fore any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Daniel James, Jr. [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Otto J. Glasser [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William J. Evans, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, [redacted] (Army of the United States), major general, U.S. Army.

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Donn Royce Pepke, [redacted] (Army of the United States), brigadier general, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Orwin Clark Talbott, [redacted], U.S. Army.

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

To be general

Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Melvin Zais, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Merton D. Van Orden, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5150.

Vice Adm. John V. Smith, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

First Lt. William D. Rusinak, U.S. Marine Corps for appointment to the grade of captain.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Robert E. Abraham, to be second lieutenant, and ending John J. Zielinski, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 1973.

Air Force nominations beginning Leroy A. Aafedt, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Clarence B. Wingert, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 1973.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Wilmott Abbuhl, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Hershel B. Webb, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 2, 1973.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning William Acosta, to be captain, and ending Benedetto R. Lobalbo, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 1, 1973.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Dan C. Alexander, to be colonel, and ending Billy M. Mitchell, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 1973.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 21, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, says the Lord.—Zechariah 4: 6.

We are thankful, our Father, for Thy guiding spirit in the life of our Nation. We pray for Thy guidance for our leaders now. The burden of our world is great and our hands are small. We are trusting Thee to strengthen the hands and direct the wills of those who serve in this House and all of our leaders.

We confess our confusion and pray that you will help us to see clearly. Give us ability to distinguish between true and false claims and the courage to accept and do the right.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6077. An act to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees.

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

S. 355. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to promote traffic safety by providing that defects and failures to comply with motor vehicle safety standards shall be remedied without charge to the owner, and for other purposes.

S. 1672. An act to amend the Small Business Act; and

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week of May 20–26, 1973, as "Digestive Disease Week."

RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations as members of the U.S. Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

MAY 14, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep regret that due to important business in Arizona, I must inform you that I will be unable to participate in the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Conference.

Because of the above, I hereby resign as a delegate to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group.

Sincerely,

SAM STEIGER.

MAY 15, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of my inability to participate in the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary meeting in Mexico from May 24–29, I wish to notify you of my resignation of the appointment to the Interparliamentary Group under PL 86–420.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. STEELE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, and the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BURKE, to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 132, I am incorrectly recorded as voting "aye." I was present and voted "no."

MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the

Constitution to provide that no individual may be seated as a Representative or as a Senator after attaining the age of 68.

Retirement is required of civil service employees and also of the military at a certain age. Private industry also follows this same line of action and requires its executives to retire at a certain age. I feel that this rule should also be applied to Members of Congress.

As of the beginning of the 93d Congress, there were more than 30 House Members age 68 or over, and 18 in the other body.

My joint resolution provides that no individual may begin a term of office as a Representative or a Senator who has attained the age of 68. Since House Members have 2-year terms, this means that someone who was seated at age 67 would then fill out his term and actually retire at age 69. A Member of the Senate could be seated through the age of 67, and with a 6-year term, would then be retiring at age 73.

There is a great deal of sentiment for approval throughout the country of mandatory retirement for Members of Congress, and I see no reason why it should not apply to us, as well as others engaged in different areas of work. The Constitution now provides minimum ages of 25 years and 30 years for Members of the House and Senate, respectively, and I believe the time has come to set a maximum constitutional age for Members of Congress.

WATERGATE PUBLICITY

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, you can hardly find out what is going on in Washington because the media generally devotes 90 percent of its attention to "Watergate."

Martin Petree, newscaster for WMNI radio in Columbus, Ohio, made a commentary about the newsgathering profession on May 15, which is worth reading:

WMNI RADIO COMMENTARY, MAY 15, 1973

I don't know about you, but I'm getting rather sick of hearing about Watergate. From the cries of anguish coming forth from the ultra-liberal elements within the news gathering profession, one gets the misguided conception that the bugging of the democratic headquarters is equaled by very few events in the history of man.

The real thing that "bugs" me, if you will permit the pun, is the fact that most of those doing the loudest screaming nowadays, are the same one's who remained deathly silent during the 1960 election when numerous vote frauds in Illinois and Texas literally stole the presidential election from Richard Nixon. Where were these great champions of the left who are in such "hot" pursuit of truth today? Where were they when Barry Goldwater in 1964, was being sliced to ribbons by ridiculous charges and out-and-out propaganda and distortions. I'll tell you exactly where they were. They were right in the front line making sure their written and spoken words did their share to discredit the Arizona senator in his bid for the presidency.

There was a time in this country that journalists prided themselves in the knowledge that their profession dealt in fact, rather than rumor, hints, innuendo, and distortions. Any newsman worth his "salt" would check and double-check his sources, but today, I must confess, there are those among us who rush into print or jam the airwaves with nothing but common gossip. They do it with a purpose. . . . to damage the person who happens to be the target of their attack. In short, the muckrakers are having a "ball". They are damaging the reputations of people without ever bothering to make certain of their facts. It's enough to make an honest journalist seek another profession.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is a Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY MEDICAL HELICOPTER SERVICES TO CIVILIANS IN EMERGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7139) authorizing the Secretary of Defense to utilize Department of Defense resources for the purpose of providing medical emergency transportation services to civilians, and limiting Government individual liability incident to providing such servces, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) if this applies as well, and is permissible in the use of Air National Guard helicopters?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) for an answer to that question.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the gentleman's question.

This, as the gentleman knows, is a bill to allow the use of military helicopters for accident victims growing out of automobile crashes.

In answer to the gentleman's question, the answer is: "Yes." This bill is permissive only. It allows the Secretary of Defense to institute these programs wherever there are military installations and equipment available, as well as military personnel, without having to transfer them to some other place, if the Secretary of Defense sees fit, and if the military unit, whether it be National Guard or whatever it may be, desires to engage in this, he may do so.

Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 7139) provides the Secretary of Defense the authority to utilize, within specific parameters, the personnel and resources of the Department of Defense in order to provide emergency medical helicopter transportation to civilians.

As the Members of the House may recall, legislation on this general subject was considered last year and passed the House and Senate but failed to be enacted due to the inability to report out of conference with the Senate prior to the end of the 92d Congress.

The bill which is presently before the House would authorize the continuation of a service which has been demonstrated in a pilot program since July of 1970. At that time the Secretary of Defense entered into agreements with the Departments of Transportation and HEW to test the feasibility of using military medical emergency helicopters, with specially trained miltary medical personnel aboard, to support localities in the vicinity of certain military bases in handling time-factored emergency transportation. Under the acronym MAST—military assistance to safety and traffic—pilot programs were established at five sites in Texas, Colorado, Washington, Idaho, and Arizona. These particular sites housed adequate numbers of medical evacuation helicopters, qualified pilots and experienced medical and paramedical personnel to support this test program.

As many members are aware, the program has been a great success. As of April 29, 1973 a total of almost 2,000 missions had been flown, providing assistance to some 2,185 patients. There is no doubt in my mind that this assistance meant the difference between life and death for many of these patients.

In H.R. 7139, there are several limitations established under which the expansion of this test into a continuing emergency assistance program can be effected. These limitations differ somewhat from the language of previously considered bills and are as follows:

First, H.R. 7139 places responsibility for emergency medical transportation programs in the Secretary of Defense rather than in the service Secretaries. While the Secretary of Defense would in all probability designate the service Secretaries to make decisions of this sort, it is the practice of the Armed Services Committee to provide authority to the Defense Secretary in matters in which all services may be involved. Such a procedure recognizes the proper chain of command and ensures uniformity of policy and practice among the services.

Second, assistance of the type prescribed may only be provided in areas where the appropriate military medical resources are regularly assigned.

Third, the reassignment of military units from one location to another for the purpose of providing this support is prohibited.

Fourth, the provision of assistance is not permitted to cause any increased costs for the Department of Defense.

Fifth, the personal liability question is specifically delineated. In this regard, after the chairman had been in contact with Chairman RODINO of the Judiciary Committee and determined that a jurisdictional question existed with respect to governmental liability, the offending portion of my bill was stricken. Governmental liability remains under the provisions of the Federal Torts Claims Act; and

Sixth, the bill, as amended, also clarifies the point that authorized military medical emergency transportation is restricted to helicopter services.

It must be recognized that the primary mission of the Department of Defense is national security. There is, therefore, a certain reluctance to involve military personnel and resources in such a way as to cause a possible degradation of the services' ability to perform its primary mission. With the limitations recommended by the Armed Services Committee, we feel that both the local communities and the armed services can benefit from this program. It does, after all, provide an opportunity for real-life practice of the skills these military personnel are trained in, while making a significant contribution to the efforts to save the lives of injured Americans.

The report which accompanies this bill, House Report 93–172, adequately explains the amendments proposed by the House Armed Services Committee. As I have indicated, the amendments limit the scope of the emergency transportation in question to helicopter service and insure that the liability of the Federal Government under the provisions of the Federal Torts Claims Act is retained.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services recommends passage of this bill.

I trust that my colleagues will avail themselves of this opportunity to share in this worthwhile effort by voting for passage of H.R. 7139.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

I asked the question to show intent in the RECORD with respect to this legislation. I would hope that Air National Guard helicopters, all things being equal, could be used for this purpose, and I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

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

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

H.R. 7139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 2635. Medical emergency transportation assistance and limitation of individual liability

"(a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to assist the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Transportation in providing medical emergency transportation services to civilians. Any resources provided under this section shall be under such terms and conditions, including reimbursement, as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate and shall be subject to the following specific limitations:

"(1) Assistance may be provided only in areas where military units able to provide such assistance are regularly assigned, and military units shall not be transferred from one area to another for the purpose of providing such assistance.

