God-fearing lady, what chance have the rest of us to avoid her fate, the young man's, or worse? Tears and repentance, then, sweet death? No, for most of us it's going to be the freeway crack-up, or the lonely, bitter death of a terminal ward—or the scalding sitz bath.

Why should God, capable as He is of infinite subtlety, arrange for the top of the world to blow off at Amchitka. He can arrange for every man a personal Amchitka. I believe that is possibly just what He's doing. I'm suggesting that the American way of death may in fact be His punishment for our way of life. If you don't believe in Him, let's just say that it's nature fighting back.

LABOR LOSES A LEADER

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Miami community was deeply saddened this week with the untimely passing of one of our brightest and most energetic labor leaders. Joseph Caleb, who was the president of the International Laborers Union Local No. 418, was cruelly cut down by an unknown assassin Sunday night.

Mr. Caleb was a top labor official as well as a leader in our community. He was one man that many of us had learned to respect and look to for advice and counsel. We counted heavily on the leadership of this young man of 34.

The entire Dade County community grieves this tragic loss of this very fine and outstanding young man who, in his short lifetime, played such an important role in enhancing the opportunities for all of our people.

We will miss Joseph Caleb.

SIR MALCOLM STODDARD-SCOTT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege for my wife and me for many years to enjoy the warm friendship of a distinguished member of the British House of Commons, Sir Malcolm Stoddard-Scott, his lovely wife, Lady Stoddard-Scott, his able son, John, and his charming daughter, Carolyn. We have exchanged visits over the years and my wife and I have found the friendship of Sir Malcolm and Lady Stoddard-Scott and their family to be a great source of delight.

Sir Malcolm has had a distinguished professional career as a physician, as a colonel in the British Army during World War II, as an outstanding business and civic leader, and now, for more than 26 years, as an eminent and highly esteemed Member of the British House of Commons as a member of the Conservative Party. Sir Malcolm for many years headed the British Interparliamentary Union Delegation and performed distinguished service for his country and for the free parliamentary system in the world. He was only recently asked by the Speaker of the House of Commons to chair a British delegation making an extended tour of Africa. On April 14, 1971, Sir Malcolm was awarded the Freedom of the City of Ripon, an ancient and honored city in his constituency in the vicinity of the great cities of York and Leeds, among others. On the occasion of being given the Freedom of the City of Ripon, Sir Malcolm delivered a very learned and memorable address upon the great and honorable history of Ripon; its contribution toward British leadership and life. It is fascinating to review in Sir Malcolm's magnificent address the long history of Ripon, the distinguished achievements of so many of its citizens, and the important role that Ripon has played in the life of Great Britain. Sir Malcolm, with great honor and eminence carries on the illustrious role of leadership in British national life which members of the House of Commons from Ripon have so long discharged. We all recognize that a part of the glory and greatness of the British people is to be found in the deep and ancient roots of their cities and institutions and the richnesss which derives from such long continuity.

Sir Malcolm and Lady Stoddard-Scott have visited many times in Washington and their friends here will share Mrs. Pepper's and my delight upon Sir Malcolm's being awarded the Freedom of the great City of Ripon and they and, I am sure, all of my colleagues will be immensely inspired to read the fascinating address in which Sir Malcolm responded so fittingly to the bestowal of this high honor. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, insert Sir Malcolm's able address in the body of the RECORD at this point following my remarks:

SPEECH MADE BY COL. SIR MALCOLM STODDART-SCOTT

Mr. Mayor, Members of the Ripon City Council, My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen: I beg you to accept my sincere acknowledgement and grateful thanks for the kind expression of congratulation and goodwill which you have conveyed to me. I cannot hide from you the fact that the Freedom of your City which you have bestowed upon me this afternoon gives me the greatest possible pleasure. To be a Freeman of this famous, ancient and unique city is a privilege which has only rarely been conferred upon individuals and is, therefore, an enormous honour of which I am most appreciative and grateful.

This ancient city clustered around the Mother Church of Ripon, whose power and influence was effective from the 7th Century, is one of the most ancient ecclesiastic districts in England. It is not inappropriate to remind ourselves that Ripon was one of the first English cities to which a Civic Institution was granted. In the whole country, only YORK can claim to be older and senior to Ripon. For many centuries you have possessed the institutions and organisations by which men and women have been trained to discharge the great and important duties of public life. Such a past has imposed upon very many individuals great responsibilities, many sacrifices and much devoted service. For to govern is to serve.

Ripon city was first incorporated in the 14th year of the ever memorable King Alfred the Great—in the year 886, many years before the Norman Conquest. It is said about King Alfred 'That he changed the whole face of the Kingdom into better form; dividing the provinces into counties and the counties into Tythings and Parishes.'

Out of Local Government Institutions there grew here in Ripon, as elsewhere in Britain, the right to Parliamentary Representation. It was Edward 1st who availed himself of the fruitful conceptions of that great man Simon de Montfort. He called to the Council of the Nation, meeting in London, representatives from the cities and boroughs of England. To the first Parliament, Ripon was asked to send two members, and in most Parliaments since 1295, Ripon has had 1, 2 or 3 Members.

Parliamentary representation in early times was considered more of a burden than a privilege or an honour. Those who sent the Representatives to Parliament were obliged to maintain them. Representatives had little say in making or amending the laws. The main cause for summoning Parliament was to give consent to taxes proposed, or to taxes which had already been imposed. Over the past 7 centuries, over 90 individuals have served this City in Parliament: and we are honoured Mr. Mayor, to have with us to-day, descendants of more than a dozen of my predecessors. Many of the Members for Ripon have traversed the corridors of power and some have found an abode in the Hall of Fame.

Before the Reform Bill of 1832, there was no thought about democracy in the return of M.P.s for Ripon. Up to Elizabethan times, Members were nominated by the Archbishop of York and the Lord President of the Council in the North. In the 18th century, the right of nomination for the 2 M.P.s for Ripon lay in the hands of the 146 tenants of the Aislabie family who lived at Studley. This family controlled the representation with the result that there was no contested election for 118 years between 1714–1832. In spite of this undemocratic method of selection, Ripon was frequently represented by distinguished, courageous and notable Members of Parliament.

Members of Parliament for Ripon have filled all the important offices of State, including Foreign Secretaries, Colonial Secretaries, Home Secretaries, Secretaries of State for War, for India; a President of the Board of Trade, an Attorney General, a Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 2 Lord Chancellors of Great Britain, 5 Chancellors of the Exchequer, 2 Viceroys of India, and a Prime Minister.

The Hon. George Gosham represented the City 1880–1885; he was a great decliner of offices. He declined to be Secretary of State for War. He declined an invitation to be Speaker of the House of Commons, he declined an even greater honour—to be Viceroy of India, but ultimately, he replaced Lord Randolph Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer. In 1880 at the general election, he defeated Francis Darwin, who was squire of Creskeld in the Parish of Arthington. After his defeat, Mr. Darwin devoted himself to the work of the newly formed West Riding County Council, and played a much larger part in local affairs than the present overworked, inadequate and retiring Squire of Creskeld has been able to do.

Thomas Pemberton represented Ripon at Westminster from 1835 to 1843, he too, was noted for his refusal to accept honours and appointments. In 1843 he declined Sir Robert Peel's offer of the Solicitor Generalship. He also declined an invitation from the Lord Chancellor to become a Judge. Four successive Governments offered him a peerage. Lord Derby pressed him to become Lord Chancellor. It was said about him that 'For 20 years without ever receiving or desiring a shilling of public money, he rendered to the public unnoticed services of the highest imperial value.'

Sir Charles Wood a distinguished Statesman who ultimately became Viscount Halifax in 1865 became M.P. for Ripon after having represented Grimsby and Halifax in previous Parliaments. He filled the offices of Secretary of State for India, President of the Board of Trade, first Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Privy Seal and Chancellor of the Exchequer.

He is said to have been a good administrator, a man of sound judgment, and his weight in the House of Commons was due to his knowledge of public affairs. Hon. Edward Wood, a grandson of Sir Charles Wood, represented Ripon for 15 years, and was in the unusual position in this century of being returned unopposed at 4 general elections. He filled many important posts between the two World Wars and during the last war. He was Secretary of State for War, Foreign Secretary, our Ambassador in Washington and a Member of Mr. Churchill's War Cabinet. In 1924 he was created Lord Irwin and became Viceroy of India, where he is still remembered as 'the great Christian Viceroy'.

To sit in Parliament in the 16, 17 and 18th centuries, called for courage, fortitude and a spirit of adventure, which is not demanded of Parliamentarians today. Sir John Mallory was the son and grandson of Members of Parliament for Ripon, as well as being M.P. for Ripon himself. He was also Governor of Skipton Castle and commanded a Regiment of Dragoons. In 1643 he distinguished himself by surprising the Parliamentary Troops holding Ripon and succeeded in capturing his Constituency in the name of the King. Three years later in 1646, Ripon returned Sir John Bourchier who was in the opposite camp to Sir John Mallory. Sir John Bourchier was one of the Judges when Charles I stood for trial in Westminster Hall. He, along with Oliver Cromwell and 58 other M.P.s signed King Charles' death warrant, an act which demanded courage, determination and fortitude. After the Restoration, the Speaker acquainted the House of Commons of his surrender in 1660. He died shortly afterwards, asserting to the last 'the justice of the King's condemnation'. Those were truly trying times for Parliamentarians.

