The Office of Emergency Preparedness, which has set up a center in Washington, D.C., to monitor the shortage, reports the threat of fuel shortages in the Midwest is the gravest it has observed. Ironically, supplies of propane gas are available in the Western oil-producing states, but the means to distribute it—either by pipeline or tank car—are in short supply. After considerable Congressional pressure, efforts are underway to find ways of getting propane gas to the Midwestern states for crop-drying efforts.

In Indiana, an inventory is now being taken by the Farmers Home Administration to determine the extent of the harvesting losses, and whether an emergency should be declared in those counties suffering the most severe losses. Under present time schedules, this survey is to be continued through the months of December and January before a recommendation is to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture for an emergency declaration. I have contacted the Secretary of Agriculture to urge that the process be accelerated.

Such action would permit farmers in emergency counties to qualify for low-interest, stay-in-business loans. Eligible farmers in designated counties would be those who lost more than 20 percent of their major crop, or more than 10 percent of their entire crop production if they have no major crop.

The procedure to have an emergency declared in designated counties differs from a declaration of disaster, which is made by the governor. A disaster declaration normally follows an act of nature in which public services are knocked out, the public health is endangered, and homes and public facilities are damaged or destroyed.

HARRY S TRUMAN—OF THE PEOPLE AND FOR THE PEOPLE

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, over 27 years ago—April 12, 1945, to be exact—in a small private room in the Capitol, Speaker Sam Rayburn and Vice President Harry Truman were talking things over as was their custom when a telephone call came through for Mr. Truman summoning him to the White House. It was learned later on that historic day that President Roosevelt had passed away in Warm Springs, Ga., and that Harry S Truman, of Missouri, was now President of the United States. No other man in our history has been thrust into the position of ultimate national responsibility at so critical and difficult a period. President Truman himself realized this full well when, in all humility, he said to the press the following day:

When they told me yesterday what had happened, I felt like the moon, the stars, and the planets had fallen on me.

The sterling quality of our 33d President was quickly revealed, however, as he promptly shouldered the heavy burden of war-time President displaying the strength, courage, and tenacity for which he later became world famous. Great office has a way of taking its toll, but Harry Truman, perhaps more than any of his predecessors, remained the same tough, independent, intensely human individual that his associates had known so well through all his years in public office. What is truly remarkable is the fact that Harry Truman's hard shell of political sagacity concealed a compassion that was worldwide and encompassed the entire human race.

The man that made the heartbreaking decision to bomb Hiroshima also conceived the Marshall plan that rebuilt the war-torn nations of Europe. His Americanism was intense; he made the decision to prevent Communist aggressors from overrunning South Korea, Greece, and Turkey—wherever the spark of democratic liberty offered hope for the future against totalitarian encroachment. In keeping with the sign on his desk, "The buck stops here," he made decisions and his Marshall plan did rebuild Europe; his policy of containment was successful in drawing a circle around communism and keeping it from achieving world supremacy; and his point 4 program strengthened underdeveloped nations and enabled them to resist the forces of aggression.

Throughout his career, Harry Truman served the people with courage and candor. He was frank and straightforward; his honesty had no taint of diplomatic guile; and Americans came to regard the man from Independence with deep and abiding respect, a wonderful tribute indeed. The statement he made some years after leaving office—"I never did give anybody hell. I just told the truth and they thought it was hell," in retrospect, says again, that Harry Truman was really above the arena of partisan politics. There was no credibility gap; people knew where he stood, and they knew he had their interests at heart.

Like our greatest Presidents, Harry Truman was a man of the people. He was not afraid of work and he knew from personal experience, what it was like to meet a payroll; he knew the day-to-day struggles of our farmers; he knew, from combat in World War I, the terrors and the tragedy of war; he knew, from his 12 years as a county court judge, the problems and difficulties that people must cope with to keep going. His career of public service at the highest levels of National Government, had a core of tough but malleable humanism forged in the actual give and take of American society. His close identification with the average man was typified in a statement he made as a Senator in 1944:

Of course I believe in free enterprise but in my system of free enterprise, the democratic principle is that there never was, never has been, never will be room for the ruthless exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few.

It is impossible to overemphasize the enormous contribution which Harry Truman made to his Nation and the world. He himself, properly sized up the importance of strong leadership:

Men make history and not the other way 'round. In periods where there is no leadership, society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous, skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better.

Harry Truman proved the truth of this statement—he got things done, and he brought in the Truman era of progressive Americanism.

The thoughts we express today, in all probability, do not properly evaluate the historic stature of Harry Truman for only in recent years have historians and political commentators recognized the debt we all owe to the strong-minded and dedicated man from Missouri, and I am confident that his bulldog determination, his total commitment to the public interest, and his selfless dedication to peace and prosperity for all the people will be even more greatly respected with the passing of time.

In 1945, Harry Truman presented a scroll rewarding a "good public servant" and said at that time:

I hope that will be my epitaph.

It is indeed his epitaph for it is the sum of this philosophy in the context of an active working life, and the scholarship which gave depth to his extraordinarily perceptive comments. The Truman Library is a further dimension of this great President—it is a splendid and important historical center, but it is also a symbol of Harry S Truman's lifelong devotion the ideals of American democracy. Harry Truman was a great man because he was an indomitable human being with profound faith in humanity, which is to say he was of the people and for the people.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, January 15, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Look unto Me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God and there is no other.—Isaiah 45: 22.

O Lord our God, grant that each one of us may be true to our own high calling and in so doing serve Thee more faithfully, love our fellow man more fully, and seek the good of our country with more fidelity.

Have mercy upon this land of ours and so guide the destiny of our Nation that the power of Thy presence may be revealed and people learn to live together in peace and with good will.

Give understanding hearts and discerning minds to these leaders of our Republic that the safety and security of our citizens may be advanced.

Grant that by looking to Thee our love may be rekindled, our faith renewed, our strength restored, and our hope for a better world be revived.

In the spirit of Him who walked in Thy way we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE AND ECONOMIC REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) extending the time within which the President may transmit the budget message and the economic report to the Congress and extending the time within which the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 2. Not later than February 5, 1973, the President shall transmit to the Congress (1) the reports, with respect to all funds impounded on or after October 27, 1972, and before January 29, 1973, required by section 203 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 (as added by section 402 of the Federal Impoundment and Information Act), and (2) a report, with respect to all funds impounded on or after July 1, 1972, and before October 27, 1972, containing the same information as is required by such section."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have at least a brief explanation of what the resolution purports to do?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an explanation of what the resolution is about. House Joint Resolution 1 gave the President until the 29th of January to submit the budget. Under the law the President must submit the budget within 15 days after the Congress convenes. The President requested the extension as it will not be possible to comply with the 15-day provision. If we do not provide the extension, of course, the President would be in violation of law. The resolution also extended the time for the submission of the Joint Economic Report to Congress and extended the time within which the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report.

We passed this resolution through the House and when the measure went to the other body it was amended. A proviso was added which stated that a list of impoundments is to be submitted to the Congress on February 5. The Office of Management and Budget advises me that there is so much stress and strain incident to the submission of the budget that it would be most desirable that the OMB have a little more time to submit this list of impoundments. We were asked that we postpone the date that the impoundment list be submitted from the 5th of February to the 10th of February. Here today I propose to submit an amendment to the Senate amendment to provide for this extension to February 10 for the submission of the list of impoundments.

This does not affect the date for submission of the budget which is the 29th day of January.

Mr. GROSS. So the limiting date for the submission of the budget is January 29 and the limiting date for the submission of the impoundments is February 10 under the amendment which would be offered by the gentleman from Texas. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Iowa is correct.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves to concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment: On the first line of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 1 strike out "February 5, 1973" and insert "February 10, 1973".

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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. 4]

Abzug	Denholm	Kemp
Addabbo	Dent	Kluczynski
Anderson, Calif.	Diggs	Koch
Andrews, N.C.	Dingell	Kyros
Annunzio	Donohue	Landrum
Ashbrook	Dorn	Leggett
Badillo	Drinan	Lent
Bafalis	Dulski	McCloskey
Baker	du Pont	McCormack
Barrett	Eckhardt	McEwen
Bell	Edwards, Ala.	McKinney
Biaggi	Eilberg	Macdonald
Bingham	Esch	Mallary
Blatnik	Eshleman	Maraziti
Brademas	Fascell	Martin, N.C.
Brasco	Fish	Mathias, Calif.
Breaux	Flowers	Mathis, Ga.
Brinkley	Flynt	Melcher
Brooks	Foley	Michel
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford, Gerald R.	Mink
Broyhill, Va.	Ford, William D.	Minshall, Ohio
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell, Md.
Burke, Calif.	Froehlich	Montgomery
Burke, Fla.	Fulton	Moorhead, Pa.
Burton	Fuqua	Morgan
Butler	Gaydos	Murphy, Ill.
Camp	Giaimo	Murphy, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Grasso	Nix
Casey, Tex.	Gray	O'Hara
Chappell	Griffiths	Owens
Chisholm	Grover	Pettis
Clancy	Harrington	Peyser
Clark	Harvey	Podell
Clay	Hastings	Pritchard
Cleveland	Hawkins	Railsback
Cohen	Hébert	Randall
Conable	Heckler, Mass.	Rangel
Conyers	Helstoski	Riegle
Corman	Henderson	Rinaldo
Cotter	Hogan	Roberts
Crane	Holifield	Robinson, Va.
Cronin	Holtzman	Rodino
Daniel, W. C. (Dan)	Huber	Roe
Davis, Ga.	Hudnut	Roncallo, N.Y.
Delaney	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Dellums	Jordan	Rosenthal
Runnels	Stuckey	Rostenkowski
Ryan	Talcott	Roush
St Germain	Taylor, Mo.	Widnall
Sandman	Teague, Tex.	Wiggins
Sebelius	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson, Bob
Shipley	Tiernan	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Shriver	Treen	Winn
Smith, Iowa	Van Deerlin	Wolff
Snyder	Vander Jagt	Wyatt
Stanton, J. William	Vanik	Wydler
Steed	Veysey	Yatron
Steele	Vigorito	Young, Ga.
Steiger, Ariz.	Walsh	Young, S.C.
Stokes	Ware	
	Whitehurst	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 251 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE AND ECONOMIC REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. EDITH GREEN OF OREGON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 8, 1973.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 11, Ninety-third Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect Edith Green of the Third District of Oregon, I have the honor to report that on the 3rd day of January, 1973, at Multnomah County, State of Oregon, I administered the oath of office to Mrs. Edith Green, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mrs. Green subscribed.

I have the honor to be,

Yours respectively,

JOHN C. BEATTY, Jr.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 129) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 129

Whereas Edith Green, a Representative from the State of Oregon, from the Third District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable John C. Beatty, Jr., Judge, Circuit Court of Oregon, Fourth Judicial District, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in her behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to her election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Edith Green as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRONIC VOTING

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement and would like to have the attention of Members because it applies to the Members of the House.

On January 3 the Chair announced that under authority contained in clause 5, rule XV, rollcalls and quorum calls would continue to be conducted in the manner used in the previous Congress. The Chair also stated at that time that sufficient notification would be given before activation of the recently installed electronic voting system.

Members are hereby advised that effective on Tuesday, January 23, the new electronic voting system will become operative. If any Member has not yet obtained an identification-voting card the Chair urges action before January 23.

A detailed statement concerning the operation of the new voting system has been mailed by the clerk to each Member's office and a copy thereof will be inserted at this point in the RECORD. The Chair is also advised that each Member has been given a committee print entitled "The Electronic Voting System for the U.S. House of Representatives."

The statement and committee print follow:

STATEMENT ON ELECTRONIC VOTING

Members are familiar with the fact that an electronic voting system was designed, developed, and installed during the 92d Congress. The rules of the House, adopted on January 3, 1973, now provide for the use of this new voting system. The Chair will announce in a few days when this system will be utilized, but in advance of its implementation, it seems advisable to promulgate the procedures regarding its use.

The Chair has given careful consideration to the implementation of this new voting mechanism. Discussions have been held with the Committee on House Administration, which is responsible for the technical development of the system, with the Committee on Rules, and with the Leadership on both sides of the aisle to determine the most efficient and practical means of utilizing the electronic system.

This new voting system has been designed primarily with the aim of reducing the time required to conduct recorded votes and quorum calls while at the same time assuring the accuracy of the vote or call. Consequently, the Chair anticipates that the use of this new procedure will not supplant votes by voice, division, or tellers as provided in the Rules of the House.

The use of this system by the Members can best be described in terms of the essential physical components. A number of *vote stations* are attached to selected chairs in the Chamber. Each station is equipped with a vote card slot and four indicators, marked "yea," "nay," "present," and "open." The first three indicators are also push-buttons used to case votes, while the fourth is illuminated only when a vote period is in progress and the station is in operational readiness to accept votes. Each Member has been provided with a personalized Vote-ID Card. The vote cards are encoded with a pattern of holes so as to be uniquely identifiable by the system when inserted into any of the vote stations. The *main display,* located over the press gallery, lists the Members' names alphabetically and will indicate their vote preferences by the illumination of colored lights adjacent to each Member's name. The color code is: green for yea, red for nay, and amber for present. The duplicate *summary displays,* located on the east and west gallery ledges, will identify the issue under consideration, provide running tallies of the yea, nay, and present responses recorded by the system, and show the time remaining during a vote period.

As the Members are undoubtedly aware, a computer system coordinates the interaction of these components and maintains a permanent record of the Members' votes.

Where a vote is to be taken, electronically, the Chair will instruct Members to record their presence or votes by means of the electronic device. This will initiate a fifteen minute voting period during which a Member may cast his vote. The initiation of a vote period will be accompanied by the illumination of the blue "open" light at each of the vote stations and by activation of the main and summary displays. The time indicated on the summary displays will reduce from 15:00 minutes to 00:00 minutes during the vote period.

A Member casts his vote by inserting his Vote-ID card into any one of the vote stations and depressing the appropriate push-button indicator. The voting system indicates the recording of the Member's vote by illuminating the selected push-button indicator at the vote station and the vote preference light adjacent to the Member's name on the main display panel. At the same time, the appropriate running tally on the summary display will be incremented.

If a Member mis-casts his vote or desires to change his vote during the voting period, he may do so by simply repeating the method used for casting his original vote. The system will illuminate the push-button he last selected when he inserts his Vote-ID card into the station. At this point, he may change his vote by depressing another push-button. The running tallies on the summary displays will reflect the changed vote, and the vote preference light adjacent to the Member's name on the main display will change accordingly.

A Member may also verify his previously cast vote by simply inserting his Vote–ID card into a vote station and observing which push-button is illuminated.

In the event that a Member is in the Chamber without his Vote–ID card, he may still cast his vote in the following manner. Green "yea" ballot cards, red "nay" ballot cards, and amber "present" ballot cards will be available in the cloakrooms and in the Well. These cards have spaces for the Member to fill in his name, State, and district. Upon properly filling out an appropriate ballot card, the Member casts his vote by handing the ballot card to the Tally Clerk in the Well. The Tally Clerk will then record the vote electronically and the main and summary displays will reflect the Member's vote preference. At the same time, the system deactivates the use of the Member's Vote–ID card for the duration of the vote then in progress. A Member without a Vote–ID card who has been recorded in this fashion and who then wishes to change his vote must seek recognition by the Chair and announce his change. That Member does not submit a second ballot card.

If a Member present in the Chamber at the time of a recorded vote in the House desires to be paired with a Member not present, he should record himself as "present" in the manner prescribed above and, at the conclusion of the voting period seek recognition by the Speaker to announce his desire to create a pair with his absent colleague. As has been the practice under the precedents "pairs" will not be permitted in Committee of the Whole.

At the conclusion of the 15 minute voting period, the time indicated on the summary displays will show "0:00"; however, the vote stations will remain open, indicated by the blue illumination of the "open" indicator light, until the Chair declares the vote to be closed and announces the final result. At this point, the summary panel time display will indicate "FINAL" and the vote stations will be closed to the acceptance of further votes.

When the vote is finally declared, printed reports of the results, alphabetically listing Members who responded "aye", "nay" or "present" or who did not respond at all will be available to the Leadership.

A similar method governs the use of the electronic vote system for the recording of quorum calls, both for the House and for the Committee of the Whole. The Chair will instruct that a quorum call be taken by electronic device. This will initiate a 15 minute period during which the Member may indicate his presence by inserting his Vote–ID card into a vote station and depressing the "present" push-button. The main and summary displays will reflect the Members' responses as in the case described above for a recorded vote. The vote stations, however, will not accept a vote other than "present" during a quorum period. At the conclusion of the 15 minute period, the time indicated on the summary display will be "0:00". The vote stations will remain open until the Chair announces that the count is final, at which point the vote stations will be closed and the time indicator will show "FINAL". A printed report of those responding on the quorum call will then be distributed as previously described.

If a Member is in the Chamber without his Vote-ID card, he may indicate his presence by using the amber ballot card, as previously described.

One further aspect of the electronic voting system deserves mention at this time. Video consoles equipped with key boards are located at both the majority and minortiy tables. These devices may be used by the Leadership to review the progress of the vote. The same information is available on both devices, though, of course, they are operated independently of one another. The actual operation and use of the devices is the responsibility of the majority and minority leaders.

Under the provisions of Rules XV and XXIII, the Chair may in his discretion determine that recorded votes be taken by alternative procedures in lieu of the electronic device. In the House, the Constitutional yeas and nays or an "automatic roll call" (where a quorum is not present and objection to a vote is made for that reason) may be taken by a call of the roll under Clause 1 of Rules XV. In such event, the names of Members shall be called alphabetically and there shall be a second roll call of those Members who failed to respond to the first roll call. Members may respond "aye", "no", or "present" when their names are called.

In the House and in the Committee of the Whole a "recorded vote"—that is a vote demanded under the provisions of Clause 5, Rule I by one-fifth of a quorum—may, at the Chairman's discretion, be told by tellers in lieu of using the electronic system. In that event, Members will fill in a green "aye" ballot card to be deposited in the "aye" ballot box at the rear of the aisle to the Chair's left or a red "no" ballot card to be deposited in the "no" ballot box at the rear of the aisle to the Chair's right. Members wishing to be recorded as "present" in such case will announce this fact to the Chair prior to the announcement of the result.

Quorum calls in the House and in the Committee of the Whole may, at the discretion of the Chair, be recorded by clerks in lieu of electronic devices under clause 2(b) of Rule XV. In that event, Members will find quorum call cards here at the Clerk's desk which must be filled in by name, State and district. Tally clerks will be stationed at a box to be located at the rear of the center aisle. The Clerks will take the cards, deposit them in the box and count the number of Members who respond to the call. When the Chair declares that procedures under this clause

have been completed the Tally Clerk will give the Chair a final count which the Chair will announce to the House.

The implementation of this new voting system will necessitate a change in the bell system.

The Chair has directed that the bell and light system be utilized in the following manner:

One bell indicates a teller vote, taken in accordance with clause 5, Rule I (Members indicate their preference by walking up the center aisle and counted by Members who are named as tellers by the Chair. This is not a recorded vote).

Two bells indicate an electronically recorded vote, either demanded under the Constitution by one-fifth of those present (in the House) or by one-fifth of a quorum under clause 5, Rule I (either in the House or in Committee of the Whole). Two bells may also indicate a recorded vote under clause 5 Rule I whenever Members are to record their votes by depositing ballot cards in the "aye" or "no" boxes. *The two bells will be repeated five minutes after the first ring* to give Members a second notice of the vote in progress.

Two bells, a brief pause, followed by two bells indicates a yea and nay vote taken under the provisions of Rule XV, clause I, by a call of the roll. *The bells will be sounded again when the Clerk reaches the "R's" in the first call of the roll.*

Three bells indicate a quorum call, either by means of the electronic system (Rule XV, clauses 2 and 5) or by means of tellers (Rule XV, clause 2(b)). *The bells will be repeated five minutes after the first ring* to give Members a second notice of the quorum call in progress.

Four bells indicate an adjournment of the House.

Five bells indicate a recess of the House.

Six bells indicate a civil defense warning.

The Electronic Voting System for the U.S. House of Representatives

I. INTRODUCTION

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-510) in Section 121 provides that "the names of Members voting or present may be recorded through the use of appropriate electronic equipment." This provision, introduced as an amendment to the Act, culminated a long history of legislative proposals to bring automated voting procedures to the United States House of Representatives. The concept of automated voting was first introduced to the House through a resolution in 1941 in an unsuccessful attempt to satisfy the need to diminish the time required by the House voting process. This need has increased markedly in recent years, as illustrated by the 1st Session of the 92nd Congress, in which recorded votes and quorum calls consumed more than a month of legislative time.

The Electronic Voting System has been developed through the efforts of the Committee on House Administration. In conjunction with the development of this system, the House in October 1972 passed H. Res. 1123 amending the Rules of the House to provide for use of the Electronic Voting System. The purpose of this report is to describe the features of the system and their use.

II. DESIGN CONCEPT

The design of the Electronic Voting System is based primarily on the requirements that the time to record a vote or a quorum call be reduced significantly. The lengthy roll call of Members' names is replaced by a definite voting period, during which Members vote at their convenience.

Several additional enhancements to the voting process have been embraced in the design. For example, in-progress information related to a vote or quorum call can be displayed to the Chamber. Such information as the individual votes of the Members, the running totals of Yea, Nay, and Present responses, the time remaining during the voting period, and identification of the vote or quorum issue under consideration can thus be made available to the Members.

The decision to utilize modern computer technology in the voting system was influenced by a number of technical considerations as well as procedural ones. For example, the fact that the Members do not have assigned seats in the Chamber presented a technical problem in recording and tabulating Members' votes. The need for in-progress vote information retrieval also suggested the application of computer techniques. Perhaps the most significant consideration was the fact that the operational characteristics of a computer-oriented system could be altered with minimal effort and cost. For example, possible future changes in the Rules of the House affecting voting procedure can be incorporated simply by restructuring, where necessary, the programming of the system.

The use of a computer system to record votes will assist various clerical activities associated with the voting process. Thus, when a vote is declared final, printed copies of the complete vote results can be produced and distributed to the legislative leaders, the Government Printing Office (for inclusion in the Congressional Record), and the press. In addition, the system offers an efficient and automatic method for compiling data for the Members Vote History System, which heretofore required manual data entry prior to processing by the House computer facility.

III. SYSTEM COMPONENTS AND THEIR OPERATION

Those components of the system that interact with the Members during the vote process are described in this section. Illustration 1 indicates the location of the Chamber components when the Electronic Voting System is activated, while Illustration 2 shows that the Chamber will appear unchanged when the system is not in use.

Voting Stations.—Forty-four voting stations are attached to the backs of chairs located throughout the House Chamber, as shown in Illustration 3. The stations are equipped with three pushbutton indicators to handle vote options: the YEA, NAY, and PRESENT pushbuttons show respectively green, red, and amber colors when used. A fourth indicator is illuminated by a blue light whenever the voting station is OPEN during a vote period. The voting station details are indicated in Illustration 4.

A Member may vote by inserting his voting card into the slot on any one of the stations. Each voting card, which also will serve as the Member's official identification, is encoded with a pattern of holes so that the system can reliably identify the Member. The system will extinguish the blue light for a fraction of a second after the voting card is inserted while the card is identified; the blue light then goes on to indicate that the voting station is ready to accept the Member's vote. While his card is still in the voting station the Member records his vote by depressing the appropriate pushbutton, which will then be illuminated to indicate that the vote has been recorded. A Member may verify his vote during the voting period by reinserting his card into any station: the pushbutton indicating his last vote will be illuminated. At this point, if the Member desires to change his vote, he simply depresses one of the other pushbuttons.

Display Panels.—The roster of Members' names appears on the *main display* that occupies the four central panels on the south wall of the Chamber, above the Speaker's desk. Adjacent to the left of each name are three lights—green, red, and amber—one of which will be illuminated when the system records the Member's vote. Illustration 5 shows the arrangement of Members' names on one of the four panels. The Members' names and vote preferences are illuminated from within the panels, which are faced with a silk screened plexiglass that matches the cloth tapestries covering the remaining panels about the Chamber. The names and vote preferences may be seen only when the main display is activated.

Duplicate *summary display* panels are mounted on the balcony ledges on the east and west sides of the Chamber, as indicated in Illustration 6. During a voting period each of these summary displays will identify the issue under consideration, show the running totals of the Yea, Nay, and Present votes, and give the time remaining in the voting period. This summary information will be illuminated through silk screened plexiglass panels that blend into the mahogany balcony surface when these displays are not in use.

The Chamber Consoles.—The system incorporates three video display consoles in the Chamber. These are located at the Majority table, the Minority table, and at a desk in the Well. Illustration 7 shows the placement of the console at the Majority table. The console keyboard is shown in Illustration 8, along with a typical console display of vote information.

The Majority and Minority consoles provide the same vote information as that shown on the main and summary displays at any time during the vote period. The main function of these consoles is to provide in-progress vote information, such as an alphabetical list of Members grouped by party and vote preference. A vote information request is handled through simple keyboard commands. The Majority and the Minority consoles have identical capabilities, but are operationally independent of one another. For example, Illustration 8 shows a video display of Members who have voted *YEA*, beginning alphabetically at GRay."

The console located in the Well, called the *Control Console,* will be used by a clerk for direct system control during a voting period. Primary functions of the control console include vote period opening and closing, identification to the system of the legislative issue under consideration, and the recording of votes by Members who fail to bring their voting cards with them to the Chamber. In addition, a number of secondary duties can be performed, such as system checkout, notification of the use of invalid voting cards, and the recording of Pairs data.

A printer and video console are located in the Tally Clerk's office near the Chamber. These devices are used for the production of a number of printed vote reports, which may be distributed to the Speaker and other Leadership, the Pairs Clerks, the Government Printing Office, and the press. These include: A report of the Members' votes in roster order, a report used by the Pairs Clerks to facilitate the pairing of absent Members, a report of the complete vote results in Congressional Record format, and a summary report of each day's voting activity.

The Computer System.—The nucleus of the Electronic Voting System consists of two Control Data Corporation 1700 computers located in the Rayburn House Office Building and connected via cables to the equipment in the House Chamber. Two computers are incorporated in the system to provide maximum reliability. One computer, called the Master, actually controls the system during a voting period. The other computer, called the Monitor, constantly checks the Master and assumes the Master role if a system malfunction is detected.

The Master computer accepts votes from the voting stations and commands from the consoles. Voting information is processed, stored, and retrieved according to programmed instructions. The computer then directs information to the proper output device: voting station, printer, consoles, or displays.

IV. USE OF THE ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM

The final form of the electronic voting procedure awaits definition by the adopted Rules of the House and regulations approved by the Speaker. Subject to final action by the

House on its rules and direction from the Speaker, it is presently anticipated that the Electronic Voting System will be used for quorum calls and all recorded votes. Other methods of voting—voice votes, division votes, and teller votes—will not be affected. The fundamental objective of the system, that the time required to conduct a recorded vote be reduced, was recognized by the House with the passage of H. Res. 1123 in October 1972. This Resolution amended the Rules of the House to provide for the use of electronic voting for all recorded votes and quorum calls, except when the Speaker (or the Chairman of the Whole, as the case may be) deems its use inadvisable. The minimum voting period was set at 15 minutes through this Resolution.

In order to explain the capabilities of the system, this section describes, subject to the ruling of the Speaker, how the various components and their features might be used to conduct a recorded vote in the House. A similar procedure would be used for quorum calls and for recorded votes in the Committee of the Whole.

To initiate a record vote, the Speaker directs a clerk at the control console to activate the system. Using the control console keyboard, the clerk informs the computer system of the type of vote, identifies the issue to be voted upon, and directs the system to open the voting stations and to activate the displays. This being done, the system will accept votes from the voting stations and will display these votes on the main display panels and, on request, at the Chamber consoles. In addition, as votes are cast, a tally of *Yea, Nay,* and *Present* votes will be shown on the summary display panels along with the minimum time remaining in the voting period.

When a Member enters the Chamber to cast his vote, he can view the identification number of the issue under consideration along with the current in-progress vote totals on the summary displays. The main display will provide information on the individual votes of the Members.

To cast his vote, the Member inserts his voting card in a convenient voting station and depresses the appropriate pushbutton. The pushbutton will then be illuminated to verify the vote, the proper light adjacent to the Member's name on the main display will be lit, and the tally shown on the summary displays will record current totals. If the Member desires to change his vote during the same voting period, he simply reinserts his voting card at any station and depresses another pushbutton. The system will respond to the Member's vote in less than a second.

In the event that the Member does not have his voting card, his vote may be recorded using the control console in the Well. The Member will be required to deposit a ballot indicating his vote preference with the Tally Clerk, who then records the Member's vote electronically.

During the voting period, the Floor Leaders may request the system to display selected vote information on their Chamber consoles. In addition to a display showing current vote totals by Party and vote preference, displays showing the Members' individual votes alphabetically by Party or vote preference, may be requested. For example, the names of the Democrats who have voted *YEA,* or the Republicans who have voted *NAY,* can be easily obtained using the console keyboard. The Majority and Minority consoles have identical capabilities, but each operates independently of the other. They do not have the capability of recording votes, but are used only for information retrieval purposes.