"(2) Assistance may be provided only to the extent that it does not interfere with the performance of the military mission.

"(3) The provision of assistance shall not cause any increase in funds required for the operation of the Department of Defense.

"(b) No individual (or his estate) who is authorized by the Department of Defense to perform services under a program established pursuant to subsection (a), and who is acting within the scope of his duties, shall be liable for injury to, or loss of property or personal injury or death which may be caused incident to providing such services."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2635. Medical emergency transportation assistance and limitation on individual liability.".

SEC. 2. Section 2680 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(o) Any claim arising from activities authorized by section 2635 of title 10, United States Code.".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6: Insert the word "helicopter" before the word "transportation".

On page 2, line 3: Insert the word "helicopter" before the word "transportation".

On page 3, between lines 2 and 3: Insert the word "helicopter" before the word "transportation".

On page 3, lines 3–7: Strike section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Authorizing the Secretary of Defense to utilize Department of Defense resources for the purpose of providing medical emergency helicopter transportation services to civilians, and limiting individual liability incident to providing such services, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE MICRONESIAN CLAIMS ACT OF 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6628) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(b) of the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971 (50 App. U.S.C. 2019(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A 'Micronesian inhabitant of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands' is defined for the purposes of this Act as a person who—

"(1) became a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on July 18, 1947, and who remains a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or is a citizen of the United States, as the date of filing a claim; or

"(2) if then living, would have been eligible to become a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on July 18, 1974; or

"(3) is the sucessor, heir, or assignee of a person eligible under paragraph (1) or (2) and who is a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or of the United States, as of the date of filing a claim.".

SEC. 2. The fifth sentence of section 104(a) of the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971 (50 App. U.S.C. 2019c(a)) is amended to read as follows: "As claims are adjudicated, the Commission shall certify them to the Secretary for payment in such manner as he may direct."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 6628, amending the Micronesian Claim Act of 1971.

As the Members will recall, Congress, at the request of the executive branch, considered and enacted the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971. The purpose of that act is to compensate the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, commonly referred to as Micronesia, for damages incurred during the hostilities of World War II and for noncombat damages after the islands were secured but prior to July 1, 1951.

The act provided U.S. contribution of $5 million to the Micronesian claims fund for war damage claims. This amount was stipulated in an executive agrement concluded with Japan in 1969 in which the Japanese Government agreed to contribute an equivalent sum in goods and services.

In addition, the act provides $20 million for payment of claims arising from damages incurred by Micronesian citizens in the postwar period, until July 1951.

Including the $5 million generated by the Japanese contribution, the total amount in the Micronesian claims fund is $30 million.

The act, in its present form, provides that only Micronesian citizens are eligible to file for claims. No allowance is made for benefits under the claims program for Micronesians who have left the trust territory and have taken up permanent residency elsewhere such as Guam and Hawaii where they have become U.S. citizens.

H.R. 6628 rectifies this inequity by amending the Micronesian Claims Act to include the following classes of persons among those eligible for benefits under the claims program:

One. Persons who were citizens of the trust territory on July 18, 1947, but are now U.S. citizens; and,

Two. U.S. citizens who are successors, heirs, or assignees or persons otherwise eligible.

These individuals were not deliberately excluded under the 1971 act and, in the name of fairness and equity, should be included among those eligible under the claims program.

Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of these individuals, estimated to number not more than 100, will not require further authorization or appropriation of funds. The ceiling on the Micronesian Claims Act will remain at $25 million.

In addition to enlarging the class of persons eligible for claims payments, H.R. 6628 gives the Secretary of the In-

terior the flexibility to make partial payments prior to final adjudication of all claims and their certification by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The Department of the Interior suggested this amendment in order to prevent a 3 to 4 year delay in the payment of claims, and to prevent an inflationary effect on Micronesia which could occur if all payments were made at once.

In approving this change, the committee did not intend to raise the statutory ceiling on amounts that can be appropriated for the Micronesian claims fund. Neither did the committee intend to shortchange any of the claimants by allowing funds to be disbursed before final adjudication of all claims. The principal that the amount appropriated must be equitably prorated among all claimants must not be violated. The proposed change in H.R. 6628 will merely provide some flexibility in the administration of this particular program without changing in any way its scope or the intent of Congress in approving the program.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6628 makes the Micronesian claims program more equitable and provides the administering authority with needed flexibility to make partial payments on individually adjudicated and certified claims. I urge the House to support its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support passage of H.R. 6628. This legislation, which amends the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971, would include two classes of persons who were overlooked in the 1971 act. This bill would make eligible for benefits: First, citizens of the trust territory on July 18, 1947, who are now U.S. citizens, and second, U.S. citizens who are the successors, heirs, or assignees of persons otherwise eligible.

When the House passed the 1971 act, it did not deliberately exclude these people. It is only fair that they be included through this legislation.

I would like to point out that passage of H.R. 6628 will not result in additional cost to the United States. The funds available are limited to the $25 million already authorized by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed the original Micronesian war claims bill for the reason that it provided the United States would put up $25 million in cash, whereas the Japanese are permitted to provide goods and services in payment as a form of reparations to the Micronesians.

In the first place, I think the Japanese ought to have paid all of the war damages and U.S. taxpayers should not have been compelled to put up $25 million in cash or any other amount.

That authorization is a fact of law now, and this bill provides equitable treatment, in my opinion, for natives who since became citizens of the United States. If claims are to be paid, these persons having been in the islands at that time, are entitled to their share of the payments.

Mr. Speaker. I support this legislation, and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6628, an amendment to the Micronesian War Claims Act of 1971. The measure which is now before the House would correct an inequity in the present law which does not permit Micronesians who now reside outside of the U.S. trust territory to file claims with the United States for war-related damages. Under the present law, only Micronesians who still reside in the trust territory are eligible to claim some of the $30 million which has been made available by the United States and Japan to pay the Micronesians who suffered grave damage to their homes and serious physical injuries during the hostilities in World War II.

When the original Micronesian War Claims Act was enacted several years ago, it was not the intention of Congress to deny any rightful claimant the ability to file for payments simply because he or she had moved out of the trust territory. A great many Micronesians from the trust territory now live in Guam, Hawaii, or on the U.S. west coast. These people are certainly as entitled to their share of the war claims settlement as those Micronesians still in the trust territory.

The Micronesian War Claims Act is a landmark in American legislative history, for it offers just compensation for the damages and suffering they incurred to a people who were merely observers of a horrible battle. One would scan the history books in vain looking for a precedent to such generosity on the part of a victorious nation. The United States could have forgotten the issue and let the Micronesian people recover without our help. But, we did not. And it is this tradition of understanding and willingness to help those whom we have hurt which puts the United States in the proud position she now holds among the nations.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of the House and our colleagues in the Senate to support this worthy measure and to let the business of compensating those who unjustly suffered continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6628, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds, having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT LAWS AND AUTHORITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 512) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 512

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

EXTENSION OF FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(b) Section 217 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(c) Section 221(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" in the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(d) Section 235(m) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(e) Section 236(n) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(f) Section 809(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(g) Section 810(k) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(h) Section 1002(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(i) Section 1101(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATE AUTHORITY

SEC. 2. Section 3(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the veterans' home loan program, to amend the National Housing Act with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1968, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1709–1), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

TEMPORARY WAIVER OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO GNMA

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages, to extend and modify certain provisions of the National Food Insurance Act of 1968, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1971, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu there of "June 30, 1974".

URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "and by $250,000,000 on July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "by $250,000,000 on July 1, 1972, and by such additional sums on and after July 1, 1973, as may be necessary to make grants under this title up to the amounts approved in Acts making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974".

MODEL CITIES AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 111(b) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "In addition, there are authorized to be appropriated for such purpose such

sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.".

(b) Section 111(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "September 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

OPEN-SPACE LAND AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 708 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", plus such additional sums as may be necessary for such purposes for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973."

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITY GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 7. (a) Section 708(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, such sums as may be necessary for grants under section 703.".

(b) Section 708(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "September 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

SEC. 8. Section 702(c) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "September 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

REHABILITATION LOAN AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 9. Section 312(h) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 10. Section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following new sentence: "In addition, there is authorized to be appropriated for such purposes not to exceed $110,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973."

NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 11. Section 713(e) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", which amount shall be increased by $195,500,000 on July 1, 1973".

RURAL HOUSING AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 12. (a) Section 513 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "October 1, 1973" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(b) Section 515(b)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(c) Section 517(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(d) Section 523(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "1973" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 512 would provide necessary extensions and authorizations for certain HUD and Farmers Home Administration programs. This is a noncontroversial bill, having been reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency by a 24 to 2 vote.

House Joint Resolution 512 would extend for 1 year to June 30, 1974, the various insuring authorities of the Federal Housing Administration. These authorities are scheduled to expire on June 30, 1973. Extension of these programs for 1 year will enable the President to reactivate these programs during fiscal year 1974 in the event that housing starts began to fall off sharply due to the rising cost of mortgage credit.