The South Sea Bubble was a tragedy at the beginning of the 18th century of Rolls Royce proportions. The South Sea Company, by Act of Parliament, obtained a monopoly of trading in the Pacific Ocean and on the East Coast of South America. In 1720 the Company made an offer to pay off the whole of the National Debt for certain exclusive commercial privileges. The Public became inflamed by the brilliant prospects of the gold and silver Eldorados awaiting exploitation in South America; they crowded in the rush to purchase shares. A £100 share sold at £1000. Ultimately, the eyes of the public were opened to the recklessness of this scheme, and the shares that had cost £1000 slumped to £135. Many people were ruined, and the failure assumed proportions of a gigantic financial disaster. At that time John Aislabie was the M.P. for Ripon. He became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1718 and was the chief promoter of the South Sea Company. The Company crashed in 1720, Aislabie resigned his office early in 1721. In March that year, the House of Commons found him guilty of the "most notorious, dangerous and infamous corruption". He was expelled from the House of Commons and committed to the Tower. It was largely thanks to Robert Walpole that he was released and was allowed to retain all the property he possessed before he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1718. So he fared much better than most of his colleagues. On his release, he devoted himself to his Yorkshire estate at Studley and local affairs. He was twice Mayor of Ripon and applied himself to the elegant and delightful art of landscape gardening. The lakes, fountains, the terraces and statues, the temples, the shady walks and the velvet lawns at Studley were his creation.

John Aislabie's son William on attaining his majority, took his Father's place in the House of Commons and sat in every Parliament until his death at the age of 81, having been M.P. for Ripon for 60 years. Only one M.P. has exceeded William Aislabie in his length of service in Parliament—Charles Pelham Villers, who was an M.P. for 63 years. Like his father, William Aislabie was twice Mayor of Ripon. It is said about him "that the contemplation of the beauties of nature and rural occupations proved his chief and unceasing delight". He had the felicity of adding, to his vast possession, the magnificent remains of Fountains Abbey, one of the most renowned structures which enrich the beauty of the valleys of England. Every man and woman who has eyes to see and a heart to feel is indebted to William Aislabie for the preservation from further decay, of this famous Abbey, which was described in 1733 by the poet Thomas Gent as "That noble work in ruinous perfection".

Ripon was represented at Westminster from 1807–1827 by Frederick John Robinson who was widely known as Prosperity Robinson. He held many public offices, Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Privy Seal, but he owed his nickname to his success as Chancellor of the Exchequer. In his first budget in 1823, he had a large surplus. He was able to reduce the National Debt and lower taxation. He halved the window tax. His budget speech was greeted 'With demonstrations of applause more loud and more general than ever before greeted a Ministerial statement on finance'. He gave £40,000 towards building the British Museum. He spent £57,000 on purchasing the Angerstein collection of pictures which formed the basis of the National Gallery. In his second budget in 1824 he again reduced taxation and paid off more of the National Debt. He spent £500,000 on building churches, and £300,000 on restoring Windsor Castle. In his third budget in 1825, he congratulated the House of Commons on the prosperity of the country and reduced duties on iron, hemp, coffee, sugar, wine, spirits and cider. On the death of Canning in 1827, Mr. Prosperity Robinson was invited by the King to become Prime Minister and form an administration. He was also created Viscount Goderich. Alas, he was P.M. for 112 days only. He was unable to preserve unity among his Cabinet colleagues, so handed in his seal of office to King George 4th and wept bitter tears on the King's shoulder. He was succeeded in office by the Duke of Wellington. It is said that Viscount Goderich was probably the weakest P.M. who ever held office in this country and was the only one who never faced Parliament in this capacity. Whilst Viscount Goderich was spending those barren, sterile and abortive days at 10 Downing Street, Lady Goderich found her stay in this famous house more fruitful and productive. On Oct. 24th, 1827 she gave birth to a son, George Frederick Samuel Robinson, probably the only child of a serving P.M. to be born at 10 Downing St.

George Robinson became M.P. for Hull, Huddersfield and the West Riding. He was Secretary of State for War, Secretary of State for India, Lord President of the Council, First Lord of the Admiralty. He succeeded to his father's titles in 1859. He had also been created the Earl of Ripon. The new Earl of Ripon became the Marquess of Ripon for his services in successfully negotiating the Washington Treaty. In 1880 he became Viceroy of India. After 4 years in India, he returned to Ripon and took a very active part in local affairs. Like his father, he became Mayor of Ripon and in 1888 he was elected the first chairman of the newly formed West Riding County Council, on which he represented Ripon for 6 years.

As the oak of the forest grows slowly but surely, so self government in Britain has grown and expanded slowly, until it has become a dominant power. So a system of municipal rule as well as Government rule has evolved. Our system has proved to be the freest and most equitable that the world has yet seen. Detailed records are available of the work your Councils have done in the last 600 years or more. Up to 1604 your Council was presided over by a Wakeman, since that date many distinguished and public spirited men and women have been Aldermen and Councillors of your City. More than a dozen of those who have served as Mayor have also served your City in Parliament. Now we live in times of great change in local government, there are to be changes in boundaries, changes in powers, and changes in the financing of local authorities. No one at this moment can foresee with accuracy the outcome of the imminent reorganization.

It would be a thousand pities if the hundreds of years of history of local government in Ripon was lost, or the enormous part the Mother Church played in creating and administering this ancient city, was not recorded. I have sketched only briefly a very small fraction of your distinguished Parliamentary history. Your city has an industrial story which should be told—the textile industry, the paint and varnish industry. Your city was famed for the best and most curious spurs in England, from whence came the proverbial saying to express a man's honesty and fidelity "That such a person is as true as Ripon spurs". There is also a military history which should be recorded. Your free Grammar School (and may it always remain free) incorporated by Queen Mary in 1555, and your College of Education, now more than 110 years old, have many records, achievements and struggles, which must not get lost in the dust and must of time. May I be forgiven Mr. Mayor for making a suggestion. In order that there shall be an even closer contact between these educational establishments and your city, your Council might consider appointing an Honorary Historian from the Staffs, in order that the history, achievements and the records of every aspect of your city life can be preserved, recorded for all time, and made known.

It is right to cherish memories of the past, but we who live now have to labour manfully and wisely to fulfill the duties that lie in our hands today and try to foresee and face the vast problems of tomorrow. I believe we must speak with reverence of the past, as it is the mother of our present and a guide to the future. Someone must be given the task of telling us of the achievements, the mistakes and the lessons from the past and to help us in the days ahead. I have, this afternoon, dealt

almost entirely with the past. May I be forgiven if for two minutes I speak briefly of the two great overwhelming problems which I see facing our nation, our countryside, our towns, our institutions, and indeed, the world. I note that through the centuries your City Council has foreseen these problems and taken action.

The two overwhelming problems which must be dealt with immediately are pollution and over population. Your city through the ages has frequently taken steps to remove pollution from your streets and your river. As far back as 1466 (over 500 years ago) a man was fined 3/4d. for putting lime skins into the water of the Skell. In 1507 Robert Kettlewell and John Middleton were chosen as Inspectors of the watercourse of to Neether Skell "for the conservation of the purity of the same". In 1509 a bye law was renewed that prevented beast bags, entrails being washed with the water of the Skell or next to it. Two men were also fined for having led a waggon of dung drawn by oxen through the Skell. In 1702 another order was remade by your Council to punish people who suffered dung hills to lie in the street. In 1786 your Council decided that the Street Cryer should give information against people who defaced, damaged or destroyed guide posts and rubbish posts and should impound pigs going about the streets or highways. Immediately after the passing of the Nuisance Removal in 1855, your Council appointed John Hall as the first Sanitary Inspector at a salary of £10 per year. Over population is a more difficult problem, but somehow Ripon has found the solution; in spite of the fact that Robert Ogiby who died in 1768 at the age of 114 having been married for 73 years, left behind, 25 children, 12 boys and 13 girls. In spite of the fact that Mrs. Lupton of Stammer Gate who died in 1718 at the age of 74 was mother, grandmother and great grandmother of 150 children. In spite of Mrs. Brown who died in 1840 having been confined 14 times, and giving birth to four sets of twins. In spite of these remarkable feats of productivity and fruitfulness, Ripon's population has not even doubled in the last 100 years, whilst the rest of the country has increased sixfold. Now we are told, the world's population will double in the next 35 years, from 3600m. to 7200m. If true, then starvation and pollution of the earth, air and water is inevitable.

Mankind is now faced with the greatest challenge in the world's history. A challenge, which in the past, Ripon seems somehow to have met and overcome. May you continue to deal with this threat to mankind, and especially to our island, which is already the most thickly populated part of this small world.

I hope, Mr. Mayor, you will permit me to express my sincere wishes for the prosperity of your City, and to add my hope that we may be enabled each in our respective ways, to promote the success and welfare of this City.

The granting of the Freedom of your ancient, unique and charming City, is a signal honour which I and my family will always be proud of and cherish.

I am most grateful to you Sir, and your Council for this great honour, I only hope I am worthy of it.

OBSERVANCE OF THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO DAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1972

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once more we are reminded of the anniversary of the birth of one of our most illustrious heroes. On February 12, 1746, there was born in Poland's Grand Duchy of Lithuania a boy who was to gain such fame at home and abroad that his remains were to be buried in the hallowed spot in the Cathedral of Cracow reserved for Poland's honored patriots and martyred heroes.

Few men in history equalled the magnificent contributions to the cause of freedom which this zealous patriot made over a long span of years. No man has endured greater personal sacrifice or endured more frustrations than did Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Yet no man has been held in higher esteem by those who were recipients of the blessings of freedom which he helped them to obtain.

Within recent days the name of Kosciuszko has been before the American public, because of the efforts being made by a large number of our prominent citizens in cooperation with Polish-American leadership to have the residence of Kosciuszko in Philadelphia established as a national historic site. Just as the grateful citizens of my congressional district in Brooklyn honored Kosciuszko with a bridge bearing his name, I feel it is entirely fitting that the home in which this great hero once lived should be set apart in his memory.

With the passage of time the writers of American history call increasing attention to the importance of the help which this young officer gave to Gen. George Washington and to his significant contributions to the winning of our independence.

The success of our Northern Army stemmed to a great degree not only from the effectiveness and durability of the mighty defenses and fortifications of Philadelphia and West Point which young Kosciuszko designed and installed but from the enthusiasm and determination which he displayed. Busy as he was with the engineering demands made upon him, he found time to author the first book written for the American Army stressing the tactical use of horse artillery. No American-born officer could have been more determined to gain America's freedom than this young Polish zealot.