As soon as the time allotted for the voting period has expired, a signal appears at the control console. At this point the time on the summary display panel will show "0:00" with the voting station remaining open. The Speaker formally ends the voting period by instructing the clerk at the control console to terminate the vote, thus closing the voting stations and filing the vote results in the computer storage.

When the vote is declared final by the Speaker, the Word "FINAL" will appear on the summary displays together with the final results, and the complete vote report will be printed. Copies of this report will be delivered to the Speaker and other leadership and to the press.

If pairing is to be done, a list of those Members voting *PRESENT* and those not voting will be produced on the printer for use by a Pairs Clerk. Pairing information can be entered into the system at any time during the remainder of the legislative day.

At the end of a legislative day during which the Electronic Voting System has been used, the complete voting activity stored in the computer system will be transferred to permanent storage. This information will be available to the Members through the Vote History System.

APPENDIX

A. DATA PROCESSING SUPPORT TO THE HOUSE

Responsibility for the design, development, and operation of the Electronic Voting System rests with the Committee on House Administration. As work progressed on this and other computer-oriented projects, it became evident to the Chairman and the Committee that it would be desirable to establish under its guidance a special staff on information and computer systems. This system is one of a number of computer-oriented projects that the Committee, acting through its House Information Systems staff, has in operation or under development. The special responsibilities of this staff were recognized by the House with the adoption of H. Res. 601 in November of 1971.

B. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

During the 91st Congress the Committee on House Administration, in conjunction with the Clerk of the House, undertook a preliminary study of an automated voting system for the House. In December 1970, a short time after the Legislative Reorganization Act became law, the Clerk contracted with Informatics, Inc., for the design of a computer-assisted voting system and for technical coordination of the project to implement their design. On the recommendation of the House Information Systems staff, the work of Informatics was terminated in September 1971, leaving as a product a preliminary design concept. Following revision and finalization of the design concept by House Information Systems, a prime contract to "develop a fully operational electronic voting system" was let by the Committee on House Administration to Control Data Corporation. A total of 16 companies were considered for various aspects of this work, and five submitted proposals for the prime contract.

The terms of this contract call for Control Data Corporation to provide at a cost of $950,000 all hardware components, detailed system design, computer programming, technical coordination, and operational training. Several features were added to the system by the Committee during the course of the project, increasing the cost by $68,147. Control Data's work began in November 1971, and the system will be ready for use with the beginning of the 93d Congress. Operational support of the system will be provided by the House Information Systems staff, which has been responsible for monitoring all aspects of the project for the Committee on House Administration and for determining its technical acceptability.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I assume, then, the quorum call on January 23 would be in order as a test for the new machine.

The SPEAKER. If there is no quorum present, a quorum call is always in order under some procedure or other.

PROVIDING FOR PAYMENT OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 130) from the Committee on House Administration, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 130

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for the period beginning January 3, 1973, and ending at the close of March 31, 1973, such sums as may be necessary for the continuance of the same necessary projects, activities, operations, and services, by contract or otherwise (including payment of staff salaries for services performed), and for the accomplishment of the same necessary purposes, undertaken by each standing or select committee of the House in the calendar year 1972 on the same basis and at not to exceed the same rates utilized in 1972. Payments of salary for services performed in the period beginning January 3, 1973, and ending at the close of March 31, 1973, shall be made to each person—

(1) (A) who, on January 2, 1973, was employed by a standing or select committee in the Ninety-second Congress and whose salary was paid under authority of a House resolution adopted in that Congress or (B) who was appointed after January 2, 1973, to fill a vacancy, existing on or occurring after that date, in a position created under authority of such House resolution; and

(2) who is certified by the chairman of such committee as performing such services for such committee in such period.

Such salary shall be paid to such person at a rate not to exceed the rate he was receiving on January 2, 1973 (or, in the case of a person appointed after January 2, 1973, to fill any such vacancy, not to exceed the rate applicable on January 2, 1973, to the vacant position), plus any increase in his rate of salary which may have been granted for periods on and after January 3, 1973, pursuant to section 5 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970.

SEC. 2. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with law.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is an interim resolution which would expire effective as of March 31.

Mr. HAYS. This is a resolution, if not identical, certainly similar to other resolutions that we introduced at the beginning of Congress to allow committee staffs to be paid until such time as committee chairmen and the ranking members have had a chance to appear before the Accounts Subcommittee on House Administration and justify appropriation, which would then be brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that while vacancies on committee staffs may

be filled during the interim period, it is not the intention of the Committee on House Administration in bringing this resolution to the floor that committee staffs be augmented or increased pending the submission of justifications for committee staffs?

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is exactly right. They can fill vacancies but not add to. I might go further and state that in the case of select committees these will not apply until they have been reconstituted by, first, the Committee on Rules and then brought before the House to be reconstituted.

It is my understanding some of them may be reconstituted very shortly. In that case this will cover them on the same prorated basis as they had in the previous Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the Committee on House Administration would carefully scrutinize the requests that come in by way of justifications later to see what transpired under this interim resolution.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not propose, as chairman of the committee, in the interim to sign any committee monthly pay vouchers that are larger for that month than one-twelfth of the money they had last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio for immediate consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 131) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 131

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives that was appointed pursuant to House Resolution 819, 92nd Congress, on February 28, 1972, is hereby continued under the same terms and conditions from January 3, 1973, through January 31, 1973, to investigate and to report to the House not later than February 9, 1973, with respect to this continuation.

Resolved, That during the period beginning January 3, 1973, and ending January 31, 1973, inclusive, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 18

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CONSUMER FINANCE

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members who have read news articles about the final report of the National Commission on Consumer Finance have been inquiring about the availability of copies of this report. The report is now in the process of being printed in final form by the Government Printing Office and a copy will be sent automatically to each of the Members of Congress, but probably not until some time next month at the earliest.

Only a limited number of prepublication copies could be assembled in time for the press conference conducted by Chairman Ira M. Millstein last week which marked the termination of the Commission's official existence. Because of the extensive press coverage given to the report, numerous requests have been coming in to the Members' offices from constituents seeking copies. Such requests for single copies should be referred to the former administrative officer of the Commission, Mr. Donald Harper, at room 2007, General Services Administration. GSA will handle the actual distribution under arrangements made by the Commission prior to its required termination on December 31. The document will also be placed on sale by the Superintendent of Documents.

SUMMARY OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

In the meantime, in order to provide Members with an overview of the recommendations of the Commission, which will form the basis for consumer credit legislation which I intend to introduce shortly, and which other congressional members of the Commission may also introduce, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a comprehensive press release prepared by the Commission information officer, Ruth K. Holstein, listing all 85 proposals contained in the final report.

As the release points out, six of the nine members of the Commission dissented from, or expressed reservations about, some of the 85 recommendations, so they do not, in all instances, represent the unanimous view of the Commission. Some are quite controversial. All of them are discussed in detail in the report itself. In order to place them in the context in which they were presented by the Commission, I am also including in the RECORD my separate views on the Commission report, indicating those recommendations or viewpoints which I personally, and several of my colleagues on the Commission, do not endorse.

The press release issued at the conclusion of the Commission's work is as follows:

COMMISSION MAKES REPORT ON U.S. CONSUMER CREDIT

(By National Commission on Consumer Finance—Created by Public Law 90-321)

The National Commission on Consumer Finance today proposed a series of sweeping recommendations designed to make consumer credit more available to more people at competitive prices. At the same time, the Commission recommended a variety of consumer safeguards including the elimination of harassing collection practices by creditors.

In a report whose basic theme is the importance of competition in the consumer credit industry, the Commission told the President, the Congress, and state legislators that greater competition could be expected to bring the same benefits to consumers of credit as it does to consumers of goods and other services. The Commission stated that greater competition, particularly in the cash loan sector of the industry, could come about only by the repeal of a number of state laws that restrict access to the consumer credit field by potential lenders.

But the fact that consumers need better protection against the legal powers of the industry—according to the report entitled "Consumer Credit in the United States"—is reflected in 21 recommendations urging restriction or repeal of a number of legal devices now available to creditors. These proposals were derived from a survey of the industry and determination by the Commission as to the effects that such proposals would have on the availability and cost of credit.

Commission Chairman Ira M. Millstein's letter of transmittal stated that the report "recommends significant additions to the protection of consumers in the fields of creditors' remedies and collection practices. We have urged restrictions on remedies such as garnishment, repossession, and wage assignment. We have recommended abolition of the holder in due course doctrine, confessions of judgment, and harassing tactics in debt collections."

REPORT MAKES 85 RECOMMENDATIONS

The 85 recommendations in the report based on close to 3 years of staff study range widely from proposals that Federal agencies which regulate financial institutions examine establishments under their jurisdiction for compliance with state consumer credit protection laws to how and when the subject of consumer credit should be taught in the schools.

One proposal, based on a widely publicized hearing on the availability of credit to women, advises "states (to) undertake an immediate and thorough review of the degree to which their laws inhibit the granting of credit to creditworthy women and (to) amend them, where necessary, to assure that credit is not restricted because of a person's sex."

The nine-member bipartisan Commission which was established by Title IV of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 notes in a foreword that it "has pioneered in collecting and presenting heretofore unobtainable data" and that "dissemination of these data, the studies, and the analyses will provide a fresh and empirical basis for legislators, the industry, and scholars to consider."

It adds, "As in any report of this nature, not all of the Commissioners agreed with all of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as evidenced by the separate views expressed by the individual members" at the end of the report. Comments or dissents on various findings and recommendations in the report were filed in separate views by six of the nine members.

PROPOSALS ON SUPERVISION, RATES, CREDIT INSURANCES

In addition to the 21 recommendations to repeal or restrict certain creditors' remedies, a number of recommendations in-

tended to increase competition in the industry, and the recommendation that discrimination because of sex be eliminated, the Commission made proposals dealing with the supervision of financial institutions, credit insurance, rates and availability of credit, other types of discrimination in granting credit, credit information to be disclosed to consumers, consumer credit education, and the responsibility of creditors in disputes with consumers.

In addition to Chairman Millstein, a New York attorney, members of the Commission include Senator John J. Sparkman, Senator William Proxmire, and Senator William E. Brock; Representative Leonor K. Sullivan, Representative Henry B. Gonzalez, and Representative Lawrence G. Williams; Dr. Robert W. Johnson of Purdue University; and Douglas M. Head, former attorney general of the state of Minnesota.

The Commission's recommendations are attached.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CONSUMER FINANCE

CHAPTER 3—SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Contract provisions and creditors' remedies

1. Contract Provisions: Acceleration Clauses, Default, Cure of Default

Acceleration of the maturity of all or any part of the amount owing in a consumer credit transaction should not be permitted unless a default as specified in the contract or agreement has occurred.

A creditor should not be able to accelerate the maturity of a consumer credit obligation, commence any action, or demand or take possession of any collateral, unless the debtor is in default, and then only after he has given 14 days' prior written notice to the debtor of the alleged default of the amount of the delinquency (including late charges), of any performance in addition to payment required to cure the default, and of the debtor's right to cure the default.

Under such circumstances, for 14 days after notice has been mailed, a debtor should have the right to cure a default arising under a consumer credit obligation by:

1. tendering the amount of all unpaid instalments due at the time of tender, without acceleration, plus any unpaid delinquency charges; and by

2. tendering any performance necessary to cure a default other than nonpayment of accounts due.

However, a debtor should be able to cure no more than three defaults during the term of the contract. After curing default, the debtor should be restored to all his rights under the consumer credit obligation as though no default had occurred.

2. Attorneys' Fees

Consumer credit contracts or agreements should be able to provide for payment of reasonable attorney's fees by the debtor in the event of default if such fees result from referral to an attorney who is not a salaried employee of the creditor; in no event should such fees exceed 15 percent of the outstanding balance. However, the agreement should further stipulate that in the event suit is initiated by the creditor and the court finds in favor of the consumer, the creditor should be liable for the payment of the debtor's attorneys' fees as determined by the court, measured by the amount of time reasonably expended by the consumer's attorney and not by the amount of the recovery.

3. Confessions of Judgment, Cognovit Notes

No consumer credit transaction contract should be permitted to contain a provision whereby the debtor authorizes any person, by warrant of attorney or otherwise, to confess judgment on a claim arising out of the consumer credit transaction without adequate prior notice to the debtor and without an opportunity for the debtor to enter a defense.

4. Cross-Collateral

In a consumer credit sale, the creditor should not be allowed to take a security interest in goods or property of the debtor other than the goods or property which are the subject of the sale. In the case of "add-on" sales, where the agreement provides for the amount financed and finance charges resulting from additional sales to be added to an existing outstanding balance, the creditor should be able to retain his security interest in goods previously sold to the debtor until he has received payments equal to the sales price of the goods (including finance charges). For items purchased on different dates, the first purchased should be deemed the first paid for; and for items purchased on the same date, the lowest priced items should be deemed the first paid for.

5. Household Goods

A creditor should not be allowed to take other than a purchase money security interest in household goods.

6. Security Interest, Repossession, Deficiency Judgments

A seller-creditor should have the right to repossess goods in which a security interest exists upon default of contract obligations by the purchaser-debtor. At the time the creditor sends notice of the cure period (14 days), and prior to actual repossession (whether by replevin with the aid of state officers or by self-help), the creditor may simultaneously send notice of the underlying claim against the debtor and the debtor should be afforded an opportunity to be heard in court on the merits of such claims. The time period for an opportunity to be heard may run concurrently with the cure period.

Where default occurs on a secured credit sale in which the original sales prices was $1,765 or less, or on a loan in which the original amount financed was $1,765 or less and the creditor took a security interest in goods purchased with the proceeds of such loan or in other collateral to secure the loan, the creditor should be required to elect remedies: either to repossess collateral in full satisfaction of the debt without the right to seek a deficiency judgment, or to sue for a personal judgment on the obligation without recourse to the collateral, but not both.

7. Wage Assignments

In consumer credit transactions involving an amount financed exceeding $300, a creditor should not be permitted to take from the debtor any assignment, order for payment, or deduction of any salary, wages, commissions, or other compensation for services or any part thereof earned or to be earned. In consumer credit transactions involving an amount financed of $300 or less, where the creditor does not take a security interest in any property of the debtor, the creditor should be permitted to take a wage assignment but in an amount not to exceed the lesser of 25 percent of the debtor's disposable earnings for any workweek or the amount by which his dispensable earnings for the workweek exceeds 40 times the Federal minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in effect at the time.

Creditors' Remedies

8. Body Attachment

No creditor should be permitted to cause or permit a warrant to issue against the person of the debtor with respect to a claim arising from a consumer credit transaction. In addition, no court should be able to hold a debtor in contempt for failure to pay a debt arising from a consumer credit transaction until the debtor has had an actual hearing to determine his ability to pay the debt.

9. Garnishment

Prejudgment garnishment, even of nonresident debtors, should be abolished. After entry of judgment against the debtor on a claim arising out of a consumer credit transaction, the maximum disposable earnings of a debtor subject to garnishment should not exceed the lesser of:

1. 25 percent of his disposable earnings for the workweek, or

2. The amount by which his disposable earnings for the workweek exceed 40 times the Federal minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, in effect at the time the earnings are payable. (In the event of earnings payable for a period greater than a week, an appropriate multiple of the Federal minimum hourly wage would be applicable.)

A debtor should be afforded an opportunity to be heard and to introduce evidence that the amount of salary authorized to be garnished would cause undue hardship to him and/or his family. In the event undue hardship is proved to the satisfaction of the court, the amount of the garnishment should be reduced or the garnishment removed.

No employer should be permitted to discharge or suspend an employee solely because of any number of garnishments or attempted garnishments by the employee's creditors.

10. Holder in Due Course Doctrine-Waiver of Defense Clauses-Connected Loans

Notes executed in connection with consumer credit transactions should not be "negotiable instruments;" that is, any holder of such a note should be subject to all the claims and defenses of the maker (the consumer-debtor). However, the holder's liability should not exceed the original amount financed. Each such note should be required to have the legend "Consumer Note—Not Negotiable" clearly and conspicuously printed on its face.

Holders of contracts and other evidences of debts which are executed in connection with consumer credit transactions other than notes should similarly be subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer-debtor arising out of the transaction, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary. However, the holder's liability should not exceed the original amount financed.

A creditor in a consumer loan transaction should be subject to all of the claims and defenses of the borrower arising from the purchase of goods or services purchased with the proceeds of the loan, if the borrower was referred or otherwise directed to the lender by the vendor of those goods or services and the lender extended the credit pursuant to a continuing business relationship with the vendor. In such cases, the lender's liability should not exceed the lesser of the amount financed or the sales price of the goods or services purchased with the proceeds of the loan.

11. Levy on Personal Property

Prior to entry of judgment against a debtor arising out of a consumer credit transaction, while a court may create a lien on the personal property of the debtor, that lien should not operate to take or divest the debtor or possession of the property until final judgment is entered. However, if the court should find that the creditor will probably recover in the action, and that the debtor is acting or is about to act in a manner which will impair the creditor's right to satisfy the judgment out of goods upon which a lien has been established, the court should have authority to issue an order restraining the debtor from so acting. The following property of a consumer debtor should be exempt from levy, execution, sale, and other similar process to satisfy judgment arising from a consumer credit transaction (except to satisfy a purchase money security interest created in connection with the acquisition of such property).

1. A homestead to the fair market value of $5,000 including a house, mobile home, or

like dwelling, and the land it occupies if regularly occupied by the debtor and/or his family as a dwelling place or residence and intended as such.

2. Clothing and other wearing apparel of the debtor, spouse, and dependents to the extent of $350 each.

3. Furniture, furnishings, and fixtures ordinarily and generally used for family purposes in the residence of the debtor to the extent of the fair market value of $2,500.

4. Books, pictures, toys for children and other such kinds of personal property to the extent of $500.

5. All medical health equipment being used for health purposes by the debtor, spouse, and dependents.

6. Tools of trade, including any income-producing property used in the principal occupation of the debtor, not to exceed the fair market value of $1,000.

7. Any policy of life or endowment insurance which is payable to the spouse or children of the insured, or to a trustee for the benefit of the spouse or children of the insured, except the cash value of any accrued dividends thereof.

8. Burial plots belonging to the debtor and/or spouse or purchased for the benefit of minor children to the total value of $1,000.

9. Other property which the court may deem necessary for the maintenance of a moderate standard of living for the debtor, spouse, and dependents.

12. Contacting Third Parties

No creditor or agent or attorney of a creditor before judgment should be permitted to communicate the existence of an alleged debt to a person other than the alleged debtor, the attorney of the debtor, or the spouse of the debtor without the debtor's written consent.

Miscellaneous Recommendations

13. Balloon Payment

With respect to a consumer credit transaction, other than one primarily for an agricultural purpose or one pursuant to open end credit, if any scheduled payment is more than twice as large as the average of earlier scheduled payments, the consumer should have the right to refinance the amount of that payment at the time it is due without penalty. The terms of the refinancing should be no less favorable to the consumer than the terms of the original transaction. These provisions do not apply to a payment schedule which, by agreement, is adjusted to the seasonal or irregular income of the consumer.

14. Cosigner Agreements

No person other than the spouse of the principal obligor on a consumer credit obligation should be liable as surety, cosigner, comaker, endorser, guarantor, or otherwise assume personal liability for its payment unless that person, in addition to signing the note, contract, or other evidence of debt also signs and receives a copy of a separate cosigner agreement which explains the obligations of a cosigner.

15. Rebates for Prepayment

A consumer should always be allowed to prepay in full the unpaid balance of any consumer credit obligation at any time without penalty. In such instances, the consumer should receive a rebate of the unearned portion of the finance charge computed in accordance with the "balance of the digits" (otherwise known as "sum of the digits" or "rule of 78's" method) or the actuarial method. For purpose of determining the installment date nearest the date of prepayment, any prepayment of an obligation payable in monthly installments made on or before the 15th day following an installment due date should be deemed to have been made as of the installment due date, and if prepayment occurs on or after the 16th it should be deemed to have been made on the succeeding installment due date. If the total of all rebates due to the consumer is less than $1 no rebate should be required.

In the event of prepayment, the creditor should not be precluded from collecting or retaining delinquency charges on payments due prior to prepayment.

In the case of credit for defective goods, the consumer should be entitled to the same rebate as if payment in full had been made on the date the defect was reported to the creditor or merchant.

If the maturity of a consumer credit obligation is accelerated as a result of default, and judgment is obtained or a sale of secured property occurs, the consumer should be entitled to the same rebate that would have been payable if payment in full had been made on the date judgment was entered or the sale occurred.

Upon prepayment in full of a consumer credit obligation by the proceeds of credit insurance, the consumer or his estate should be entitled to receive the same rebate that would have been payable if the consumer had prepaid the obligation computed as of the date satisfactory proof of loss is furnished to the company.

Unfair Collection Practices

16. Harassment

No creditor, agent or attorney of the creditor, or independent collector should be permitted to harass any person in connection with the collection or attempted collection of any debt alleged to be owing by that person or any other person.

17. Sewer Service

If a debtor has not received proper notice of the claim against him and does not appear to defend against the claim, any judgment entered shall be voided and the claim reopened upon the debtor's motion.

18. Inconvenient Venue

No creditor or holder of a consumer credit note or other evidence of debt should be permitted to commence any legal action in a location other than (1) where the contract or note is signed. (2) where the debtor resides at the commencement of the action (3) where the debtor resides at the time the note or contract was made, or (4) if there are fixtures, where the goods are affixed to real property.

Debtors in Distress—Consumer Credit and Consumer Insolvency

19. Chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act should be expanded as endorsed by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association in July 1971 to permit Chapter XIII courts, under certain circumstances, to alter or modify the rights of secured creditors when they find that the plan adequately protects the value of the collateral of the second creditor.

20. In petitions for relief in bankruptcy, the bankruptcy court should disallow claims of creditors stemming from "unconscionable" transactions.

21. Bankruptcy courts should provide additional staff to serve as counselors to debtors regarding their relations with creditors, and their personal, credit, and domestic problems.

22. Door-to-Door Sales

In any contract for the sale of goods entered into outside the creditor's place of business and payable in more than four instalments, the debtor should be able to cancel the transaction at any time prior to midnight of the third business day following the sale.

23. Assessment of Damages

If a creditor in a consumer credit transaction obtains a judgment by default, before a specific sum is assessed the court should hold a hearing to establish the amount of the debt the creditor-plaintiff is lawfully entitled to recover.

CHAPTER 4—SUPERVISORY MECHANISMS

The Commission recommends that:

1. Legislatures and administrators in states with less than 2½ man-days available per year per small loan office reassess their staffing capabilities with the goal of improving their ability to fulfill the examination responsibility prescribed by law.

2. All Federal regulatory agencies adopt and enforce uniform standards of Truth in Lending examination.

3. Congress create within the proposed Consumer Protection Agency a unit to be known as the Bureau of Consumer Credit (BCC) with full statutory authority to issue rules and regulations and supervise all examination and enforcement functions under the Consumer Credit Protection Act, including Truth in Lending; an independent Consumer Credit Agency be created in the event that the proposed Consumer Protection Agency is not established by Congress; the independent agency would have the same functions and authorities recommended for the Bureau of Consumer Credit.

4. Agencies supervising federally chartered institutions undertake systematic enforcement of Federal credit protection laws like Truth in Lending.

5. Federal law be expressly changed to authorize state officials to examine federally chartered institutions for the limited purpose of enforcing state consumer laws, but such authorization should in no way empower state officials to examine federally chartered institutions for soundness, fraudulent practices, or the like; the limited state examinations should be required by law to be performed in a manner that would not disrupt or harass the federally chartered institutions.

6. State consumer credit laws be amended to bring second mortgage lenders and any other consumer lenders under the same degree of administrative control imposed on licensed lenders.

7. Congress consider whether to empower state officials to enforce Truth in Lending and garnishment restrictions of the Consumer Credit Protection Act and any similar laws that may be enacted.

8. State laws covering retailers and their assignees be amended, where necessary, to give authority to a state administrative agency to enforce consumer credit laws against all sellers who extend consumer credit; but administrative regulation need not and should not entail either licensing or limitations on market access.

9. States which do not subject sales finance companies to enforcement of consumer credit laws amend their laws to bring such companies under enforcement; such authority need not and should not entail licensing or limitations on market access.

10. State laws be amended to give a state administrative agency authority to enforce consumer credit laws against all credit grantors—deposit holding institutions, non-deposit holding lenders, and retailers and their assignees. This authority should include the right to enter places of business, to examine books and records, to subpoena witnesses and records, to issue cease and desist orders to halt violations, and to enjoin unconscionable conduct in making or enforcing unconscionable contracts. The agency should be able to enforce the right of consumers, as individuals or groups, to refunds or credits owing to them under appropriate statutes.

11. Legal services programs—legal aid, neighborhood legal services, rural legal assistance, public defender—continue to receive Federal, state, and local government support.

12. Consumer protection laws be amended, where necessary, to assure payment of legal fees incurred by aggrieved private consumers and provide them with remedies they can enforce against creditors who violate these laws.

13. The proposed BCC be authorized to

establish a National Institute of Consumer Credit to function as the BCC's research arm.

14. The BCC, acting through the National Institute of Consumer Credit, be empowered to cooperate with and offer technical assistance to states in matters relating to consumer credit protection—examinations, enforcement, and supervision of consumer credit protection laws.

15. The BCC be authorized:

(1) to require state and Federal agencies engaged in supervising institutions which grant consumer credit to submit such written reports as the Bureau may prescribe;

(2) to administer oaths;

(3) to subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

(4) to intervene in corporate mergers and acquisitions where the effect would be to lessen competition in consumer credit markets to include but not be limited to applications for new charters, offices, and branches;

(5) to invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance in the case of disobedience to a subpoena or order issued;

(6) to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person designated by the Bureau with the power to administer oaths, and in such instances to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under subparagraphs (3) and (5) above.

CHAPTER 5—CREDIT INSURANCE

The Commission recommends that:

1. The finance charge earned by credit grantors should be sufficient to support the provision of the credit service. The finance charge should not subsidize the credit insurance service. Nor should the charge for credit insurance subsidize the credit operation.

2. The proposed Bureau of Consumer Credit in the Consumer Protection Agency make a study to determine acceptable forms of credit insurance and reasonable levels of charge and prepare recommendations.

3. The states should immediately review charges for credit insurance in their jurisdictions and lower rates where they are excessive.

4. Creditors offering credit life and accident and health insurance be required to disclose the charges for the insurance both in dollars and cents and as an annual percentage rate in the same manner as finance charges and annual percentage rates of finance charges are required to be disclosed under the Truth in Lending Act and regulation Z.

CHAPTER 7—RATES AND AVAILABILITY OF CREDIT

1. Although the Commission makes no generally applicable recommendation concerning branch banking because conditions can vary among the states, it does recommend that where statewide branching is allowed, specific steps be taken to assure easy new entry and low concentration. Such steps would:

(1) Give preferential treatment wherever possible to charter applications of newly forming banks as opposed to branch applications of dominant established banks.

(2) Favor branching, especially the *de novo* branching, whether directly or through the holding company device when such branching promotes competition. Banking regulators should exercise a high degree of caution in permitting statewide branching whether directly or through the holding company device when such branching decreases competition or increases economic concentration.

(3) Encourage established banks and regulatory agencies to see that correspondent bank services be made available (for a reasonable fee) to assist newly entering independent banks, including the provision of loan participation agreements when needed.

(4) Disallow regional expansion by means of merger and holding company acquisitions when such acquisitions impair competition, recognizing that statewide measures of competition are relevant.

2. The Commission recommends, as did the President's Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation, that under prescribed conditions savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks be allowed to make secured and unsecured consumer loans up to amounts not to aggregate in excess of 10 percent of total assets.

3. The Commission recommends that the only criterion for entry (license) in the finance company segment of the consumer credit market be good character, and that the right to market entry not be based on any minimum capital requirements or convenience and advantage regulations.

4. The Commission recommends that direct bank entry in the relatively high risk segment of the personal loan market be made feasible by:

(1) Permitting banks to make small loans under the rate structure permitted for finance companies;

(2) Encouraging banks to establish *de novo* small loan offices as subsidiary or affiliated separate corporate entities. Regardless of corporate structure these small loan offices, whether corporate or within other bank offices, should be subject to the same examination and supervisory procedures that are applied to other licensed finance companies;

(3) Exempting consumer loans from the current requirement that bank loan production offices obtain approval for each loan from the bank's main office; and

(4) Prohibiting the acquisition of finance companies by banks when banks are permitted to establish *de novo* small loan offices.

5. The Commission recommends that existing regulatory agencies disallow mergers or stock acquisitions among any financial institutions whenever the result is a substantial increase in concentration in state or local markets.

6. The Commission recommends that interinstitutional acquisitions be generally discouraged even though there is no effect on intra-institutional concentration.

7. The Commission recommends that state regulatory agencies and legislatures review the market organization of their respective financial industries after a 10-year trial period of earnest implementation of the recommendations on market entry and concentration. If, despite these procompetitive efforts, such a review discloses an inadequacy of competition—as indicated, say, by a continuing market dominance by a few commercial banks and finance companies or the absence of more frequent entry—then a restructuring of the industry by dissolution and divestiture would probably be appropriate and beneficial.