This resolution would also extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of HUD to set maximum interest rates for the FHA insurance programs and the VA-guaranteed loans at rates the finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

This resolution also provides for open-end authorizations for fiscal year 1974 for four community development programs—urban renewal, model cities, open space, and neighborhood facilities—which may need additional funds during the fiscal year 1974 transition period. It would also provide specific authorization of $110 million for comprehensive planning and $195 million for additional new community guarantees, both of which are needed to meet the administration's budget program for fiscal year 1974. Enactment of open-end authorizations for these community development programs is necessary to meet the special circumstances involved in phasing out existing HUD community development programs and preparing communities for the proposed new community development program to begin in fiscal year 1975.

The administration has asked for no new funding for fiscal year 1974 for these urban development programs which are expected to become part of a consolidated community development program on July 1, 1974. A number of cities are experiencing very serious transition problems; many are being forced to cut back on their ongoing program activities or completely postponing planned activities. Open-end authorizations contained in the joint resolution would enable the Appropriations Committee to provide the proper level of funding for cities facing severe transition problems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House quickly act on this resolution. It is my understanding that the Senate is expected to act very quickly on this resolution. I would urge the House to act quickly and favorably on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution before the House today—House Joint Resolution 512—would provide necessary extensions and authorizations for certain HUD and Farmers House Administration programs. It is noncontroversial, having been unanimously reported by the Housing Subcommittee, and reported 24 to 2 by the Banking and Currency Committee.

In addition to the 1-year extensions of FHA and Farmers Home authorities, the resolution contains the following authorizations:

First open-end authorizations—that is, such sums as may be necessary—for fiscal year 1974 for four community development programs—urban renewal, model cities, open space, and neighborhood facilities—which may need additional funds during the fiscal year 1974 transition period; and

Second, specific authorizations of $110 million for comprehensive planning and $195 million for additional new community guarantees, both of which are needed to meet the administration's budget program for fiscal year 1974.

These authorizations are necessary to permit action by the Appropriations Committee on the HUD fiscal year 1974 budget. I understand that the Appropriations Committee plans to mark up the HUD appropriations bill very shortly, but only if there is reasonable assurance that necessary authorizations will be enacted by the Congress.

The open end authorizations for certain community development programs attempt to meet a special circumstance that exists this year.

As Members know, the administration has asked for no funding for fiscal year 1974 for these programs, which are expected to become part of a consolidated community development program on July 1, 1974. As a result, many cities are experiencing very serious transition problems, either being forced to cut back on ongoing activities or postponing planned activities. The open end authorizations contained in the joint resolution would enable the Appropriations Committee to provide the proper level of funding for cities facing severe transition problems.

I urge House passage of the resolution. Since the Senate is expected to act on this resolution very quickly, the Congress will have done all it can to make certain adequate funds are provided to our cities.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation now before us originally came out of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it was decided, and I think wisely so, within the Housing Subcommittee, that we should bring this matter to the floor and to the attention of the Members at this time, and that we should do so by a simple extension. I believe that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) had adequately explained the proposed legislation, which is a simple extension of the Federal Housing Administration insurance program for 1 year, and also an extension of the flexible interest rate authority.

We had some discussion in the committee about amendments that perhaps could or could not be added, but it was decided that the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency would bring in a simple extension at this time.

This proposed legislation has the full support of the members of the minority on the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today we consider House Joint Resolution 512, legislation continuing the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure loans and mortgages, and operate other key community development programs.

The enactment of this extension bill is an administrative necessity. It continues the various authorities of the FHA; provides "open ended" authorizations during fiscal year 1974 for model cities, urban renewal, open space land, and neighborhood facilities; authorizes an additional $110 million for 701 planning grants; and extends the life of the rehabilitation loan program.

Significantly, this measure also includes a provision extending both the section 235—homeownership—and section 236—rental assistance—programs. These are the Federal housing subsidy programs which were operationally "frozen" by the presidentially declared moratorium of last January. This legislation will, at least, allow the administration the flexibility to reinstate these programs during fiscal year 1974.

From the beginning, I had serious reservations over the scope of the moratorium. Admittedly, there were problems with the subsidized housing programs in many parts of the country. But there were also some genuine successes. It was an unfortunate policy decision to shut off funds across the board, with housing starts so critical to the well-being of our economy.

The severe impact of the housing moratorium was brought home most dramatically when representatives of the Builders Institute of Westchester & Putnum Counties, Inc., recently visited with me in Washington. They stressed, for example, that in Westchester County, N.Y., approximately 50 percent of the housing starts were reliant on the Federal subsidy programs.

HUD officials have indicated that they hope to have a comprehensive housing proposal before Congress by this September. But, in the meantime, I would like to see the selective utilization of both section 235 and 236, so as to maintain the viability of the housing industry. Section 1 of House Joint Resolution 512 would permit this to occur and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 512 is legislation of enormous importance and urgency. It should be promptly passed so that critical provisions of the National Housing Act are extended for 1 year beyond June 30, 1973. These authorities simply cannot be allowed to expire on July 1 of this year.

House Joint Resolution 512 is no substitute for a comprehensive housing act. It is simply the best that can be done under existing limitations. Most Members of this body are aware that the Housing Act of 1972, similar to the Senate-passed version, died in the Rules Committee last October.

The failure of that bill was a great misfortune, but certainly the Banking and Currency Committee, rather than the Rules Committee, must take the major share of the blame for its failure. A bill of that complexity should have been put before the Congress long before the waning hours of the 1972 session.

By passing House Joint Resolution 512 this Congress has the opportunity of extending vital sections of the Housing Act—in effect keeping the most important programs alive—and at the same time giving itself a mandate to produce a careful and comprehensive new housing act either this year or early next year. Under House Joint Resolution 512, FHA insurance programs, urban renewal programs, model cities authorizations, open space programs, neighborhood facilities grants, and rehabilitation loan programs will be extended for 1 year. This is the very least that we can do.

However, authorizations available for spending in the field of housing alone will be able to carry a substantial housing program through fiscal 1974. At this time, funds—variously described as impounded, deferred or as yet unallocated—are available for housing programs as follows: $221 million for the 235 single-family program; $171 million for the 236 multiple program; and about $38 million for rent supplement programs. This total of about $430 million can be used in fiscal 1974 and is an amount approximately equal to maximum expenditures in any fiscal year to date.

Therefore, these amounts, should be authorized by the passage of House Joint Resolution 152, and maximum pursuasion should be exerted on HUD and the Office of Management and Budget to see that these moneys are directed into actual, important housing programs.

In my suburban district much work has been done over the last decade to pursuade suburban local governments and HRA's to begin publicly assisted housing programs. Over this period of time local authorities and local people have become convinced that the programs are good ones for their own communities. Only the last few years have they begun to make applications for programs such as senior citizen housing, low-incoming housing and the like. Perhaps not all of these programs are worthwhile, and certainly not all of them should be funded, but it would be a disaster for the country if all of these programs were to be terminated by the failure of House Joint Resolution 512. In my metropolitan area, the suburban governments are ready to help provide the services which previously had been thought unnecessary. Although the intention of the local governments is to take care of its own citizenry where definite needs exist, part of the effect of these programs will be an economic integration, or at least a reversal of present housing trends which tend to isolate the aged and the poor from the suburban areas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the speedy passage of House Joint Resolution 512. Along with that request, I urge the Department of HUD and the Office of OMB to make these funds available for worthwhile housing projects properly endorsed by local governments. Finally, I strongly urge the committee itself and the Department of HUD to collaborate on a comprehensive new housing program to be completed by Congress not later than early next year. The time is ideal for the structuring of a manageable program that offers maximum attractiveness and effectiveness for our local governments and for the needs of our people.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 512.

Although I support the extensions for the various programs listed in this resolution. I want to address myself briefly to the main problem that I feel that this legislation attempts to solve.

This is the problem of local areas being placed in limbo because of the President's new proposals for community development.

The administration's proposals obviously have not been enacted by Congress. Whether or not Congress enacts these proposals remains to be seen.

In the meantime, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has sent the word down to the local levels to start dismantling.

Mr. Speaker, it is not right to have the Model Cities agencies dismantled when no one knows what will take their place, if anything. Mr. Speaker, it is not right to have housing projects stopped in midstream while people wait to see how they will fare under new legislation.

It is easy for us in Washington to debate the great issues of the day, take our time, and to give long speeches about the struggle between the executive and legislative branches.

But what about the citizens living in the urban renewal area who were promised 4 years ago that their areas would be renewed. But now they are told there is no program for them, and they are to sit tight for something that may develop.

To have people think that the area would be renewed, to think that new water and sewer lines would be laid, to think that new housing projects would go up, and then have the Federal Government break its word does more to alienate the average citizen from his government than anything else.

By giving these programs interim authorization, so that the Appropriations Committee can make the nominal commitments in money to finish the jobs started, the Banking and Currency Committee has taken a positive step to helping relieve the uncertainty in local areas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of House Joint Resolution 512.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 512, a bill to extend certain programs now administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, is necessary if we are to avoid a gap in the funding authority for housing and urban development programs.

The administration has indicated that it intends to include some of these programs—such has model cities, urban renewal, open space, water and sewer grants, rehabilitation loans, and neighborhood facilities—in its special revenue-sharing package referred to as the Better Communities Act.