From the day of his being commissioned a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army, Kosciuszko applied himself without any deviation to the engineering and construction tasks which General Washington needed so desperately. Even so, this diligent engineer yearned to get into actual fighting himself. He longed to try out the wide military skills which he had acquired as a student in the Royal College of Warsaw and from his military scholarships in graduate studies in England, Germany, and France. In 1780, Kosciuszko obtained a transfer to assume the assignment of chief engineer of the Southern Army. Here he served with equal distinction as a fighting man and as an expert strategist in playing a major role in the winning of the Battle of Saratoga.

On October 13, 1783, Congress took unusual measures to show Kosciuszko its own and the Nation's appreciation of his magnificent services by awarding him American citizenship, a land grant, and promotion to the rank of brigadier general. But General Kosciuszko was not one who could rest on his laurels or be content to bask in the praise and adulation of his grateful American friends. He had proven himself years ahead of his time as a military strategist, and he also demonstrated he was a great humanitarian possessed of tremendous compassion for all mankind. No present-day hero can excel the possession of the great personal social awareness which Kosciuszko demonstrated almost two centuries ago when he took a bold step in support of the emancipation of slaves in America. His last will and testament, turned over to his close friend Thomas Jefferson to execute in his behalf, is truly historic and today, 183 years later, is more meaningful than ever.

Mr. Speaker, every American citizen should read and ponder this classic statement:

I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, leaving America, hereby dispose and declare, on my failure to return, my friend Thomas Jefferson authorized to use all my possessions in the States of America to buy any of his slaves and the slaves of others and in my name to give them freedom and the opportunity in education; prepare them for their new life by training them in their moral obligations that they might become good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives; that by training them in their civic duties, they might become defenders of their own freedom and their country; and, in general, teach them anything that might make them happier and useful. I name the above mentioned Thomas Jefferson as the executor of my Will.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO.

Surely no American-born citizen could leave for posterity a more monumental last will and testament. But great as was this man's love for the people of America, his love of his own country, and her people was still dominant in his affections. In consequence, he felt the call of his homeland where his fellow countrymen in Poland were beginning to take steps to get out from under the Czar's less than benign rule. He was intrigued, too, with the French revolution, so he returned to Poland in 1786 to study the political issues facing both Poland and France.

Month after month he became more and more involved with the Polish patriots. He led them in the battle of Dubrenka in 1792. When the king deserted the nationalist cause, Kosciuszko fled to France. He returned to Poland in 1794 as the recognized leader of national insurrection against Czardom. In Poland, he employed the same brilliant military leadership he had shown in America. He won the battle of Raclawice and freed Warsaw. But even Kosciuszko could not win all battles. Faced with the threat of a formidable Prussian army at his rear, he was forced to meet head on the greatly superior Russian forces at Maciejowice where he was wounded and taken prisoner. In 1796, he was freed by Czar Paul, but expelled in exile to France. Here he was asked by Napoleon to join him in an effort to free Poland, but he declined because of lack of confidence in Napoleon.

Even while living in exile in France and later in Switzerland where he met his untimely death in October 1817, Kosciuszko continued his unremitting fight to obtain freedom for his countrymen but with little success.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all

Americans know and remember the story of our great hero, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. It is important that we do all in our power to preserve for posterity the physical reminders of this great man's help to us in our abject hour of need, but it is even more important to remember and take to heart the magnificent efforts which he made to right a social injustice in America which caused him great anguish. In so remembering this great hero we can but acclaim the tribute paid him by Thomas Jefferson who wrote:

He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all and not to the few and rich alone.

We are grateful to the Polish-American Congress and our Polish-American leaders for their continued leadership in paying highest homage by all our citizens to this great man who so truly merits it. May their efforts be crowned with success.

NEED TO PROTECT TERRITORIAL LICENSING

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today along with 43 cosponsors reintroducing legislation to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to allow continuation of the franchise system for the distribution of soft drinks and other trademarked food products. The need for this legislation stems from complaints issued by the Federal Trade Commission alleging the franchise distribution system hinders or eliminates competition by restricting soft drink manufacturers to designated geographical areas.

Undoubtedly the staff of the FTC is genuinely seeking to promote the public interest and, upon a superficial view, the elimination of these territorial restrictions might appear to serve that end. Such a theoretical analysis, however, ignores the hard facts and realities of the marketplace.

The traditional route delivery marketing method of the soft drink industry has produced intensive competition between soft drink manufacturers for the trade of virtually every restaurant, filling station, bowling alley, country store, and every other imaginable outlet in these territories. Competition for shelf space, aisle location, facings, and consumer attention in the supermarket is fierce. Breakdown of the traditional territorial system will replace the struggle for individual outlets with warehouse deliveries to grocery chains and other volume buyers.

The success of the Commission's complaints will inevitably lead to the demise of the majority of small local bottlers. Any immediate, short-term gain in intrabrand competition which might result from the Commission's decision will be outweighed by the long-term loss to competition in general as one after another of the small bottlers are forced out of business by enlarged regional operations.

The consumer will be left with less service in choices and availability, as well as the likelihood of higher prices. The public will witness still another industry now largely based in nonmetropolitan areas move to the cities, with resulting loss to local economies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration and action on this legislation to overturn an ill-advised decision of the Federal Trade Commission and continue a method of competition that has proven itself for almost a century in America.

The list of sponsors follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Begich, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Mathias of California, Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Mathis of Georgia, Mr. Michel, Mr. Railsback, Mr. Findley, Mr. Myers, Mr. Dennis. Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Shriver, Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Shoup, Mr. McCollister, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Blanton, Mr. McEwen, and Mr. Terry.

Mr. Hastings, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Belcher, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Williams, Mr. Ware, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Vigorito, Mr. Mann, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Baker, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Downing, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, and Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

RISING FOOD PRICES

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have just received and analyzed the January consumer price data provided to my office by the 22d Ohio Congressional District Community Committee on Consumer Prices.

The data indicates that the Department of Agriculture is misleading the American consumer by predicting that food prices will rise only 3 to 3.5 percent in 1972. In addition, this data, collected by a volunteer organization of 215 retirees, students, businessmen, unionists, housewives, and others in the eastern suburbs of Cleveland, Ohio, shows that while the Secretary of Agriculture may be proud of rising meat prices for the farmer, the administration's policy is driving fresh meat off of the American dinner table.

The latest data supplied my office is the second consumer check in the Cleveland area during phase II of the New Economic Policy. The consumer committee was first organized on October 25, 1971, as an effort on the part of private citizens to check on the progress of phase I and phase II, determine strengths and weaknesses in the program, and provide specific price data to the Internal Revenue Service and other public officials. The committee collected "base-price" or "freeze period" data on 5,000 consumer items before the end of phase I on November 13. The committee did its first "price check" during the first week of December 1971. The second price check, which I am reporting on today, covered some 1,805 items during early and mid-January 1972.

The first price check showed that most consumer items, including most foods and services, remained stable in the first month of phase II. The first price check did reveal very disturbing increases in the cost of fresh foods—meats, vegetables, and fruits. These fresh food items, which make up such a major portion of our diet, were never covered under phase I of the freeze or phase II—even though meat was covered during World War II and the Korean war. The price increases in fresh foods which the Consumer Committee has documented clearly reveal that the failure to control these items is destroying the budgets of the American people whose incomes have been stabilized.

As a result of this finding, I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Cost of Living Council on January 5, 1972, asking that, although fresh foods were exempt from controls, special efforts be made to curb the rising costs of these foods. I pointed out that the establishment of more adequate meat import quota levels would be helpful in keeping the price of meat within reason. The Department replied that it was studying the matter, but admitted that some meat prices would indeed be rising. For example, because of high corn prices several years ago, a considerable proportion of the Nation's pig stock was slaughtered and there is now a shortage of animals for the stockyards.

The second price check again showed that most durable consumer items and services remained constant. To that extent, phase II has been very successful to date. But, food prices, so important to us all—particularly to the low income, continue to skyrocket. Following is a table summarizing the consumer items which were watched and the areas of increase by category since the start of phase II:

Category	Number checked	Number increased in price
Autos and transportation	6	0
Clothing	112	0
Food	1,203	231
Health care	162	7
Housing	220	17
Recreation	81	8
Services	21	2

Within the food categories, fresh meats were clearly out of line. Of 77 beef items checked in a variety of stores, a total of 53 experienced an increase since the start of phase II. The trend appears to be accelerating. An examination of several price lists which came in late—about the 25th of January—show that of four beef items checked, all four had risen in price. Some of the price increases are very large:

Description of meat	Quantity	Price at start of phase II	Price in mid-January
All beef hot dogs	12 oz	$0.65	$0.85
Ground chuck	Per pound	.74	.84
Chuck, semiboneless	do	.79	.94
Chuck steak	do	.59	.79
Rump	do	1.28	1.44
English cut	do	.88	1.04
Sirloin butt	do	1.24	1.44
Boneless brisket	do	1.12	1.28
Round top steak	do	1.29	1.49
Sirloin (super right)	do	1.09	1.65
Hamburger (24 to 30 percent fat).	do	.59	.69
Pot roast	do	.74	1.08

Note: In this sample, the cost of sirloin went up 51 percent and the cost of pot roast was up 46 percent. Hamburger, with 24 to 30 percent fat, was up 17 percent.

Other meat prices are up as well. One cannot substitute other fresh meats for beef, because they are all up in cost. Of 24 luncheon meats checked, five were up—and the average increase was not minor: 19 percent. Of 12 poultry items checked, four were up. For example, a whole fryer was 25 cents per pound in early November and is now 43 cents per pound. If one had bought a pound of each of these four poultry items in early November, they would have cost $1.76. Now they would cost $2.22—a 26 percent increase.

Many pork items are up significantly. A pound of ham could be bought in Cleveland for 99 cent in early November. On January 8, that same ham was selling for $1.29.

A number of fish prices were also up. Frozen perch sold for 78 cents per pound on November 6 and for 99 cents per pound on January 15.