8. The Commission recommends that antitrust policy, both Federal and state, be alert to restrictive arrangements in the credit industry. Any hint of agreement among lenders as to rates, discounts, territorial allocations and the like must be vigorously pursued and eliminated.

9. The Commission recommends that each state evaluate the competitiveness of its markets before considering raising or lowering rate ceilings from present levels. Policies designed to promote competition should be given the first priority, with adjustment of rate ceilings used as a complement to expand the availability of credit. As the development of workably competitive markets decreases the need for rate ceilings to combat market power in concentrated markets, such ceilings may be raised or removed.

CHAPTER 8—DISCRIMINATION

The Commission recommends that:

1. States undertake an immediate and thorough review of the degree to which their laws inhibit the granting of credit to creditworthy women and amend them, where necessary, to assure that credit is not restricted because of a person's sex.

2. Congress establish a pilot consumer loan fund and an experimental loan agency to determine whether families whose incomes are at or below the Federal Guideline for Poverty Income Levels issued annually by OEO have the ability to repay small amounts of money which they may need to borrow.

3. $1.5 million be appropriated for an experimental low income loan program to be allocated among operating expenses, loss write-offs, and loan extensions according to guidelines developed by an advisory committee to the Bureau of Consumer Credit.

4. There be continued experimentation by private industry in cooperation with Federal, state, and local governments to provide credit to the poor.

5. Legislation permitting "small small" loans should be encouraged as a suitable means of providing loans to the poor from regulated, licensed lenders.

CHAPTER 9—FEDERAL CHARTERING

1. The Commission recommends that Federal chartering of finance companies be held in abeyance for 4 years while two complimentary courses of action are pursued: (1) efforts should be undertaken to persuade the states to remove from existing laws and regulations anticompetitive (and by extension, anticonsumer) restrictions on entry and innovation and, (2) Congress should sustain the research initiated by the Commission.

2. If the substantive portions of the Commission's recommendations regarding workably competitive markets are not enacted within 4 years and states have not eliminated barriers to entry, the Commission recommends that Congress permit Federal chartering of finance companies with powers to supersede state laws in three basic areas which sometimes severely limit competition in availability of credit: limitations on entry, unrealistic rate ceilings, and restraints on amounts and forms of financial services offered consumers.

Chapter 10—Disclosure

The Commission recommends that:

1. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System regularly publish a statistical series showing an average (and possibly a distribution) of annual percentage rates for at least three major types of closed end consumer installment credit: new automobiles, mobile homes, and personal loans.

2. The Truth in Lending Act should be further amended to require creditors who do not separately identify the finance charge on credit transactions involving more than four installments to state clearly and conspicuously in any advertisement offering credit: "THE COST OF CREDIT IS INCLUDED IN THE PRICE QUOTED FOR THE GOODS AND SERVICES."

3. The Truth in Lending Act be amended to make clear the presumption that all discounts or points, even when paid by the seller, are passed on to the buyer and hence must be included in the finance charge.

4. Section 106(e) of the Truth in Lending Act be amended to delete as excludable from the finance charge the following items numbered in accordance with that paragraph:

(5) Appraisal fees

(6) Credit reports

5. A full statement of all closing costs to be incurred be presented to a consumer prior to his making any downpayment. In any case, a full statement of closing costs should be provided at the time the lender offers a commitment on a consumer credit real property transaction or not later than a reasonable time prior to final closing.

6. Section 104(4) of the Truth in Lending Act which exempts public utility transactions from disclosure requirements be repealed.

7. Creditors be required to disclose the charge for credit insurance both in dollars and as an annual percentage rate in the same manner as the finance charge is required to be disclosed. Additionally, where credit insurance is advertised, that the premium be required to be expressed as an annual percentage rate.

8. Exempted transactions (Section 104) of the Truth in Lending Act should include credit transactions primarily for agricultural purposes in which the total amount to be financed exceeds $25,000, irrespective of any security interest in real property.

9. Creditors offering open end credit be permitted to advertise only the periodic rate and the annual percentage rate.

10. Where terms other than rates are advertised, only the following terms be stated in the advertisement:

Closed end credit

The cash price or the amount of the loan as applicable.

The number, amount, and due dates or period of payments scheduled to repay the indebtedness if the credit is extended.

The annual percentage rate, or the dollar finance charge when the APR is not required on small transactions.

Open end credit

The minimum periodic payment required and the method of determining any larger required periodic payment.

The method of determining the balance upon which a finance charge may be imposed.

The periodic rate(s).

The annual percentage rate(s).

11. Sections 143 and 144 of the Truth in Lending Act be amended to make clear that there may be no expression of a rate in an advertisement of closed end credit other than the annual percentage rate as defined in the Truth in Lending Act and regulation Z.

12. Legislation be adopted to permit private suits seeking injunctive relief to false or misleading advertising.

13. The Truth in Lending Act be amended to provide that the Act and regulation Z apply to oral disclosures.

14. State laws which are inconsistent with the Federal Truth in Lending Act or which require disclosures which might tend to confuse the consumer or contradict, obscure, or detract attention from the disclosures required by the Truth in Lending Act and regulation Z be preempted by the Federal law.

15. The Truth in Lending Act be amended as necessary to assure that subsequent assignees are held equally liable with the original creditor when violations of the Truth in Lending Act are evident on the face of the agreement or disclosure statement: and that there be equal enforcement by all appropriate agencies of this provision concerning assignees and all other Truth in Lending Act provisions in order to assure equal protection to all consumers.

16. Both suggestions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System pertaining to class action suits—one providing a "good faith" defense and the other spelling out more precisely the kind of "transactions" subject to civil damage claims—be adopted.

17. The Commission supports the recommendation of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that Congress amend the Truth in Lending Act specifically to include under Section 125 security interests that arise by operation of law.

18. The Commission supports the recommendation of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that Congress amend the Truth in Lending Act to limit the time the right of rescission may run where the creditor has failed to give proper disclosures.

CHAPTER 11—EDUCATION

The Commission recommends that:

1. Congress support the development of improved curricula to prepare consumers for participation in the marketplace, with adequate attention to consumer credit as one aspect of family budgeting.

2. Appropriate Federal and state agencies should continue their emphasis on adult education for low income consumers, try to reach more of them, and develop useful programs for the elderly.

3. Federal resources be used to encourage expanded research and carefully monitored pilot projects to generate and test new ideas in adult consumer education.

4. Business organizations support and encourage nonprofit credit counseling, provided it is conducted for the benefit of the consumer and does not serve solely or primarily as a collection agency.

5. If private debt adjusting services are allowed to continue, their activities be strictly regulated and supervised, including their fees and advertising.

6. Counseling be made a mandatory requirement for obtaining a discharge in both Chapter XIII and straight bankruptcy, unless the counselor in a particular case should determine that counseling would be unnecessary or futile.

CHAPTER 12—THE FUTURE OF CONSUMER CREDIT

1. The Commission recommends that legislation be enacted to achieve the following goals:

(1) Each consumer's complaint should be promptly acknowledged by the creditor.

(2) Within a reasonable period of time a creditor should either explain to the consumer why he believes the account was accurately shown in the billing statement or correct the account.

(3) During the interval between acknowledgment of the complaint and action to resolve the problem, the consumer should be free of harassment to pay the disputed amount.

(4) The penalties on creditors for failure to comply should be sufficiently severe to prompt compliance.

2. The Commission recommends additional Federal and state legislation specifically prohibiting any regulatory agencies from establishing minimum merchant discounts.

3. The Commission also recommends that studies be undertaken now to consider the eventual Federal chartering and regulation of credit reporting agencies, both to assure the accuracy and confidentiality of their credit information and to achieve open and economical access to their data.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN

Next, Mr. Speaker, I submit the separate views I filed to be made part of the Commission report, discussing some of the 85 recommendations, or policy positions included in the report, with which I disagree in whole or in part:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN FOR FINAL REPORT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CONSUMER FINANCE

As the principal sponsor of the legislation which created the National Commission on Consumer Finance, I have had no illusions that a bipartisan group of nine Members with divergent views on regulation of the credit industry—based on extensive participation individually in Federal or state legislative battles on this subject—would or could achieve unanimity on all of the controversial issues this Commission was assigned to investigate. Nevertheless, many far-reaching recommendations have been agreed upon, at least in principle, and the work of the Commission can provide many worthwhile benefits.

But the final Report is an attempt at accommodation of differing views which is only partially successful, and the Report will be useful only to the extent that those who read it and seek to imlpement it understand the circumstances under which the data was collected and the Report was written.

By the very nature of a national commission composed of six Members of Congress with extremely heavy legislative responsibilities and three private citizens able to devote only limited time to the assignment, the day-to-day workload rested on a small professional staff possessed of special expertise (and the inevitable biases acquired in their own wide experience in economics, law, and other fields). It was the responsibility of the Commission Members to hire the staff director, authorize the employment of specialists and the development of staff studies and outside contracts, review the results, and provide general policy direction. This Commission has suffered from the fact that there have been numerous changes in its membership, although, fortunately, a majority of five of its nine Members has served continuously, including Chairman Millstein, who had to take over the leadership midway through the Commission's work and has performed this assignment with ability, courtesy, tact, and conscientiousness.

Even under the best of circumstances, I am sure we would have had disagreement on some basic conclusions dealing with the question of maximum legal rates on credit charges. Unfortunately, unanticipated delays in the Census Bureau in carrying out the most extensive of the Commission's statistical studies resulted in the submission of great masses of material to the Commission Members, and a necessity for judgments to be made on staff analyses of the data, at a time when four of the six Congressional Members were in the midst of re-election campaigns and all six were deeply involved in major legislative battles in Committee and on the House and Senate Floor in the chaotic homestretch of a two-year Term of Congress.

PROJECTIONS BASED ON DATA STILL TO BE PUBLISHED

Hence, although the Report language was continuously being rewritten down to the deadline to reflect additional data and the comments of individual Members, there was no occasion when all nine Commissioners—or even a majority of five—were able to sit down together and argue out the issues face-to-face once the staff had finally assembled the economic data on which some of the most controversial conclusions of the Report are based—those dealing with maximum rates. In view of the individual dissents from those conclusions, they emerge, therefore, largely as staff recommendations, based on staff studies and econometric projects only four of us serving on the Commission actually had explained to us in detail during nearly three full days of morning, afternoon and evening meetings. Had all nine been present for that extended discussion and debate, I think Chapters 6 and 7 dealing with rates would probably have been cast differently.

When the Report states, at it does in Chapter 7, that state legislators should study the advisability of adopting a rate ceiling structure suggested by the Commission staff as a basis for achieving optimum competition in the extension of loans to low income borrowers, it refers to projections based on data not available to us in final form, which will be published later. Once the data is subjected to the kind of intensive critical analysis it deserves, among a wide spectrum of economists and other consumer credit specialists, we will all have a better basis for judging the validity of these projections. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity to have that kind of public review of the survey information before the Report had to be completed in conformance with the deadline set by the stature under which the Commission operated.

KEEPING THE REPORT IN PERSPECTIVE

The fear has been expressed that instead of being viewed as a package of approaches toward improving the overall operations of the consumer credit market in this country, the Report will be dissected into separate and unrelated segments which will be used to promote the special interest objectives of various pressure groups in the economy. Certainly this can happen if those who shared in the work of the Commission permit such efforts to go unchallenged. The Congressional Members, all serving on the respective House and Senate Committees having jurisdiction over consumer credit legislation and over the functioning of federally chartered or insured financial institutions, are in an excellent position to prevent misuse of Commission data or findings in the achievement of special interest legislative objectives at the Federal level. Furthermore, the state legislatures have demonstrated, under intense pressure of the credit industry in 1969 to pass quickly and without critical analysis the controversial provisions of the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code, that they are capable of examining with caution and care issues such as those discussed in this Report, particularly when they recognize that the Commission itself has not endorsed any proposed rate structure as "ideal."

There was basic agreement in the Commission on the value of the Truth in Lending Act in promoting a more informed use of credit by consumers, and there was a desire shared by all of the Members to make this landmark law more effective and more useful through changes in the law and education of consumers in using the law. There was general agreement on the need to stimulate more competition in the marketing of consumer credit. The staff studies and outside research financed by the Commission have provided us with a comprehensive catalogue of the statistics of credit granting in each of the 50 states, not only in terms of comparative amounts and rates but broken down into major categories of consumer credit. This was a monumental task, bringing together information not previously available. For the first time, also, we have a clear picture of how creditors' remedies are used in the various states by different types of creditors in enforcing the repayment of credit arrangements, to enable us the better to judge which techniques are fair and necessary and which are abusive and predatory. Chapter 3 will be particularly useful to the Congress and to the state legislatures in assessing the need for reform in this area.

REPEALING STRONG STATE GARNISHMENT RESTRICTION LAWS

This is certainly not to say that all of the Recommendations of Chapter 3 have been enthusiastically agreed to by all of the Members of the Commission. That is certainly not the case. I personally oppose very strongly the proposal in Chapter 3 which calls upon the states which have much stronger laws than the Federal statute in protecting consumers against garnishment abuses to modify their laws in order to bring them into conformance with the relatively mild provisions of Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act. When the Federal Restriction on Garnishment Act was adopted in 1968, it undoubtedly was a strong step forward, in comparison with most of the state laws on this subject at that time; but it was admittedly a compromise intended to win the approval of the Senate Conferees for any Federal law on this subject. Since 1968, and particularly since the garnishment title went into effect on July 1, 1970, many of the states have improved their garnishment laws and brought them at least up to the standard of the Federal law. But I do not think the Federal law is strong enough; nor would it be even with the increase in exemptions proposed in Chapter 3 to 40 times the minimum wage. And I certainly don't think that states like Pennsylvania and Texas, North Carolina and Florida, and others which regulate and restrict garnishment more severely than the Federal law does, should be challenged to repeal—or have superseded by the Federal law—their tougher restrictions on garnishment.

EMPHASIS ON EXPANDING CREDIT FOR HIGH RISK BORROWERS

Which brings me to my basic criticism of this Report, which is that so much of the emphasis is directed toward the expansion of the availability of credit to those who do not now qualify for it because of the fear or probability that they cannot or will not repay. Except for instances of outright discrimination, there was little evidence collected by this Commission to show that *creditworthy* Americans cannot obtain as much credit as they can afford to repay. In fact, the evidence is convincing that large numbers of Americans obtain far more credit than their economic situations would justify. True, they frequently pay a high—a very high—interest rate for this credit. This would seem to indicate that those who extend credit to high risk borrowers are making tremendous profits. But the Commission studies clearly show that the cost of extending credit make it impossible for creditors to extend small loans to high risk borrowers at rates that can possibly be considered "reasonable."

Is the answer, then, to raise all legal ceilings on interest rates to encourage and promote this kind of loan? I think not. As Chapter 8 points out, the ultimate solution for making very low income families eligible for more credit is to enable them to raise their incomes so that they can afford to repay the credit. But coupled with this sage, if not easy-to-implement, advice is extensive argument in the Report for making it economically feasible, and in fact, quite profitable, for private enterprise to extend cash loans to high risk borrowers through a rate ceiling structure sufficiently high to cover—in all loans—the extra costs of doing business with the high risk borrower. These extra costs result from smaller average loan sizes, increased losses from default, high delinquency experience, and high collection costs. and include, also, provision for a favorable return on investment and borrowed loan funds. To me, this is not a satisfactory solution.

COMPETITION AND RATES

The Commission does urge the removal of existing barriers to competition so that more financial institutions can get into the field of lending money. Commission studies point to a high incidence of concentration in the banking and small loan industries—with comparatively few firms in many states dominating the field of cash consumer credit. Other studies made by the Commission staff, including an econometric model using techniques which those of us who are not economists pretty much have to take on faith, are said to demonstrate that if lenders can charge up to 42% on the first $300 of any loan, with substantially lower rate ceilings on other steps of a loan up to $3,000, this rate structure would be sufficiently high to stimulate competition among lenders for consumer loan business, and thus make more credit available—and hopefully encourage competition in rates, too.

I am not aware of any Member of the Commission who argues that we should call upon the states to set ceilings immediately at 42% on small loans. The wording of the Report is rather fuzzy on that, leading to diverse interpretations by individual Members of the Commission. Essentially, however, the rate structure described, or rather referred to in Chapter 7, is a staff projection. I am not opposed to the Commission releasing the results of staff studies which reflect extensive research authorized by the entire Commission, but on a matter of this kind the staff cannot speak for the Commission.

We have been assured that the raw material which was fed into the computers is the most comprehensive consumer credit information ever amassed for all of the 50 states for a variety of different forms of credit extension. But no computer, and no computerized data, can answer the kind of social and political questions which this Commission, as a Commission, should face, such as:

Do rate ceilings necessarily serve a *bad purpose* when they deny access to credit by those who cannot afford to repay the credit they seek? I don't think so.

Should rate ceilings be set high enough for all consumers so as to make it profitable for creditors to lend money to classes of risks likely to default? I don't think so. Why should good credit risks be subjected, during recurring periods of tight money, to the likelihood of having to pay interest rates geared to the level of return required to enable creditors to lend to bad credit risks?

Should consumers be encouraged to save in advance for major purchases and pay cash when possible I think so. One of our studies showed that 60% of consumers have that alternative, and many exercise it. Undoubtedly, more who can will do so when they learn through longer experience with Truth in Lending and through education how substantial the savings can be.

THE NECESSITOUS BORROWER

The one new technique suggested in the Report for dealing with the admittedly serious problem of credit availability for the very high risk borrower is the proposal in Chapter 8 for an experimental program of direct loans by a Federal instrumentality, operating as a test in a single city and geared to the special needs of low income borrowers in meeting emergency situations—but under circumstances intended to assure repayment. Such a test program could provide valuable information on the practicability of serving the low income market, and at what rates.

The subsidized low income credit unions so far have had a disappointing experience, according to our information, because of a variety of adverse factors including insufficient training of personnel, but also because, too often, the loans are regarded by many borrowers as being repayable only if convenient. Of course, it is difficult for low income borrowers to repay loans, even when the rate is only 12%. Yet a solution for the availability of credit to people whose needs are suddenly urgent, and whose resources are small, must ultimately lie in a recognition by the necessitous low income borrower that the loan must be repaid if he is again to be able to obtain credit from legitimate sources.

In Title II of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, dealing with loan-sharking, we made it a Federal criminal offense for the illegal loan industry to compel repayment of extotionate loans through violence or threats of violence. Chapter 3 of this Report recommends elimination of many of the abusive legal techniques of collecting debts. Bankruptcy can eliminate the need to repay debts which are clearly excessive. But we are faced still with the problem of achieving voluntary repayments by those now considered high risks but whose needs for emergency loans may be urgent and unpostponable—such as meeting arrearages in rent or mortgage payments to avoid eviction, or to regain possession from a repair shop of an automobile needed on the job, or to buy work clothing, or achieve the discharge of a hospital patient. The family on welfare can often tap public resources for emergencies; private charitable organizations frequently help, too. But the working low income family often has no source except the loan shark. That is a truly serious problem which the experimental program outlined in Chapter 8 could help solve—or at least show us how, or whether, it *can* be solved.

THE ARKANSAS USURY CEILING OF 10%

Chapters 6 and 7 devote much of their argument to the unavailability of credit in Arkansas where the usury ceiling is only 10%. There is some published evidence that people in Arkansas pay somewhat higher prices for consumer durable goods than those of neighboring or other states where usury ceilings are higher. The Commission itself did not investigate that. And, so far as I know, we have no documentation to show that the *combined* cost of the credit and the retail price on a purchase in Arkansas exceeds the combined price and credit charges for the same goods in states with higher usury ceilings.

The staff studies argue that the people who pay cash in Arkansas are helping to subsidize the cost of extending credit to those who buy on time. The same argument can be made for the department store shopper in any state who pays cash and thereby helps to subsidize the cost of the store's 30-day charge accounts or the discount paid by the store to credit card companies on credit card purchases. The cash buyer, of course, does have the right to ask for a *discount*, too, and can often obtain one; furthermore, under Regulation Z the store can give a cash discount up to 5% without being required to determine its APR as a finance charge. How widespread is this practice in Arkansas?

Before deciding whether to come to the aid of the consumers of Arkansas on the theory that they are being discriminated against by not being permitted to pay more than 10% interest for credit, I would want to know how the *people of Arkansas* felt about it.

THE HEARING OF THE COMMISSION

In my opinion, the most useful work performed by the National Commission on Consumer Finance has been the series of hearings conducted by the Commission over a period of several years. The information brought out in the hearings on abusive collection methods and archaic legal remedies available to creditors in compelling the repayment of disputed debts not only contributed to the recommendations in Chapter 3 of the Report but have already stimulated reform in state legislatures of outmoded laws dealing with consumer credit, such as Maine's "debtor's prison" statute.

The hearings on enforcement by Federal and state agencies of the Truth in Lending Act and of state laws dealing with consumer protections in the use of credit formed the basis of the recommendations in Chapter 4 of this Report and also led to increased recognition of the importance of having Federal bank regulatory agencies, with exclusive jurisdiction over the institutions they supervise, examine those institutions for compliance not only with Federal laws but with state laws intended to protect consumers. The "no-man's land" of national bank compliance with state laws, and compliance by federally-chartered savings and loans and credit unions with state laws—institutions which apparently are not subject to inspection and examination by the state authorities—must be brought under effective regulation to show compliance with all laws. The Commission's work in this field has been invaluable.

Another set of hearings, held this year, spotlighted the obsolete practices of many lending institutions and credit grantors in refusing to make credit available to creditworthy women. Our exposure of the problem has helped immeasurably to expedite its correction. This situation is described in Chapter 8.

The survey of consumer credit volume conducted by the Commission through the Census Bureau will, when published, undoubtedly provide extremely valuable data to the credit industry for years to come. So too will the data on the costs of extending credit. To the extent that the Commission has amassed information not previously available in the field of consumer credit, it has performed a useful service and justified its existence. But some of the conclusions drawn from this data are questionable, and as the Member of Congress who initiated the legislation which created the Commission, I disagree with them in whole or in part. Taking up these issues by Chapters:

CHAPTER 3—CREDITORS' REMEDIES AND CONTRACT PROVISIONS

This is an excellent chapter. My reservations deal primarily with *garnishment*. The recommendations on garnishment would effectively insulate workers earning no more than the Federal minimum wage from any garnishment of their wages. I support this. However, for those earning more than the minimum wage, I believe that at least 90% of their weekly wage should be exempt from garnishment—the figure agreed to by the House in 1968 in passing the Consumer Credit Protection Act. The 75% limitation written into the law by the House-Senate Conference Committee, and endorsed in Chapter 3, was a compromise agreed to by the House Conferees at the insistence of the Senate Conferees, who had opposed *any* Federal restriction on garnishment. Furthermore, the recommendations in Chapter 3 that states with more restrictive laws on garnishment than the Federal law should modify their laws and bring them into conformance with the Federal statute is contrary to the basic thrust of Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and I oppose that recommendation. Chapter 3 refers only obliquely to one of the main purposes of Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, (Restriction On Garnishment) which was to discourage *excessive* extensions of credit to workers who are not able to repay the obligations without substantial harm to their family living standards, and who are forced into bankruptcy or made unemployable. The evidence was clear in the hearings which led up to the enactment of the Consumer Credit Protection Act that the existence of the opportunity to garnishee a worker's wages was often the *major factor* in a creditor's decision to extend excessive credit to many marginal risks. A garnishment law which permits no more than 10% of a worker's pay to be taken in satisfaction of debt (as is the case in New York) would still provide a device for collecting from those who refuse to pay just debts while at the same time discouraging the predatory extension of credit to those who cannot handle it without great family hardship.

According to Commission staff studies, as described in Chapter 3, "the availability of credit was substantially curtailed, and the charge for credit was significantly increased" in states where garnishment was either prohibited or restricted beyond the limitations imposed by Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act. This may be true in New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, South Carolina, North Carolina and other states which impose restrictions on garnishment tougher than those contained in the Federal law or which prohibit garnishment entirely. But what this data does not show is the *quality* of the credit extended in those states. I completely disagree, therefore, with the suggestion in Chapter 3 that "garnishment be allowed in all states subject to the restrictions" contained in the Consumer Credit Protection Act. I would be less opposed, however, if Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act were amended to impose a restriction on garnishment of *no more than 10%* of a worker's pay, rather than 25%, and it applied also to wage assignments.

Furthermore, the proposal in Chapter 3 that employers be prohibited from firing employees regardless of how many garnishments they may sustain requires further study to make sure that employers are not placed in the unhappy situation of being involuntary bill collectors for predators in the consumer credit field. This was one of the situations we were trying to prevent in 1967 in introducing the original version of Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act which would have outlawed garnishment entirely.

CHAPTER 4—SUPERVISORY MECHANISMS

The recommendation that all of the *enforcement responsibilities for the Truth in Lending Act* be placed under one agency instead of, as at present, being under nine different Federal agencies having jurisdiction over different categories of credit grantors, would be workable, and would have my support, *only* if we had the assurance that the single agency assigned to this responsibility would have adequate funds to carry out its responsibilities. At the present time, there is no question about the availability of whatever funds are needed by the Federal Reserve Board to carry out its regulatory responsibilities under the Truth in Lending Act and to supervise the enforcement responsibilities of the other eight agencies which share with the Federal Reserve the administrative enforcement of the Act. Some of those eight agencies are not now performing their jobs effectively. But this is not because of lack of funds. The same staff people who enforce other laws for regulated lenders, such as banks, savings and loans, and credit unions, can, at little or no additional expense, examine also for violations by those institutions of the Truth in Lending Act.

The Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor which administers the garnishment title of the Consumer Credit Protection Act has had no financial problems in investigating such violations. If funds for an independent regulatory agency are not available, there is no reason why existing agencies cannot continue their present responsibilities as long as there is close surveillance of their performance, either by the Federal Reserve Board which now has that responsibility or by a proposed new Consumer Credit Agency. The Federal Trade Commission has been doing a good job of enforcing the Truth in Lending Act among the vast numbers of businesses over which it has jurisdiction and I would want to be certain that the proposed Consumer Credit Agency would be able to do the job as effectively if the Federal Trade Commission were to be relieved of it.

CHAPTER 5—CREDIT INSURANCE

This Chapter states that the Commission has not had the time or the resources to study credit insurance comprehensively. That is regrettable. It is an important cost of credit. A proper and thorough study should be undertaken by the proposed Consumer Credit Agency recommended by the Commission. As this Chapter points out, the rates charged for credit life insurance are frequently excessive and should be brought under effective regulation.

CHAPTER 6—RATE CEILINGS

I disagree with some of the conclusions of this Chapter. I certainly do not believe it is "this Commission's view"—certainly it is not my view—that cash borrowers in Pennsylvania and New York would be "significantly better off" if banks were able to charge the same rates for loans as small loan companies. Obviously, many banks in New York and Pennsylvania can make and are making loans at 11.6% APR, as is at least one bank in Washington, D.C., currently advertising a loan of $1,000 at a rate of 11.5% APR. Raising ceilings on rates for *good* risks in order to expand the market for bank loans to higher risk borrowers is not, in my opinion, the solution for the uneven availability for credit.

Furthermore, before I would be prepared to tell the residents of the State of Arkansas that their 10% usury ceiling is unworkable, I would want to know—and we do not have this information—whether credit is available in Arkansas in sufficient quantity for those who are clearly able to repay their loans.

The reference to the APR rates in Hawaii for new car loans as being substantially be-

low the ceiling for such loans does not take into consideration, it seems to me, the fact that U.S.-made automobiles are already priced much higher in Hawaii than they are in the continental United States because of the transportation costs. The average rate for new car loans in Hawaii made by commercial banks during the second quarter of 1971 of 9% APR, compared with a legal rate ceiling of 24.85%, merely suggests, to me, that the ceiling on new car financing in Hawaii is incredibly high and that far fewer new cars would, or could, be sold in Hawaii if a 24.85% rate were charged for new automobile financing in a state where housing costs and other living expenses are extremely high.

The discussion of rates versus ceilings reminds me that after the courts in the District of Columbia ruled that the D.C. banks could not charge more than 8% APR for instalment loans (before that ceiling was raised by Congress to between 11 and 12 percent) some banks in the District of Columbia mounted very extensive advertising campaigns to *attract borrowers at 8%*. Their profit or loss on these loans should have been looked into. Obviously they must have extended loans only to good risks. But what was the actual experience? The Report suffers from the lack of this information.

A theme running through Chapter 6, and through many other sections of the Report, is that since higher rates tend to make more credit available for consumer credit purposes, higher ceilings are therefore a good idea. This is not necessarily so. It ignores the whole picture of credit availability for all purposes—including industrial plants and equipment, housing, consumer loans, automobile credit, small business expansion, government needs, etc. In a period of tight money, unrestricted rates for business credit siphon off vast amounts of money from housing and from other essential purposes. I do not subscribe to the philosophy that we should permit investment funds willy-nilly, to go to those credit purposes which bring the highest return. Congress in 1969 faced up to this problem by giving to the President and the Federal Reserve Board the power to regulate interest rates and credit terms in any and all types of credit when this is essential to prevent credit inflation and a distortion of the requirements of housing, small business, and other areas of the economy. Consumer credit *is* important to the economy, but it is not the sole concern of those who are responsible for setting credit policy. Even though it is the major responsibility of this Commission, all of us on this Commission are conscious of the fact that a policy for consumer credit cannot be created in a vacuum, insensitive to and insulated from the other credit needs of the economy.