Unless action is taken to extend the authorization of these programs, however, a timelag will develop between the

termination of the authorization for these programs and the proposed starting date of the special revenue-sharing plan.

Authorization for some of these programs will expire June 30 if no action is taken to extend it. Other programs are in danger of losing their authorization in the fall. However, the revenue-sharing plan, as proposed by the administration, would not start until July 1, 1974.

The resulting gap, amounting to a year in the case of most programs, would place an unwarranted burden on communities in need of housing and development funding. This gap is especially unfair when one recalls the current status of such funding.

Last January, the administration imposed a freeze on most HUD programs. Therefore, many projects which normally would have been funded months ago and would now be well along in construction, remain, instead, well worn application forms in agency offices.

If this legislation is not passed today—if our communities are forced to wait until 1974 to turn plans for housing, sewers, and other vital projects into reality—our towns and cities will fall still further behind in helping to solve community problems and build a better life for their citizens.

In my district, applications have been prepared for the funding of several needed projects under programs listed in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the administration is failing to realize that these programs have been helping to build better communities for years. Allowing their authorizations to terminate, then, would indicate a lack of concern on the part of the Federal Government for the problems confronting the Nation's towns and cities.

In addition, let us not forget that these programs were designed and approved by Congress, and thus it is Congress who should decide their fate.

Consequently, I strongly support the extension of these programs, and I urge my colleagues in the House to do the same by voting for House Joint Resolution 512.

Passage of the legislation before us today is essential for the future health and welfare of our Nation.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state my dissatisfaction with House Joint Resolution 512, which temporarily extends certain housing and urban development laws and authorities, even though, as I will indicate, it probably represents the "least bad" solution under present circumstances.

This proposal, if enacted, would simply extend the sections 235 and 236 subsidized housing programs for 1 year without the provision of any additional contract authority.

In the area of community development, the resolution simply authorizes "such additional sums as shall be necessary." The committee report makes the following statement regarding this amorphous grant of spending authority:

> Enactment of "open end" authorizations for these community development programs is necessary to meet the special circumstances involved in phasing out existing HUD community development programs and preparing communities for the proposed new community development program to begin in fiscal year 1975.

Thus, in one fell swoop, the committee treats the passage of the so-called Better Communities Act as a foregone conclusion and takes steps to implement it, acquiesces in the administration's extralegal termination and suspension of congressionally mandated programs, and transforms the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 into a hollow mockery of its former self.

At stake in this decision is the status of Congress as a coequal branch of Government. The fact is that the administration has terminated or suspended programs mandated by Congress in a manner which is at best extralegal. Congress, which is given the appropriation power by the Constitution, was not even consulted, but was instead presented with a fait accompli. The Committee on Banking and Currency, in its committee report accompanying House Joint Resolution 512, nods weakly to this usurpation of our power and permits it to continue.

The language of that report would seem to indicate that the committee accepts the Better Communities Act and envisions is early passage. I sincerely hope that the committee will not do so without careful consideration of those factors which made the categorical programs less than completely satisfactory. In the testimony that I have heard as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, it is by no means clear that the failures were due to program rather than administrative inadequacies.

In my view, the people's faith in representative government is also at stake. In 1968 Congress committed itself to the construction of 6 million subsidized housing units in the next decade in order to achieve its commitment to "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family." In 1970 President Nixon reaffirmed this goal and said that it was "consistent with other urgent claims on our productive resources."

A few short years later President Nixon has abandoned this committment and a similar one to community development. Is it any wonder that the American people are cynical and mistrustful of the pronouncements of their representative Government?

Nevertheless, under present circumstances, I recognize that the committee probably made the wisest choice. Secretary Lynn has stated categorically that he will not spend any funds authorized by Congress in excess of the administration's request. Consequently, the undesirable features of the resolution are forced on the committee and the Congress by an administration which has no respect for law or constitutional separation of powers. Additional funds would be placed in reserve by the OMB and would consequently only give wider rein to this administration's proclivity to reprogram funds in the face of congressional priorities.

In my opinion, the principal conclusion to be drawn from this experience is that of the necessity for prompt approval of anti-impoundment legislation. In the interim, as the Committee on Banking and Currency recognizes, grants of additional contract authority would be unwise.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the passage of House Joint Resolution 512 in order to provide a temporary extension of the Federal housing laws. Included in the resolution are the section 235 and section 236 programs, the subsidies from which have proved invaluable in the past in providing quality housing to middle-class and lower middle-class families. Urban renewal, Model Cities, Open Space, and Neighborhood Facilities are all within the scope of the bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must emphasize that this legislation will be worthless if the administration maintains its current moratorium on expenditures for Federal housing programs. On January 8, 1973, the administration announced an indefinite freeze on new commitments for Federal housing subsidies, and this action is having serious adverse effects in our urban areas across the country. The rebuilding and rehabilitation of our big cities has been cynically brought to a halt by an administration which appears oblivious to the pressing need for quality housing which is felt by millions of Americans.

When urban dwellers seek to provide themselves with decent housing by obtaining Federal subsidization for rehabilitation of their homes or for venturing into home ownership, they find that the funds which Congress intended for these purposes have been impounded by the executive branch. I hope that today's action by the House will be a crystal-clear indication to the President that we want full expenditure of all the funds which we appropriate for Federal housing programs.

Some time back, the administration announced, "watch what we do, not what we say." Perhaps Congress and the American people should have heeded that warning far more seriously, for what the administration did once all of last November's votes were counted bears little resemblance to what the administration had to say before the election. Indeed, watching what the administration has done within the past few months has proven to be a shattering experience.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 512), as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—357

Abdnor	Eckhardt	McClory
Abzug	Edwards, Ala.	McCloskey
Adams	Eilberg	McCollister
Addabbo	Esch	McCormack
Alexander	Eshleman	McDade
Andrews, N. Dak.	Evans, Colo.	McEwen
	Evins, Tenn.	McFall
Annunzio	Fascell	McKay
Armstrong	Fish	McSpadden
Ashley	Fisher	Macdonald
Aspin	Flood	Madden
Bafalis	Flowers	Madigan
Baker	Flynt	Mahon
Barrett	Ford, William D.	Mailliard
Beard		Mallary
Bennett	Forsythe	Mann
Bergland	Fountain	Martin, Nebr.
Biester	Frenzel	Martin, N.C.
Bingham	Frey	Mathias, Calif.
Blackburn	Fulton	Mathis, Ga.
Boggs	Fuqua	Mayne
Boiling	Giaimo	Mazzoli
Bowen	Gilman	Meeds
Brademas	Ginn	Melcher
Bray	Gonzalez	Metcalfe
Breaux	Goodling	Mezvinsky
Breckinridge	Grasso	Michel
Brinkley	Gray	Miller
Brooks	Green, Oreg.	Minish
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Mink
Brotzman	Griffiths	Minshall, Ohio
Brown, Calif.	Gross	Mitchell, Md.
Brown, Mich.	Grover	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Mizell
Broyhill, N.C.	Gude	Moakley
Broyhill, Va.	Gunter	Montgomery
Buchanan	Guyer	Moorhead, Calif.
Burgener	Haley	
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	Morgan
Burke, Mass.	Hammer-schmidt	Mosher
		Moss
Burleson, Tex.	Hanley	Murphy, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton	Hansen, Wash.	Myers
Butler	Harrington	Natcher
Byron	Harsha	Nedzi
Camp	Harvey	Nichols
Carey, N.Y.	Hastings	Nix
Carney, Ohio	Hays	Obey
Casey, Tex.	Hébert	O'Brien
Cederberg	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara
Chamberlain	Heckler, Mass.	Parris
Chappell	Heinz	Passman
Clancy	Helstoski	Patman
Clark	Henderson	Patten
Clausen, Don H.	Hicks	Pepper
	Hillis	Perkins
Clay	Hinshaw	Pettis
Cleveland	Hogan	Pickle
Cochran	Holifield	Pike
Cohen	Holt	Poage
Collins	Holtzman	Podell
Conable	Horton	Powell, Ohio
Conlan	Hosmer	Preyer
Conyers	Howard	Price, Ill.
Corman	Hudnut	Price, Tex.
Coughlin	Hungate	Quie
Crane	Hunt	Randall
Cronin	Hutchinson	Rangel
Culver	Ichord	Rarick
Daniel, Dan	Jarman	Rees
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Johnson, Calif.	Regula
	Johnson, Colo.	Reuss
Daniels, Dominick V.	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes
	Jones, Ala.	Rinaldo
Danielson	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Okla.	Robinson, Va.
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Robison, N.Y.
de la Garza	Jordan	Rodino
Delaney	Karth	Roe
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Rogers
Dellums	Kazen	Roncalio, Wyo.
Denholm	Kemp	Roncalio, N.Y.
Dennis	Ketchum	Rose
Dent	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Derwinski	Koch	Rostenkowski
Devine	Kuykendall	Roush
Dickinson	Kyros	Rousselot
Diggs	Landgrebe	Roy
Dingell	Latta	Roybal
Donohue	Lent	Runnels
Downing	Long, La.	Ruppe
Drinan	Long, Md.	Ruth
Dulski	Lott	St Germain
Duncan	Lujan	Sarasin
du Pont		
Sarbanes	Steiger, Ariz.	White
Satterfield	Stephens	Whitehurst
Saylor	Stokes	Whitten
Scherle	Stubblefield	Widnall
Schneebeli	Stuckey	Wiggins
Schroeder	Studds	Williams
Sebelius	Sullivan	Wilson, Bob
Seiberling	Symington	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Shipley	Symms	
Shoup	Talcott	Winn
Shriver	Taylor, N.C.	Wolff
Shuster	Teague, Calif.	Wright
Sisk	Thomson, Wis.	Wyatt
Skubitz	Thone	Wydler
Slack	Tiernan	Wylie
Smith, Iowa	Towell, Nev.	Wyman
Smith, N.Y.	Treen	Yates
Snyder	Udall	Yatron
Spence	Ullman	Young, Alaska
Staggers	Van Deerlin	Young, Fla.
Stanton, J. William	Vander Jagt	Young, Ill.
	Vanik	Young, S.C.
Stanton, James V.	Veysey	Young, Tex.
	Vigorito	Zablocki
Stark	Waggonner	Zion
Steed	Walsh	Zwach
Steele	Wampler	
Steelman	Whalen	