As pointed out in my previous letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, the increase in fresh meat prices during the winter months was not normal. Usually, under seasonal adjustment, these prices go down during the winter months. If they are rising at this time, their prices will certainly reach fantastic new highs by early summer, before the 1972 slaughtering season starts.

Other fresh foods are also up in price. Out of 13 brands and types of eggs checked, most were up in price. In early November, one could have bought a combination of nine cartons of a dozen eggs each for a cost of $4.00. By mid-January these same cartons would cost $5.12—over an extra penny an egg in cost.

Fresh fruits were up. Of 26 items checked. 10 were up. If one had bought those 10 fruits in early November, the cost would have been $2.51. In January, the same items were up by 27 percent to $3.20. One of the worst increases in the fresh fruit category was in large oranges which were selling for 8/89 cents in early November and are now 6/98 cents. One could turn to canned fruits instead of fresh ones—but some of these are starting up. In the committee's sample, 5 out of 29 samples rose in price—29 ounces of Seaway cling peaches went from 33 cents in early November to 41 cents now.

Of course, fresh vegetables were up. Out of 43 items checked, 17 had increased in price over 25 percent. The American staple, Idaho potatoes, went from 59 cents for 5 pounds in early November to 60 cents in January. Leaf lettuce was up 10 cents, from 69 cents to 79 cents. Even the weight watcher's delight, fresh celery, which takes just about as many calories to chew as it gives you, was up from 48 to 58 cents per pound.

Again, these increases are contrary to customary Consumer Price Index figures for vegetables and fruits during the winter months. Prices for these items usually decline during the dead of winter and rise to highs in late spring before the first harvests are in.

What can be done about all this? I believe that the administration must make stronger efforts to control and stabilize the prices of items used by the farmer. Fertilizer, farm equipment, and supplies must be carefully controlled so that these increased costs do not burden the farmer. This control of equipment and supplies is particularly important since the economic stabilization law does not—and should not—control most farm labor costs which are already among the very lowest and most disgraceful in the Nation.

I am writing again to the Cost of Living Council and the Interstate Commerce Commission to ask that they consider an immediate emergency rollback on all food transportation of the 2.5 percent surcharge granted to the railroad freight carriers on February 5, 1972. This increase in transportation cost will be passed on in higher costs and will destroy any remaining price stability in the fresh—or staple—foods.

The effort to stop inflation has been declared an economic emergency. The wages of most Americans have been frozen or controlled. Yet food prices—particularly the vitally important fresh foods—are rising. For the health of the American people, these fresh food prices must be stabilized.

In the special problem area of fresh meats, on which most families spend 25 percent of their food budget, there is another alternative left open to the administration. Under the meat quota law of 1964, the level of foreign meat, which is usually significantly cheaper than domestic meat, has been set at an import level of about 3 percent of domestic consumption.

In the last 2 years, this quota has been suspended because of rising costs and the President has been left free to reach restrictive agreements with the meat-producing countries, such as the Commonwealth nations of New Zealand and Australia. He has set these agreements at only about 100,000 to 150,000 pounds of meat above the quota law. This level is inadequate to supply the American market and still provide for relative price stability.

It is vital that this year's agreements allow a significantly higher level of imports. The Department of Agriculture reported on January 31 that beef-cattle prices had just broken a 21-year record set during the Korean war, reaching an average of $31.40 per hundredweight for live animals. The Department also announced that retail prices of choice grade beef in December—before the full effect of the record cattle market was felt—rose to an all-time high, all-cut average of $1.08 per pound. The Wall Street Journal, on January 31, reported that:

> Unless the government clamps down, economists say meat probably will become even more expensive this winter and spring. And they hold out little hope of any significant relief at retail meat counters until fall at the earliest.
>
> Meat prices will be "a major factor" this year in pushing up the consumer price index, the government's inflation gauge. Meat accounts for 5.5% of the index, one of the heaviest "weights" carried by any specific category of goods.
>
> "BUDGET-STRETCHER" HIT, TOO
>
> Everything from hamburger to porterhouse is becoming more expensive, but some of the biggest price bulges are in cuts that many housewives think of as budget-stretchers. Blade-cut pot roast now commands up to 79 cents a pound in some Chicago supermarkets; in late fall, as Phase 2 was starting, the price was about 55 cents a pound.
>
> Analysts look for further increases of a few cents a pound on most beef cuts because recent high prices for cattle and wholesale beef haven't yet filtered to the retail level. Fattened cattle sold last week in Omaha for $38.15 a hundred pounds, up 25% from a year ago and the highest in 20 years.
>
> Pork prices are climbing fast from the bargain levels of the past two years. The national average retail price is around 72 cents a pound, four cents higher than a year ago and the highest since the fall of 1970.
>
> Prices for pork will climb higher in coming months, analysts say, because the crop of pigs to come to market through May will be 10% smaller than a year ago, and pork production traditionally slumps in the summer. Pig farmers have cut back production drastically to recover from price-depressing surpluses of two years ago.
>
> BROILERS CREEPING UP
>
> Broiler chicken production is inching ahead of a year ago, after being cut back late last year, but these prices are climbing, too, because housewives are buying more broilers. Most chicken is bought at special-sale prices, which now are around 27 cents to 29 cents a pound, up two to four cents from last fall. Trade observers predict the prices will increase another three to four cents a pound by July.
>
> Fish prices are climbing steadily, too, with lobster and shrimp leading the pack to new records. Even such usually plentiful fish as halibut is in short supply, thereby pushing up prices for cod and other less expensive fish. Says an official of Burhop's Seafoods in Chicago: "a rising world population is boosting consumption faster than nature is increasing supplies."

There are additional reasons for the need for an increased import level. In recent years, the American beef industry has increasingly concentrated on the production of fine, high-quality steaks and roasts. As a result, there has been an inadequate supply of lower cost food products—the very products which the foreign producers are best equipped to supply. Unless this demand is met, the day of the low-cost, carry-out hamburger shop will soon be over.

As a result of all of these findings, I am today urging the President and the Cost of Living Council to extend controls to meats, fresh fruits and vegetables. This action is absolutely necessary to hold down the cost of living index and preserve a necessary fresh food balance in the American diet.

The citizen volunteers in the Cleveland area plan to continue their consumer watchdog activities. In the coming months, I plan to make further observations in the House on the progress of phase II. If the administration can be spurred to action in the fresh food area, it is my hope that my future reports will bring good news—and not the frightening news of this last report.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DOES NOT PROTECT AMERICAN JEWS TRAVELING IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was recently visited by students from Loyola University who expressed their concern over the failure of this administration to take a more active role in lending its assistance to speed the emigration of Soviet Jews who want to emigrate to

other countries. I want to commend the students who were led by Dan Tracy, of the Student Government Association of Loyola University, for their active participation. It is the good work of such private citizens in building pressure upon the Soviet Union to permit such emigration. Which has helped speed up the rate of emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel and to other countries.

Soviet authorities are quite paranoid in their efforts to cover up the plight of Soviet Jewry. Americans visiting the Soviet Union have been harassed and even jailed when they have raised the question. One would have thought that such American citizens would receive the protection of our Embassy and of our other officials on duty in Russia, but that is not the case. Apparently, they could not care less.

The Department of State has been very derelict in failing and refusing to protect the rights of American Jews traveling in the Soviet Union. For example, my good friends, Stanley A. Kaplan, professor of law at the University of Chicago, and his wife, Joan Kaplan, in July 1971 were expelled from the Soviet Union. Soviet authorities abruptly terminated their tour of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tashkent, Samarkand, and Bokhara on completely fabricated charges of distributing forbidden literature to Soviet Jewish citizens. Their only conceivable "crime" was to attend, at Intourist invitation, the local synagogue in Samarkand and attempt to converse with a group of elders and children with the aid of a Russian phrase book. Intourist officials served as complainants, judge, and jury in irregular proceedings which held the Kaplans for three days, subjected them to harassment, and resulted in their expulsion.

No American traveling in the Soviet Union is immune from this treatment. On January 12, 1972, Congressman JAMES H. SCHEUER of New York was detained in Moscow. Two days later he, too, was expelled. As far as Representative SCHEUER and Mr. and Mrs. Kaplan were aware, they were violating no Soviet laws. Indeed, in the Kaplan's case, they had no prior preoccupation with the condition of Jews in Russia and made no concerted effort to contact Jews seeking to emigrate to Israel. The Soviet intention is clear. They are not afraid of the publicity attendant upon the arrest, detention, and expulsion of a Member of Congress. Quite the contrary, they are determined to frighten Soviet Jews from informing Americans of their plight and to discourage Americans from expressing their concern.

There is, however, a major difference between the two incidents. U.S. Embassy officials in Moscow were quick to respond to the news of Representative SCHEUER'S detention. On hearing of the Congressman's expulsion, an embassy official told the Soviet foreign ministry that the action "would not be helpful to Soviet-American relations." A State Department spokesman in Washington commented, "We will obviously have to follow up on this."

No one followed up on the Kaplans' experience. They were prevented from telephoning the Embassy in Moscow following their arrest, but they were able to inform a number of Americans of their situation and request them to contact the Embassy. This their contacts did, but the Kaplans heard nothing from the embassy nor from the State Department after their return to the United States. They did not even ask the Kaplans to inform them of the details of their ordeal.

In the past the Department of State has declined to raise the Jewish question and further trouble Soviet-American relations. It is extraordinary and disturbing if this policy extends to neglect of the interests of private U.S. citizens traveling in the Soviet Union.

Joan Kaplan has vividly described their experience in the New Republic of December 25, 1971. Her article follows:

ENCOUNTER IN SAMARKAND: SOVIET JEWS

(By Joan Kaplan)

After long silence, the State Department has spoken out, before a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee, on "denial of rights to Soviet Jews." This was the subject upon which the department was called to testify—but only a fifth of the 21-page statement by Deputy Assistant Secretary Richard T. Davies dealt directly with it. In one paragraph, Davies glossed over the "well documented facts," which he decided "need no elaboration here." He then proceeded to offer, in effect, an apologia for Soviet discrimination against its Jews, stating that it bears no comparison to Stalin's blood purges and the Nazi holocaust. He nevertheless conceded that Jews are "suspect in a special way," that "Jewishness has come to be regarded as a more alien phenomenon than . . . other cultures in the USSR." While the department asked Congress to pass a resolution supporting Soviet Jewry, many of his remarks sought to strengthen the department's conclusion that claims of terror are "overdrawn." There is "little evidence," he said, that anti-Zionist propaganda "has spilled over into . . . anti-Semitism."