Chapter 6 discusses critically the decisions of some states to impose ceilings on department store revolving credit at less than 18% APR stating that this is not in the best interest of consumers. We have no documentation of our own to support that. Some stores have been offering 3-month (and before Christmas 4-month) credit without service charges in order to promote the sale of goods. This is the basic purpose of retailer credit—just as the advertised specials, parking arrangements, and other services are intended to bring in business and increase sales, whether or not they fully pay for themselves. The retailers who had argued mightily against being required by the Truth in Lending Act to disclose an annual percentage rate for their revolving credit had insisted during Truth in Lending hearings that extending such credit costs them at least 18% of credit sales, citing the same Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart study referred to in Chapters 6 and 7. I did not take that study seriously during hearings on Truth in Lending in 1967 and I do not do so now as proof that an 18% rate is *required*. It ignores the fact that the credit systems used by retailers are not separate operations intended to pay for themselves any more than do other supportive services of the stores which are adjuncts of selling merchandise. The fact that stores simultaneously offer other credit terms to good customers underscores the weakness of the argument that 18% is sacrosanct.

CHAPTER 7—RATES AND AVAILABILITY OF CREDIT

I have already commented on this Chapter. Some of it is incomprehensible to me. I would feel embarrassed if I thought that all of the other Members of the Commission understood all of the diagrams and technical details better than I do. I consider most of this Chapter a scholarly economic report by highly qualified staff researchers and I accept it as part of the Report only in that context. I think the technical data it contains should have been attached as an appendix to the Report, and identified as a staff study, rather than being presented as part of the Commission's findings since I doubt that any of the Members of the Commission would endorse it completely as their own views.

Several of the Members of the Commission, in separate views, have expressed the fear that the rate structure referred to in this Chapter as a so-called ideal to achieve the "optimum availability of credit" will be seized upon by credit industry lobbyists to pressure such ceiling rates through the legislatures while the proconsumer features of the Report are ignored. Certainly, we all have an obligation to make sure this does not happen. The proposed rate structure does not represent a consensus of the views of the Commission Members.

The Commission generally agreed on the expansion of competition in consumer credit as a principal objective. Furthermore, once the research material on which this Chapter is based is made available to the economics profession, it can stimulate discussion and evaluation of the factors used by our staff econometricians in developing the kind of rate ceiling structure they feel would promote more competition among credit grantors. This material will also encourage further study of the advisability of making more credit available to low income, high risk borrowers. But in the meantime, I certainly have no intention of endorsing, or passively accepting, any rate ceiling structure recommended to the states which would set no interest rate ceiling on loans under $100 and let rates on $300 loans go up to as much as 42%. Although the 42% rate ceiling on $300 loans is not specifically cited in Chapter 7 it emerged from the econometric model on which much of Chapter 7 is based. I think most of us on the Commission are fearful that when this data is published, it will be taken as reflecting the *Commission's* views that a 42% ceiling is justified in order to make credit available to low income borrowers and promote competition. Hence, it should be stressed that the Commission itself has never voted for such a rate schedule and does not endorse it.

CHAPTER 8—SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF UNAVAILABILITY

The "small-small" loans in Texas at rates in excess 100% are cited approvingly in Chapter 7 and also in this Chapter. The figures show that 10% of the loans are written off as bad debts. Yet, even so, the return on loan company investment after taxes is more than 10%, despite the high loss ratio. Obviously, extending such credit is costly and requires a high rate. The question is whether such credit serves a useful purpose or merely victimizes those who are encouraged to borrow at such fantastic rates of interest. The fact that people "come back for more" does not establish the validity of these loans as a matter of public policy. Do these people ever get out of debt or do they spend their lives borrowing to pay off maturing obligations?

CHAPTER 9—FEDERAL CHARTERING

The legislation creating the Commission expressly called upon it to "include treatment" of "the desirability of Federal chartering of consumer finance companies. . . ." Chapter 9 presents a series of pro and con arguments which are useful for discussion purposes and may stimulate public interest in this idea. I have no strong feelings on this issue one way or the other. However, I do not believe the main thrust for such a program should be for the purpose of enabling the federally chartered institutions to ignore state usury laws.

CHAPTER 10—DISCLOSURE

There was no evidence presented to the Commission, that I am aware of, to indicate that present requirements of the Truth in Lending Act on the advertising of credit terms are too stringent or are impractical. While it is true that credit advertising virtually stopped after the Act went into effect, it began to revive as creditors discovered the value of advertising their credit terms honestly and fully, and not deceptively. Many automobile dealers, second mortgage lenders, banks and other types of creditors are now advertising their installment terms, giving all of the essential facts, including the down payment required and total cost including finance charge. Chapter 10 proposes eliminating those two requirements. I think that would be a disservice to consumers shopping for the best credit terms. Similarly, the proposal for eliminating the necessity of including certain critical features of open end credit arrangements when advertising what purport to be the terms, while simplifying space problems for merchants and credit card companies in soliciting new accounts, could very well mislead consumers into signing up for open end accounts with advantageous terms. I disagree completely with these recommendations.

I have difficulty with another recommendation in this Chapter that sellers' "points" in real estate transactions should be counted in all instances into the annual percentage rate of the finance charge on the assumption that the seller's points are automatically incorporated into the selling price of the house. Both FHA and VA are committed by law and regulations against permitting seller's points to be added to the appraised value of the house and, although we know that this prohibition is often violated through lax appraisal practices or subterfuges of various kinds, I would be reluctant to legitimize the practice by amending the Truth in Lending Act on the assumption that it is *always* happening. Of course, when there is evidence that the seller's points are indeed included in the sales price, they should be figured into the APR.

Chapter 10 skims only in passing over one of the assignments given to this Commission in the Conference Report on the legislation which became the Consumer Credit Protection Act—that is, determining the consequences to effective disclosure under Truth in Lending of exemption from annual percentage rate disclosure of minimum monthly charges of 50 cents on open end credit and finance charges of $7.50 or less on closed end transactions of $75 or more. Chapter 10 assumes these were wise decisions by Congress in writing the law. The House Conferees had *opposed* exemption of minimum charges from annual rate disclosures, but reluctantly compromised with the Senate Conferees on the point, specifying that the issue should be studied by this Commission. The Commission, to my knowledge, has developed no information to justify such exemptions, merely citing the generalization that the exemptions simplify computations for small business firms. The exemptions definitely obscure the comparative costs of such credit as measured by the APR, particularly on in-

stallment contracts. We have not really studied this issue in any depth.

CHAPTER 11—EDUCATION

This Chapter attacks the basic problem of consumer unawareness of interest rates, finance charges, and the costs of using credit in an uninformed manner. Truth in Lending disclosures are of little value to those who pay no attention to the information disclosed. Much more serious are the consequences to the unwary debtor of signing a credit contract he does not understand. While the recommendations in Chapter 3 dealing with creditors' remedies will go far towards eliminating abusive practices which frequently victimize consumers entering into consumer credit transactions, the ultimate consumers in contracting debts under terms and conditions they do not understand (and which they are often not in a position to discharge) is to make information about credit not only *available* to consumers but *understandable* and *important* to them. This Chapter sets out a variety of approaches to that objective. This Commission has financed extensive research into how much or how little the average consumer using credit knows or remembers about the terms he agreed to, and it is clear that, three-and-a-half years after the initiation of Truth in Lending, we still have an appalling amount of ignorance on this matter, particularly among young low income individuals with less than a high school education.

CHAPTER 12—THE FUTURE OF CONSUMER CREDIT

The expected emergence of a "checkless-cashless" society through an electronic funds transfer system scares many consumers, and with good reason. The computer may be ready to take over a multitude of consumer transaction accounting chores, but the public is not yet ready for the computer! The cancelled check, and a copy of the voucher that the consumer signed in entering into a credit transaction, are still, in the customer's mind, his main and perhaps only effective defense against recurring computer errors and the resulting frustrations, annoyances and threats.

Taming the computer—or at least training adequately the human beings who operate computers and those who initiate the harassments which result from computer errors—is an absolute must or the credit industry will lose more in customer good will than it can ever gain in accounting efficiency. Of all of the letters received by Members of Congress from constituents on consumer credit issues, complaints about billing errors in computerized systems—and the inability to straighten them out—are by far the most voluminous.

The existence of the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970 has gone far toward alleviating the worst fear of consumers about billing errors—the concern that their credit rating will be damaged because of a creditor's error. But as present trends in consumer credit clearly forecast, and as Chapter 12 points out, credit decisions will become increasingly less personal and more automated, and it is essential that the Fair Credit Reporting Act be strengthened to meet these challenges. Experience under this Act since it took effect in April 1971, points up the necessity to provide—as the House Conferees on this bill had proposed—clear-cut authority to the Federal Trade Commission to issue compliance regulations which would have the force and effect of law, just as the Federal Reserve Board has authority to issue binding regulations under the Truth in Lending Act.

The Commission did not go into the deficiencies of the Fair Credit Reporting Act which limit its effectiveness as a "Good Name" Protection Act. The 93rd Congress should do so.

A SUMMING UP—CHAPTER 1

In an attempt to summarize the work of the Commission, Chapter 1—the last Chapter to be written and one which has been subjected to numerous revisions down to the final deadline—implies that the consumer credit industry has done a remarkable job of serving the American people despite inordinate interference and "tinkering" by government. There is no question that the industry has grown tremendously since World War II and has made possible a great expansion in consumer purchases and improvements in living standards for most Americans.

But the role of Government—Federal, state and local—in regulating this industry is of vital importance in maintaining not only its integrity but its health and growth and stability. The so-called "tinkering" has by no means been all negative: the existence of consumer credit stems primarily from our monetary system which makes available, through governmental decisions, and often through government loan funds, the money which *finances* credit.

The differing state laws on the regulation of consumer credit provide us with a laboratory for testing out various approaches to effective regulation in the public interest. The work of this Commission has resulted in the testing of many of those approaches from the standpoint of credit availability, competition, and over-all effectiveness.

The staff of the Commission, under Executive Director Robert L. Meade, has developed voluminous research material which will be of great assistance to the states and to the Federal Government in determining future policy on credit regulation. Once this mountain of data is published in usable form, and is subjected to the kind of critical study on a wide scale which it deserves, those of us who dissent from the staff recommendations on rate structures may eventually feel that we were wrong or hasty in our judgments. Only time and thorough analysis of the data will determine that. But, on the basis of the limited time which we have had in which to try to understand the complex material obtained during the course of the staff's extensive investigations, surveys and econometric projections—information which has been developed in the final months of this Commission's existence and is still in the process of being organized—we have not been persuaded that the facts justify many of the conclusions expressed. That is certainly the situation as far as I personally am concerned.

Commissions have the power only to recommend laws, not to enact them. Therefore, there is time for Congress and the Executive Department, and for the state legislatures, to study this Commission's proposals in depth before attempting to write laws based on them.

Hence, consumerists who specialize in economic theory and consumer law must be just as active as the credit's industry's consultants and experts in studying the Commission's technical reports and making their voices heard on the facts as they see them. The legislatures will certainly need this kind of consumer assistance, and so will the Congress, in making the ultimate decisions on new consumer credit laws.

IN SUPPORT OF THE NEDZI RESOLUTION TO END FUNDING FOR THE CONFLICT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Nedzi resolution to declare it to be the policy of the Democratic caucus that no further funds be authorized, appropriated, or expended for U.S. combat operations in or over Indochina, subject to release of American prisoners and an accounting of the missing, thereby leaving the war to the South Vietnamese, who, after all, vastly outnumber their Communist attackers.

There may have been a time when this war was justified. Certainly in the years when someone very close to me was fighting in Vietnam and was nearly killed there, I felt strongly that it was justified. But whatever its justification in the past, this war is no longer justified now. Every pronouncement our President has made indicates that we have no further objective in Vietnam that can be clearly defined and that is consistent with our national interest. It has become a no-win war. How then can we ask any boy—any son of ours or of any constituent—to die for what is left of American interest in Vietnam?

We are told it is a fight against Communist domination of Asia. Well, if the Communists are to dominate Asia, it will not be Vietnamese Communists, but the Chinese and Russian Communists. Yet in this past year the United States has moved to bolster Chinese Communists with U.S. trade and with advanced technology, and has sold, some think too cheaply, U.S. grain to have Russian Communists from the consequences of decades of robbing their agricultural economy in order to build up a war machine that is equal or superior to the United States both in Asia and worldwide. So with our right hand we act to save the big Communists while with our left we bomb the little Communists.

We are told that peace is just around the corner:

"I fully expect [only] six more months of hard fighting."—General Navarre, French Commander-in-Chief, Jan. 2, 1954.

"Every quantitative measurement shows we're winning the war. . . ."—Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, 1962.

"We have reached an important point when the end begins to come into view . . . the enemy's hopes are bankrupt."—General Westmoreland, Nov. 21, 1967.

"I will say confidently that looking ahead just three years, this war will be over. . . ."—President Nixon, Oct. 12, 1969.

"Peace at hand."—Dr. Henry Kissinger, Oct. 26, 1972.

I have sat on military committees in the House for 10 years and listened to generals and admirals and Secretaries of State tell us that all we had to do was give more money, more equipment, more training to the South Vietnamese and we could get an acceptable settlement. Yet the war goes on.

We are told that the President and his advisers know best. This has been shown over and over again to be less than the truth. Indeed, Presidential adviser after adviser after retirement from office has written books and articles indicating sharp disagreement or a change of mind about what the facts were in Vietnam and about the war's justification.

Nothing can be greater folly than to rely on the notion that the President and his advisers know best. At the time of the Thirty Years' War, Chancellor Oxenstierne of Sweden said:

Do you know, my son, with how little understanding the world is governed?

When I think of the Vietnam war and what I have been told by Presidents and their advisers, those words seem to be as applicable today as 3½ centuries ago.

We are told that our honor is involved. Well, honor to some—dishonor to others.

We are told that this is a vote for surrender. A surrender of what and to whom? Certainly it would not be an American surrender. The South Vietnamese have 1 to 2 million men under arms. No one has ever claimed the Communists have over a quarter of a million. We have given our South Vietnamese allies the finest fighting equipment in the world. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird told the House Armed Services Committee on January 8, 1973:

> From a military standpoint, the Vietnamization program has been completed . . . [making possible] the complete termination of American involvement in the war.

South Vietnam has the organized government. It has a large anti-Communist population. It has everything it needs to win this war—except possibly the will. And if we have not been able to instill in South Vietnam the will to win after 10 years, how can we do it in the future? Indeed, it is possible that the South Vietnamese will never have the will to fight their own war as long as we are fighting it for them.

We are told that this resolution is poor politics, that this Democratic Caucus will be "taking the President off the hook." Maybe so. But even if so, this reasoning is a betrayal of the American boys who will die every week this war is prolonged if we abdicate our control over the warmaking power merely to gain a few points in one-upmanship with the President. There are times when the best politics is no politics.

Let us do the job we should have done years ago—the job that would have saved tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. Let us pass the Nedzi resolution and put the Democratic Party on the high road toward getting our country out of a conflict which, whatever its original justification, is no longer in our national interest—a conflict which, indeed, is no longer our war.

A TIMELY WARNING ABOUT FEDERAL "AID" TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the event you missed reading, during the period between Congresses, the article from U.S. News & World Report entitled "On Campus—An Iceberg of Government Intervention?" I have appended it to my remarks for yours and that of other Members' perusal and reflection.

Over the years, the majority of Members of this body have believed that one form or another of Federal aid to education was a "critical," "overpowering," "legitimate," "necessary," "priority," concern of the Congress of the United States. A small but determined band of Members, including myself, have steadfastly warned that such "aid" would produce results contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, the intent of Congress even after enactment, and the rights of the citizens.

Now comes George C. Roche III, president of Michigan's Hillsdale College, with a horror story which is becoming all too common in this age of galloping centralization of power in Washington. In a speech before the American Association of Independent College Presidents, Mr. Roche clearly vindicates the warnings that Federal "aid" is a euphemism for Federal "control" of the educational process. The fact that such control has become arbitrary, capricious, without legal foundation, and naturally, contrary to the spirit of the laws enacted by the Congress, should serve as another warning to all in this House that we must radically curb the discretionary power we have granted to the executive branch of the Government.

I sense, finally, a restiveness among Members of this new Congress which I believe will lead to a reassertion of the coequal stature of the Congress. Naturally, the abdication of our powers has not only been in the area of educational legislation, but in virtually every field of public business with which we deal.

It is my hope that Members of the 93d Congress will make up for lost time and address itself to the fundamental question of who controls the Government's power over the lives of our citizens.

The article—and the issue it represents—may serve as a beginning issue from which the "people's" House can regain its constitutional perogatives in directing the affairs of the citizens of the Nation as we were elected to do:

ON CAMPUS: "AN ICEBERG OF GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION"?

(Following are excerpts from a report to the American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities, meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., on Dec. 4, 1972, by Dr. George C. Roche III of Hillsdale College.)

Colleges and universities across the nation today find it commonplace in their departmental files and on their bulletin boards to discover announcements of a peculiar sort, announcements which a few short years ago would have been described as racist and discriminatory:

"The department of philosophy at the University of Washington is seeking qualified women and minority candidates for faculty positions on all levels beginning fall quarter 1973."

"All of the California State colleges have been requested to implement a program of active recruitment of qualified faculty of minority background, especially Negro and Mexican American."

"Since I am unable to determine this type of information from the résumés you have sent me, I should very much appreciate if you could indicate which of your 1972 candidates are either Negro or Mexican American."

"We desire to appoint a black or a Chicano, preferably female. . . ."

"We are looking for a female economist and members of minority groups. As you know, Northwestern, along with a lot of other universities, is under some pressure from the Office of Economic Opportunity to hire women, Chicanos, etc. I would greatly appreciate it if you would let me know whether there are any fourth-year students at UCLA that we should look at."

These announcements are soon followed by actions even more discriminatory. Let me share with you the plight of Mr. W. Cooper Pittman, a doctoral candidate at George Washington University, as reported by the University Centers for Rational Alternatives. He received a letter Aug. 16, 1972, stating:

"The recommendation for your appointment to the department of psychology at Prince Georges Community College was disapproved by the board of trustees on Aug. 15, 1972. The basis for disapproval was primarily that the position presently vacant in that department requires certain qualifications regarding the over-all profile of the institution and department as well as educational qualifications of the individual involved.

"The disapproval in no way reflects upon your professional preparation or specific background in the area of clinical psychology. The decision was based primarily on the needs of the department in accord with its profile and qualifications."

This reversal came on the heels of a series of earlier promising developments. While specializing in clinical psychology, Mr. Pittman taught during the past academic year certain courses at the Prince Georges Community College. Planning to make college teaching his lifetime profession, he applied, at the same institution, for the academic year 1972-73. Last winter, the chairman of the department described his chances as "very good." In the spring he became "the leading contender." During the past summer he was introduced as the man who would be "with us this fall." This seemed natural, since he was selected by the departmental committee from among 30-plus applicants as the department's "No. 1 recommendation."

The rank of assistant professor and the corresponding salary were approved by the dean of social sciences and the vice president of academic affairs. The chairman of the department asked, in July, for preferences in the autumn teaching schedules. The agreed choice was a morning program. Mr. Pittman and his wife began a search for a house in the Maryland suburbs which would be able to accommodate their two children.

And so it went until August 3, when the department chairman broke the news orally that the president and the trustees of the college, at a meeting on July 31, disapproved the recommendation for appointment to the department of psychology. Furthermore, the president or trustees ordered that the two open positions be filled by women, and, especially, by blacks. A woman applicant was subsequently hired. The president and trustees then ordered the department of psychology to go out and find blacks qualified in clinical psychology for the remaining position and to invite them to apply. . . . In the opinion of the chairman, Mr. Pittman would have been hired without difficulty had he been a woman or a Negro.

[Editor's note: Checking with Mr. Pittman, "U. S. News & World Report" was told by him that, after intervention by members of Congress, the American Association of University Professors and other interested parties, the college reversed its position on November 14 and hired him. Mr. Pittman said he was given a contract as assistant professor of psychology, with pay retroactive to Aug. 21, 1972.]

Examples of such hiring policies could be multiplied almost indefinitely, reflecting a nationwide rush on the part of America's colleges and universities to conform to the new Affirmative Action guidelines of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Similar patterns exist in regard to students. Today, admissions procedures in many schools are governed by a quota system which sets its own special double standards, unwritten but exercising great force in the lives of individual students. Such admissions policies also have their effect on campus standards, compelling steadily lower requirements as the original applicants, often unqualified for admission, are retained on campus despite their poor performance. Such

preferential treatment in admissions to undergraduate, graduate and professional schools has become increasingly common, penalizing both these qualified students who are thereby denied admission and the standards of the schools themselves, which are eroded to maintain in residence those unqualified students who have been accepted.

Dormitory and social regulations on many campuses are similarly under assault. For example, the State of Pennsylvania, both through the Human Relations Commission and the Office of Education, has launched a drive against "sexism in education." These State bureaucracies have moved to enforce changes in faculty hiring and promotion, curricular offerings, housing, hours and other aspects of campus business in both the public and private higher educational institutions of the State.

The principal line of assault on higher education, however, has come through the HEW Affirmative Action programs governing faculty-hiring policies. Many schools have been subjected to great legal and financial pressure—pressure generated largely behind the scenes.

Typically, one school at a time has been selected for pressure. Indeed, there would be little public knowledge of such programs if it were not for the fact that some of the highhanded measures involved have provoked a reaction from some of those schools most hard pressed by the Affirmative Action programming.

For example, the American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities began an inquiry into Affirmative Action only after an appeal for information and help on the part of a sister school.

At a board meeting of the Association of Presidents held in the last spring of 1972, it was decided that some further exploration of what was actually happening would be in the interest of the member schools. The resultant exploration of the subject has revealed an iceberg of Government intervention in higher education, raising problems of far greater magnitude than the public, or indeed most of us in higher education, have fully appreciated.

The result of this investigation is the preliminary report which I now present. Certainly this preliminary report is not the exhaustive treatment which the subject demands. We are discovering that the problem and its implications are far greater than anticipated. There are philosophic and practical considerations involved of the greatest import for higher education. What began as a preparation of a paper for this meeting now has grown into a projected book, to be completed in the months immediately ahead.

Most of my remarks today will be limited to the question of hiring, because it is here that the HEW directives are most actively being applied, and here that a college or university is currently most likely to run into legal difficulties. What ultimately is at stake is the institutional integrity of higher education. If America's institutions of higher learning lose control of admissions, hiring, curriculum and campus policy—in effect losing control of who attends the schools, who teaches in the schools and what standards are enforced in the schools—private, independent higher education will no longer exist.

Let me summarize the situation as it has developed, together with the questions raised by Affirmative Action. While hiring specifications for Government contracts have existed since the early '40s, the story properly begins with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII of the Act expressly forbids discrimination by employers on the grounds of race, color, sex, religion and national origin, either in the form of preferential hiring or in the form of differential compensation.

Until amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 title VII did not apply to educational institutions. Between 1964 and 1972, however, Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 had already directed *all* Federal contractors and those receiving federal assistance from HEW to take "affirmative action to insure that employes are treated during employment without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin." The Labor Department was charged with enforcement of these executive orders and designated HEW as the enforcer for educational institutions.

Thus began the rash of directives and orders which now engulf higher education. In Labor Department Revised Order No. 4, affirmative action was for the first time defined as "result-oriented procedures" measured by "good-faith efforts" emphasizing "goals and timetables" to be used in correcting "deficiencies in the utilization of minorities and women." Revised Order No. 4, the fulcrum for the Office of Civil Rights' present activities, must cause the original drafters of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and President Johnson, whose executive order gave passing mention to "affirmative action," to pause and wonder if this is indeed their stepchild.

Affirmative Action, under the auspices of HEW and OCR, has blossomed into a bureaucratic nightmare. Laudable goals have been badly distorted by overzealous HEW advocates. Backed by the full force of Revised Order No. 4, HEW and the Office of Civil Rights have, since 1971, developed enforcement procedures which reflect a political attempt to mold the hiring practices for America's colleges and universities. American higher education is particularly vulnerable to this attack, since the Federal Government now disperses contract funds among colleges and universities which run to virtually billions of dollars a year. The funding continues to grow. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has also recently suggested that federal funding to higher education be increased within the next six years to some 1 billion dollars per annum.

Some of America's most prestigious institutions are already deeply committed to the continued receipt of this federal funding. The University of California budget calls for federal-contract funds in the vicinity of 72 million dollars a year, the University of Michigan is involved in federal funding to the tune of 60 million dollars, and similar dependence is evidenced by other first-line schools of the rank of Princeton, Columbia and Harvard.

As J. Stanley Pottinger, director of the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, readied for battle in the first stages of Affirmative Action, some of America's largest and most prestigious educational institutions found themselves under heavy attack. In a legal procedure most unlike traditional American practice, the schools in question have been assumed guilty until proven innocent. In Mr. Pottinger's own words:

"The premise of the Affirmative Action concept of the executive order is that systematic discrimination in employment has existed, and unless positive action is taken, a benign neutrality today will only preserve yesterday's conditions and project them into the future."

Nothing about Mr. Pottinger's action since that time has suggested that he would be guilty of benign neutrality.

Mr. Pottinger's assumption that American higher education is guilty until proven innocent is a rather highhanded approach, but this presents no real difficulty, since, as Mr. Pottinger himself phrased it in a recent West Coast press conference: "We have a whale of a lot of power, and we're prepared to use it if necessary."

The college or university faced with proving its innocence by showing "good faith" has discovered that satisfaction of the bureaucratic task force is a supremely difficult undertaking. Those schools attempting to comply with Affirmative Action programing find themselves trapped in a mass of paper work, a labyrinth of bureaucratic guidelines, and an endlessly conflicting collection of definitions concerning "good faith," "equality," "minorities," "goals" and "quotas."

A central fact in the confusion has been the discussion of "goals" versus quotas. American academies are properly suspicious of the racist overtones involved in the quota system. We have tended to pride ourselves on the ability to judge people as individuals rather than as members of a group. The concern over quotas has been met by HEW with substitution of another word: "goal." Since then, endless amounts of ink have been expended on the semantic distinction. And the distinction remains exclusively semantic.

Professor Paul Seabury of the University of California has been highly outspoken concerning the artificial nature of the distinction. In the process, he has developed two hybrid labels which put the question in perspective: the *quoal*, a slow-moving quota-goal; and the *gota*, which is a supple, fast-moving quota-goal.

There is more validity in Professor Seabury's humor than HEW has been willing to admit. The "results-oriented goals and timetables" aspect of Affirmative Action simply results in a *de facto* quota system. As one highly placed OCR official recently commented: "The job won't get done unless the university is subjected to specific objectives that are results oriented."

HEW's insistence that it abhors quotas holds little weight when seen in the light of Mr. J. Stanley Pottinger's remark to the representatives of six Jewish groups. He said: "While HEW does not endorse quotas, I feel that HEW has no responsibility to object if quotas are used by universities on their own initiative." In practice, no matter what the semantic distinctions are, the central fact remains that both quotas and goals demand that our colleges and universities treat people as members of a group rather than as individuals.

"The New York Times" in an editorial earlier this year [1972] confronted the quota issue rather directly:

"The resort to quotas, which is the unmistakable suggestion in HEW's approach, will inevitably discriminate against qualified candidates. It can constitute a direct threat to institutional quality. . . . Preferential quotas are condescending, divisive and detrimental to the integrity of a university."

HEW demands colleges and universities demonstrate "good faith" in complying with their guidelines. What indeed is good faith? The HEW version of good faith is almost impossible to decipher. Compliance procedures are outlined in five pages of very fine print in "The Federal Register." The amount of paper work and continual analysis update that is demanded of the university and department chairman is almost inexhaustible. Have you then demonstrated "good faith?" No one can know. As one OCR official phrased it, "Judging good faith is a very elusive thing." Elusive indeed!

This raises a number of fundamental questions for higher education. For example, the equality issue itself raises many questions. What is equality? What is a minority?

BUREAUCRACY'S "BIZARRE DEFINITIONS"

Such questions have led to bizarre definitions in the bureaucratic pursuit of Affirmative Action. Let two examples suffice:

1. A departmental chairman in a large Eastern State university circulated a letter to a number of other departmental chairmen across the country, asking that the *curricula vitae* of new Ph.D.'s contain identifications of race and sex, since HEW hiring orders were impossible to follow in the absence of

such information. To his credit, one of the departmental chairmen of a Western university replied:

"If there were objective or legally established definitions of race, together with a legal requirement of full disclosure of racial origins, we would be in the clear. I understand that a number of steps in this direction were achieved by the 'Nürnberg laws' of Nazi Germany. And in the Soviet Union, I am told, all individuals carry their racial identifications on their internal passports. Similarly for blacks in South Africa. So there are precedents.