NAYS—1

Hanrahan

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gibbons

NOT VOTING—74

Anderson, Calif.	Foley	O'Neill
	Ford, Gerald R.	Owens
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Peyser
Andrews, N.C.	Frelinghuysen	Pritchard
Archer	Froehlich	Quillen
Arends	Gaydos	Railsback
Ashbrook	Gettys	Reid
Badillo	Goldwater	Riegle
Bell	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Bevill	Hawkins	Rooney, Pa.
Biaggi	Huber	Ryan
Blatnik	Keating	Sandman
Boland	King	Sikes
Brasco	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Burke, Calif.	Leggett	Stratton
Carter	Lehman	Taylor, Mo.
Chisholm	Litton	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	McKinney	Thompson, N.J.
Collier	Maraziti	Thornton
Conte	Matsunaga	Waldie
Cotter	Milford	Ware
Davis, S.C.	Mills, Ark.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Dorn	Mills, Md.	
Edwards, Calif.	Mollohan	Young, Ga.
Erlenborn	Moorhead, Pa.	
Findley	Nelsen	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Mills of Maryland.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Conte.

Ms. Chisholm with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Keating.

Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Ware.

Mr. Reid with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Archer.

Mr. Thornton with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Litton with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Froehlich.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Huber.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. King.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Lehman with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Pritchard.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Davis of South Carolina.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Taylor of Missouri with Mr. Ware.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the measure just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 8 OF THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6330) to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6330

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 607) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Notwithstanding the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 or any other provision of law, the Armory Board (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), created by the Act of June 4, 1948 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–1702), is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the conduct in the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium authorized by such Act of 1957 of major league football, baseball, and softball, and motorcycle races, rodeos, musical concerts, and other events, and to increase the seating capacity of such stadium by an additional 8,000 seats, at a cost not to exceed $1,500,000. Notwithstanding such Act of 1957, or any other provision of law, the Board is further authorized to borrow such sums as may be necessary to provide for the additional seating authorized by this subsection in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

"(1) in the case of revenue from professional football, 50 per centum of the revenue attributable to the additional seats authorized by this subsection shall be used solely for the purpose of repaying the sums borrowed for such seats;

"(2) no part of any revenues derived from such additional seats shall be paid to the National Football League or to any team within such league other than the team doing business under the trade name of the Washington Redskins, or its successors, until all sums borrowed for such additional seats have been repaid;

"(3) except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all revenues attributable to such additional seats shall be subject to section 6 of such Act of 1957.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6330 should please every Member of the House. It permits the Armory Board of the District of Columbia to enlarge R.F.K. Stadium by 8,000 additional seats without costing the taxpayers 1 cent. The additional seats will mean approximately $1 million in additional revenue per year with 6 percent going to the District of Columbia government for taxes and other revenues going to the Armory Board for their expenses. The 8,000 additional seats will be utilized by ardent fans of the Redskins football team who have been precluded from purchasing a season ticket or attending a game.

Mr. Speaker, the average seating capacity of stadiums around the country is 60,000 seats. R.F.K. Stadium now has a total capacity of only 53,041. The $1½ million to be financed privately will increase the total capacity to 61,039. In our report accompaning the bill we set down guidelines for the Redskins management to provide 1,000 additional seats per game to people who cannot afford or are unable to purchase season tickets. This means in 10 games there will be 10,000 individual seats sold to nonseason ticketholders.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that this legislation is an all-American bill designed to help sports enthusiasts, improve the size of our Nation's Capital sports stadium, provide additional revenues badly needed in the District of Columbia and using the American tradition of letting people who use the stadium pay for it instead of saddling taxpayers throughout the country.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, if memory serves, when the Congress first authorized the construction of the District of Columbia Stadium in 1955–56, this body was told it would cost about $5 to $6 million. Mr. Speaker, it ended up costing around $20,100,000. This follows the pattern of our grandiose building projects here in the District of Columbia.

Still worse, though, is the fact that not one dime of the principal has ever been paid off—not one bond has ever been retired. In only 2 years in the history of this project has any part of the interest been paid out of the revenues of the stadium; and that was in 1960 and 1961 when a portion was paid.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1973 District of Columbia appropriations bill contained a figure of $848,432 to pay the interest on this indebtedness. This included an additional short-term loan from the Treasury of $16,832 for an additional interest payment.

Though not yet printed, it is my understanding that the fiscal year 1974 District of Columbia appropriations bill contains a request for $831,600 for the same purposes—that is payment of the interest on the stadium debt; a debt which has never been touched by stadium revenues.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration here today would authorize the borrowing of some $1,500,000 by the Stadium Board for construction of 8,000 new seats at the stadium.

Even if it turns out to cost only this amount—and that is problematical at best—is there any reason to believe that these seats will be paid for out of revenues any more than the 50-some-odd-thousand seats already out there have?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we are witnessing still another exhorbitant request in the long and painful litany of requests which this inflated stadium has engendered.

I ask my colleagues not to go along with this again—not to go along with what is apparently a bottomless pit of interest payments which yearly have to be made up at a cost of well over three-quarters of a million dollars in taxpayers' money through the vehicle of the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

Let us vote this one down.

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

Mr. SNYDER. If I have any time left, yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

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

The gentleman made a very eloquent statement which proves why we need this bill, because he knows the revenues have not been sufficient to pay the costs of operation at R.F.K. We are having a deficit that my taxpayers and his taxpayers have been faced with every year, almost a million dollars. The bill is designed to increase revenues and to provide facilities for people who want to see the Redskin games.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, 50,000 seats will not pay for themselves; the additional seats will not pay for themselves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky says if we cannot completely erase the deficit, then do not do anything. We do not subscribe to that theory. We want to do what we can.

Mr. SNYDER. Whatever money the Armory Board does not have for debt or interest comes out of the taxpayers' pockets in your district and in my district in the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia year after year.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have now on the waiting list a sufficient number of people to purchase the tickets to pay back the entire million and a half dollars in advance, if the Redskins want to sell them that far in advance.

Mr. SNYDER. We have people on the waiting list to pay for the 50,000 seats already there, but it is still not sufficient to pay one cent on the debt or interest.

Mr. GRAY. We have 50,000 people wanting to buy tickets for these 8,000 seats, I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, there is a waiting list of people, this I admit, but they are not paying their own way.

Mr. GRAY. The Redskins last year paid the Armory Board more than one-half million dollars. This bill will increase that amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the problem is that there are only 10 days per year when we have Redskin games, and we have 355 days out of the year when the stadium is not utilized. This is the problem causing the deficit: underutilization.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right, we have seats, 53,000 seats which are only being used a few days per year, and now we will have 61,000 seats vacant 355 days per year.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the 8,000 additional seats will bring back several times what they are going to cost. What we are trying to do is to provide additional generators for revenue.

Mr. SNYDER. If the 8,000 additional seats will do it, why are the 53,000 not doing it?

Mr. GRAY. They will help do it. We must also find other uses. But we must do something if we are to meet the gentleman's objections.

Mr. SNYDER. Why are not the bonds or any of the interest being paid?

Mr. GRAY. If the Redskins were not playing out there, the deficit would be one-half million more—thank God for the Redskins.

Mr. SNYDER. There is no interest paid at all. The deficit is 100 percent of the debt and interest now.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6330, a bill to authorize the District of Columbia Armory Board to enter into contracts to construct an additional 8,000 seats in Robert F. Kennedy Stadium.

This bill is unique in that everybody gains—the public will have a greater opportunity to see the Redskins in action; the stadium will generate additional revenues, thus helping to retire the debt on the stadium; this bill will not cost the Federal Government a dime in appropriations; and, the construction of these seats will not interfere with baseball if it were to return to Washington.

R. F. K. Stadium is one of the smallest stadiums housing a National Football

League team. As we all know, a Redskins' ticket is a scarce commodity. Last season, all home games were sellouts and many thousands are on the waiting list for these precious tickets. H.R. 6330 will allow an additional 8,000 seats for the stadium, bringing the total seating capacity to over 60,000, more in line with other stadiums in use by National Football League teams. Additional attendance brought about by these seats will not adversely affect current parking facilities.