The condition of Soviet Jews merited a more comprehensive treatment than the two-day subcommittee hearing afforded. Much of the testimony was inexpert or irrelevant or dripping with political banalities. Yet enough documentation was put on the record—some in Mr. Davies' own testimony—to indicate that the Jews of Russia are indeed living in a state of terror. For instance, Davies noted the findings of Mrs. Rita Hauser, US representative on the UN Human Rights Commission: . . . "It was stated [in Pravda] that any Soviet Jew who wishes to migrate to Israel is automatically an 'enemy of the people.' " Davies also cited Dr. Hannah Edmonds' statements that, "Jews are not treated as citizens on an equal level with all other Soviet citizens . . . it is not surprising that large numbers of Jews are seeking to leave the Soviet Union."

Department testimony did not include evidence that *The New York Times* has been reporting with alarming frequency—arrests of Jews by the Soviet Secret Police (KGB) in front of the Moscow Synagogue at Yom Kippur, the highest Jewish holiday; Jewish librarians from Samarkand and Odessa charged with treason and imprisoned (two years for writing a letter to Kosygin complaining of anti-Semitism, three years for reproducing fragments of anti-Stalinist literature); confiscation by Soviet postal authorities of thousands of *visovs* (these are invitations in the form of affidavits—sent by Israeli relatives to Soviet Jews, without which an application for repatriation is impossible). No mention was made in Mr. Davies' testimony of such anguished pleas as the one from the widow and son of Peretz Markish, distinguished Jewish poet who was executed in the Stalin purge of Jewish intellectuals in 1952, and then "rehabilitated" after Stalin's death. This year Mrs. Markish and her son David were fired from their jobs, and reduced to the status of non-persons after they were denied permission to repatriate.

Beware Zionism, an internationally distributed Soviet paperback (now called *Cautions Zionism* in the revised English edition) blames the Zionists for the Czech uprising, credits the Zionists with ruling the Vatican as well as Yale University, and weaves a fantasy of world conspiracy: "International Zionism is the enemy of all peoples . . . relying on the theory of Jewish racial superiority, Zionism is following in the footsteps of Fascism . . ." According to Professor Michael Zand, a recent Soviet expatriate, the author of *Beware Zionism*, has for 10 years been a top Soviet expert on "the Jewish problem." (Professor Zand, himself a distinguished Orientalist, suffered a heart attack when he was subjected to the indignity of force-feeding while in a Soviet prison for "sitting-in" against the government's policy on repatriation; he and his family were permitted to leave the Soviet Union only after an international protest in his behalf.) Ivanov's book is at least more subtle than its predecessor, *Judaism Without Embellishment*, which so outraged world opinion—including foreign Communist parties—that it was withdrawn in 1964. That book's author, Trofim Kichko, received special high honors four years later from the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine, and his new book *Judaism and Zionism*, repeats his anti-Jewish slanders.

The New Times, a "Soviet Weekly of World Affairs" published in several languages, is one of many costly propaganda publications which are the exclusive reading matter in Russian airport waiting rooms, hotels and Intourist offices. In June of this year it reported on "Zionism and the Swastika" as follows: butcher, Eichmann, viewed the Zionists with Fascism from [its] inception . . . The Nazi butcher, Eichmann, viewed the Zionists with favor and made deals with them . . . Zionists themselves have had a hand in the desecration of synagogues . . . The militant anti-Semitism of the Nazis turned out to be a godsend for the Zionists . . ." In a country with a history of pogroms, a country where the most infamous of twentieth century anti-Semitic slanders, "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," was fabricated and which has a long record of persecution, is it possible for the victimized not to feel terror [—"intense, sharp, overmastering fear which is somewhat prolonged and may refer to imagined or future danger"—*Random House Dictionary*]?

The Soviet regime has arrested Russian Jews for speaking to western newsmen and now apparently seeks to restrict communications between Soviet and American Jews. On this, I can speak from some slight experience. My husband and I were expelled from the Soviet Union last July after three days of detention. We were charged and found guilty of a "crime" that was wholly fabricated. As tourists, we had visited Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, Erevan and Kniva, in what is now Uzbekistan, Soviet Central Asia. Toshkent, capital of Uzbekistan, was our jumping-off place to Samarkand and Bokhara, which were to have been the highlights of our tour. We had no prior preoccupation with the plight of Soviet Jewry; neither of us speaks Russian, Hebrew or Yiddish, though my husband has a smattering of German. What began as a mild interest was aggravated by several incidents.

In Moscow a group of clean-cut, well dressed youths of 17 or 18 burst in and spat all over the lobby of the synagogue while we were there. The few elderly Jewish men silently shrugged.

At the one working synagogue in Leningrad, young and old worshippers were terrorized by threats of a hostile Russian who

watched their every move. When a few less fearful Jews came closer to ask us for news of Jewish life abroad, the guard headed toward us angrily, shoving the people away, informing us that he was Russian—not Jewish—and insisting that we leave. Suddenly a tall, bearded young man rushed up and shook hands with my husband, whispered "Shalom," then fled. The Russian cursed and broke into a run, shouting obscenities as he chased the young Jew. My husband had acquired a scrap of paper during the handshake—on it was scrawled a name, an address and a plea for help.

In Tbilisi, capital of Georgia, we were followed from the time we met him until we left by a Jewish man in his early thirties. He spoke only Hebrew, Georgian and Russian, but beckoned us into his home. While we were there, he and other members of his family ran in and out, searching among trusted members of their community for a possible interpreter. Each time the door opened to the courtyard, the young man's wife made certain we were out of the sight of informers. We finally learned that our host had lost his job for requesting repatriation. He waited vainly for his visas, although he had all the other necessary documents and funds had been made available to him for the exit fees—900 rubles ($1,000 U.S.) per person for his family of four. During the next two days, he mysteriously appeared in dining rooms, museums, parks—and in the doorway of our hotel room the morning we left Georgia. He was acting as bellhop, accompanied by a housekeeper who whispered in halting English that she was Jewish and we must help him. He thrust some photographs at me, smiling sheepishly, then lugged our three bags down to the cab stand, where he waved till our car was out of sight. The photos were of us, but on one he had superimposed a solemn shot of himself in his best suit and *yarlmulka*.

At a park bench in Tashkent, after the apprehensive appraisal we'd grown accustomed to from Russian Jews, a few elders approached. In Yiddish, they despaired of Jewish life in Russia, asked how many synagogues there were in America. Distressed by what we had seen earlier, we tried to ask—through the aid of what little German my husband spoke and our Russian phrase book—if they could take us to the Tashkent synagogue. At that moment, one man alerted the others to a woman standing about 10 feet away, staring in our direction. The group abruptly dispersed.

Our stay in Samarkand was providing the pleasure we had anticipated; the monuments were gloriously restored. On our last afternoon, Victoria, our Intourist guide, invited us to visit the local synagogue, which surprised us because she had told us it did not exist. We accepted her invitation. At the synagogue, Victoria and the driver waited while we went into an alley, then into the tiny dirt courtyard where we found a shabby synagogue compound. We spent about 15 minutes with a group of withdrawn, suspicious elders and children in the exotic atmosphere of ancient Central Asia. During this quarter-hour, Victoria strode in twice asking us to leave, so that our communication with these people was limited to convincing them—through the aid of our official, six language phrase book—that we were not Soviets, or Israelis, but American Jews. They were troubled by Victoria's intrusion. Nevertheless, one old man presented me a slightly used bouquet of flowers and they all nodded, smiling warmly when we attempted to arrange to have my father mentioned in a traditional Jewish prayer on the anniversary of his death. Before we could translate the name and date into Russian, Victoria barged in a third time, exchanged a few heated words with one of the men, and ordered us to leave, all traces of amiability gone. We followed her rather than risk any further alarm. She suggested we were distributing literature, though she knew we carried only the Russian phrase book; she had asked to see it at our first meeting. We asked her to examine it again; she refused, though we persisted. We saw the last of her when she curtly reminded us to be in the lobby at 7:30 the following morning for our flight to Bokhara.

The next morning we found that orders had been given early the night before, by the Intourist manager in Samarkand, not to let us leave the hotel. We were forbidden services of a porter, but we got our bags down from the sixth floor—the lift in the eight-month-old hotel was broken. In the lobby we were denied any services or information until an hour later, when the assistant Intourist manager informed us in English that we were being "detained for questioning for unbehavior in yesterday's excursion"—that we had "much to explain" and were in "serious difficulty."

Affidavits against us had been signed by Victoria, the driver, and, ostensibly, an official of the Samarkand synagogue—whom Professor Zand, the Jewish scholar, later identified from a photo as a KGB agent. They accused us of "distributing forbidden literature in violation of Soviet regulations in old-Jewtalk, Urdu and other unknown languages" at the synagogue. We had no literature to distribute at the synagague or, indeed, anywhere else. We were found guilty by Intourist, without trial and were forbidden to telephone the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, 2,000 air miles away.

They kept us one day and night in Samarkand, and at dawn we were flown to Tashkent. The room we were assigned in Tashkent was next to the Intourist headquarters and presumably tightly monitored. Ground transport was unavailable without express consent of Intourist. In both Samarkand and Tashkent it was Intourist officials who interrogated us.

During the first interrogations various punishments were implied for our "anti-Soviet activity." We had nowhere to turn for assistance and didn't know the real nature of the Russian game. The authorities deliberately set out to frighten us in petty, underhanded ways. We decided to destroy all our photos and addresses, even some babypictures we had been given when we had the good fortune to visit the homes of several of the Russians whom friends in America had told us to look up. Most of these Russians were academicians or highly skilled professionals, and non-Jews. We tore up everything we thought might connect anybody with us—mere acquaintance with "anti-Soviet offenders" might get them in trouble. The world had become Kafkaesque.