"I would suggest that the American Economic Association call upon the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and other bureaucratic agencies now engaged in promoting racial discrimination for assistance. We should ask them to establish legal 'guidelines' as to: (1) Which races are to be preferred, and which discriminated against; (2) What criteria (how many grandparents?) determine racial qualifications for employment; (3) What administrative procedures must be set up for appeals against arbitrary classification. .

"With guidelines like these, you and other department chairmen would suffer neither embarrassment nor inconvenience in employing some individuals, and refusing to hire others, on the grounds of their race and sex. And you will have the peace of mind of knowing that the authenticity of racial labelings have in effect been guaranteed by an agency of the Federal Government."

2. Another professor, fed to the teeth with quotas, minority definitions and politically enforced "equality," proposed the creation of a Sociological Caucus, so constructed as to provide proper representation to various groups. Such a caucus would be composed of:

"Two blacks (one man, one woman); one Chicano (or Chicana on alternate elections); one person to be, in alphabetical rotation, Amerindian, Asian and Eskimo; and 16 white Anglos. Of the latter, eight will have to be men and eight women; 14 will have to be heterosexual and two homosexual (one of these to be a lesbian); one Jewish, 10 Protestant, four Roman Catholic; and one, in alphabetical rotation, Buddhist, Mormon and Muslim; 15 will have to be sighted and one blind; eight must be juvenile, four mature and four senile; and two must be intelligent, 10 mediocre and four stupid." . . .

FOR MINORITIES, DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

The attempt to achieve a statistically adequate representation of women and ethnic groups on college faculties has tended to produce a rush to discover sufficient numbers of well-qualified professors with minority credentials. In actual practice, the numbers demanded of such minority types rather exceed the qualified people available. Thus a strange new word has entered the Affirmative Action dialogue. Today we talk about the appointment of persons who are not qualified, but who are "qualifiable." In point of fact, the guidelines state: "Neither minority nor female employes should be required to possess higher qualifications than those of the lowest qualified incumbent."

Has merit come to mean only equality on the lowest level of performance? Not only does this do an injustice to the institution and the students coming in contact with faculty members unqualified to hold their position, but also it excludes from consideration large numbers of an entire generation of young scholars, quite well-qualified to hold a position, yet often rendered ineligible by virtue of their nonmembership in an HEW-approved minority group. Unfair discrimination and the lowering of standards go far beyond reverse discrimination. Today many well-qualified blacks are passed over for consideration precisely because they are not from the ghetto. The search is not merely for blacks, but for "authentic ghetto types." . . .

Black professors and black students alike have been downgraded. The first-rank performers have suffered this downgrading because whatever accomplishment they attain is often assumed to be because of some special privilege. Meanwhile, unqualified professors and students from various ethnic groups have been cheated into assuming that they were taking their place in a true educational framework, when, in fact, all the standards which gave the framework any meaning had been undercut. As one Cornell professor bluntly put it: "I give them all A's and B's, and to hell with them." Surely this is not the "equality" which we desire for higher education. . . .

One of the most pressing threats arising from the Affirmation Action programing has been the assault upon the institutional self-determination and integrity of many schools. As one president phrased it:

"Many of us simply do not like the idea that the Feds can come in and demand the personnel files. Nor do we like the fact that the guidelines clearly place the burden of proof of nondiscrimination in our laps. The amount of time and money we have to spend to comply with the order is considerable. If they want to show we are guilty, let them dig up the proof."

THE HIGH COST OF COMPLIANCE

The costs involved in compliance are large in material terms as well. Another college president, recently under the gun on this question, was quoted as saying: "To tell you the truth, my little college simply does not have the personnel to go through all our records and do the necessary homework." The Office of Civil Rights investigator replied: "Too bad. You'll just have to dig up somebody to do it."

The briefest examination of a completed Affirmative Action plan—only a handful have been accepted by HEW—should make it abundantly clear how high the costs are in preparation of the original material. It has been estimated by the Affirmative Action director of a large Midwestern university that 1 million dollars would be necessary to make the transition to the new set of records and procedures demanded by Affirmative Action on his campus. This figure does not include the continuing costs involved in the maintenance and monitoring of an Affirmative Action program.

One academic investigator deeply involved in studying the impact of Affirmative Action programs on a number of campuses conservatively estimates that on a number of campuses conservatively estimates that an ongoing Affirmative Action program, operated within HEW guidelines, would consume 50 per cent of the total administrative budget of a typical school. Not only is the Affirmative Action program a heavy financial and administrative burden for higher education, but the new drive for a spurious "equality" finally challenges the integrity of the institutions in question.

North Carolina's Davidson College, a school long committed to nondiscriminatory policies in all areas, received a letter from the chief of the education branch of the Atlanta office of Health, Education and Welfare, acknowledging that Davidson "generally eliminated barriers which would prohibit admission or participation of any person on the basis of race, color or national origin." However, the letter continued with several pages of "observations and suggestions," including pressures to (1) raise the number of blacks to 10 per cent of the student body; (2) allow for more flexibility in admission requirements (thus lowering standards), and (3) restructure the "curriculum to include additional emphasis on black contributions in all areas of academic instruction."

The tone in which such material is usually couched leaves little doubt that compliance is not only expected but demanded.

The bureaucratic arrogance involved becomes even clearer in the recent experience of one Western college president. After making every effort to comply with the HEW demands, the president of New Mexico State University still apparently was not moving fast enough for the Affirmative Action team. While he had exceeded his goal in the professional category of hiring by more than 400 percent, he did not yet satisfy the HEW regional office in Dallas.

Mr. Miles Schulze, branch chief of contract compliance, chided the college for not meeting its goals in the office-manager, technicians and sales-workers categories (10 projected—nine hired). "Why was there no native American on the faculty?" asked the HEW report. President Gerald W. Thomas went to great lengths to explain that "Assistant Professor Richard J. Lease of the Political Science Department is three-fourths Cherokee, considers himself native American. This fact is shown in all . . . reports since he joined the faculty in 1965. The new director of the Agriculture Extension Service is also part Cherokee Indian."

Despite his great efforts to comply with HEW, how was Dr. Thomas and New Mexico State University treated? He received a letter with the following closing paragraph:

"A detailed response to our findings and the revised Affirmative Action plan (inclusive of goals and timetables) must be submitted to our office within 30 days. The award of a substantial contract of over 2 million dollars is pending our approval. In view of this fact, we are sure you will want to act as expeditiously as possible by making adequate commitments."

The ultimatum in such a letter is unfortunately common. This is typical of the HEW bureaucratic assault upon the self-determination and integrity of an educational institution. Dr. Thomas replied:

"I am concerned when the Office of Contract Compliance of HEW feels that it is necessary to use threats and coercion to force quotas. . . . I am concerned about the lost time and effort and the tremendous expense associated with the investigation and review merely because we were not given advance information about the nature of the investigation or the time span of the study. We were told by the review team that the universities 'could not be trusted with advance notices' because they would 'change their records.' This statement is a reflection on all institutions of higher education in this nation and cannot foster the co-operation needed to correct our historic problems of discrimination."

The bureaucracy has appointed itself not only the judge, jury and executioner of higher education, but its conscience as well. The present situation can be summarized as an assault upon the standards and integrity of the institutions involved. A false view of equality is being pursued by dangerous political means, producing a variety of negative effects on higher education—negative effects pressing with special severity on the individual members of the minority groups in whose name the entire project is undertaken.

Virtually hundreds of examples have already accumulated in the first months of the Affirmative Action programing, which began with the formal issuance of the guidelines only as recently as this October. Already, numerous individual injustices, assaults upon the dignity and integrity of our educational institutions, and bureaucratic interferences with the educational process have accumulated so rapidly that it will take a book-length treatment to examine all the practical and philosophic issues raised by Affirmative Action.

One major question remains in this deliberately brief survey: What can higher education do in the face of this threat?

At present, there can be no doubt that most of our colleges and universities are severely handicapped in this contest with bureaucracy. Federal funding remains the key. Those schools most heavily involved

in federal funding are naturally most exposed to bureaucratic assaults. Independence retains a high priority—independence which can be purchased only through total divorce from political funding.

Even that independence cannot long be guaranteed. The basis of the Pennsylvania assault upon private higher education, touching all dormitory and social regulations as well as curriculum, is undertaken not through Health, Education and Welfare but through State-level "public accommodation" laws. Similar legislation is already being considered in several other States and, given the present state of the body politics, seems likely to spread still further.

Finally, we are all exposed in an even more basic way. The matter of tax exemption forms an unavoidable portion of this discussion. A member school of AAPICU has already been faced with the experience of an IRS [Internal Revenue Service] inquiry concerning the number of blacks in the student body. When it was suggested to the IRS official that the number of blacks in the student body of a private institution was not a concern for the Federal Government, the response from the agent in question was a thinly veiled threat, warning that compliance with general federal guidelines *in all fields* was a necessary prerequisite for retention in good standing of a tax-exempt status.

It may well be that the IRS agent in question was running well ahead of his fellow bureaucrats. Yet the fact remains that tax exemption is a privilege which, given the present state of tax legislation, is an absolute prerequisite for our continued existence, a privilige which exists at the pleasure of the Internal Revenue Service.

Tax exemption, though a privilege, is nevertheless governed by separate statutory language which Congress has not tied to compliance with other federal laws, such as antitrust, labor relations or patents. Certainly noncompliance of a business enterprise with a federal antitrust statute should not result in an adverse tax ruling re that corporation. Neither should opposition to federal Affirmative Action requirements result in a university's tax exemption being threatened. Legal strategies do exist for contesting these Affirmative Action directives. Yet, new strategies need to be developed.

COMBATING A "DIVIDE-AND-CONQUER STRATEGY"

The most pressing danger in the present higher educational situation is that colleges and universities will stand aside, being unwilling to be involved in a difficult fight. In the process, we will tend to be picked off one at a time. It is this divide-and-conquer strategy which has already been pursued in the early forms of Affirmative Action. Rest assured that the time is coming for all schools to face—the same problem. . . .

Those educational institutions who choose to resist will have the preliminary tools at hand to form an impressive legal case in their defense.

Consider the fact that middle-echelon bureaucrats have been responsible for the implementation of administrative law, far beyond the original confines of any action taken by an elected official, in either the legislative or executive branch of Government.

Consider also the vagaries and confusions involved, especially in the area of reverse discrimination. Many of the programs now pressed so ardently by the Office of Civil Rights are almost diametrically opposed in intent to the original idea of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Are we indeed banning discrimination by race and sex, as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 suggests? Or are we encouraging a reverse discrimination, as the Affirmative Action programs seem to insist?

In the period immediately ahead it is up to the private, truly independent colleges and universities to speak out on this issue. A great deal is at stake.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING USE OF METHADONE

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1972, the Food and Drug Administration issued new regulations governing the use of methadone, including its use in clinical settings. While the regulations place some admirable restrictions on the availability of methadone, they contain an extremely fatal defect. Nowhere in the regulations is there a meaningful and positive requirement to the effect that methadone maintenance treatment programs must be geared to eventual discontinuance of methadone maintenance and entry into a drug-free posture. Without such a provision, I fear that this country's methadone maintenance clinics will only encourage wider use of methadone—and wider abuses of this addictive drug. For this reason, I have today written to Dr. Charles Edwards. Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, asking that a rule-making proceeding immediately be initiated on an amendment which would add to the new regulations a requirement for discontinuance of methadone use after 2 years of treatment, unless, based on clinical judgment, the patient's status indicates that treatment with methadone should be continued for a longer period of time.

I include my letter to Dr. Edwards in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1973.

Dr. CHARLES C. EDWARDS,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Rockville, Md.

DEAR DR. EDWARDS: This is with regard to the recently published regulations entitled "Methadone Listing as Approved New Drug with Special Requirements and Opportunity for Hearing" which appear in Volume 37, Number 242 of the Federal Register.

Pursuant to Section 4(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 553) it is requested that the regulations be amended to include a requirement for discontinuance of methadone use after two years of treatment, unless, based on clinical judgment, the patient's status indicates that treatment with methadone should be continued for a longer period of time.

I am gravely concerned that the regulations provide no meaningful incentive to either the patient or his physician for the patient's discontinuance of methadone treatment and entry into treatment which encourages a drug-free status. Indeed, except for paragraph 130.44(d)(8), which provides meaningless and unenforceable admonishments that patients will be "given careful consideration" for discontinuance and "should" (not "shall") "be encouraged to pursue the goal of eventual withdrawal from methadone" the regulation does not even afford consideration to the goal of treatment of drug addicts—and the goal of numerous Acts emanating from the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment—that persons receiving treatment for drug abuse shall become drug free. Any lesser goal encourages failure.

During hearings before the Subcommittee on November 8, 1971 you stated that

"I also want to emphasize that methadone is an addictive narcotic drug. It is certainly not a cure-all or panacea for the treatment of heroin addiction." (Hearings on bills to Establish a Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention, Vol. IV, p. 1496.)

My objection to the regulations is that they contain no positive criteria which will require that, prior to approval, a program must be geared to eventual cessation of addiction to methadone. In my view, it is necessary to instill in the mind of each patient at a methadone maintenance clinic that the treatment is not directed at his substituting addiction to methadone for addiction to heroin, but is directed toward total abstention from all drugs. And in my view, this will only be accomplished by advising the addict upon initial treatment that at some point in time his methadone privileges will terminate. This can only be insured through establishing, by regulation, a specific time period by which those privileges must terminate, unless, on a case by case basis, clinical judgment dictates otherwise.

The existing regulations already impose similar restrictions. An age limit is placed on individuals who are to be afforded admission into the program. The regulations also require that care must be taken in order to insure that patients not be placed on methadone maintenance treatment unless they are found to have been addicted to heroin or other morphine-like drugs for a period of two years. I find it ironic that such care be taken with respect to admission to the program—indicating a proper caution of the use of methadone maintenance treatment—but that no such care is taken to insure removal from the program.

I am also concerned that in its present form, the regulation runs the very real risk of doing little more than expanding the availability of methadone in this country. Increased federal financial assistance to methadone treatment programs makes the formation of "methadone bureaucracies" inevitable. Undoubtedly, methadone programs will be funded largely on the basis of the number of patients treated. This provides a subtle incentive against cessation of methadone use, making it critical that an amendment designed to counteract this incentive be adopted.

I will appreciate your publishing this proposal in the Federal Register at your earliest convenience so that a rule-making proceeding thereon may be initiated.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

SPACE BUDGET CUTS DECRIED

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our debates as to just how, and where, the Federal budget should be cut—or should not be cut—both by the Congress and in the executive branch, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an eloquent presentation of one point of view, and I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Pasadena, Calif., Star-News of Tuesday, January 9, 1973. The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL—MORE MONEY FOR SPACE

The time is long past due for Congress and President Nixon's staff to recognize the importance of space exploration—both because it is an extremely important scientific endeavor and because of its value in lifting the human spirit.

The announcement that the Nixon administration plans to make major cuts in the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is a calamity, if those plans are allowed to be pursued to their idiotic conclusion.

We in Star-News Country can be happy that the Jet Propulsion Laboratories apparently will not be too hard hit by these cutbacks, but in the larger sense we must be appalled that there is any sort of cutback when an expansion of space activities is called for.

Any slowdown in the space shuttle program is ridiculous. This is the next natural step in our manned space program. Slowing it down after the amazing and uplifting successes of the Apollo program is akin to saying in 1492 that Columbus did an interesting thing, but no one should rush to explore the new world he found.

The impact of the slowdown and other cutbacks will be heavily felt in the Southern California economy, which, it should be remembered in Washington, has usually given its votes to the politicians who have evidenced the greatest support for the aerospace industry. Instead of adhering to their promises and listening to the voters, those opting for space cutbacks seem to be giving in to their opponents who want to move these dollars into some other federal pocket.

The Southland areospace industry has only recently bottomed out of its tumble of the Sixties and begun to rise again as an asset to the economy. It doesn't need the sort of hurdle inherent in the proposed cutbacks.

None of the cutbacks, in fact, seem necessary or desirable—no matter which part of the nation they effect economically. We have already witnessed space expenditure cutbacks which were downright nonsense. The denial of JPL's Grand Tour of the planets is just one example of a great opportunity being lost. The planets in our solar system will be in line for such an unmanned mission late in this decade. Even though this will not occur again for 175 years, the project wasn't funded.

Washington apparently has surrendered to the foolish folk who say, "If we can put a man on the moon, why can't we . . .?" That question is usually ended with some other scientific or social goal. The answer is that we can do both, but curtailing our space program won't mean that some other need will be fulfilled. In fact, the evidence points in the other direction. The scientific byproducts of the space program have given us many health and technological answers and moved us closer to others. The morale uplift provided by the space program has spurred us toward the discovery of more equitable social answers.

To be sure, a balanced budget and a smaller federal budget are being demanded of Washington. The Star-News bows to no one in its continued insistence that these demands be met. But the money needed to fund our space program at a proper level is peanuts compared to the billions of dollars needlessly wasted every year in the bureaucratic maze of other federal programs. The space effort has been successful by any measure—including its worth as a public works program employing those who might not be employed otherwise.

Is it to be penalized for its very success? The typical Washington answer for the failure of a federal program is to pour more money into it. Are the few successful federal projects going to have their funds cut back because some sick logic is applied?

The space program has been successful in accomplishing its goals. The spinoffs of the program have enriched our daily lives and created better health care. The program has done more for the people than public works programs of the Depression or most of the welfare prgrams which have been promulgated since.

President Nixon must restore the needed space funds to his budget. If he does not, Congress must make sure that the space program is properly financed before passing the federal budget.

The U.S. space program needs more money, not less.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, January 15 of this year is at once a joyous and a sorrowful occasion. It is a happy day because it marks the anniversary of the birth of that great and good man, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who served the Nation and the cause of humanity so well. It is a day of sadness because of his untimely loss.

I am very pleased that in my home district, and throughout the State of New Jersey, tributes and special commemorative ceremonies are being undertaken in his memory, and include an article from the Star-Ledger of Newark, N.J., January 14, in the RECORD describing these events.

Dr. King was a man of noble vision and unique leadership, and the turmoils and dissensions the Nation has endured during the years since his death have proven again and again how much he meant to us and how much we have needed him.

We are still engaged in a cruel war and the destruction of human life against which he fought. We have still to reach his dream of equality and human dignity for all men.

But while he was with us, inspiring the Nation to vital humanitarian goals, he left us a heritage to live up to and to strive to emulate. I fear he would be gravely disappointed with our progress, so it is especially important, as the Newark-Essex Committee of Black Churchmen has suggested, to consider today as a day of remembrance of and rededication to the principles that gave fortitude to his effort and beauty to his life.

The article follows:

MANY SCHOOLS CLOSED TOMORROW—JERSEYANS TO OBSERVE KING'S BIRTHDAY

(By Stanley Terrell)

A variety of commemorative ceremonies are scheduled throughout the state today and tomorrow in observance of the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday.

Most schools in New Jersey will be closed tomorrow to honor the slain civil rights leader, and a number of schools, churches, civic and community organizations are planning special events honoring King.

Recognition of King's birthday began as early as Friday, when a number of Garden State schools—which will be closed tomorrow—held special assembly programs.

A number of municipalities are expected to proclaim tomorrow "Martin Luther King Day," and Gov. William T. Cahill is scheduled to sign a statewide proclamation tomorrow.

Dr. King, an Alabama Baptist minister who founded the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) was the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964. The civil rights leader who popularized nonviolent direct action as a tool to gain black equality was killed by an assassin's bullet April 4, 1968, in Memphis, Tenn.

A memorial service will be held tomorrow at 8 p.m. at Zion Hill Baptist Church at Osborne Terrace and Hawthorne Ave., Newark, co-sponsored by the Baptist Minister's Conference of Newark and the North Jersey Leadership Conference.

The Newark-branch NAACP will exhibit local black art in conjunction with the Newark Museum Arts Discovery Workshop at its Cultural Center, 83 Elizabeth Ave., and will present the documentary film, "King: A Filmed Record . . . Montgomery to Memphis."

The film has been shown since Friday and will conclude its run tomorrow. It can be seen at noon, 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. and admission is 50 cents for children and $1 for adults. The art exhibit is on display from noon to 5 p.m. at no cost.

The South Ward Unit of Boys Clubs of Newark will hold a special program beginning with breakfast at 400 Hawthorne Ave., Newark. After a memorial service, members will be taken to New York's Radio City Music Hall for a memorial performance.

Newark Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson, in a proclamation, called King "one of America's most influential moral leaders during the century" who sought to find "that elusive bit of acreage called the common ground."

The mayor said the nonviolent leader "tried to gather the poor of all races and religions and demonstrate to them that they had common needs which could only be met through brotherhood."

Gibson called upon society to "recognize the dreams of Martin Luther King and work with honest energy to make these a reality."

Newark schools will be officially closed tomorrow, although Acting Superintendent Edward I. Pfeffer said some schools will hold special assembly programs for interested students and residents.

The Network Teachers Union (NTU) will hold a special breakfast meeting at 10 a.m. at the Holiday Inn, Broad Street, to present the NTU Martin L. King award to an unannounced union member who has "demonstrated a commitment to human rights and union principles."

The Newark-Essex Committee of Black Churchmen has called upon citizens to observe tomorrow "as a day of remembrance of and rededication to the principles that gave fortitude to his effort and beauty to his life."

In Union County, public school systems reportedly to close tomorrow are Elizabeth, Linden, Plainfield, Scotch Plains-Fanwood, Summitt, Union and Westfield.

In Essex, public schools will be closed in Newark, East Orange, Orange, Montclair and Livingston. Five Bergen school systems will be closed—Hackensack, Teaneck, Ridgewood, Englewood and Glen Rock.

New Brunswick, Carteret, Edison and Piscataway will close in Middlesex, and other schools closing tomorrow include Morristown, Trenton, Paterson, Passaic and Red Bank.

Princeton University, as well as a number of other colleges in New Jersey, will also hold special services and programs commemorating Dr. King.

Mayor F. Edward Biertuempfel of Union Township will read a proclamation passed by the Union Township Committee asking citizens "to mark the day with proper remembrances and honor King's esteemed memory."

A day-long celebration, including poetry readings by the Afro-American Poetry Theatre of New York, an exhibit of art works from the Mid-Block Art Service of East Orange and a movie on Dr. King's life, "The March and the Man," will take place at the township's Jefferson School in Union.

A guest speaker will be Dr. Mattie Cook, administrative director of the Malcolm-King College, a school for working adults in Harlem.

A memorial service will be held at the Calvary Church, 320 Monroe Ave., Plainfield, featuring Union County Freeholder Everett Lattimore as guest speaker. Refreshments will be served following the affair at the Mohawk Lodge, 1357 West 3d St.

In Monmouth County today, there will be a community sing-in at Brookdale Community College's new gymnasium on the Lyn-

croft campus, sponsored by the Dr. Martin Luther King Observance Committee. The affair begins at 3:30 p.m., with churches, schools and various community organizations participating.

There will be a community festival commemorating King tomorrow at the Red Bank Regional High School, and the county will mark King's birthday by displaying the film, "Nothing But a Man," at the eastern branch of Monmouth County Library at 7:30 p.m.

TOP MILITARY MEN SHIFT VIEWS ON WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Laird stated last week—

> The complete termination of American involvement in the war is now possible, contingent only on the safe return of prisoners and an accounting for men missing in action.

His statement can only be interpreted as indicating a position substantially identical to the position stated in resolutions passed by the Democratic caucuses in the House and Senate last week. Thereafter, the incoming Secretary of Defense, Elliot Richardson, stated that he agreed with Secretary Laird's stated position, but indicated that there is still a broader objective; namely, to end the threat to Laos and Cambodia and to lay a foundation for peace and stability in Indochina.

If Mr. Richardson was stating the administration's current position, then truly no end is in sight, for the administration's objectives remain unchanged. Having failed, after 8 years of fighting, to achieve those objectives on the battlefield, how can the administration continue to pursue the illusion that they can be obtained by negotiating?

It appears to me that the President has only two important "cards" left to play in the negotiations. One is the threat of massive bombing of North Vietnam until its economy is totally shattered. The administration has already experienced a nationwide, indeed, a worldwide, revulsion against the immorality of such a tactic, with its implications of virtual genocide for an entire people.

So, unless, to use the words of Senator SAXBE, the President has "left his senses" the threat of renewed massive bombing must be viewed as an idle threat.

The other "card" is the offer of several billion dollars to help repair the terrible destruction which our own bombings of North Vietnam have brought about. We have a moral obligation to do this in any event. However, it is obvious we would not and should not make any contribution for reconstruction of North Vietnam unless the North Vietnamese repatriate all American prisoners in their hands. The prospect of receiving this desperately needed financial aid should be a sufficient "bargaining chip" to obtain return of the prisoners, if the administration does not attempt to use it to extract other unrelated political concessions.

It is interesting to note that Secretary Laird's expressed views seem to parallel the views of other leading military men. In the New York Times on Friday, December 29, 1972, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Ambassador to South Vietnam, the man who has been characterized as the original architect of our Vietnam involvement, points out that we have no need of any formal agreement with Hanoi or the Vietcong in order to withdraw our remaining forces, without diminishing the fair chance of survival of the Saigon Government. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Another distinguished military man, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff and commander in chief in Europe, Korea, and the Far East, in an article which appeared recently in the New York Times pointed out, with respect to Vietnam—

> There comes times when the cost of seeking to obtain an objective promises to exceed by far any value which could accrue from its attainment. At that point wisdom dictates abandonment of pursuit of that objective.

General Ridgway points out that the United States cannot reorder the world any more than we can withdraw from the world. He points out that, while we must maintain our military strength on a par with that of the other great powers, we cannot ignore our great domestic problems. Finally, and most important, he calls for a return to simple honesty and moral courage in our national leadership.

I include General Ridgway's article in the RECORD immediately following the article by General Taylor:

LEADERSHIP

(By Matthew B. Ridgway)

PITTSBURGH.—There come times when the cost of seeking to attain an objective promises to exceed by far any value which could accrue from its attainment. At that point wisdom dictates abandonment of pursuit of that objective, whether it be a government's political, or an individual's personal, objective.

Reversal of our former political objective of containment of China was implicit recognition of this truism. So, too, were recent changes in our objectives in Vietnam, but whether the action being taken to achieve these altered objectives will result in their attainment remains very much in doubt at this writing, both with respect to achievement and the price to be paid.

The United States cannot reorder the world. As that ancient philosopher and intellectual, Omar Khayyam, sagely said: "Ah love, could you and I with Him conspire to grasp this sorry scheme of things entire, would not we shatter it to bits—and then remold it nearer to the heart's desire."

There is a limit to our power, notwithstanding the arrogant cynicism of those in our society who still cling to the false premises with which they view our major overseas problems, that we are intellectually and morally superior to other peoples—in the view of a not inconsiderable number, superior to all other peoples.

We cannot assuage the hatreds between Catholic and Protestant in North Ireland; between Arab and Jew in the Middle East; between the Hutu and the Tutsi in Burundi; or the Moslem and Christian in Mindanao. Nor can we, however, altruistically or selfishly motivated, kill an idea with bomb and bullet.

Yet neither need we fall victim to Charybdis in seeking to avoid Scylla, to fall back on "fortress America" in our disillusionment with today's "new morality" as displayed in Burundi, Bangladesh, Uganda and Munich, by withdrawing from the great problems that affect the whole world.

In this savage, brutal, amoral world we must, if we value our independent national existence and our fundamental principles, insure that our armed forces are adequate for our security against the most dangerous challenge any foreign power is today capable of presenting.

We must clearly perceive that among great powers diplomacy is no stronger than the military forces in being capable of backing it up, if challenged. We must maintain our research and development on at least a par with that of the greatest of other powers. And we must decide now that we can afford to pay for whatever it takes to insure our survival as a free people.

Simply stated, we must correct the imbalance we have permitted to develop in the field of conventional weapons and forces and attain again quickly a capability to defeat any challenge the strongest foreign power can pose to our vital interest, by either the threat or the actual use of armed force with conventional weapons, a field which SALT has left untouched. Otherwise we shall be deflecting our aim and our resources from what should be our main effort.

Grave as are the domestic issues which confront us—inflation, the poverty level, drug abuse, crime, and the erosion of moral principles—they are of lesser importance than the potential menace of a foreign state which sees us as the only major barrier to the expansion of its power, and once this barrier is demolished or neutralized, a clear open path to the seizure of the riches of this, the most affluent people on earth.

We cannot ignore our great domestic problems save at our peril, nor can we spend without limit. But there can be a reordering of our spending practices, a more stringent and honest control of Government expenditures, and an abatement of seeking partisan political advantage in Congressional authorizations and appropriations.

Some years ago Archibald Rutledge wrote: "There is no true love without the willingness to sacrifice, if necessary." That is as true today as when man first formed family groups. To those who really love our country this needs no repetition, but there is an urgent need to broadcast it.

Recognition of the primal principles which have evolved in every societal fabric throughout the ages—refusal to deal in lies, to cheat, or to steal—must become essential elements in the mores of our people, if we expect to raise the tone of our national life and to contribute to a better world.

The name of this game is leadership, the elevation to the seats of power in our land of men with wisdom, integrity, and moral courage of the highest standards There are plenty such among us. They must be identified and utilized. Their role will be one of extreme difficulty. The masses will never perceive their worth nor willingly follow them initially. But a minority will, and with true leaders that minority will steadily grow, as will the strength of our nation, which in the final analysis rests on the character of its people.