The construction of the original stadium structure was financed through the sale of bonds, totalling approximately $20 million. But, with the exit of the professional baseball team, the revenue generated by public events in this stadium was diminished drastically. Total events in the stadium dropped from 93 in 1971 to 21 in 1972. Today, even the interest payment on these bonds cannot be met by the Armory Board, and must be paid for by the District of Columbia.

Revenue from these additional seats will total some $741,000 per regular football season, one-half of which would go for the repayment of the $1.5 million loans for construction of these seats until that loan is repaid, and the remainder paid in accordance with the Redskins' management agreements with the Armory Board. Once this obligation has been met, revenue from these additional seats will be allocated in accordance with current agreements among the visiting teams, the National Football League and the Armory Board. The sooner these seats are available, the faster this additional revenue will go toward interest payment and bond retirement. I realize that the stadium should and must be used for events other than the 10 Redskins games and other special events. But, the additional seats is a step in the right direction to making R. F. K. Stadium financially sound.

This bill will not obligate the Federal Government to provide any additional funds. It merely authorizes the Armory Board to borrow up to $1.5 million for the construction of these seats and enter into agreements for such construction. During consideration of this legislation in committee, our distinguished subcommittee chairman stated that there are three entrepreneurs who are willing to loan the Armory Board this money at no more than the prime interest rate. This legislative action is necessary because the stadium sits on Federal land and current seating is restricted by statute. The Redskins football team is a tenant of this facility and could not legally add these seats on its own.

Of the total new seats to be added, about 1,000 will be permanent mezzanine-level seats and will be in place for the 1973 football season. The remaining 7,000 will be removable grandstand seats and will be in place for the following season. I emphasize that the 7,000 seats will be removable, and in no way will restrict major league baseball or any baseball from being played in R. F. K. Stadium.

This piece of legislation is needed, it is timely, and everyone will benefit. The city of Washington is proud of the Redskins. Let us show our faith in this superior football team, and the city of Washington by acting favorably on this bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much intrigued to hear the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) assure the House once again that here is something that will not cost the taxpayers of Iowa or Illinois a single dime. This is in the great American tradition, he says. Let me tell you that you had better take that with more than just the proverbial grain of salt, because the gentleman has made that statement before and only to our sorrow did we find that the taxpayers of the country got socked for a lot of money to pay into some of the ventures he has proposed.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois briefly.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my friend for yielding.

First of all, as the gentleman knows, I have never handled a single piece of legislation on the R. F. K. Stadium. It was the gentleman from Iowa primarily who caused us to bring out this kind of a bill, because, as the gentleman will recall, he has been on the floor year after year and rightly so pointing out that we have a large deficit at R. F. K. and not one cent has been paid to retire the bonds in the past years.

Mr. GROSS. I have the idea. Please do not take all my time because I have another question or two I would like to ask. I get the idea of what the gentleman is trying to say.

Mr. GRAY. I am bragging on my friend from Iowa. He is one of those responsible for this Redskin revenue generating bill.

Mr. GROSS. And I could not care less if that stadium would fall down.

And from the way it was built it is likely to do that at any time, in fact I think it is more likely to fall down than the west front of the Capitol.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me go on with this subject matter.

The gentleman in his bill says that—

is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the conduct in the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium authorized by such Act of 1957 of major league football, baseball, and softball, and motorcycle races, rodeos, musical concerts, and other events. . . .

Mr. Speaker, if this bill was amendable I would offer to help the gentleman from Illinois to the best of my ability, and then vote against it, by submitting an amendment which would include operas, bullfights, chariot races, dog races, dog shows, cat shows, horse shows, tobacco auctions, religious and political rallies, and open-air sessions of the Congress, or any committee thereof.

As I say, I would like to help the gentleman, but the gentleman did not leave me that opportunity since the bill is brought up under a procedure that prohibits amendments from the floor.

Let me ask the gentleman from Illinois a serious question, and that is why the 40 percent to be paid each year, was not fixed at 100 percent?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for yielding to me, and I would state to the gentleman from Iowa that the bill has been amended, that is one of the amendments that has been offered in the motion that we suspend the rules and move for the passage of the bill H.R. 6330, as amended, and that changes that figure from 40 to 50 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Why not 100 percent?

Mr. GRAY. We cannot. Six percent of the overall revenues go to the District of Columbia for taxes. This will generate about $50,000 a year for the District of Columbia government, and this means therefore that the Federal payment should be less.

Second, the Armory Board charges 12 percent for the use of the stadium——

Mr. GROSS. I will tell the gentleman from Illinois that the revenues from this operation should not be going to the District of Columbia as such but to the payment of the $20 million in defaulted or virtually defaulted bonds.

Mr. GRAY. This will help do that. If we do not pass the bill we will be in the same rut.

Mr. GROSS. So as to help pay for the losses on this white elephant, that is where the money had better be going.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: What if the Armory Board defaults on this deal, then who pays?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman from Iowa yield further, that is the same point the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) made, and again I point out to the gentleman that only the revenues from the sale of the tickets is pledged, no full faith and credit of the Armory Board, the District of Columbia government, or the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. But who will pay for this if that revenue is not raised to pay for these extra seats? Who will then pick up that bill?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the answer is that no one will, if the tickets are not sold on time the armory board will merely stretch out the time of repayment until the lender gets all his money.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Illinois will not do as he has in the past with certain enterprises around here—come back and ask the Congress for more money?

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from Iowa knows that in my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds that I am merely carrying out the will of the committee. The gentleman from Iowa leaves the impression that I am here asking all of our colleagues to dig down in their pockets for these projects, such as the project for the building of the National Visitors Center, and in that case we tried to not have any of the costs charged to the taxpayers although it will be for their use. We wanted private enterprise to do the job

and it was kicked around for over 5 years, and then finally the Penn Central Railroad went into bankruptcy, so we have had to find other ways to finance the project. But I assure the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from Illinois is merely trying to build up our Nation's Capital.

Mr. GROSS. I will tell the gentleman from Illinois who will then pay for this. It will be the taxpayers of this country who will pay for it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that we have tried in this bill to bring in additional revenues to do what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) want done. They want to help bail out that white elephant over which most Members of this body had nothing to do with unless they were here in 1957, and voted for the original Stadium Act. It is costing the taxpayers of my State, which is the fourth largest tax-paying State in the Nation and the other States over $1 million a year deficit.

Here is a situation where people are clamoring for tickets to attend the Redskins football games, and they cannot buy them. Through this bill we allow them to pay for this expansion, and then after about 7 years when all of the money is paid back, the District of Columbia, the Federal Government, and the Armory Board and the Redskins will share these revenues to help bail out our taxpayers.

I do not know of a more feasible plan than taking a facility that needs to be utilized and utilizing it, and letting the people who use it pay for it. That is the American tradition.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunate enough to be here when that bill went through. If the gentleman will read the RECORD back in the day when the stadium was authorized, we were told by certain gentlemen in this House that it would not cost the American taxpayer one single dime.

Mr. GRAY. I know exactly to whom the gentleman has reference. He is now a fine Federal judge down in Arkansas, but I repeat what I said earlier, the bill did not come out of our Committee on Public Works. We are trying to correct a serious problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The fact remains that we must find additional uses for the stadium, and I certainly feel that we can bring in additional uses such as motorcycle racing and some of the other things the gentleman from Iowa talked about a moment ago. But this is the beginning of utilizing the stadium for more than it is being used now, and I think it is a good start and a good bill. I certainly know that the 8,000 additional seats will be sold and the money paid back without asking the taxpayers for a dime.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6330, to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia, to authorize the District of Columbia Armory Board to increase the seating capacity of the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium by an additional 8,000 seats.

As an enthusiastic Redskin fan and as a practical businessman I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I doubt that a single Member of this House would deny that he could use tickets to Redskin games whenever they are played at home were they available to him. The fact that they are not and have not been available for years is well known among our colleagues and among all sports fans who reside in or near Washington, D.C., either permanently or temporarily.

When Robert F. Kennedy Stadium was completed in 1961, it contained 49,219 seats. It was sold out almost as soon as the tickets went on sale. By combing the stadium from end to end, the Skins managed to find space for 2,212 additional seats which they put in place at their own expense. Then, in 1971, they installed temporary open deck bleacher seats, bringing the total capacity to 53,041, all sold immediately upon completion.

More than 7,500 people are now on a waiting list for Redskin tickets, and as many more would probably join them if they felt the possibility of obtaining tickets was not hopelessly remote.

With the attrition rate of less than 1 percent, it is unlikely that most of those now waiting, some as many as 10 years, will ever obtain tickets unless the stadium capacity is enlarged. And the additional income these seatholders would bring to both the Armory Board and the Redskins is lost year after year because the stadium capacity prohibits their attendance at home games.

Despite the fact that the Redskins led the National Football Conference and had every seat sold for every game their gate receipts for home games for the 1972 home season were only $366,362, lower than the average for the Eastern Division, for the entire NFC, the AFC, and the overall National Football League.

The Redskins are now paying the Armory Board rental on 53,041 seats at a rate of 12 percent of the net ticket cost per game. Last year they paid the Board about $580,000 for 12 games. Under provisions of H.R. 6330, instead of paying at the 12-percent rate for the new seats, 50 percent of the revenue from the additional seats would be applied to repaying the $1.5 million needed to build them until the loan is repaid.