Midway in the second day of interrogation, the affidavits were read to us through an interpreter and the line of inquiry seemed to shift. My husband explained his position as professor of law at an eminent American university and insisted on contradicting each phony bit of evidence as it was read, though he was ordered not to do so. His refusal to be intimidated seemed to confuse and frustrate our interrogators. They didn't expect or know how to deal with protest, and although they grew angrier and more petulant, we sensed uncertainty in their attitude.

Shortly thereafter, we were notified that we were to be "expelled from the Soviet Union as quickly as possible," and the money we had paid for our coveted trip to Bokhara would be confiscated as punishment. Further, our record was "permanently soiled and we would not again be welcome in the Soviet Union." Their bullying continued during our last day and night in Tashkent. Three sets of customs and KGB agents repeatedly searched our property during a 10-hour wait at the airport the next day. We doubted whether we would get out until our plane was in the air, and even then we weren't sure.

Why us? Possibly our guide's invitation to the synagogue was prearranged—she said her father had been a top party official in Uzbekistan for 40 years—and our status as independent tourists made us more vulnerable; we were without the protection of numbers that is the advantage of group travel in Russia. The commotion staged at the Samarkand synagogue and the travesty of the charges against us—and the expulsion of other American Jewish tourists as well—seem designed to discourage and frighten Russian Jews from communicating with foreign Jews. The regime may have been seeking to prop up its myth of an "international Zionist Conspiracy." Obviously the Soviets don't want the rest of the world to realize the intensity of Soviet Jewry's apprehension.

PROVIDING LONG-RANGE FUNDING FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the forests of the United States have many uses. There is frequently violent disagreement as to the kinds and extent of uses of the forest lands. All can agree on one premise. We need forests.

The Forest Service has done an excellent job of administering our national forests under law. But the law, and the appropriations have left many problems for the administering agency.

One of the greatest needs is some kind of guaranteed, long-range funding for management purposes. Man is impatient. Mother nature is exceedingly patient. We have not been able to generate the money it takes for a constructive, long-range management program.

There has been much criticism of funding schemes which grow larger only as the allowable cut of timber grows. There has been opposition to dominant use concepts.

After reviewing at least 25 different means of getting long-range funding for forest management over a period of years, I have found one answer which I am today introducing as a bill for consideration by this House.

Under existing law, dollars generated by import duties can be earmarked on a categorical basis for domestic agriculture promotion. I am told that more than $60 million per year could be dedicated to forest improvement.

Because we are about 5 million acres behind in reforestation and because we need vast funds on which we can count to catch up and keep current on this very basic need, my proposal would dedicate all the money so generated to reforestation and those things necessary to make reforestation possible.

Twenty Members of this body have joined in offering this proposal. We hope that the bill might have early and thorough consideration. Those sponsoring the bill are: Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BARING, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HALEY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEE, Mr. LINK, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. ULLMAN.

REMARKS OF SENATOR FRED HARRIS AND CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN CONCERNING WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INDUSTRIAL WORLD AHEAD

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the White House Conference on the Industrial World Ahead ended today. The 3-day conference brought together many of America's business leaders and leading figures from government and the academic world. This conference had the potential for thoroughly examining some of the fundamental structural problems in the American economy—in particular the trend toward excessive concentration of economic power.

Perceiving the potential this conference presented for meaningful dialog, Senator FRED HARRIS had recommended that individuals conversant with the social responsibilities of business—such as Ralph Nader and FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson—be invited to participate in the conference. However, this request did not meet with a favorable response by the White House conference organizers. Therefore, in order to help raise the issues of excessive concentration, inflationary pressure, and unemployment, Senator HARRIS and I today held a news conference at the Sheraton Park Hotel, the site of the conference. By raising these issues we hoped to engender a dialog, which had thus far been missing.

Senator HARRIS discussed particularly the growing concentration of economic power and its effect upon small business and competition.

The statements of Senator HARRIS and myself follow:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRED HARRIS

When I heard there would be a White House conference on the future of American business, I hoped we might see an honest examination of the fundamental economic questions facing America. Instead, we got a festival of self-congratulation. We saw businessmen telling businessmen how well things are going.

The groups represented at this conference are the ones most interested in preserving the economic status quo. Keeping things as they are is no answer. Those who call for taking a hard look at the ways American business does business were carefully excluded.

Where on the program is Ralph Nader or Nicholas Johnson? Where are the representatives of America's biggest unions, the AFL-CIO and the UAW? Where are the spokesmen for environmental groups such as the Sierra Club and Environmental Action? Where are the public interest lawyers and members of the Consumer Federation? Where are the members of public interest centers like the Project on Corporate Responsibility or the Agribusiness Accountability Project?

The fact is that the participants in this White House Conference look like the prospective board of directors of America, Incorporated. The White House is giving the executives of the big corporations and their like-minded cohorts in government and academia another chance to talk to one another.

I hoped the regular session of this White House conference would address the need for basic changes in the American business community. It became clear, however, that the direction of these meetings was towards finding ways to fit the new trends in American life into existing framework of big business—rather than searching new ways of business to better serve the emerging needs of the seventies.

The spokesmen for the big corporations here seemed very willing to talk about the technological paradise just around the corner. But they waffle on the fundamental question of who is going to control that technology, and who is likely to benefit. Making every American a Buck Rogers will not make every American happy. But you wouldn't know it from walking through the exhibits here today.

The business analysts here foresee a society in 1990 so complex that it must be managed by teams of professional socio-technocrats. We hear this forecast even though ordinary people all over this country are already rebelling against the tyranny of experts. These people demand, and rightly so, that government and industry respond more to the public, rather than the pocket book.

Most of all, I regret that there was virtually no talk here of the overriding problem facing our economy today: the overwhelming and ever-increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer freely competing corporate giants. Perhaps the people here just couldn't see the forest for the trees. Because, to me, it seems irrelevant to talk so optimistically about the future of free enterprise when the present rate of concentration makes it likely that real competition in American industry will be eliminated by 1990.

This conference sought a vision of the future of American industry. I feel such a vision could be very bright. There can be a reorientation of our society, and the American business community, operating once more under the free enterprise system, could be an important part of that reorientation. But until the forces of big government and big business are willing to face up to the very basic issues which are confronting the ordinary American every day, a true partnership between the American people and the industries which should serve them will be impossible.

What we needed was a tough, sometimes uncomfortable, look at the growing concentration of wealth and power in this country. What we got was a three-day family reunion of the university-industrial-government complex.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN

The White House Conference on Industry should provide an opportunity for meaningful discussion of the problems of this country as they relate to American industry. The two basic economic problems in this country are inflation and unemployment. But instead of presenting this conference with meaningful possible alternatives for dealing with these problems, the Administration has relied upon worn out rhetoric and football coach-like exhortations to American business to do something, to get out and compete, to improve productivity, to increase investment and employment. Such exhortations are at best naive, for they assume that businessmen will react to football coach-like pep-talks rather than in accord with basic economic facts of life. There are certain basic economic facts which the Administration's exhortations blithely ignore.

Take the problem of unemployment. American industry is currently operating at less than 75 percent of capacity. Therefore the Administration's investment tax credits and exhortations to invest constitute an Alice-in-Wonderland approach to creating jobs in the economy. One basic answer to unemployment is a legislative program to create 500,000 public service jobs, which will put people directly to work and stimulate aggregate demand in the economy. Senator Harris and I have joined many colleagues in both Houses of Congress in sponsoring such legislation. But the Administration has thus far not shown any interest.

Take the problem of inflation. One would have thought that a White House Conference on Industry might address at some point the undeniable fact that the highly concentrated character of American industry creates tremendous inflationary pressures in the economy. The Administration has chosen to deal with inflation by instituting a complex program of price controls. However, it also could have used appropriate antitrust policy to attempt to reduce the amount of economic concentration in this country. Of course, Senator Harris has been one of the leaders in this effort.

Excessive economic concentration causes a fundamental inflationary pressure since industries in monopolistic positions generally will not respond to weakening markets and will keep prices rigid, whereas competitive prices should decline.

These are fundamental structural facts of the American economy. These structural facts should have received attention at this conference. Until there is a program of full employment including a meaningful effort to provide public service jobs and until American industry becomes deconcentrated and more competitive, we will continue to be plagued with the twin ills which have been a hallmark of the Nixon era: inflationary pressure and unemployment.

LEAA—THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1972, Vice President AGNEW and Attorney General Mitchell announced with much fanfare the launching of a **$160 million anticrime impact program.** The program is designed to provide, over a 3-year period, the precise sum of $20 million to each of eight cities with populations of between 250,000 and 1,000,000. According to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which is the source of these funds, the cities were selected on the basis of burglary and street crime incidence and geographic distribution. The goal of the program is to reduce the incidence of those crimes by 5 percent in 2 years and by 20 percent in 5 years.

All Members of this body share a concern over the spiraling crime rate and a hope that Federal aid, primarily through LEAA, will help State and local governments reverse the crime trend.

As chairman of the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, which has conducted extensive hearings on the block grant program of LEAA, I have learned at first hand of the need for an effective and efficient Federal assistance effort in the criminal justice area.

This new program may not achieve either of those standards, and I said so when it was announced:

Pouring money out first and making plans afterwards leads to waste, mismanagement, inefficiency, and crime.

I also stated that expressions of total surprise about the awards by the mayors of the eight cities selected "lend credence to suspicion that public relations rather than solid achievement in crime control was the objective of the announcement" by the Vice President, the Attorney General, and the LEAA Administrator.

The commitment of such a large amount of LEAA's so-called discretionary grant funds to eight cities also has the effect, as I said, of virtually cutting off a good portion of the Nation from those funds for the next 3 years.