NONEXPECTATIONS OF A NEGOTIATED PEACE

(By Maxwell D. Taylor)

WASHINGTON.—If confusion has been the chronic state of the American public mind during most of the Vietnam conflict, there is little to suggest that its terminal phase will be a period of enlightened understanding. Since Oct. 26 when we first became aware of the sudden hope in the Paris negotiations, our understanding of the situation has become increasingly clouded by veiled or in-

adequate official statements supplemented by endless media speculations.

Presumably we know what our Government is trying to obtain—a supervised cease-fire throughout Indochina, the return of our prisoners of war concurrently with the withdrawal of our remaining forces, and a political settlement worked out by the contending Vietnamese parties during the cease-fire. In the course of this sequence we would insist that no preconditions be imposed which would prejudice a fair chance of survival for South Vietnam.

As for the position of North Vietnam, we have only its nine-point summary of Oct. 26, but this is sufficient to reveal a wide disparity with the American negotiating objectives. Although we are led to believe that the Hanoi terms have changed in the meantime, we do not know enough about the changes to form a judgment as to what to expect from further efforts to reach an agreement.

In the present uncertainty we can at least record certain things which we can not expect to take place. And I shall offer my list of principal nonexpectations.

To begin with, I would not expect Hanoi ever to abandon the myth that there are no North Vietnam forces in South Vietnam, a myth carefully fostered in the nine-point draft. Its acceptance would have the effect of excluding the most important body of enemy forces from the terms of a cease-fire and from the provisions of any agreement covering noninfiltration or troop withdrawal. Neither would I expect Hanoi to accept any form of effective international supervision of a cease-fire arrangement. From these nonexpectations I draw the conclusion that no genuine cease-fire worthy of the name can be expected under present circumstances in South Vietnam.

Next, I would never expect supervised general elections ever to take place. Communists have almost never been willing to stake their political future anywhere on the one-man-one-vote principle. The proposed National Council of Reconciliation and Concord is a troika monstrosity charged with organizing general elections which, by its tripartite composition of equal numbers of Communists, non-Communists and "neutrals," would guarantee that general elections would never take place.

I would never expect Saigon to recognize the status of political equality accorded the Vietcong in the Hanoi document any more than Hanoi would ever acknowledge formally the legitimacy of the Saigon Government. Nor will Saigon ever agree to a coalition government imposed by a political settlement.

Finally, I would never expect Hanoi to release our prisoners until every possible advantage had been extracted from this priceless asset. When it occurs it is likely to be one of the final acts of a deliberately protracted negotiation.

So much for nonexpectations.

If we cannot expect to achieve a supervised cease-fire, general elections, a negotiated coalition or a prompt return of our prisoners in a finite time, it is hard to see how we can expect to attain our present objective of a negotiated peace assuring a fair deal for South Vietnam. May it not be time to reconsider the possibility and even the desirability of terminating our American commitment without resort to a formal agreement involving Hanoi and the Vietcong?

We have no need of such an agreement to withdraw our remaining forces, to continue to exploit our air power as we see fit in either North or South Vietnam, and to transfer our share of responsibility to Saigon for the conduct of future political negotiations. And we can do these things without diminishing the fair chance for survival which we owe our ally.

It is true that such a course of action would not guarantee "peace in our time" for Indochina, but neither would a signed statement of honorable intentions from the warring parties if such a statement could be extracted from them by force, threats, or bribes. It would not establish a firm date for the return of our prisoners, but that date is far from firm if their release depends upon the successful conclusion of a negotiated settlement.

But it does leave us with leverage to apply to both sides to influence future events; our air power, the possibility of postwar economic aid for all Indochina, and the need of Saigon for our future support. It removes the fear on its part of the South Vietnamese of a settlement which would eventually assure a Communist take-over. It permits Hanoi to retain the hope of fighting again on a better day, even if obliged to draw back now. Obviously it is not a perfect solution but it offers us a better chance of an early and honorable disengagement than would further pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of a negotiated peace. We would come out, if not with colors flying, at least without leaving our colors in the hands of the enemy.

HOW FOREIGN POLICY IS MADE—AND OUGHT TO BE MADE

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic study group's task force on foreign policy, I would like to report to the House that we are conducting a series of informal discussions on the subject, "How Foreign Policy Is Made—And Ought To Be Made." The purpose is to try to discern more clearly the appropriate role of Congress in this regard. As discussion leaders we have invited a number of distinguished persons who are or have been close to the process in some respect. The meetings are generally held in the Speaker's dining room at 4 p.m. Tuesdays through Thursdays. The exact schedule may be obtained by contacting Miss Bentley of my office on extension 52561. On behalf of my cochairman JOHN SEIBERLING and the task force members, I would like to extend a most cordial invitation to Members of the House to attend the discussions as and when their schedules permit.

POAGE INTRODUCES BILL TO CONTINUE REAP

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on December 26 the Department of Agriculture arbitrarily announced that it was terminating the rural environmental assistance program, otherwise known as REAP. Henceforth, the Department announced, it would honor only those commitments made on or before December 22, and no further request for cost-sharing under REAP would be considered.

REAP and its precedessor, the agricultural conservation assistance program, is the principal channel through which the Federal Government, in the national interest and for the public good, shares with farmers and ranchers the costs of carrying out approved soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation and pollution abatement practices on farmland. The main objective of the program, as described by the Department last June, is the prevention and abatement of agriculture-related pollution of water, land, and air.

For those of us who farm and represent farmers and ranchers, REAP programs have been one of the best of our cost-sharing programs. Every dollar spent by the Government has been matched by farmer funds. In many cases there have been several of the farmers' dollars for each dollar the Government spent—Secretary Butz told members of our committee, that the Government contribution averaged only 30 percent. The benefits of the program have been far ranging and are a source of pride for all of rural America.

REAP cost-sharing programs have helped farmers establish conservation measures on about 1 million farms a year, Mr. Speaker. In a typical recent year, the programs helped build 45,000 water storage reservoirs, which helped control erosion, conserve water, and provide habitats for wildlife and pollution abatement.

During the same year, 300,000 acres of timber and shrubs were planted for pollution abatement and erosion control, 600,000 acres were served by terraces to further stabilize land and reduce stream pollution through silt runoff; another 300,000 acres of contour and field stripcropping reduced air and water pollution and there would have been much such work had there been adequate funds.

In my own 11th Congressional District, over 11,611 farms have participated at least once in the REAP program during the past 5 years. These are small farmers, Mr. Speaker, since no one anywhere can receive more than $2,500 a year under this program, and the average payment last year was, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, only $239 per participating farm.

In short, REAP is one of the best of our cost-sharing programs. It has done more to clean up our streams than all of our other more costly pollution programs. It has stopped the movement of silt at its source through the erection of terraces, the use of contour farming, and the establishment of cover crops and grasslands. It has slowed the spread of noxious brush and weeds and restored to millions of acres of land which was previously being eroded by both wind and water. It has practically eliminated the giant dust storms of the Southwest so prevalent when I first ran for Congress 30 years ago.

However, Mr. Speaker, I did not come down to the well today to deliver an obituary, for I do not intend to give up on REAP. I would like to talk of the war still being waged to control pollution of our rivers and streams and the fight against the uncontrolled sediment that still finds its way to our streams. Last year alone over 3 million acre-feet of silt poured into our streams—practically all of it from rural areas. Only a fool will declare that you can provide clear water in a lake or a stream that is filled with sediment; and there is nothing more

ridiculous to me than, in the middle of this hard fight against pollution being waged on all fronts, to allow the administration to arbitrarily stop a program that is obviously providing such huge benefits to the American farmer and the American people—as has REAP.

But as large as are the problems that the administration has presented to the American public by its termination of REAP, there is an even larger one—the way the program was terminated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the fact that the administration, prior to election day had proceeded with all the plans for continuation of the program through 1973, and that they had actually gone so far as stating that they intended to make $140 million available as an initial allocation out of the $225 million we here in the Congress had appropriated for REAP.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the feeling of the administration that it can destroy this—or any other program which has been approved by Congress and for which an appropriation has been made and signed into law by the President—simply because he has belatedly decided he wants to destroy it.

If my memory serves me correctly, there are still three branches of Government in this Nation, and it was my understanding that we here in Congress were given the responsibility by the Constitution to create, approve, disapprove, and if we choose, terminate any of a hundred programs that I understand they are getting ready to try to terminate downtown.

In the case of REAP, this is a highly popular and beneficial program whose mandate of existence has been approved by the Congress every year since it was first formulated in the thirties, and for which appropriations have been studied and approved every year by the Appropriations Committee. Yet suddenly, the administration has simply decided it does not want this program, or apparently any pollution and sediment control program, for rural America.

I don't believe that the administration has any sound legal basis for such action, Mr. Speaker, without first coming up here to the Hill and obtaining the approval of the Congress. However, I have read a legal argument from the Department saying that they do have the power because, in the language of the argument, the substantive legislation authorizing REAP—and I quote, "clearly vests broad discretion in the Secretary with regard to the carrying out of the program including discretion as to the extent to which the programs should be effectuated." I am not going to get into a legal argument with a battery of bureaucratic lawyers here today, Mr. Speaker, except to say that the administration is confusing the ability to administer the program with the ability to terminate it. We gave them the power for the former, but not the latter.

Mr. Speaker, we in the House Agriculture Committee have normally tried to give the Secretary of Agriculture a reasonable degree of discretion; no one can do their best job when their hands are completely tied, and they have no freedom of choice.

Unfortunately, in this case, Mr. Speaker, the discretion we have given has been abused, creating a situation where we have no logical choice but to withdraw those discretionary powers we have given. That is why I have here today introduced a bill to continue the REAP program by taking away all discretion of Secretary of Agriculture with respect to REAP and its continued existence—including the withholding of funds for the program which had been previously approved by Congress.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I personally find no fault with the President's efforts to keep our expenditures within reasonable limits. Indeed, I think that the Congress has gone much too far at times and I have personally voted to reduce money in many appropriation bills. However, I do not believe we should stand by and give tacit approval while the administration tries to require our rural residents to carry all of the burdens of soil and water conservation, of stream protection, of reforestation, and a large part of our open air recreation.

There were 3 million acre-feet of silt poured into our streams last year—practically all of it from our rural areas. There were only 104,000 acre-feet of sewage—virtually all from metropolitan areas. I voted for the Federal Government to help care for these cases of urban pollution. I still favor help for our cities but I must insist that our rural areas need similar help. Now the President is taking away all help from rural areas, and it is not only illegal, it is patently unfair to rural Americans and all Americans to expect small farmers to bear the total cost of combating pollution in our countrysides.

If enacted, this bill will reinstate our farmers' right to be free of the Government's share of the burden. It will continue the highly successful programs of REAP, and preserve the thrust of our strongest soldier in the war against pollution in rural America. On another, equally important front, this signals to the administration and the American public that Congress, having been given the authority by the Constitution to mandate programs for a better America—intends to keep that authority, as it has for the past 190 years of the Republic.

I am, therefore, Mr. Speaker, giving notice here and now that the Committee on Agriculture will, subject to the process of the organization of the House, hold hearings on the bill I introduced, and on all similar bills, beginning on January 22 and if the organization be delayed just as soon as such hearings become in order, and to continue such hearings until disposition of the bill.

HEARINGS ON BILL TO CONTINUE REAP

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to announce that I have today introduced legislation which I hope will result in requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the REAP—rural environmental assistance program—as the Congress proposed that it should be done.

Mr. Speaker, subject to the organization of the House I want to announce that 1 week from today the Committee on Agriculture will hold hearings on this subject and will continue those hearings as long as it takes to have action on the bill. Should the House not be organized at that time, we will begin those hearings at the earliest date authorized by law.

OPPOSITION TO BOARD OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCAST KILLING PBS NETWORK PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to record my very strong opposition to the action taken last week by the board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in killing PBS network public affairs programs. This is an action that destroys much of the vitality of public broadcasting.

The board's action is the latest step taken by the Nixon administration in trying to fashion news and broadcasting programs which are more favorable to its purposes. The pattern began some years ago with the blasts by Vice President AGNEW against the press, it continued with pressures for change by various members of the administration, and it culminated recently in the threat to private broadcasting networks which was implicit in the announcement by Clay Whitehead, the President's Assistant for Broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, the board's action demonstrates a subservience to the White House that was never envisioned by the legislation which created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Certainly Congress never intended that the governing body of PBS should be a voice of the Government in power and it never intended that the board should act in the role of a hatchet man in censoring public affairs programs.

Mr. Speaker, a very fundamental issue is at stake here. I trust that the Congress will prevent to its ability the administration's assault upon freedom and independence of the press.

VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1973." I pray that present peace negotiations will consign this legislation to Chairman MORGAN'S "business accomplished" file. Though my proposal, hopefully, will become a moot issue within a matter of days or hours, as a Member of Congress I, nevertheless, feel dutybound to address myself to the issue of our military involvement in Vietnam. It is by far the most important problem facing our country today. Indeed, it rep-

resents, in my opinion, the greatest foreign policy error in America's history.

My objections to the Vietnam war are the same as they were in 1967.

First, the outcome of the ideological conflict in Vietnam has no bearing on our own national interests, security or otherwise.

Second, we simply do not know why we are in Vietnam. Every stated objective ultimately has been repudiated by successive administrations. Thus, we cannot explain to relatives of U.S. servicemen killed in Indochina what national purpose their deaths served.

Third, the costs of our military effort far outweigh any benefits which might have accrued therefrom. Preserving Vietnam from a Communist government in favor of a military dictatorship has cost 55,000 American lives, over 300,000 wounded in action, over $150 billion in taxpayers' funds, serious economic dislocations—demand-pull inflation, cost-push inflation, recession—distraction from our domestic ills, divisions at home, and loss of prestige abroad.

Since I have been in Congress, I have refrained from basing my opposition to the war on moral grounds—although I have been repelled by atrocities allegedly committed by both sides. Rather, my criticism, as manifested by the foregoing reasons, reflects, perhaps, my background as an economist. I deplore the squandering of scarce resources.

Yet, as a Christian, I was appalled at the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam cities by American aircraft during the holy season, a time which calls for "Peace On Earth, Good Will Toward Men." If, as Dr. Kissinger noted, we were "99 percent in agreement" with the other side, the renewed attacks were more vindictive than an aid to negotiations. Further, they ignored history. Years of bombing have not brought North Vietnam to its knees. Finally, the decision to inflict terror upon a people with whom we have no real quarrel has produced a tragic erosion of our country's moral stature.

It is absolutely essential that the United States immediately extricate itself from Vietnam. The Nation—in fact, the world—will rejoice if the President is able to achieve this objective prior to his inauguration this Saturday. If the executive branch again fails in this quest for withdrawal, it is time for the Congress to act.

TO REVITALIZE THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House of Representatives four bills designed to restore to American citizens their fundamental right to freely buy, sell, and own gold; to insure a secure source of gold for our space and defense needs; and to revitalize the gold mining industry.

My district includes many of the most historic gold mining areas of California. In this area, we have had a longstanding interest in gold mining—dating back to the California gold rush.

In direct contrast with the gold situation back in those times, our present outlook is not good. We produced an estimated 1,450,000 ounces of gold during 1972 in the United States, but we consumed an estimated 7,500,000 ounces of gold. This means we are dependent upon foreign countries for better than 4 of every 5 ounces of gold we use for our arts, science, industry, including our defense and space industries which are demanding constantly increasing supplies of gold. Domestic gold production has not even come close to meeting our defense and space needs.

About half of our gold imports come from Canada, but the rest come from countries far overseas, whose sources of supply could at any time be cut off. The two leading gold producing nations in the world are the Soviet Union and the Republic of South Africa, and no one can say how dependable these sources would be for supplying our own strategic needs for this mineral.

The fact that we are not meeting our needs for gold is not because there is no more gold to be mined in the United States. The Bureau of Mines has reported that there are some 400 million ounces of known gold ore reserves, but virtually none of it can be mined profitably at the present price of gold on the open market. Furthermore, tooling up a gold mining operation is an extremely costly operation, and cannot be undertaken overnight. If we are to avail ourselves of this source of desperately needed gold, we must begin to tool up now, not tomorrow.

My first bill would permit Americans to purchase, hold, sell, or otherwise deal with gold in the same manner as any other metal. It is sadly ironic that in the land of the free, citizens do not have this basic right. Over 40 countries from every continent in the world give their citizens this fundamental liberty, yet we do not have it here in the United States. I note that the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee has recommended that all prohibitions on the purchase, sale, and holding of gold by American citizens should be abolished. Clearly, the time has come to restore this right to the people.

My second bill would require the Office of Emergency Preparedness to purchase during the next 2 years some 11,000,000 ounces of gold for the strategic stockpile. The gold would be purchased on the open market at the going rate.

My third bill would also establish a strategic stockpile, but in a different manner. Domestic gold producers would contract with the General Services Administration for the sale to the Federal Government at prices ranging from $45 to $75 per ounce. Smaller mines would receive the higher price.

The fourth bill is the Gold Mines Assistance Act, which would provide a basic incentive payment to offset the high cost of operations. Newly reopened mines would receive the greatest incentive. The payments would range from $4 to $7 per ounce for the larger producers and $8 to $15 per ounce for the smaller producers. This would be in addition to the market price of gold, which has been fluctuating around $60 per ounce during 1972.

In offering these bills, I am suggesting to the Congress a number of ways the gold mining industry in this country might be revitalized. I believe a viable and expanding domestic gold mining industry is decidedly in the national interest. But this industry is, for practical purposes, on the verge of disappearing in the United States. Certainly if our domestic mines cannot even meet our strategic needs and production has been decreasing as demand increases, we cannot say we have a healthy viable industry.

SPEAKER ALBERT'S COMMENTS ON TERMINATION OF PHASE II ECONOMIC CONTROLS

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the statement made by the Speaker.

President Nixon in terminating mandatory price and wage controls has taken a serious economic gamble. Naturally, I share the hopes of the President and his economic counselors that this decision will contribute to our national economic well-being. In light of this administration's dismal record as to economic prophecy and economic performance alike, however, I am not optimistic.

President Nixon's pre-August 1971 economic record was characterized by what economists had previously regarded as unattainable: runaway inflation coupled with sharply accelerating unemployment. That period likewise featured periodic Pollyanna pronouncements by administration spokesmen to the effect that unemployment and/or inflation had abated. When the Congress, over strong administration opposition, gave the President standby price and wage controls, he declared that he would never use them. For the better part of 2 years, he persisted in this unrealistic and dogmatic stance.

Controls under phase II have certainly been far from perfect. As administered I do not believe that they were fully equitable to all elements of our society. Neither have they entirely eliminated inflation. But the record is clear. The reluctant imposition of these controls by the President has given this Nation by far the best record of any developed industrialized nation of holding in check the forces of inflation.

If the year ahead witnesses a return to accelerated inflation, President Nixon and the Republican Party must be prepared to accept the responsibility for that result.

CONGRESSMAN HANSEN OF IDAHO INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR MORE EFFECTIVE INSPECTION OF IMPORTED MEAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 2012 to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide for more effective inspection standards for imported meat products. My bill is necessary if we are to prevent the importation into this country of contaminated or unwholesome meat.

It is true that inspection standards for meat produced in the United States assure the consumer the highest standards for wholesomeness. Over the past 60 years, very significant steps at the Federal and State levels of Government have been taken to develop and enforce high standards to insure that only the highest quality of meat will be produced and sold in the United States. Consequently, public confidence in the meat available in the market has increased to the extent that frequently little thought is given to the possibility that such meat might be impure.

However, that same confidence is not fully justified when it comes to meat imported from other countries. And, in light of the increasing flood of imports of meat and meat products which has resulted from the administration's relaxation of import quotas, there is increasing cause for concern. In hearings conducted during the 92d Congress by the Livestock and Grain Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, it was revealed that of the percentage of meat samples inspected at U.S. docksides during the first half of 1970, no less than 15 percent of the produce was rejected. I believe that it is reasonable to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that of the amounts which were not inspected, a similar percentage would have also been rejected.

This figure is startling when we remember that only 1 percent of the meat imported into this country is actually subjected to dockside inspection. Other testimony produced at these hearings confirmed what the mounting evidence indicates—that inspection standards applicable to imported meat fall far short of those needed to assure compliance with the U.S. standards of wholesomeness. It is difficult for me to understand this in light of a 1972 report by the Comptroller General of the United States in which the GAO concluded that better inspection and improved methods of administration were needed for foreign meat imports. The GAO's report basically reaffirmed the deficiencies which I call to the attention of my colleagues when I introduced a similar bill in the 92d Congress. Though the Department of Agriculture has replied to this report and represented that the Department has corrected the deficiencies noted by the Comptroller General, after a careful study of the Department's actions, I am compelled to conclude that the Department's corrective actions are insufficient. As an example of this we could note that for the inspection of over 1,100 foreign plants which are certified to import meat into the United States, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has only 19 veterinarians who serve as foreign review officers. And though the Department has tacitly agreed that a quarterly inspection of plants is desirable, it is manifestly impossible for 19 individuals to make quarterly inspections of 1,100 plants which are located in over 40 countries.

So. Mr. Speaker, as a result of inadequate inspection of the foreign plants by U.S. inspectors, most of whom are based in this country, and as a result of inadequate dockside inspection of the meat when it arrives in the United States, I have been informed of several instances in which impure and unwholesome meat and meat products have been sold to the American consumer through retail outlets.

The purpose of my bill is to correct the glaring deficiencies in the present law. Its purpose is not that of protectionism for the American cattleman. But if foreign meat processing operations are unwholesome processing techniques, which can allow them to compete unfairly against the American cattle industry in the American market place, while at the same time subjecting the American consumer to health risks, then I believe that the situation should be rectified. Passage of my bill will provide this needed protection to the consumer, and will also help to assure more equitable treatment for domestic producers and processors.

Mr. Speaker, included as a part of my remarks is the text of H.R. 2012:

H.R. 2012

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) The Secretary shall provide for the inspection at least four times a year, on an unannounced basis, of each plant referred to in subsection (e)(2) of this section.

"(g) The Secretary shall provide for the inspection of at least 2 per centum of each imported lot of meat, including fresh, frozen, processed, canned or any other form of meat product. Core sampling techniques shall be used where appropriate in the inspection of such meats.

"(h) The Secretary shall prescribe appropriate inspection procedures to detect contamination from pesticides or other chemicals regardless of whether ingested or absorbed by the animals prior to slaughter or introduced into the meat or meat products subsequent thereto.

"(i) The Commissioner of Customs shall levy on all products entering the United States which are subject to this section, in addition to any tariffs, a charge or charges set by the Secretary of Agriculture at levels which are in his judgment sufficient to defray the probable costs of all examinations and inspections carried out pursuant to this section."

INTRODUCING THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Free Flow of Information Act, a bill to provide an absolute privilege for newsmen to protect the confidentiality of their news sources. My proposal embodies the concept recommended by the American Newspaper Publishers Association that, to be effective, the privilege must apply to State as well as to Federal proceedings. Although approximately half of the States presently provide newsmen's privileges in varying degress, it is essential that this protection be established on a nationwide basis, consistent with the nationwide dissemination of news itself.

Until last June, it had been generally assumed that since a newsman's pledge of confidentiality to his sources was so essential to unfettered reporting, any governmental action which infringed upon it would also be an infringement on the freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Last June, however, the Supreme Court rejected this principle in the case of United States against Caldwell. The Court held that newsmen must reveal confidential news sources and information or be jailed for contempt.

Opponents of the newsmen's privilege have a valid point when they note the possible frustration of criminal justice in occasional cases wherein a newsman possesses valuable evidence concerning a crime about which he has learned, either consciously or inadvertently. It is useful to note in such cases, however, that the newsman would not have possessed the information at all were it not for his pledge of confidentiality.

It is my view, moreover, that the rare occurrence of this kind of situation is overwhelmingly offset by the continuing service rendered by energetic investigative reporting both to the public at large and to law enforcement agencies in particular. Whether exposing corruption in a union, bureaucracy, private industry, or politics, the newsman is in an unmatched position to focus the attention of both the public and prosecutors on crimes which are being or have been committed. Without protecting confidentiality, such investigative reporting will dry up entirely, resulting in a great decrease in the disclosure and prosecution of criminal conduct. Newsmen have already reported a decline in the willingness of their sources to reveal information which would not reach the public in any other way.

The provisions of my bill differ from those previously introduced in the House in that the newsmen's privilege would be absolute and would apply to any person receiving confidential information in his capacity as a newsman, whether or not that individual is still a newsman at the time a request for his information is made. The bill, would, of course, have no effect on a newsman's voluntary decision to release any information either publicly or to any agency of government.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 1895

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this act may be cited as the "Free Flow of Information Act."

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds that action by courts or other governmental agencies which compels persons who are engaged in gathering, writing, editing, or otherwise preparing information for public dissemination to disclose the sources of their information or information not made public is a severe impediment to the freedom of the press and to the dissemination of information to the public. The Congress finds that it is essential to the maintenance of our free society and the general welfare of the United States that the free flow of information be safeguarded from governmental interference.

(b) The Congress further finds that the impediment of the free flow of information through the press to the public affects interstate commerce.

SEC. 2. No person shall be required by any court, grand jury, agency, department, commission, legislature or any committee thereof any of the States or of the United States

to disclose any confidential information or the source of such information received, processed or obtained by him in his capacity as a reporter, editor, commentator, journalist, writer, correspondent, announcer or other person directly engaged in the gathering or presentation of news for any newspaper, periodical, press association, newspaper syndicate, wire service, radio or television station or any other news medium.

RICHARD LITTLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Scranton, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and indeed this entire Nation have lost a great and distinguished citizen through the death of Mr. Richard Little.

I had known Dick Little through all my adult life. I never had a firmer friend. I never had a wiser counselor. I never knew a finer intellect.

He was the copublisher of the Scrantonian, which was founded by his father at the end of the 19th century, and its sister paper, the Scranton Tribune. He was as thorough a newspaperman as ever covered a story; he had worked in every job at the papers—in the composing room, as a photographer, a reporter, and as publisher—and was respected all across the Nation as one of the outstanding publishers in America.

And yet, it is not principally as a newspaper publisher that I will remember him.

I will remember Dick Little, above all, as a man of compassion. His was a door that was always open for those who wished to speak to him, and they found in him an understanding and compassionate man. There was no member of the working press whom he did not know as a friend. He knew and cared for every man and woman who worked with him, from the men in the pressroom to the paper boy on the street, to the fellow who might be down on his luck in trying to find a job.

He knew that friendship was the most precious thing we might find in life, and he gave his friendship everywhere, unstintingly and with kindness.

He engaged himself in the problems and challenges of his community and yet, in spite of all his commitments, he found time to give himself to the church, the Church of the Epiphany in Glenburn, where he served as a member of the church choir for 50 years, as vestryman for 33 years, and as senior warden for the past 26 years. He served also as the senior trustee of Keystone Junior College, and gave to that position the enthusiasm and intelligence he brought to all his work.

David Little was a friend to me and to countless other people who were fortunate enough to cross his path. He will be deeply missed. I offer my most sincere condolences to his widow and to his family.

And now Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like to include at this point in the RECORD three editorials about David Little, one from the Scrantonian, one from the Scranton Tribune and one from the Scranton Times:

[From the Scrantonian, January 14, 1973]

RICHARD LITTLE

We at the Scrantonian and the Scranton Tribune are saddened today by the death of our co-publisher Richard Little whom we admired for his integrity, his friendly and honest characteristics, his devotion to the people of our community, and his firm understanding of the problems and objectives of journalism.

Mr. Little was the son of the founder of the Scrantonian, which this year is observing its 75th Anniversary. His was a well-founded knowledge of the newspaper business in that he was personally involved with practically every phase of a newspaper's operation. He served in his youth as a printer's apprentice, a reporter, and a photographer, and as advertising manager of the Scrantonian. At the time of his death he was co-publisher with Herman S. Goodman of both the Scrantonian and the Tribune and President of the Scrantonian Publishing Company.

Mr. Little was born in Scranton on July 17, 1898, the son of the late Richard Little and Jean Niven Little. He was a graduate of Keystone Academy, now Keystone Junior College, and later matriculated at Bucknell University. He was married to Lois M. Thomas, daughter of the late G. J. and Ida Thomas in 1924.

Along with the late M. L. Goodman, Mr. Little effected the purchase by the Scrantonian of the Scranton Tribune in 1938. Mr. Goodman died in 1954 and his son Herman became his successor as co-publisher with Mr. Little of both newspapers.

Under their management both the Scrantonian and the Tribune have been the recipients of many awards for excellence in journalism and for their adherance to a code of ethics which fully recognizes the public's right to know. The awards included citations for fine typography, for excellence of editorials, for outstanding news coverage which included the award of a Pultizer Prize to one of the paper's reporters, J. Harold Brislin.