Approximately 6,150 new seats will sell for $9 a ticket, net cost after taxes $8.64; another 1,500 seats will sell for $8, netting $7.68; and 650 will be $15 seats netting $14.40. Forty percent of the income from these seats should amount to approximately $35,000 per game, or a total of $350,000 per year, all to be applied to repaying the Armory Board loan.

Other additional income should come from increase sales by concessions. Sales from concessions average about 90 cents per person. So sales from concessioners to the occupants of the additional seats during the course of three preseason and regular season games should bring the Armory Board about $72,000 in additional income each year, and parking 20,000 new cars a year at $2 a car could yield an additional $40,000.

Once the loan is repaid, as it should be within 10 years, the Armory Board will own a stadium with capacity for football of 61,039, and will realize an additional annual rental income for the new seats of approximately $82,855, under the current rental arrangement between the Redskins and the Board.

The growing popularity of professional football and the tremendous popularity of the Washington Redskins has far outstripped the capacity of Kennedy Stadium to house their fans, Mr. Speaker. Unless we act to remedy the situation, one of the top, if not the very top team in the Nation will have to continue to play in one of the smallest stadiums in professional football, with only 6 of the 26 league teams now playing in stadiums of comparable size. It makes no sense that the Nation's Capital does not do better for its championship team.

The architect who prepared the new seat plans has assured the Armory Board that the planned changes will not affect the baseball field in any manner. The capacity for baseball will be decreased by 774, not enough to make a bit of difference to the new team we hope to have in Washington soon.

I understand the rearrangement of seats now planned will actually increase the number of good seats for baseball. We can hope that this will be an added inducement for a good baseball team to give Washington another chance to show we will support baseball.

It is also hoped that with enactment of H.R. 6330 we can encourage the Armory Board to invite many other sporting events, rodeos, musical concerts and the like to use our often vacant stadium. The added capacity can also serve as an inducement to major college teams to play frequently in the Nation's Capital. It would seem to me that Washington would be an ideal place for the service teams to play the Army-Navy, Army-Air Force, and Navy-Air Force games as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am both a cosponsor and enthusiastic supporter of H.R. 6330. I believe it is a good bill that would not only benefit thousands of Redskins fans, but would also represent a big step toward relieving the District of Columbia Armory Board of some of its chronic financial troubles. The first Redskin preseason game is scheduled for August 3, so time is of the essence. I sincerely hope that the House will act favorably on H.R. 6330 today.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say the football team pays $75,000 to $80,000 a year.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Approximately $40,000 to $45,000 per game, which resulted in about $500,000 rent last year.

Mr. SNYDER. That is in excess of 50,000 seats for which that amount is paid.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. With approximately 53,000 seats.

Mr. SNYDER. Then how can we figure we will get $400,000 out of the additional 8,000 seats. There is no way.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It is elementary mathematics. The Redskins pay 12 percent. It is 12 percent of gross receipts on what is now about 53,000 seats. This bill provides for 50 percent of the receipts on the additional 8,000 seats, and many of those will be in the mezzanine, so it will result in $350,000 to $400,000 per year.

Mr. SNYDER. The money that is derived from this good deal we have with the football team, if it is such a good deal, how come there has never been a penny to pay on the interest, much less on the principal?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. This is not the fault of the football team. They have been paying their full share. If we had a baseball team which would be using the stadium, we would have more revenue.

Mr. SNYDER. Does it not prove the operating costs have exceeded the revenues?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more point. It is estimated that the additional 8,000 seats at the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium will bring in to the Armory Board more than $70,000 additional revenue just from the concessions alone.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to this bill is to continue with the $1 million a year deficit and no money being paid on the $19 million outstanding bonds, which are almost due. This is the only hope we have of getting additional revenue at the present time.

I want to reiterate that all we are pledging in this bill is the revenue from the sale of the tickets to pay back the entrepreneurs who will loan the $1.5 million.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding and commend him for his hard work and diligence on behalf of this legislation. The gentleman has made a persuasive argument that this is a good package. I urge adoption of this legislation.

Eight thousand additional seats at R. F. K. Stadium would cost the taxpayer not a cent while providing revenues to the District of Columbia and the Armory Board. Furthermore, the patient but frustrated Washington Redskin fans would have more of an opportunity to attend the games. I was particularly pleased to note that 1,000 of the seats would be reserved for nonseason ticketholders.

The additional seats will help to increase the capacity of the stadium for football games. The fact that the stadium does not have as large a capacity as other NFL facilities has been a financial problem.

Certainly, the Redskins have been a boon to the civic pride and vitality of the D.C. area. I urge my colleagues to support this proposal which would allow additional seats. The public demand for tickets guarantees the success of this expansion plan.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, for his comments.

Also in closing I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, and his staff who have been very helpful in finding additional uses for the R. F. K. Stadium.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not replow the ground which has already been covered by previous speakers. This seems to be a good business proposition, as previous speakers have indicated, and the fact that it is something to help my constituents makes it even better.

Mr. Speaker, there is a long waiting list for season tickets for the Redskins games. The tickets are highly valued by those lucky enough to have them and are passed on from generation to generation.

The fact that the Redskins are the best team in football and have the smallest stadium is a situation which should be remedied. The remedy is to allow more people to go to the games and have this additional money used to help retire the debt on the stadium.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point I would like to make in relation to the Redskins and the Congress responsibilities in connection with the stadium. No one has referred to the civic pride which the Redskins have brought to the Nation's Capital, a city which desperately needed it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish all the Members of this body could have seen the feeling in this town, where race relations have sometimes been a problem, to see black and white football players cooperating and playing together on the field and then achieving and sharing the great success that the Redskins enjoyed last season. This had tremendous effect on the community itself and the civic pride which went with winning the championship after so many lean years was beautiful to see.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the enjoyment which we all receive from seeing professional football, there is this additional benefit from having the Redskins, a winning team, in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I think Congress has a responsibility to do what we can to help put the team on a more economically sound basis, particularly when we have a situation before us today which is not going to cost the taxpayers of the United States or the District of Columbia any money.

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

Mr. HOGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, who won the Super Bowl?

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to pay off this debt of the stadium, we have to have more attendance, more seating capacity. That is all this legislation does, is to provide additional seating capacity without obligating the Federal Government. It gives us an opportunity to raise attendance to try to pay off this debt.

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the very distinguished minority member of the Committee on Public Works, Mr. HARSHA and also Mr. GROVER, of New York, the minority member on the subcommittee, for their bipartisan interest and support of this bill.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point which has long been a question mark in the minds of many residents of the Washington metropolitan area. It concerns the disposition of season tickets which are returned to the Redskins because the owners are deceased, move from the city, or do not renew their seats for some other reason.

In a city in which the stadium is owned publicly, it is most unusual that there is no public accounting of the seats which are returned annually to the Redskins for disposition. At present, there are over 8,000 people on the waiting list for tickets. According to the Redskin ticket office, the number of tickets which go to the waiting list have been in the range of 25 to 50.

It strains the imagination to contemplate that the Redskins have only 25 or 50 new tickets to reassign each year. I would like to suggest that the Redskins voluntarily provide a public accounting of the tickets turned in and their disposition each year to dispel any suspicion that there is a black market or whatever we call it, operation in these highly valuable seats.

This action on the part of the team owners would go far to maintain the trust which the public invests in this fine athletic club and its stockholders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6330, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 98, present 1, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—270

Abdnor	Baker	Brooks
Abzug	Barrett	Brotzman
Adams	Bergland	Brown, Calif.
Addabbo	Bingham	Brown, Mich.
Alexander	Blatnik	Broyhill, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boggs	Broyhill, Va.
	Bolling	Buchanan
Annunzio	Bowen	Burgener
Arends	Brademas	Burke, Calif.
Aspin	Breaux	Burton
Bafalis	Breckinridge	Butler