It has subsequently become clear to me that no meaningful planning was done by the Justice Department, LEAA, or the recipient cities prior to the announcement of the $160 million program. At my request, LEAA has provided me with a document it sent to the eight cities after the awards were announced.

The voluminous document, 91 pages in length, is a questionnaire prepared by LEAA's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. The purpose of the questionnaire, in its words, is:

To provide a planning, analysis, and data collection source document for planners to use in the development of an impact program.

The long list of questions is introduced with the instruction that the cities' "initial program planning should commence with a thorough gathering of needed information and data to assist in the identification and development of implementable projects."

This is no way to disburse public funds. I certainly do not complain that Federal funds are being awarded to cities since in many cases they have been shortchanged under LEAA's block grant programs. I do not criticize the selection of these eight cities although the exclusion of certain others raises questions about the standards of selection. Illustrative is the selection of Atlanta over Miami in the southeast region of the country. Miami has a population within the limits established by LEAA; it has the highest crime rate in the Nation; it has received less than 2 percent of all funds subawarded by the Florida agency which receives the block grants from LEAA; it has an overall crime rate, based on the 1970 FBI Uniform Crime Reports, of 5,343 per 100,000 inhabitants compared with 3,567 for Atlanta; it has a robbery rate of 426 compared with Atlanta's 194; it has a burglary rate of 1,858 compared with 1,480 for Atlanta.

What I do emphasize is the lack of planning by LEAA and the absence of sound management procedures in the disbursement of the taxpayers' funds. It continues to violate a basic rule of management which is to spend money only after thorough planning of its details.

Following are two articles, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 16 and the Criminal Justice Newsletter of January 31 that report on squaring off and tussling for funds among officials of three of the eight recipient cities:

MORE DETAILS ON IMPACT PROGRAM

One of the keys to the successful implementation of LEAA's just announced High Impact Anti-Crime Program (Special Bulletin, Jan. 17) will be the planning process.

If a city selected to share in the $160 million pot over the next two years has a well functioning planning agency, the going should not be too difficult. If it has no such agency, it may have problems getting its program off the ground—the LEAA wants plans finalized within three months.

Cleveland in conjunction with Cuyahoga County has a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, supported administratively by the privately financed, very capable Administration of Justice Committee.

Newark has an active Office of Criminal Justice Planning, but its effectiveness in handling this program could be impaired by a hot political dispute betwen Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson and the city council. A large part of the dispute involves a bitter power struggle over control of federally funded programs in the city.

A companion challenge will be communicating to the mayors of the respective cities what the program is supposed to do. After attending the hastily called briefing Jan. 13, Mayor Ralph Perk of Cleveland thought he might use some of the money to reinstate laid-off policemen and buy hardare. "That's not what the program is about," complained a Cleveland planning official. As of last week, the Mayor's Office and the Administration of Justice Committee had had only preliminary discussions about the program.

SHORT NOTICE

The situation was not helped by the suddenness of the summoning to Washington. City officials reportedly had two days notice of the conference. "It's disturbing that the mayors whose cities have been announced as beneficiaries of the $160 million crime program were surprised at the awards and had no plans for utilizing the newly awarded money," commented Rep. John S. Monagan, D-Conn., chairman of the House Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, which is investigating LEAA.

The cities will be planning their projects, but the burden of management and guidance will fall principally on the LEAA regional offices. While the cities will have great discretion within the program design to draw up plans, it is plain that the regional administrators will take an active and pursuasive role in the planning stage. The regional offices, incidentally, were bolstered in the recent LEAA reorganization.

CJN had a long conversation, with Joseph Nardoza, administrator of the New York region, which has jurisdiction over New York State, New Jersey, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Nardoza saw formation of a coordinating council as a possible solution to the political problem.

INTER-AGENCY COOPERATION

He is also looking for the cooperation of other federal agencies to help fund social, educational and training programs—vocational rehabilitation of unemployed young men and programs dealing with truants and school dropouts are integral parts of the program design.

LEAA Administrator Jerris Leonard has told regional administrators that he wants them to work closely with the regional offices of HEW, HUD and Labor. As a result, the LEAA regional offices are seeking membership in the respective Federal Regional Councils.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 16, 1972]

POLITICS TO PLAY ROLE IN ANTICRIME DRIVE

(By Ted Gest)

Police, court and corrections officials are already squaring off over which agencies can best use the massive dose of Federal anticrime funds coming to St. Louis.

The Department of Justice said last week that it would make $20,000,000 grants for the next two and one-half years to St. Louis and seven other cities to test new methods of curbing street crime and to strengthen old ones.

But politics, both at the state and local levels and among the justice agencies themselves, will play a leading role in how the funds are administered.

St. Louis Police Chief Eugene J. Camp believes that all of St. Louis's $20,000,000 should be used to bolster the police department, especially in the areas of manpower and purchase of vehicles and communications equipment.

"This grant is geared toward reducing crime in the streets, and that means burglary and robbery," Camp said in an interview. "We need to study the effect of putting more manpower to work in these critical areas."

Camp would like to hire several hundred more men, pay overtime and purchase items such as three-wheeled motorcycles and compact two-way radios.

But courts and corrections, the agencies that deal with the criminal after he has been apprehended, need an equally hefty shot in the arm, anticrime experts say.

"You can't give money only to police and ignore courts and corrections," says Williams L. Culver, executive director of the Missouri Law Enforcement Assistance Council. "If you do, the criminal justice system might not be able to handle the additional persons arrested by the police."

John Bass, who as St. Louis director of welfare oversees the city jail and Workhouse, said, "Less money has gone to corrections than any other part of the justice system. If we are to make a dent in street crime, we must give equal treatment to corrections."

"In my conversations with inmates, I know that getting them jobs makes the difference, if they can't get a decent job, they tell me that they will return to what they know best—crime in the streets."

Circuit Judge Harry M. James urged that much of the anticrime money be designated for improving courts. He said criminal cases in the city were being delayed because of lack of security at the Civil Courts Building, where three criminal divisions are housed.

"We need $300,000 to be able to have all criminal divisions in the Municipal Courts Building," James said.

Mayor Alfonso J. Cervantes said he would like to see the crime section of the recently issued Challenge of the 70s report used as a guideline for allocating the new anticrime funds.

The report proposed a package that would cost about $7,000,000 a year, not including capital investments like the equipment Camp would like to purchase.

Largest single item is a $2,500,000 proposal to employ 500 more policemen, increasing the number of officers to 2730 from 2230.

The St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners, in asking the Legislature to authorize the increase, offered a more conservative goal of a 2500-man force.

Delbert Miller Jr., new president of the board, said he did not believe 500 men qualified to join the force could be found immediately.

Another major goal is to provide more staff and higher salaries to the circuit attorney, prosecuting attorney and public defender, a $1,500,000 proposition.

Improvements would speed the handling of criminal cases, the Challenge report says. It calls court congestion "a major impediment to the effective functioning of our criminal justice system."

Another recommendation is that more than $1,000,000 be provided annually for projects aimed at releasing more persons from the city's jail and Workhouse and providing job and recreation opportunities for those who must remain.

Not to do so, the Challenge report says, would lead to an increase in street crime

committed by former prisoners who had been frustrated by the lack of education, job training and recreation in the city's correctional institutions.

PASSPORT LOGJAM BROKEN

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the passport logjam which develops each year during peak travel season. The rapidly increasing number of people traveling abroad has strained existing passport facilities to the breaking point, and as a result, I have expended considerable effort trying to alleviate this situation.

After urgings by myself and others, the Department of State in June 1970, instituted an experimental program in Connecticut which allowed individuals to apply for passports at first-class post offices. When the State Department declared this pilot to be "quite successful," I introduced legislation to authorize the expansion of this program nationally. This bill has since been passed into law, and it now allows the State Department to pay an execution fee of $2 to the U.S. Postal Service for each passport application handled by the post offices.

Just recently, the State Department announced the first major expansion of the Connecticut pilot program under this legislation. Citizens in 10 additional States will now be able to apply for passports at first class post offices, and by May 1972, citizens across the United States will be able to apply for passports at approximately 600 post offices.

I am pleased to have editorial support for my efforts in passport programs. I would like to include at this point an editorial from the Meriden Morning Record of February 1, 1972:

THANKS TO CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN

Two years ago this summer a program of issuing passports to citizens through first class post offices was undertaken in Connecticut, largely upon the instigation of Congressman Monagan, who urged the program to relieve congestion in the Federal courts. Travelers were seriously inconvenienced, and court personnel were swamped in work by the flood of passport applications.

It was in the summer of 1970 that the post offices in the state began issuing passports. Last year Monagan introduced a bill authorizing the State Department to expand the program. The bill became law, and last June Secretary of State Rogers and Postmaster General Blount signed an agreement to start the program nationally. Under the agreement the State Department will pay the U.S. Postal Service $2 for each passport application handled.

In announcing the expansion of the program, Secretary Rogers commented, "Our pilot project to provide the public with a more convenient passport application service has been extremely successful, and I am pleased to announce that this service will be expanded on a national scale in time for the travel season this coming summer."