The job of co-publishing two newspapers did not preclude Mr. Little's varied other activities. He was active in a variety of civic endeavors, welfare projects, the Chamber of Commerce, community benefit drives, and religious affairs. In years of service he was the oldest trustee of Keystone Junior College. He was particularly active as a member of the Church of the Epiphany, Glenburn, which just recently honored him with a plaque citing his many years of service. He was a member of the Church Choir for 50 years and he served as vestry man for 33 years, and for the past 26 years was a senior warden.

Over the years he evinced a profound interest in political affairs and served as Republican State Committeeman from Lackawanna County for 18 years up to the time of his resignation from the post in 1972. In the course of his tenure as a State Committeeman, he made a wide field of acquaintances and friends among the politically powerful including Presidents, Governors, Members of Congress, and State Legislators.

As a hobby Mr. Little pursued the collection of model railroad equipment and his collection includes pieces dated back well into the last century. This pursuit made him new friends not only throughout the United States but overseas.

In all of his activities, however, Mr. Little maintained a modesty which manifested itself by his shunning of the limelight. He sought no public plaudits or publicity, avoiding it whenever possible.

We on both newspapers will miss hm deeply for he was always ready to share our problems. His was the role of a friend.

We extend our heartfelt sympathy and consolences to his wife and to his son and two daughters to whom he was a good husband and father.

[From the Scranton Times, Jan. 15, 1973]

RICHARD LITTLE HAD LOW-KEYED STYLE

A major figure in Scranton journalism for more than half a century has died. He is Richard Little, 74, the co-publisher of The Scrantonian-Tribune.

Mr. Little, who made journalism his life's work, also distinguished himself in politics and in church affairs. Along the way, in his low-keyed sort of way, he won himself a legion of friends.

The son of the late Richard Little, who established the Scrantonian in 1897, Mr. Little began his work in 1916 as a printer's apprentice after graduating from Keystone Academy. He spent two years in this job before going on to college. Over the years, he also worked in the news and advertising departments before moving into a management position, but it was his initial connection with printing that continued to dominate his interest in the newspaper business over the years. To use an old cliche, he had printer's ink in his veins—and everyone in the news business knows that this is a condition without a cure.

Mr. Little was active in Republican politics for decades, serving 18 years as a state committeeman. While politics is an activity which frequently can become rough, it's hard to recall any incident where Mr. Little was personally embroiled in political controversy. That speaks well for his easy-going nature.

Over the years, Mr. Little also found time to serve the Episcopal Church in many capacities, including vestryman and senior warden.

One of the lesser known sides of Mr. Little was that he was an avid model railroad hobbyist with a national reputation among other collectors. The tinkering required in this hobby was a natural relative of the mechanics of the newspaper business that he loved so well.

Upon his death, we extend condolences to members of his family and to The Scrantonian Tribune.

[From the Scranton Tribune, Jan. 15, 1973]

RICHARD LITTLE

In the death Friday night of Richard Little, copublisher of this newspaper and The Scrantonian, we at The Tribune have experienced a saddening loss a regret made all the more poignant because Mr. Little always related to us as a true, concerned and caring friend, never as an executive or employer.

The sense of comradeship conveyed by Mr. Little as he stopped to visit and chat with an editor or reporter, conversed with a printer or moved among members of the advertising, circulation and other departments of the newspapers certainly derived in part from the fact that Mr. Little, in fashioning what was to become a distinguished career in journalism, chose to familiarize himself with all aspects of newspaper publishing.

As a young man, son of Richard Little, who established The Scrantonian, Mr. Little served as a printer's apprentice and learned the mechanics' of putting out a newspaper. He later served in the news gathering operation, working both as a reporter and photographer, then turned to the business-management responsibilities and advanced to the position of advertising manager of The Scrantonian.

With copublisher Herman S. Goodman, also the son of an honored and much loved publisher and civic leader, the late M. L. Goodman, Mr. Little was dedicated and steadfast in pursuing policies which have made The Tribune and The Scrantonian, powerful instruments for the public and community welfare and service and which

have gained for the newspapers many awards for journalistic excellence.

Aside from his publishing duties, Mr. Little involved himself, quietly, unobtrusively but always effectively in church, political, humane and civic endeavors.

Only six days before his death the Church of the Epiphamy, Glenburn, honored Mr. Little for 50-year membership in the church choir, 33 years as a vestryman and 26 years as a senior warden. At his death he had the longest tenure as a trustee of Keystone Junior College. Until he stepped down this year, he was a member of the state Republican committee. He was a delegate to the 1952 Republican National Convention, a presidential elector for President Eisenhower, a friend of governors, cabinet officers, congressmen, legislators, county and city officials.

Above all, Mr. Little was a gentleman, in the highest meaning of the word, unfailingly loyal, modest, unselfish. We will miss him very much and we have deep sympathy for Mrs. Little, their son and two daughters.

TAX CREDIT FOR NONPUBLIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation which I sponsored in the last Congress to provide tax credits for the costs of nonpublic education.

There are now more than 5.3 million students enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in the United States. Approximately 4.4 million are in parochial institutions educated at a cost of about $2.5 billion annually or about $434 per year for each child.

It is clear that private education is facing a severe financial crisis in our country. The cost of this education is rising rapidly and many parents, particularly middle income parents, are finding it increasingly difficult to afford to send their children to the school of their choice.

Nonpublic schools are closing at a rate of 6 percent each year. If this trend continues, and it will in the absence of some type of relief, nearly 65 percent of our Nation's private elementary and secondary schools will be closed by 1980.

The legislation I am proposing would permit the parents of parochial and other private schoolchildren to subtract up to $200 each year directly from their final tax bill. The credit would be available for each child enrolled in a nonpublic school and would amount to 50 percent of tuition charges or $200 per year, whichever is greater. In order to insure that assistance is given to those most in need, the full credit would be available only to families with incomes of up to $18,000 per year. The amount of credit would gradually diminish for higher income families.

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee acted favorably on this legislation late in the 92d Congress. I would urge that committee, under the able leadership of its distinguished chairman, to approve this measure for floor consideration as soon as feasible in the 93d Congress.

The Congress must act promptly to preserve our heritage of educational diversity and the freedom of parents to control their children's schooling.

RENT FREEZE

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

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's fiat to cease all housing starts under such programs as those provided for under sections 235 and 236 of the Housing Act is but the latest piece of outlawry emanating from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

On top of his violation of the Constitution and laws—specifically, section 601 of Public Law 92–156—with regard to our military activity in and over Indochina, his extermination of various rural development programs, his impoundment of billions of dollars of funds appropriated by Congress and signed into law by him, his flagrant violation of the Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 92–500, and his ill-concealed plans to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity, it may not seem like that much more. But to those of us who represent the urban areas of this Nation, it represents a possible death knell for our cities and our constituents.

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 4.2 million occupied housing units in this country are substandard, and more than 12 million people live in them. In New York City, over 1 million human beings live in substandard housing, often without heat and hot water and almost always infested by roaches and rats. The problem in New York is especially serious in light of the city's vacancy rate of less than 1 percent. The combination of this new Federal housing freeze, vacancy decontrol—under which apartments becoming vacant are freed from all rent controls, the lifting of all Federal rent controls, and the "maximum base rent" program, under which landlords are permitted to increase rents of previously controlled units, is truly strangling my home city and others like it across the country.

I have been very critical in the past of the "MBR" program because of the undue financial burden it places on hundreds of thousands of low-, moderate-, and middle-income people. This has been especially true during the current inflationary period and the imposition of the Nixon phase II program which was grossly unfair to the wage earner. In addition, there is mounting evidence that many tenants are not receiving what they were promised in return for the "MBR" increases—upgrading of building repairs, maintenance and service.

The freeze on Federal funds is an additional compelling factor which militates against the continuance of increases under the MBR as well as the rent stabilization and vacancy decontrol programs. I will, of course, do all I can to reverse this and similar abuses of Presidential power, but how can we allow rents to continue to rise when we are faced with the real prospect that there will be available fewer low-, moderate-, and middle-income housing units than ever?

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to freeze all rents during the 18-month freeze on Federal housing funding imposed by Mr. Nixon. Rents would be set for this period at their levels during phase I, the 90-day period beginning on August 15, 1971. The legislation will permit increases in rent during this period only on a case-by-case basis in which it is determined that a landlord's costs have risen. Increases granted in such cases will be in such amounts, and last only long enough, to allow the landlord to recover his out-of-pocket expenses.

If we are going to shirk our duty to provide sufficient and adequate housing for our citizens, we should at least take steps to prevent profiteering on the limited housing we have.

The text of the bills follows:

H.R. 1969

A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to direct the President to stabilize rentals and carrying charges

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in any housing during the period beginning upon the date of enactment of this subsection and ending at midnight June 30, 1974, shall not exceed the levels at which such rentals and carrying charges were stabilized during the ninety-day period beginning August 15, 1971 (under the authority of section 1 of Executive Order 11615); and the President shall take such action as may be necessary to regulate or restrict such rentals and carrying charges in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) Any practice which constitutes a means to obtain a higher rental or carrying charge than is permitted under this subsection shall constitute a violation of this subsection. Such practices include, but are not limited to devices making use of inducements, commissions, kickbacks, retroactive increases, premiums, discounts, special privileges, tie-in agreements, falsification of records, or failure to provide the same services previously provided.

"(3)(A) Any aggrieved person or class of persons may commence a civil action against any person, or entity, including officers or agencies of the Federal, State, or local governments, who is alleged to have violated this subsection. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties to require compliance with this subsection or to order the performance of any nondiscretionary act or duty under this subsection.

"(B) No action may be commenced under this paragraph with regard to any housing accommodation if the President has commenced and is diligently prosecuting a civil action in a court of the United States to require compliance with this subsection with regard to such housing accommodation, but in any such action, any person aggrieved may intervene as a matter of right.

"(C) In any action under this paragraph, the President, if not a party, may intervene as a matter of right.

"(D) The court, in issuing any order in any action brought pursuant to this paragraph, shall award costs of litigation (in-

cluding reasonable attorney and witness fees) to any successful plaintiff or plaintiff-intervenor.

"(E) Nothing in this subsection shall restrict any right other than that granted under this paragraph which any person or class of persons may have to seek any other relief.

"(4) Any owner or operator of housing accommodations for which the rental or carrying charges which may be charged are affected by this subsection may apply to the President for an exception on the basis of increased capital or operating costs. Any such exception shall remain effective only until such owner or operator has recovered an additional sum sufficient to cover his outlay for such increased capital or operating costs."

H.R. 1970

A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in federally assisted housing may not exceed certain previous levels

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STABILIZATION ON RENTALS AND CARRYING CHARGES IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING

"SEC. 525. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in any housing covered by a mortgage insured under this Act (or for any other accommodations with respect to which interest reduction payments are made under section 236 of this Act or payments are made under section 235 of this Act or rent supplement payments are made under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) during the period beginning upon the date of enactment of this section and ending at midnight June 30, 1974, shall not exceed the levels at which such rentals and carrying charges were stabilized during the ninety day period beginning August 15, 1971 (under the authority of section 1 of Executive Order 11615); and the Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to regulate or restrict such rentals and carrying charges in accordance with this section.

"(b) Any practice which constitutes a means to obtain a higher rental or carrying charge than is permitted under this section shall constitute a violation of this section. Such practices include, but are not limited to devices making use of inducements, commissions, kickbacks, retroactive increases, premiums, discounts, special privileges, tie-in agreements, falsification of records, or failure to provide the same services previously provided.

"(c)(1) Any aggrieved person or class of persons may commence a civil action against any person or entity, including officers or agencies of the Federal, State, or local governments, who is alleged to have violated this section. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties to require compliance with this section or to order the performance of any nondiscretionary act or duty under this section.

"(2) No action may be commenced under this subsection with regard to any housing accommodation if the Secretary has commenced and is diligently prosecuting a civil action in a court of the United States to require compliance with this section with regard to such housing accommodation, but in any such action, any person aggrieved may intervene as a matter of right.

"(3) In any action under this subsection, the Secretary, if not a party, may intervene as a matter of right.

"(4) The court, in issuing any order in any action brought pursuant to this subsection, shall award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and witness fees) to any successful plaintiff or plaintiff-intervenor.

"(5) Nothing in this section shall restrict any right other than that granted under this subsection which any person or class of persons may have to seek any other relief (including relief against the Secretary).

"(d) Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this section, or regulations or directives issued thereunder, shall be subject of a fine of not more than $5,000 for each violation.

"(e) Any owner or operator of housing accommodations for which the rental or carrying charges which may be charged are affected by this section may apply to the Secretary for an exception on the basis of increased capital or operating costs. Any such exception shall remain effective only until such owner or operator has recovered an additional sum sufficient to cover his outlay for such increased capital or operating costs."

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE SUNSHINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the public's business should be done in public. Most regrettably, it is not. Much of it is done in secret, and secrecy in government is patently undemocratic.

A government that prefers to do its business in secret neither has nor deserves the public's confidence and trust.

Surely, the world's greatest democracy ought not to be afraid of a little democracy itself.

To correct this pernicious habit of secrecy in government, I have joined with my colleague, Mr. FASCELL, and several other Members from both parties in the introduction of the "government in the sunshine" bill, H.R. 4.

This bill, modeled on a tough anti-secrecy statute enacted a few years ago in Florida, would do the following:

First. Require all meetings of Federal Government agencies at which official action is taken, considered, or discussed to be open to the public, with certain exceptions. Exceptions would be in matters relating to national defense and security or required by statute to be kept confidential, meetings related to an agency internal management, and disciplinary proceedings which could adversely affect the reputation of an individual.

Second. Require that all meetings of congressional committees, including markup and conference committee sessions, be open to the public, with exceptions similar to those cited for meetings of Government agencies.

Third. Require that a transcript be made of each open agency or congressional committee meeting, and that it be made available to the public.

Fourth. Provide for court enforcement of the open-meeting requirement for Government agencies.

Hearings on an identical bill have already been promised in the Senate, and I hope the House will follow suit and take prompt action to enact this legislation.

The "government in the sunshine" bill builds on a provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which requires that committee meetings be open unless a majority of the committee members decide otherwise. This provision pertains only to standing committees, however, and exempts markup sessions of Senate committees. These weaknesses would be corrected by H.R. 4, which includes all standing, select, special and conference committees and most markup sessions, and which has no provision for a majority vote to close meetings not otherwise exempted from the bill.

Unfortunately, secrecy is still a fact of life in the Congress. The Legislative Reorganization Act has not had any real impact on the extent of committee secrecy: the percent of all congressional committee meetings that were closed to the public jumped from 36 percent in 1971 to 40 percent in 1972. Figures for the House alone are 41 and 44 percent, respectively. Almost 80 percent of the House committee markup and voting sessions were closed last year.

One of the distinctive marks of a democracy is its commitment to an open society. It is assumed in a democracy that policy can be improved by steady public examination and debate. If the people are no tin the know, they cannot choose the prudent path. Few topics should be immune from public scrutiny and criticism, because only by such examinaiton can mistakes be corrected.

Closed government meetings damage our political system. They imply hanky-panky and shady deals. They arouse suspicion and resentment. They make it more difficult to get the support and cooperation of persons affected by the secretly made decisions. Closed meetings destroy the credibility of public officials and make their tasks more difficult.

Surveys of public opinion reported in the recently published book entitled "State of the Nation" show that government as a whole, on balance, does not get favorable marks from Americans for honesty, fairness and justice. Another study by a political scientist from Ohio State University showed that the American people's trust in its government dropped nearly 20 percent from 1964 to 1970, an alarming rate of change.

Many steps are needed to restore public confidence and trust in government, but no one step is more important than letting in the sunshine. Fortunately, the crisis of confidence in government is widely recognized and sentiment to end secrecy in government is rapidly building. The goal of the sunshine bill has been endorsed by Common Cause, Fortune magazine, and the 1972 national platform of the Democratic Party. Colorado and Washington, following on the Florida example, have acted dramatically to open their State governments to public view. The Congress even passed legislation, now law, last year that requires that every meeting of the estimated 1,100 Federal Government advisory committees be open to the public.

What the Congress did for the Federal advisory committees it should do for its own committees and for the Federal Government agencies. We must renew our efforts, begun with the 1970 Reorganization Act, to open our governmental processes to the fullest extent possible. This will lead to better lawmaking and greater

public confidence in our democratic system.

It is time to let the sunshine in.

EIGHTY-TWO MEMBERS INTRODUCE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference H.R. 1415, which would provide 500,000 federally financed public service jobs in each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The bill is cosponsored by the following Members:

BELLA S. ABZUG of New York.
BROCK ADAMS of Washington.
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO of New York.
LES ASPIN of Wisconsin.
HERMAN BADILLO of New York.
ALPHONZO BELL of California.
BOB BERGLAND of Minnesota.
TOM BEVILL of Alabama.
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM of New York.
EDWARD P. BOLAND of Massachusetts.
JOHN BRADEMAS of Indiana.
GEORGE E. BROWN, JR. of California.
CHARLES J. CARNEY of Ohio.
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM of New York.
FRANK M. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
JOHN CONYERS, JR. of Michigan.
JAMES C. CORMAN of California.
WILLIAM R. COTTER of Connecticut.
PAUL W. CRONIN of Massachusetts.
W. C. (DAN) DANIEL of Virginia.
GEORGE E. DANIELSON of California.
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR. of Michigan.
JOHN D. DINGELL of Michigan.
ROBERT F. DRINAN of Massachusetts.
THADDEUS J. DULSKI of New York.
BOB ECKHARDT of Texas.
DON EDWARDS of California.
JOSHUA EILBERG of Pennsylvania.
WALTER E. FAUNTROY of District of Columbia.
HAMILTON FISH, JR. of New York.
DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania.
WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan.
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS of Pennsylvania.
SAM GIBBONS of Florida.
WILLIAM J. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
MICHAEL HARRINGTON of Massachusetts.
WAYNE L. HAYS of Ohio.
KEN HECHLER of West Virginia.
HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey.
FLOYD V. HICKS of Washington.
BARBARA JORDAN of Texas.
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin.
EDWARD I. KOCH of New York.
PETER N. KYROS of Maine.
ROBERT L. LEGGETT of California.
WILLIAM LEHMAN of Florida.
RAY J. MADDEN of Indiana.
LLOYD MEEDS of Washington.
RALPH H. METCALFE of Illinois.
PATSY T. MINK of Hawaii.
PARREN J. MITCHELL of Maryland.
JOHN MOAKLEY of Massachusetts.
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.
THOMAS E. MORGAN of Pennsylvania.
JOHN E. MOSS of California.
MORGAN F. MURPHY of Illinois.
LUCIEN N. NEDZI of Michigan.
ROBERT N. C. NIX of Pennsylvania.
DAVID R. OBEY of Wisconsin.
CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida.
BERTRAM L. PODELL of New York.
MELVIN PRICE of Illinois.
THOMAS M. REES of California.
HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin.
PETER W. RODINO, JR. of New Jersey.
FRED B. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL of New York.
EDWARD R. ROYBAL of California.
PAUL S. SARBANES of Maryland.
JOHN F. SEIBERLING of Ohio.
JAMES V. STANTON of Ohio.
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK of California.
ROBERT H. STEELE of Connecticut.
LOUIS STOKES of Ohio.
GERRY E. STUDDS of Massachusetts.
JAMES W. SYMINGTON of Missouri.
FRANK THOMPSON, JR. of New Jersey.
ROBERT O. TIERNEY of Rhode Island.
JEROME R. WALDIE of California.
CHARLES H. WILSON of California.
LESTER L. WOLFF of New York.
GUS YATRON of Pennsylvania.

Although the economic indicators show an encouraging recovery from the slough of 1971 in some respects—corporate after-tax profits, for instance, rose 15 percent in 1972 over 1971, and sales shot up close to 12 percent—unemployment has not declined satisfactorily. After remaining at 5.5 percent or worse for over 2 years, the unemployment rate fell in November 1972, to 5.2 percent where it stayed in December. This is still way above any definition of full employment; but even worse are the astronomical unemployment percentages among young people and minorities which this figure includes. The December jobless rate for nonwhites was 9.6 percent—virtually unchanged from a year ago—while 16 percent of the teenage labor force were out looking for jobs. Unacceptable levels of unemployment—especially among these groups—are going to plague us for some time yet.

President Nixon's attempts to deal with the problem of unemployment via tax breaks for business investment have given ample proof to those who needed it that "trickle down" economics just do not work. The asset depreciation range system and the 7-percent investment tax credit costs the Treasury $5–$6 billion a year between them, and unemployment is still high.

The fastest and cheapest way to make jobs is simply to make jobs. But Nixon, dismissing the valuable functions which public service employment can provide as "dead-end jobs," vetoed a comprehensive manpower bill with a public service jobs component in 1970, and only very reluctantly signed the Emergency Employment Act in 1971. A small fraction of the unemployed found jobs last year through the EEA; at its peak in July 1972, the EEA provided public service jobs for 185,000 people, or roughly 4 percent of the unemployed. But even this meager program is being phased out.

The Jobs Now bill expands and improves the EEA. By creating 500,000 public service posts, the Jobs Now program could reduce unemployment almost immediately by more than one-tenth. In addition, the multiplier effect of these jobs, by triggering an increase in spending and investment, could bring about another 1 to 2 million jobs.

Are these public service jobs in "dead-end" projects? Far from it. Public service work, as defined in the Jobs Now bill, includes work in such fields as environmental quality, health care, education, public safety, crime prevention and control, prison rehabilitation, transportation, recreation, maintenance of parks, streets, and other public facilities, solid waste removal, pollution control, housing and neighborhood improvements, rural development, conservation, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and community improvement.

The need for these social services is greater all the time. Teachers are beaten up in schoolyards for lack of police protection; the water and air we drink and breathe is dirtier every day; health care has become more expensive and time-consuming for want of paramedical personnel. With 4.5 million men and women unemployed, what on earth are we waiting for?

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 1415

First. Funding—the bill authorizes the appropriation of a sum necessary to provide 500,000 jobs in each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975. With current EEA costs per job at approximately $7,000 per job, it is reasonable to assume $3.5 billion in annual appropriations.

Second. Allocation—the funds will be allocated by the Secretary among the States strictly on the basis of the proportion which the total number of unemployed persons in each States bears to the total number of unemployed persons in the United States. If any funds remain unused after a reasonable period, the Secretary will reallocate them, on the same basis, among the other States.

Funds will be distributed within States on a similar basis according to the proportion which the total number of unemployed persons in an eligible unit of government bears to the total number of unemployed persons in the State. If any funds remain unused, they are to be reallocated as above.

Third. Applications—eligible applicants are units of Federal, State, and general local government—basically, cities and counties—or combinations of general local governments, public agencies and institutions which are subdivisions of State or general local government—such as school boards and Community Action programs recognized by OEO—or Indian tribes on Federal or State reservations. Current Labor Department practice in administering the EEA has limited applicants who may apply directly to the Federal Government to units of government with jurisdiction over at least 75,000 people. Smaller areas must apply through the State of which they are a part. The bill does not alter that administrative regulation.

Applications must include assurances regarding maintenance of local effort, parity in salary and benefits between public service program employees and civil service employees, links with other manpower programs, hiring limited to unemployed or underemployed persons—as defined in the bill—number of professionals to be hired, et certera.

Fourth. Manpower and Training Services—the bill specifies that no less than 85 percent of the funds appropriated must be used for wages and employee benefits. The remaining 15 percent, in addition to funds available from other

Federal manpower and training programs, may be used for training purposes. It is understood that much training will consist of on-the-job development of skills.

Fifth. Report to Congress—the Secretary of Labor must submit to Congress at least annually a report on the program, including information on the person hired and the subsequent employment history of public service program employees who leave the program.

COMPETITION IN THE ENERGY INDUSTRY

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, one can hardly pick up a newspaper or magazine these days without seeing a story about the "energy crisis." The problem of obtaining the increasing amounts of fuels to heat our homes, run our appliances and power the machines of commerce and industry is one of the more serious problems facing the Nation and the Congress. The reasons for the energy problem are numerous, and include such factors as the oil import quota system and State restrictions on oil production, both of which limit the available supply of the fuel and boost the price to the consumer. Another important factor, the one which is the subject of legislation I am introducing today, is the increasing concentration in the energy industry. Essential to an understanding of the energy problem is the realization that it is not the result of any lack of natural resources in this country. The resources are available, in some cases in abundance. The crux of the energy problem lies in obtaining fuels at a reasonable price to the consumer and in a manner that will have minimum impact on the environment. Accomplishment of those objectives can be stimulated by vigorous competition in the energy industry.

But such competition is lacking today as the multifuel "energy companies" continue to concentrate more and more of our energy resources in fewer and fewer hands. This concentration has become increasingly apparent in the past decade as major oil companies have acquired assets in the competing fuels such as coal and uranium. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to bring a halt to this concentration and to insure competition in the energy industry. This antitrust legislation would amend the Clayton Act by prohibiting oil companies from acquiring coal or uranium resources. It also would require oil companies who now hold coal and uranium assets to divest themselves of those resources.

Economic concentration in any industry can hurt the consumer by boosting the price he pays for a product and by giving him less choice in the marketplace. But concentration in the energy field is doubly harmful, because it directly affects every other industry, dependent on energy to produce a product or provide a service. Thus, the higher price of energy will be reflected in higher prices for almost all products. And the lack of competition between fuels increases the likelihood of price increases.

Ample evidence is available on concentration in the energy industry. A study done several years ago, for instance, showed that of the Nation's 25 largest oil companies, 11 had coal assets and 18 had uranium assets. Further, a House Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems said in a 1971 report that major oil companies, which account for 84 percent of U.S. refining capacity and 72 percent of natural gas production and reserve ownership, also account for 30 percent of domestic coal reserves and more than 20 percent of domestic coal production. The majors also have more than 50 percent of uranium reserves and 25 percent of uranium milling capacity. The committee also noted that oil companies are acquiring oil shale and tar sands as well as water rights in many areas of the country.

Of the top 15 coal producers in 1970, four were oil companies. In each case, the oil company acquired its coal assets by buying a major coal company during the 1960's. The four were Continental Oil Co. which acquired Consolidation Coal Co. in 1966 when Consolidation was the Nation's leading coal producer; Occidental Petroleum Co. which acquired Island Creek Coal Co. in 1968; Standard Oil of Ohio which acquired Old Ben Coal Co. in 1968; and Gulf Oil Co. which acquired Pittsburg & Midway Coal Mining Co. in 1963. In addition, two other among the top 15 coal producers have assets in competing fuels even though coal is the principal product of each company. The Pittston Co. has major oil holdings as well as coal and Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates earns considerable income from gas sales as well as coal. The four oil companies produced 19 percent of the Nation's coal in 1970; the oil companies plus Pittston and Eastern produced 25 percent.

The major coal producers also include a number of steel and nonferrous metal companies. Significantly, only three of the top 15 producers—Westmoreland Coal Co., North American Coal Corp., and Southwestern Illinois Coal Corp.—are independent coal companies which do not depend on competing fuels for an important share of their income.

Figures on coal production show the current oil domination of the coal industry. The prospects for even more significant long-term domination are revealed in records showing the ownership of the country's vast coal reserves. In its issue of November 15, 1972, Forbes magazine listed 27 companies which each have estimated reserves of 100 million tons or more. Only seven of those 27 companies are engaged primarily in coal production and they own an estimated 7.4 billion tons, or less than 10 percent of the coal reserves owned by the entire group of 27 companies. The list also included six oil companies, five nonferrous metals firms, three railroads, three utilities, two steel companies, and an aerospace firm.

The six oil companies, which own a combined total of 23.3 billion tons of coal reserves, include Continental Oil—Consolidation Coal—8.1 billion tons; Exxon—Monterey Coal—7 billion tons; Occidental Petroleum—Island Creek Coal—3.3 billion tons; Gulf Oil—Pittsburg & Midway Coal—2.6 billion tons; Kerr-McGee 1.5 billion tons; and Standard Oil of Ohio—Old Ben Coal—0.8 billion tons.

Three railroads own a combined total of 22.4 billion tons of coal reserves, including the two top reserve holders, Burlington Northern, Inc., with 11 billion tons and Union Pacific with 10 billion tons. The five nonferrous metals companies own a combined total of 16.2 billion tons of coal; the two steel companies 4.8 billion tons, the three utilities 4.1 billion tons, and the aerospace firm 0.6 billion tons.

An additional indication that oil companies are moving into the competing coal market is shown in the leasing of public domain coal lands. As of April of 1971, the Federal Government had issued 520 leases on almost 768,000 acres of such lands, almost one-fourth of that to oil companies. But there has been little development on those coal lands. Only 73 of the 520 leases were producing coal and unproductive lands included 90 percent of all acres leased.

The movement of oil companies into the uranium industry is equally apparent. As previously noted, oil companies account for 50 percent of uranium reserves and 25 percent of uranium milling capacity. A single oil company, Kerr-McGee, accounts for 27 percent of uranium production in the United States making it the Nation's largest producer of that fuel. Other oil companies which have moved actively into the uranium industry include Exxon, Atlantic Richfield, Gulf Oil, Continental Oil, and Getty Oil. In fact, nearly all oil companies are actively engaged or planning to enter some stage of uranium production.