The service performed by Congressman Monagan is appreciated by Connecticut citizens, including his constituents in Meriden and throughout the Fifth District. Now, thanks to his enterprise and initiative, citizens in practically every state will benefit by the program which, in many cases, will enable them to apply for a passport without going out of their home community.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's pioneers of progress and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

The first hydroplane in the world was invented by Glenn Curtiss of the United States in 1911.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolutions we have just discussed.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAZZOLI. 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 special order given today by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

(By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:)

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for February 16 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 16 through February 23, on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 16 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. SHOUP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, for 20 minutes, February 16.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CAFFERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ECKHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GALLAGHER, for 60 minutes, on February 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. ULLMAN, to extend his remarks immediately following those of Mr. CONABLE today.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAYNE to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during general debate today on House Joint Resolution 1025.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. RAILSBACK in three instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. MIZELL in three instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. BEGICH in five instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. PICKLE in four instances.
Mr. DOWDY.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in five instances.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in two instances.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
Mr. TIERNAN.
Mr. WRIGHT.
Mr. DOW.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. STOKES in three instances.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in five instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12488. An act to change the name of the Columbia lock and dam, on the Chattahoochee River, Alabama, to the George W. Andrews lock and dam.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to designate the week which begins on the first Sunday in March 1972, as "National Beta Club Week"; and

S.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast between certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7987. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; and

H.R. 12488. A bill to change the name of the Columbia lock and dam, on the Chattahoochee River, Alabama, to the George W. Andrews lock and dam.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on February 16 next.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 16, 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:

1585. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1586. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July–October 1971, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1587. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District of Columbia shall be deemed to have given his consent, under certain circumstances, to give a specimen of his blood, breath, or urine for chemical testing to determine its alcoholic content, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1588. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1589. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting copies of Presidential determination No. 72–10, concerning the grant of military assistance, pursuant to section 614 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1590. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Interior to establish the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1591. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the progress of the 5-year plan for family planning services and population research programs submitted in October 1971, pursuant to Public Law 91–572; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1592. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report covering fiscal year 1971 on the implementation and administration of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 89–755; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1593. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of legal assistants in the courts of appeals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1594. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1595. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting notice of a delay in the submission of the reports on the 1972 highway needs study and on the relationship of highway construction to public transportation services; to the Committee on Public Works.

1596. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

1597. A letter from the Federal Cochairman, Coastal Plains Regional Commission, transmitting the fourth annual report of the Commission, covering fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 748 with amendment (Rept. No. 92–830). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 749, with amendment (Rept. No. 92–831). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 2010 with amendment (Rept. No. 92–832). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 811. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12350. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–833). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3122 (Rept. No. 92–834). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 13066. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ROGERS):

H.R. 13067. A bill to provide for the administration of the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site, in Palm Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13068. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to limit radiation exposure resulting from the use of uranium mill tailings in the area of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13069. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 13070. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CABELL, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WAMPLER, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 13072. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 13073. A bill to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to additional group of severaly disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 13074. A bill to provide for environmental improvement in rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13075. A bill to ban the usage of diethylstilbestrol (DES) as a growth promotant; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13076. A bill to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to promote the conservation and orderly development of the hard mineral resources of the deep seabed, pending adoption of an international regime therefor; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 13077. A bill to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to hire comptrollers to examine proposed expenditures of the executive agencies to determine if each such expenditure is consistent with the legislative intent of Congress with respect to the legislation authorizing it, and if it is inconsistent, to prohibit the making of such expenditure; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13078. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 13079. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13080. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to receive a widow's, widower's, or mother's insurance benefit simultaneously with an old-age or disability insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. PELLY, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. LENNON, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. KEITH, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. STEELE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. DU PONT, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 13081. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan):

H.R. 13082. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969 to increase the limitation on the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of conserving, protecting, restoring, and propagating selected species of native fish and wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 13083. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 13084. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that amytrophic lateral sclerosis developing a 10-percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service during a period of war shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13085. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, for payment of additional compensation to certain disabled veterans with children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 13086. A bill to amend the Railroad Labor Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13087. A bill to provide health care insurance for people of the United States and to improve the availability of health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DINGELL (by request), Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 13088. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to limit the power of the Secretary of Transportation to delegate his authority to examine medical qualifications of airmen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BARING, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HALEY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEE, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. LINK):

H.R. 13089. A bill to provide for acceleration of programs for the planting of trees on national forest lands in need of reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 13090. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business, or any business having 15 or less employees, in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses, from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 13091. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 13092. A bill to designate as wilderness the Cranberry, Otter Creek, and Dolly Sods areas in the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. CABELL, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 13093. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13094. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. HALEY):

H.R. 13095. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 13096. A bill to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 13097. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to Federal habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 13098. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13099. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN,

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MANN, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 13100. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROY, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.R. 13101. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13102. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide coverage under the civil service retirement program for temporary or intermittent employment which is otherwise excludable if it follows employment covered under such program without a break in service of more than 30 days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 13103. A bill to provide preference to certain disabled veterans in the purchase of certain Government-owned vehicles; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13104. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude compensation for service-connected disability from consideration as income for purposes of all Federal benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13105. A bill to repeal provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 which place a limitation on the capital gains treatment in the case of total distributions from qualified pension, etc., plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 13106. A bill to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968 to provide that certain records of the sale or delivery of firearms and ammunition shall be maintained for a period of only 1 year and shall thereafter be destroyed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13107. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13108. A bill to provide benefits to certain survivors of members of the uniformed services and law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13109. A bill to provide that Federal, State, and local communications taxes paid by individuals over the age of 65 shall be allowed as a credit against their liability for Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13110. A bill to gear the income tax more closely to an individual's ability to pay, to broaden the income tax base of individuals and corporations, and to otherwise reform the income and estate tax provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself and Mr. DE LA GARZA):

H.R. 13111. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13112. A bill to regulate the interstate trafficking and sale of hypodermic needles and syringes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13113. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide each taxpayer with an analysis of the proportionate dollar amounts of his taxpayment which were spent by the Federal Government, during the latest fiscal year for which data is available, for certain items; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 13114. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to liberalize requirements governing payments of unemployment compensation to otherwise eligible veterans receiving disability benefits for service-connected disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. FREY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 13115. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the Big Cypress National Fresh Water Reserve in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ROE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WARE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 13116. A bill to promote international cooperation in United Nations efforts to protect the world's oceans and atmosphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. WINN, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 13117. A bill to promote international cooperation in United Nations efforts to protect the world's oceans and atmosphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 13118. A bill to establish an independent Board of Parole, to provide for fair and equitable Federal parole procedures, to establish a National Parole Institute, and to provide assistance to the States for the operation of fair and adequately staffed parole systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKAY:

H.R. 13119. A bill to amend the family planning provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 13120. A bill to provide for a modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13121. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide a comprehensive child development program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 13122. A bill to establish a system of universal voter registration for Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13123. A bill to restore the right to vote in Federal elections to certain disenfranchised citizens; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13124. A bill to prohibit the imposition of inequitable residency requirements as a condition of voting for Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 13125. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13126. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FREY, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 13127. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to permit certain veterans up to 9 months of educational assistance for the purpose of pursuing retraining or refresher courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 13128. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to $3,000 and $4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUP (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. MCCLURE):

H.R. 13129. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions, to lower certain age limits from 21 years to 18, and to eliminate certain recordkeeping provisions with respect to ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS (for himself, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. KEATING).

H.R. 13130. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18, United States Code (respecting transportation of kidnap victims in interstate commerce), to eliminate a constitutional infirmity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 13131. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WARE, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. DUNCAN,

Mr. BAKER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 13132. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 13133. A bill to require candidates for Federal elective office to resign any elective public office the term of which ends after the beginning of the term of such Federal office before filing in the general election for such Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself, Mr. SANDMAN and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.R. 13134. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to require the establishment nationally of an emergency telephone call referral system using the telephone No. 911 for such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 13135. A bill to provide for the coordinated development of transportation in the United States and to provide for technical assistance to regions in the United States, to the States, and to local areas for comprehensive transportation planning and for research, development, and demonstrations in transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.J. Res. 1062. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.J. Res. 1063. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1064. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the effects of the display of violence in television programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.J. Res. 1065. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October each year as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 1066. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.J. Res. 1067. Joint resolution to clarify Presidential power to order use of nuclear weapons in declared or undeclared war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 530. Concurrent resolution to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the first amendment to the Constitution applies to radio and television broadcasting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to "Operation Identification," a program to curb thefts and aid in the recovery of stolen property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. HOGAN):

H. Con. Res. 533. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the current situation in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 810. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by rule XI(8) and House Resolution 304; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Res. 812. Resolution calling for peace in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 813. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 114; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 814. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 361, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 13136. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Brainard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13137. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Naval Reserve who were killed on January 8, 1967, while their airplane was taking off from Andrews Air Force Base, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 13138. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Jessie B. Morris, Jr., U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H.R. 13139. A bill to provdie for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States acquired in connection with the Jim Woodruff lock and dam project to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 13140. A bill for the relief of James Evans, publisher of the Colfax County Press, and Morris Odavarka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA REMINDS US THAT AMERICA'S YOUTH SEEK LOFTY GOALS AND HIGH STANDARDS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today marks the 62d anniversary of the formation of the Boy Scouts of America. It is a date worthy of note, for over the years many millions of young people and adults have participated in the movement and benefited from the teachings of character development, citizenship training, and mental and physical fitness. We congratulate the BSA and express our gratitude for the contributions this organization has made to our Nation.

Today one out of every four boys between the ages of 8 and 16 is in scouting programs. There are nearly 1,000 Scout camps across the country, serving not only Scouts but thousands of young people who are not organization members. The good work that is being accomplished is known to all of us; there are programs to combat delinquency, drug abuse, pollution and other needed endeavors. This anniversary reminds us that America's youth seek lofty goals and high standards.

The Boy Scouts of America is a private organization that is willing and ready to help every community and every State. It is the first and the largest youth organization to be chartered by the Congress.

Chief Scout Executive Alden G. Barber recently had prepared for each separate State a report on goals and achievements. In my home State of West Virginia, the record on pollution and beautification is especially commendable.

I share with my colleagues some of the projects that have been successfully undertaken. I ask unanimous consent that the report of Scouting activities in West Virginia be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the following report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA AND SCOUTING

The Mountain State and the Scout movement share many interests such as the problems of drug abuse and pollution. Thus the State and the organization work together in many ways, each contributing to the other. The State of West Virginia, on the one hand, gives to the Boy Scouts of America through its people, its cooperation, and its locale. Scouting, on the other hand, gives a program of benefit to the State and all its people, in particular the youth.

PEOPLE

West Virginia is, of course, a location for many central Scouting activities. Last year in Logan, for example, reactions from the field were taken to recommendations for the general revision and improvement of the Scout program.

But most importantly, Scouting in West Virginia is helped by the State's contribution of people who serve as leaders of the Scout