The significance of oil company activity in other fuels was underscored last year in an economic report prepared by the staff of the Federal Trade Commission. The staff examined the utility industry, which uses almost one-fourth of the fuel consumed in this country. The report concluded that the four primary fuels—oil, natural gas, coal, and uranium—are "sufficiently substitutable in their use by electric utilities to support the conclusion that they trade in the same economic market." It logically follows, them, that oil company acquisition of assets in other fuels tends to have an anticompetitive effect on the energy market.

Add that factor to the already existing anticompetitive aspects of the oil industry—joint ventures, joint ownership of pipelines, vertical integration from wellhead to gas pump—and the artificial restraints on supply—import quotas and State restrictions on oil productions—and the message is clear: The rich and powerful get richer and more powerful at the expense of the victimized consumer. Five of the 10 most profitable corporations in the country and 14 of the most 57 profitable are oil companies—and yet the big oil companies paid only 6.7 percent of their net income in Federal income taxes in 1970. Just one of the Government favors for the power-

ful oil industry, the quotas on foreign oil imports, adds an estimated $5 to $7 billion a year to consumers' fuel bills. Concentration threatens to compound the unfair balance favoring the giant energy companies.

Without competition in the energy industry, there is danger of collusion, price fixing, and market sharing. And there is little incentive for lower prices, greater efficiencies and more research into better technology.

An oil company has little incentive to develop economic conversion of coal into synthetic liquids and gases or to solve the environmental problems associated with coal if an artificial shortage of oil keeps company prices up and profits high. But an independent oil company, dependent on new technology, has every incentive to pursue development of synthetic fuels and solution of environmental problems. And the competition from that independent coal company should spur the oil company to greater efficiencies and lower prices and to further exploration for oil and natural gas.

On the latter point, it is significant to note that the National Petroleum Council, an industry group which advises the Secretary of the Interior, stated in a recent report:

> No major source of U.S. fuel supply is limited by the availability of resources to sustain higher production.

The council reported that reliable estimates suggest there are sufficient reserves to produce twice the oil and three times the gas produced in this country through 1970, although much of those resources remain to be discovered. Coal is abundant. Not surprisingly, the petroleum council predicts much higher fuel prices in the near future, a position which may be affected by the council's obvious self-interest in such a conclusion. One would search in vain to find a consumer representative among the several hundred industry people who participated in this study.

But the essential point is this: The so-called energy crisis is not due to a shortage of fuels, but to a failure to develop those resources. While the incentive of higher prices may serve the interests of the few giant energy companies, the incentive of vigorous competition among many companies in different fuel industries will best serve the interest of the consumer. Such competition can be assured if the oil companies are prohibited from acquiring interests in coal and uranium production.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that assuring competition in the energy industry is only one step the Congress must take to solve the energy problem. Action is needed in other areas, such as ending the quotas on oil imports. It is time for the Federal Government to protect the public interest rather than the special interest.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. RUFUS JUDSON PEARSON, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Rufus Judson Pearson, Jr., MC, USN, retired on January 3, 1973, as the Attending Physician to Congress, and from the Navy, after more than 26 years of active naval duty, of which the last 6½ years were as the physician of the Congress.

Judson Pearson carries with him the deep appreciation and best wishes of the Senators and Representatives to whom he has ministered from March 1966 to January 1973. While we hate to see him leave us we are very glad that he came our way. He demonstrated a very deep interest in the health of Members of Congress and constantly improved his staff and facilities to better minister to the medical requirements of the Members.

I have especially enjoyed the renewal of a personal friendship with Jud Pearson which began when he was a medical student and I was a law student more than a few years ago.

During the entire period of his service in the U.S. Navy and including the time served as Attending Physician to the Congress, Admiral Pearson reflected credit upon the highest tradition of the U.S. Navy and the medical profession.

During the time that Dr. Pearson served as Attending Physician, he effected many improvements in health care and the delivery of health care in the Capitol. As evidence of this, Members of Congress have repeatedy expressed appreciation of his interest in the health and welfare of Members, Members' families, congressional staffs and especially of the Pages. In addition to being an outstanding physician, he has a marvelous understanding which meant much to every person with whom he came in contact.

It is of interest to note that he was invited to accompany the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate on their historical visit to China in 1972.

Dr. Pearson was in private practice in Jacksonville, Fla., for 5 years prior to returning to active duty in the Navy. He served as chief of medicine at the Naval Hospitals, Charleston, S.C. and Portsmouth, Va., and was chief of cardiology at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md., from 1955 to 1961. Before his appointment as Attending Physician, he served as director of clinical services and chief of medicine at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md. He trained at the Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn and at the Grady Hospital, Atlanta, and had additional training in cardiovascular diseases at the Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, under Dr. Paul Dudley White. He is certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine and the Sub-specialty Board in Cardiovascular Diseases.

At the retirement ceremony, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., Chaplain of the House opened the ceremony with a prayer and then Admiral Davis made a few complimentary remarks about Admiral Pearson and his service in the Navy and at the Capitol and then presented him with the Surgeon General's Award and following this the Distinguished Service Medal. At the end of this, Admiral Davis read Admiral Pearson's orders for retirement at midnight, January 3.

Admiral Pearson's remarks began with an expression of appreciation at the opportunity for working in the Capitol, with a reminder that all employees at the Capitol—elected and appointed—had a very special feeling. He quoted Congressman GEORGE H. MAHON, who said even though he had been at the Capitol for over 30 years, he still got a thrill each day at the sight of the Capitol Dome.

He expressed thanks to his patients and friends, hoping that the former were also the latter and to his fellow naval officers for his exciting naval career. He particularly thanked Vice Adm. George M. Davis, the present Surgeon General, for his advice and counsel and aid with all things related to the Capitol Hill office. He mentioned Vice Adm. Robert B. Brown, the former Navy Surgeon General, who had been responsible for his being "in the right place at the right time" and reminded the audience that Admiral Brown at times could be a pretty strict disciplinarian and at some times had "put him in his place."

The history of the office at the Capitol was reviewed briefly. There was no attending physician in the Capitol until 1928. On December 5, 1928, Congressman Fred Britton of Ohio, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee introduced a resolution on the House floor requesting Secretary of the Navy Curtis Dwight Wilbur to detail a naval medical officer to the House of Representatives as Attending Physician. The resolution passed unanimously. Comdr. George W. Calver was assigned to the Capitol and at first put his hat in the Democratic cloakroom, off the House floor. Before long, he had acquired room H–166, which was John Nance Garner's room, and in 1929, he also acquired room H–165 for the office. With ingenuity and with imagination, Dr. Calver increased the facilities at the Capitol. In 1929, Dr. Roy O. Copeland, a Senator from New York, introduced a resolution on the Senate floor requesting that a naval medical officer be detailed to the Senate as Attending Physician and suggested that Dr. Calver be the physician. With the coming years, Dr. Calver acquired more space and increased the size of his staff and the services of the Capitol office.

The outstanding services of the staff were mentioned by Dr. Pearson and credit was also given to Capt. Bill McGehee, MSC, who had had a great deal to do with the selection of Dr. Calver's staff and the present staff.

In closing, he recalled that 35 years ago it had been his intention to be a family doctor, but that along the line he had gotten sidetracked, by entering a naval career, then becoming a specialist in internal medicine and then a specialist in cardiology. He then became a medical administrator, having been chief of medicine at two of the larger naval hospitals, but he stressed that he had been particularly gratified by spending the last 6½ years of his naval career as a family practitioner on Capitol Hill and particularly, with the opportunity to associate with the Nation's leaders.

Chaplain Latch said the benediction closing the proceedings.

Admiral Pearson was awarded a Distinguished Service Medal by the Secre-

tary of the Navy and a Certificate of Merit by the Surgeon General of the Navy.

The citation for the Distinguished Service Medal reads as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as the Attending Physician to the Congress during the period March 1966 to January 1973.

Rear Admiral Pearson brought to his unique position exceptional skill, innovation, farsighted leadership, and the highest sense of dedication. Through his superlative efforts, Members of Congress and their staffs received the best possible medical care.

Rear Admiral Pearson was instrumental in effecting numerous improvements to the health care delivery system in the Capitol complex. In addition to his role as a physician, he served as advisor, consultant, and confident to the nations' legislators, earning the respect of all with whom he came in contact.

By his distinguished and inspiring devotion to duty, Rear Admiral Pearson reflected great credit upon himself and the Medical Corps, and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

For the President,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

The citation for the Certificate of Merit reads as follows:

For over twenty-six years of distinguished, loyal and exceptionally meritorious service in the Medical Corps of the United States Navy.

Throughout his naval career, Admiral Pearson dedicated his professional energies, clinical skills, and administrative abilities to providing quality health care. During World War II, he served overseas with a Navy Construction Battalion. Subsequently, he was assigned on the Medical Service at Naval Hospitals, Jacksonville, Florida; Beaufort, South Carolina; Bethesda, Maryland; and was Chief of Medicine at Naval Hospitals, Charleston, South Carolina, and Portsmouth, Virginia. Immediately preceding his present assignment, Admiral Pearson served as Chief of Medicine and Director of Clinical Services at Naval Hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. To each of these assignments, he brought a high level of professional competence coupled with dynamic leadership, drive and imagination.

Such impressive credentials as his certification by the American Board of Internal Medicine in both Internal Medicine and Cardiovascular Diseases, his status as a Fellow in the American College of Physicians and the American College of Cardiology, and his vast professional experience made Admiral Pearson imminently qualified for assignment as Attending Physician to the Congress. During his tenure from July 1966 to January 1973, he continually demonstrated his intense devotion to duty and dedication to purpose by totally administering to the medical needs of the members of both Congressional Legislative bodies. In addition, Admiral Pearson served with distinction as Chairman of the Armed Forces Participation Committee for the Presidential Inauguration in January 1969.

On the occasion of his retirement, it is a privilege and a distinct pleasure to record here our appreciation and gratitude, and to confer upon Admiral Pearson this Certificate of Merit in recognition of a distinguished career in the service of his country.

G. M. DAVIS,
Vice Admiral,
Medical Corps, USN.

Rear Adm. Freeman Hamilton Cary, MC, USN, is the successor to Admiral Pearson and has already assumed his duties as Attending Physician. Dr. Cary, is eminently qualified by training and experience to serve as Attending Physician to the Congress and is already well and favorably known to most of the Members. I take pleasure in joining in welcome and congratulations to Dr. Carey as he assumes the duties of his new position.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHAPPELL (at the request of Mr. MCFALL) for today through January 18 on account of official committee 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. COCHRAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 30 minutes, on January 18.

Mr. TEAGUE of California, for 30 minutes, on January 18.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, for 10 minutes, on January 15.

Mr. BELL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDADE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, on January 18.

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

Mr. MINISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLYNT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PATTEN, for 60 minutes, on January 18.

Mr. BADILLO, for 60 minutes, on January 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,530.

Mr. SEIBERLING and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,020.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in five instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. ZWACH in three instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK in three instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

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

Mr. STARK in 10 instances.

Ms. ABZUG in five instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in seven instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. BERGLAND.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. LEHMAN in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California in 10 instances.

Mr. CAREY of New York in two instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. WON PAT.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. KOCH in two instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 18, 1973, 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:

220. A letter from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report of actions taken under the export expansion facility program, during the quarter ended September 30, 1972, pursuant to Public Law 90–390; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

221. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his report with respect to proceedings instituted before the Subversive Activities Control Board during the period January 1 to December 31, 1972, pursuant to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Internal Security.

222. A letter from the Chairman, National Parks Centennial Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Commission for the year 1972, pursuant to section 5(c) of Public Law 91–332; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Management and

Budget), transmitting a report on the actions taken with respect to scientific and professional positions, pursuant to title 5, United States Code, section 3104; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

224. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

225. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 1973 Annual Report on the urban area traffic operations improvement program (TOPICS), pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 135(d); to the Committee on Public Works.

226. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 54th Annual National Convention of the Legion, together with a financial statement and audit, pursuant to Public Law 88-105 (H. Doc. No. 93-32); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

227. A letter from the Chairman of the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the 17th Annual Report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1972, pursuant to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

228. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the functioning of the Maryland system for reviewing the use of medical services financed under medicaid, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 1967. A bill to prohibit any civil or military officer of the United States using the land or naval forces of the United States or the militia of any State to exercise surveillance of civilians except where such forces or militia are actually engaged in repelling invasion or suppressing rebellion, insurrection, or domestic violence pursuant to the Constitution or laws of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1968. A bill to prohibit the United States from engaging in weather modification activities for military purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to direct the President to stabilize rentals and carrying charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in federally assisted housing may not exceed certain previous levels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1971. A bill to insure international cooperation in the prosecution or extradition to the United States of persons alleged to have committed aircraft piracy against the laws of the United States or international law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1972. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1973. A bill to provide for a system of children's allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1974. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1975. A bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1976. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1977. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide benefits to survivors of police officers, firemen, and correction officers killed in the line of duty, and to police officers, firemen, and correction officers who are disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1979. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1981. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CULVER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 1983. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a Commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 1984. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 1985. A bill; Free Flow of Information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 1986. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that accurate medical records be kept with respect to each member of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1987. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1988. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require certain labeling to assist the consumer in purchases of packaged perishable or semiperishable foods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1990. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1991. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transportation, mailing, and broadcasting of advertising, information, and materials concerning lotteries authorized by law and conducted by a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1992. 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 Senate and House of Representatives may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 1993. A bill to amend section 803 of the Education Amendments of 1972 to reemphasize the intent of Congress with respect to busing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 1994. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1995. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age), and medicare benefits, will be payable at age 60 (with such insurance benefits being payable in reduced amounts at age 57), to provide a minimum primary benefit of $100 a month, and to liberalize the earnings test; and to amend title XVIII of such act to provide coverage for prescription drugs under the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1996. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute one-third of the cost of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the hospital insurance program, with corresponding reductions in the contributions otherwise required of employees, employers, and self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FREY, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1997. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HUBER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. POAGE):

H.R. 1998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STEED, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. WYATT, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. MIZELL):

H.R. 1999. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 2000. A bill; the Eastern Wilderness Areas Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 2001. 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. DANIELSON:

H.R. 2002. A bill relating to the disclosure of information and news sources by the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. E DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 2003. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FISH, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. ZION, Mr. BRAY, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HUDNUT, and Mr. BIESTER):

H.R. 2004. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges in Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2005. 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. DICKINSON:

H.R. 2006. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Defense to utilize Department of Defense resources for the purpose of providing medical emergency transportation services to civilians; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 2007. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 2008. A bill to amend section 101(b) of the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971 to enlarge the class of persons eligible to receive benefits under the claims program established by that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SLACK, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 2009. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pensions and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 2010. 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. HAMMERSCHMIDT (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. HICKS, Mr. THONE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. EVINS of TENNESSEE, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 2011. A bill concerning the allocation of water pollution funds among the States in fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. SHOUP):

H.R. 2012. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide for more effective inspection of imported meat and meat products to prevent the importation of diseased, contaminated, or otherwise unwholesome meat and meat products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 2013. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 2014. A bill to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 2015. A bill to protect confidential sources of the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2016. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2017. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2018. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2019. A bill to amend the act establishing the Gateway National Recreation Area to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for water transportation facilities to the recreation area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2020. A bill to prohibit under certain conditions Federal activities in connection with the construction of offshore bulk cargo transshipment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FISHER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, Mr. SCHERLE, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend the Judiciary and Judicial Procedure Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. FREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 2022. A bill to amend the Judiciary and Judicial Procedure Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2023. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2024. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2025. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2026. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry on public, Indian, and other lands within the United States and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of industry and national defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2027. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to preserve competition among corporations engaged in the production of oil, coal, and uranium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 2028. A bill to establish an independent and regionalized Federal Board of Parole, to provide for fair and equitable parole procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 2029. 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.

H.R. 2030. 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. KING:

H.R. 2031. A bill to provide that the Saratoga Battle Monument shall be made a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2032. A bill to establish the Van Buren-Lindenwald Historic Site at Kinderhook, N.Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 2034. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to clarify the definition of conscientious objector so as to specifically include conscientious opposition to military service in a particular war; and to provide to certain individuals the opportunity to claim

exemption from military service as selective conscientious objectors irrespective of their existing selective service status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2035. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 clarifying the definition of conscientious objector so as to specifically include conscientious opposition to military service in a particular war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2036. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to permit members of the Reserves and the National Guard to receive retired pay at age 55 for nonregular service under chapter 67 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2037. A bill to provide increased employment opportunities for middle-aged and older workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2038. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2039. A bill to establish a National Human Resources Conservation Corps to rehabilitate persons convicted of violating certain narcotic drug laws and persons who volunteer for membership in such Corps and to improve the quality of the environment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2040. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer a program of direct Federal employment to improve the quality of the environment, the public lands, Indian reservations, and commonly owned and shared resources through a program of recreational development, reforestation and conservation management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2041. A bill to provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2042. A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles; preconstruction certification of stationary sources; more stringent State standards covering vehicular emissions, fuel additives and aircraft fuels; emergency injunctive powers; and public disclosure of pollutants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2043. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resource, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2044. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to eliminate certain requirements respecting contributions of State and local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2045. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 2046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BURTON, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.R. 2047. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCFALL:

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FLOWER, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. STEPHENS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CULVER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. RARICK, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PREYER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SLACK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 2049. A bill concerning the allocation of water pollution funds among the States in fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 2050. 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. MAHON:

H.R. 2051. A bill to further amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to provide for the extension of certain leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 2062. A bill to amend title 5, United United States Code to provide for the designation of the 30th day of May of each year as Memorial Day, and the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 2053. A bill concerning the war powers of the Congress and the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2054. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide compensation for the injury, disability, or death of certain civilian American citizens during World War II and for which no compensation has been previously authorized by law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the payment of increased annuities to secretaries of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2056. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2057. A bill to repeal section 5532 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reductions in the retired or retirement pay of retired officers of regular components of the uniformed services who are employed in civilian offices or positions in the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2058. A bill to provide increases in annuities paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act, matching wage and salary increases paid to employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2060. A bill to modify the decrease in Federal group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2061. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the immediate retirement of Federal civilian personnel on oceangoing vessels upon separation from the service after attaining 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2062. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the concurrent payment of foreign post pay differentials and nonforeign post cost-of-living allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2062. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the pay of prevailing rate employees assigned or detailed to perform duties of positions in grades or pay schedules higher than the grades or pay schedules of their existing positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2065. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2067. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code in order to provide that certain benefits to which employees of the United States stationed in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the territories of the United States are entitled may be terminated under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2068. A bill to permit a noncontiguous State to elect to use and allocate funds from the highway trust fund to achieve a balanced transportation system responsive to the unique transportation needs and requirements of such a noncontiguous State; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2069. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for cost-of-living adjustments to disability compensation rates payable to veterans residing outside the contiguous United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2070. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2071. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to provide memorial plots in national cemeteries for certain former members of the armed forces and to permit the ad-

jacent burial of certain family members of such former members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the exemption for purposes of the Federal estate tax from $60,000 to $120,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that limited retail dealers may sell distilled spirits and to provide that their special tax shall be $4.50 a month for each calendar month in which they sell distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the personal exemptions for the taxpayer or his spouse who has attained age 65 shall be $3,000 instead of $1,500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2077. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional 1-year period for first using a new residence which was purchased during the period provided in such section 1034; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a parent who supports a handicapped child to take a personal exemption for that child, even though the child earns more than $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2079. 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.

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to exempt increases in social security benefits from consideration in determining a person's need for public assistance under the programs of aid to the aged, the blind, and the disabled or the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2082. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2083. A bill to prohibit the withdrawal of merchandise from a customs bonded warehouse for exportation pursuant to retail sales unless such warehouse is located in close proximity to a port, airport, or border crossing station; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 2084. A bill to assist in the efficient production of the needed volume of good housing at lower cost through the elimination of restrictions on the use of advanced technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to provide that daylight saving time shall begin on Memorial Day and end on Labor Day of each year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2086. A bill to develop business and employment opportunities in smaller cities by providing certain preferences for prospective Government contractors in such cities and areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2087. A bill to require all Members of Congress to disclose all income; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

H.R. 2088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit losses allowable with respect to farming operations which are incurred by taxpayers whose principal business activity is not farming; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2090. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2091. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2092. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to make the program of aid to families with dependent children a wholly Federal program, to be administered by local agencies under federally prescribed terms and conditions (embodying the eligibility formulas currently in effect in the several States but designed to encourage such States to apply nationally uniform standards), with the cost being fully borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 2095. 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. MOSS:

H.R. 2096. A bill to prohibit the imposition by the States of discriminatory burdens upon interstate commerce in wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 2098. 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. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 2099. A bill to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 2100. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that renewal licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station may be issued for a term of 5 years and to establish certain standards for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcasting licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2101. A bill, Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1973; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 2102. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2103. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2104. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 60 to 50 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 2105. A bill to provide that no State development agency shall be entitled to receive Federal financial assistance in any form unless it provides satisfactory assurances that it will take no action inconsistent with local zoning laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 2106. A bill to provide that the imposition of taxes the proceeds of which are appropriated to the highway trust fund shall be suspended during any period when the amounts in the fund are impounded or otherwise withheld from expenditure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 2107. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 2108. A bill to amend chapter 67 (relating to retired pay for nonregular service) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of retired pay at reduced percentage to persons, otherwise eligible, at age 50, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2109. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial by removing defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial and by creating an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence or the appearance of command influence from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2110. A bill to amend section 264(b) of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the transfer or expenditure of reserve component funds for purposes other than for which appropriated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2111. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of major general for the Chief of the Dental Service of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2112. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2113. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide an incentive plan for participation in the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2114. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide protection thereunder against losses resulting from earthquakes and earthslides; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2115. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2116. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2117. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2118. A bill to provide for the disclosure of certain information relating to certain public opinion polls; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2119. A bill to require an investigation and study, including research, into possible uses of solid wastes resulting from mining and processing coal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2120. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2121. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2122. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2123. A bill to require that certain short-shelf-life durable products be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which performance life becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2124. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2125. A bill to improve law enforcement in cities by making available funds to be used to increase police salaries and to add more police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2126. A bill to provide educational assistance to children of civilian employees of the United States killed abroad as a result of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2127. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, relating to the dumping of certain materials into the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2129. A bill to amend the Federal Pollution Control Act to ban polyphosphates in detergents and to establish standards and programs to abate and control water pollution by synthetic detergents; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2130. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2131. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, social oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 2132. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide for a veterans outreach services program in the Veterans' Administration to assist eligible veterans, especially those recently separated, in applying for and obtaining benefits and services to which they are entitled, and education, training, and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by imposing a tax on the transfer of explosives to persons who may lawfully possess them and to prohibit possession of explosives by certain persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2137. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2138. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide medicare benefits (financed from general revenues) for disabled coal miners without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2139. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a Formulary Committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 2140. A bill to provide for the garnishment of the wages of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 2141. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2142. A bill to provide public service employment opportunities for unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2143. A bill to provide for research for solutions to the problem of alienation among American workers in all occupations and industries and technical assistance to those companies, unions, State and local governments seeking to find ways to deal with the problem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2144. A bill to establish a Congressional Center for the Study of Domestic and International Policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2145. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, to provide grants and loans for persons who have buildings or structures registered in the National Register in order to preserve such historic properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2146. A bill to prohibit the exclusion of dog guides for the blind from certain public carriers, transport terminals, and other places of business which operate in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2147. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2148. A bill; The Federal Gun Control Act of 1973; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2149. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2150. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the armed forces, law enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2151. A bill to modify the restrictions contained in section 170(e) of the Internal Revenue Code in the case of certain contributions of literary, musical, or artistic, composition, or similar property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCKAY, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 2153. A bill; The Antihijacking Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES (for Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. THONE, Mr. GUYER, Mr. FREY, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS (by request):

H.R. 2155. A bill to retain November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to change the ingredient requirements for meat food products subject to this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assist school districts to carry out locally approved school security plans to reduce crime against children, employees, and facilities of their schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide that law schools approved by the State bar of any State be considered institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2159. A bill to establish an executive department to be known as the department of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2160. A bill to provide for the use of certain funds to promote scholarly, cultural, and artistic activities between Japan and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2161. A bill to put into effect, and advance the effective date of, certain proposed standards for the control of air pollution from aircraft and aircraft engines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2162. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2163. A bill to assure the right to vote to citizens whose primary language is other than English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2164. A bill to require special deportation proceedings in connection with the voluntary departure from the United States of any national of Mexico or Canada who is illegally in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2165. A bill to change a requirement for naturalization as a U.S. citizen from being an ability to read, write, and speak English to an ability to read, write, and speak any language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2166. A bill to provide for the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2167. A bill to offer amnesty under certain conditions to persons who have failed or refused to register for the draft or to be inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2168. A bill to establish a commission to investigate the Watergate incident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2169. A bill to implement the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2170. A bill to establish a 20-year delimiting period for completing a program of education under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an exemption of the first $5,000 of retirement income received by a taxpayer under a public retirement system or any other system if the taxpayer is at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a retailers excise tax on certain nonreturnable bottles and cans, and to provide that the collections of such tax shall be paid over to the municipalities in which such bottles or cans were sold; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the personal exemption allowed to a taxpayer for a dependent shall be available without regard to the dependent's income in the case of a dependent who is over 65 (the same as in the case of a dependent who is a child under 19); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the full deduction of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals of 65 years of age and over, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2175. A bill to provide relief to certain individuals 60 years of age and over who own or rent their homes, through income tax credits and refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2176. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and chapters 2 and 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the ceiling presently imposed upon the amount of earnings which may be counted annually for social security benefit and tax purposes (with the maximum benefits resulting therefrom being limited to twice the present maximum rate), and to fix social security taxes permanently (for cash benefit purposes) at a single reduced rate for both employees and employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2177. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide for certain insurance benefits for the beneficiaries of servicemen who died early in the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2179. 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 allowances of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Commission on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 2180. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wildfire disaster control fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2181. 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. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2182. A bill to amend section 734 of title 44, United States Code, to require the Public Printer to furnish recycled material for the official use of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2183. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide reasonable and necessary income tax incentives to encourage the utilization of recycled solid waste materials and to offset existing income tax advantages which promote depletion of virgin natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 2185. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Klamath Falls, Oreg., to the occupants thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 2186. 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. WALDIE:

H.R. 2187. A bill to insure the free flow of information and news to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 2188. A bill; Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1973; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 2189. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2190. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces and $1 pieces in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2191. A bill to provide for the establishment of the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2192. A bill to remove the appropriation limitation for development of Chamizal National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend section 106 of title 4 of the United States Code relating to State taxation of the income of residents of another State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2194. A bill to permit public school teachers (and other public school employees) who do not have coverage pursuant to State agreement under the Federal old-age survivors and disability insurance system to elect coverage under such system as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 2195. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national historic park on the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 2196. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that officers appointed in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy from other commissioned status shall not lose rank or pay or allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2197. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DOWNING, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 2198. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Dismal Swamp National Monument in the States of Virginia and North Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 2199. A bill to permit suits to adjudicate disputed titles to lands in which the United States claims an interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (by request):

H.R. 2200. A bill to insure a free flow of information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 2201. A bill to create an air transportation security program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a refundable credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 2203. A bill to establish the Countryside Development Commission to study the economic problems of rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution establishing the birthplace of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Atlanta, Ga., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution designating January 15 of each year as Martin Luther King Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution designating the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. GROVER, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to designate the first of January each year as Appreciate America Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. GROSS, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. STEED, Mr. RARICK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia):

H.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, and Mr. HUBER):

H.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution proposing and amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to establish a national policy relating to conversion to the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period from March 4, 1973, through March 10, 1973, as National Nutrition Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress recommending the imposition and enforcement of a moratorium upon foreign fisheries operations on U.S. coastal stocks of fish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 80. 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. BOLLING (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska):

H. Res. 132. Resolution to create a select committee to study the operation and implementation of Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 133. Resolution concerning the continued injustices suffered by the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 134. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KOCH:

H. Res. 135. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REID:

H. Res. 136. Resolution calling for peace in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 137. Resolution honoring the late Rossell G. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

9. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the escalation of the war by North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to complete U.S. withdrawal from Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

11. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to amending the selection for Vice-President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

12. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2204. A bill for the relief of Franco and Ida Angelucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2205. A bill for the relief of Nello Giarelli, Rosa Cafagno Giarelli, Marcelo Giarelli, and Isabel Giarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2206. A bill for the relief of Maria Nguyen-thi-Ly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 2207. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Leeba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Suchy, 2d Lt., U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 2209. A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck and Equipment Co., its heirs and assigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2210. A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck and Equipment Co., its heirs and assigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2211. A bill to provide for the payment of death benefits in lieu of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance benefits to the eligible survivors of certain individuals killed while participating in the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps Flight Instruction program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nguyen Thi Le Fintland and Susan Fintland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Cornelius S. Ball, Victor F. Mann, Jr., George J. Posner, Dominick A. Sgammato, and James R. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS (by request):

H.R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Uhel D. Polly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Purita Paningbatan Bohannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2216. A bill for the relief of Anastacia Romero Cabansag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 2217. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Owings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 2218. A bill to clear and settle title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

20. The SPEAKER presented petition of the board of supervisors, county of Sacramento, Calif., relative to hijacking of aircraft and new Federal regulations related thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.