Byron	Hogan	Roberts
Camp	Holifield	Robinson, Va.
Carey, N.Y.	Holt	Robison, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Holtzman	Rodino
Casey, Tex.	Horton	Roe
Cederberg	Howard	Rogers
Chappell	Ichord	Roncalio, Wyo.
Clark	Jarman	Roncallo, N.Y.
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Rose
Cleveland	Johnson, Pa.	Rosenthal
Cochran	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Jones, N.C.	Roush
Corman	Jones, Okla.	Roybal
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Ruppe
Culver	Jordan	Ruth
Daniel, Dan	Karth	St Germain
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Kluczynski	Sarasin
Daniels, Dominick V.	Koch	Sarbanes
Davis, Ga.	Kyros	Satterfield
Delaney	Leggett	Saylor
Dellums	Lehman	Schneebeli
Dent	Long, La.	Seiberling
Derwinski	Lott	Shipley
Diggs	McClory	Shriver
Donohue	McCloskey	Shuster
Dorn	McCollister	Sisk
Downing	McCormack	Skubitz
Drinan	McDade	Slack
du Pont	McEwen	Smith, Iowa
Eckhardt	McFall	Spence
Edwards, Ala.	McKay	Staggers
Eilberg	McKinney	Stanton, J. William
Esch	McSpadden	Stanton, James V.
Eshleman	Macdonald	Stark
Evans, Colo.	Madden	Steed
Evins, Tenn.	Madigan	Steele
Fascell	Mahon	Stephens
Fish	Mailliard	Stratton
Fisher	Mallary	Stubblefield
Flood	Martin, Nebr.	Stuckey
Flowers	Martin, N.C.	Studds
Foley	Mathias, Calif.	Sullivan
Ford, William D.	Matsunaga	Symington
Forsythe	Meeds	Symms
Fountain	Melcher	Taylor, N.C.
Fraser	Metcalfe	Teague, Calif.
Frey	Mezvinsky	Thompson, N.J.
Fulton	Mills, Md.	Thomson, Wis.
Fuqua	Minish	Tiernan
Giaimo	Mink	Treen
Gilman	Mitchell, N.Y.	Udall
Ginn	Mizell	Ullman
Gonzalez	Moakley	Van Deerlin
Gray	Montgomery	Vander Jagt
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Vanik
Green, Pa.	Mosher	Vigorito
Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.	Waggonner
Grover	Murphy, N.Y.	Walsh
Gude	Nedzi	Wampler
Gunter	Nelsen	Whalen
Guyer	Nix	White
Hamilton	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Hammer-schmidt	O'Hara	Whitten
Hanley	Parris	Widnall
Hanrahan	Passman	Wiggins
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	Williams
Hansen, Wash.	Patten	Wilson, Bob
Harrington	Pepper	Wright
Harsha	Perkins	Wyatt
Harvey	Pickle	Wydler
Hastings	Podell	Wylie
Hays	Preyer	Wyman
Hébert	Price, Ill.	Yatron
Heckler, Mass.	Pritchard	Young, Alaska
Helstoski	Quie	Young, Ill.
Henderson	Randall	Young, S.C.
Hinshaw	Rangel	Young, Tex.
	Rees	Zablocki
	Regula	Zion
	Reuss	
	Rhodes	
	Rinaldo	

NAYS—98

Beard	Cronin	Heinz
Bennett	de la Garza	Hicks
Biester	Dellenback	Hillis
Blackburn	Denholm	Hosmer
Bray	Dennis	Hudnut
Brinkley	Devine	Hungate
Broomfield	Dickinson	Hunt
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Hutchinson
Burke, Fla.	Dulski	Johnson, Colo.
Burke, Mass.	Duncan	Kastenmeier
Burleson, Tex.	Findley	Kazen
Burlison, Mo.	Flynt	Kemp
Chamberlain	Frenzel	Ketchum
Clancy	Gibbons	Kuykendall
Cohen	Goldwater	Landgrebe
Collier	Goodling	Landrum
Collins	Grasso	Latta
Conable	Gross	Lent
Conlan	Haley	Long, Md.
Crane	Hechler, W. Va.	Lujan
Mayne	Poage	Steiger, Ariz.
Mazzoli	Powell, Ohio	Talcott
Michel	Price, Tex.	Thone
Miller	Rarick	Towell, Nev.
Minshall, Ohio	Rousselot	Veysey
Moorhead, Calif.	Roy	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Moss	Runnels	Winn
Myers	Scherle	Wolff
Natcher	Schroeder	Yates
Nichols	Sebelius	Young, Fla.
Obey	Shoup	Zwach
Pettis	Smith, N.Y.	
Pike	Snyder	
	Steelman	

PRESENT—1

Armstrong

NOT VOTING—64

Anderson, Calif.	Erlenborn	Peyser
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Quillen
Andrews, N.C.	Frelinghuysen	Railsback
Archer	Froehlich	Reid
Ashbrook	Gaydos	Riegle
Ashley	Gettys	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Gubser	Rooney, Pa.
Bell	Hanna	Ryan
Bevill	Hawkins	Sandman
Biaggi	Huber	Sikes
Boland	Keating	Steiger, Wis.
Brasco	King	Stokes
Carter	Litton	Taylor, Mo.
Chisholm	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Maraziti	Thornton
Clay	Mathis, Ga.	Waldie
Conte	Milford	Ware
Cotter	Mills, Ark.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Danielson	Mitchell, Md.	
Davis, S.C.	Mollohan	Young, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Moorhead, Pa.	
Edwards, Calif.	O'Neill	
	Owens	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gaydos.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Thornton with Mr. Archer.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Huber.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Keating.

Ms. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. Clay with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Litton with Mr. Ware.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Danielson.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. King.

Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Froehlich.

Mr. Andrews of North Carolina with Mr. Quillen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A REPORT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WATERGATE—A TIME OF RENEWAL AND RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being in Arizona on Saturday, on which day our distinguished colleague (Mr. UDALL) received an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the commencement exercises of the University of Arizona.

The principal speaker at the exercises was Norman Cousins, editor of World magazine, who made some remarks that I think we all deserve to hear. Mr. Cousins pointed out that Americans should not be disillusioned by the Watergate affair because the scandal proves that the Nation is capable of being renewed, revitalized and regenerated.

He said that the incident should "reassure, awaken and renew" us because it shows the "ultimate power in the United States belongs not to the President but to the people."

Mr. Cousins observed that "the American system of government is vindicated today as never before," and that "it has been able to stand up to perversion of the law at the highest levels."

He also pointed out that the authors of the U.S. Constitution knew that man is "flawed," so they "might be disgusted, but they would not be disillusioned or dismayed" at the use by the government of "thugs" or "Gestapo tactics." "A vast cleansing process is at work in America today," he said.

Last night I read in the latest issue of the New Yorker magazine, a brilliant comment about the Watergate affair, which concluded in a vein similar to Norman Cousins, that far from dividing the country, the Watergate crisis is making it possible to end the "manufactured discord" that emanated from the White House and to renew the power and dignity of the Congress, the Presidency, the courts and the other free institutions that have served us well for almost 200 years. As the article says:

> The rule of fear has been broken. We may be exhausted, but we are free.

The article from the New Yorker follows:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

NOTES AND COMMENT

As the days pass, it becomes clear that the Watergate affair is bringing about a sweeping transformation of American politics. Never before has an upheaval of this magnitude come upon us so swiftly. One week, a political commentator was wondering whether Watergate might not turn out to be a "political plus" for the President. Two weeks later, he was wondering whether it might not force the President's resignation or impeachment. Only a month ago, the executive branch of the government seemed poised to take full control of our nation's affairs. The opposition had been surrounded and penned in, and was being disarmed: Congress had been shouldered aside, a few more appointments to the Supreme Court promised to bring the Court into line; the President and his public-relations advisers had preempted the major channels of public discourse, so that while other voices were still free to speak they could not make themselves heard. The executive had lowered a curtain of secrecy around itself. And, although the public still did not quite believe it, the men in the White House had deeply compromised the electoral system. Their well-made plans of self-aggrandizement and usurpation were unfolding smoothly in every area. Then, in an instant, the advancing executive machine went entirely to pieces, as though someone had touched a secret spring at its back. There had been no bold campaign by an opposition camp; there had been almost no speeches, and not one demonstration. Rather, a few intrepid investigators had uncovered a few facts, and the incredible collapse began.

Where a moment earlier the men of the executive had been spreading out unchecked across a clear field of action, now a whole jungle of prohibitions and laws had sprung up around them. In a flash, all their strengths had turned to weaknesses; the dynamics of self-aggrandizement had been converted into a dynamics of self-destruction. The telephone calls to powerful friends that had once protected them now increased their jeopardy. The coverups that had kept the investigators at bay now led the investigators in deeper. All the moves designed to strengthen the White House position were now expediting its undoing. Each well-laid plan emerged as a damning conspiracy, and the better coordinated it had been, the easier the investigators now found it to follow the links from one conspirator to another. The group's cohesion had been perhaps its greatest strength, and as soon as one man deserted, suspicion seeped into every relationship and they all began to desert. A frightful metamorphosis had taken place, as though a curse had been laid on the whole group overnight. Where once silence had been so efficiently preserved, there were dozens of voices broadcasting not only the damaging truth but also any rumors or lies that might help each person save his own skin by putting his former colleagues in peril. Where once fanatical loyalty had been the rule, there was betrayal in equal measure.

The ruthlessness that these men had directed outward was redirected toward one another. Each man became both the blackmailer of his old friends and the victim of blackmail by them. The same momentum that had carried these men to the pinnacle of their power was now carrying them back down to their ruin. Even the weapons they had used in the open were blowing up in their hands; in a striking parallel to the "black propaganda" they had been so fond of (propaganda with which they attempted to discredit their foes by making them appear to have uttered damaging statements), their own techniques of vituperations against the Congress and the press rebounded to their disadvantage in the changed atmosphere. And even the arguments by which their supporters had attempted to shore up the President's position turned against him; the supporters had hinted broadly that we should not press too hard for the truth, because we could not afford to have a crippled President in the White House, but when a good part of the truth had come out, and the President *had* been crippled, the argument that we could not afford to have a crippled President in the White House weighed in on the side of his stepping down. Once the fact finders had brought out their facts, the opposition had only to stand on the sidelines and watch what the executive branch of the government would do. A few people moved quietly in the direction of the truth, and the great bully overthrew himself.

It could not have happened five years ago. In those days, the fate of an Administration in such a case would certainly have been decided along the old, "polarized" lines. The liberal Democrats would have been in the vanguard of a full-scale assault on the President. At their backs would have been "the kids," in armies of millions in the streets. Republicans and conservative Democrats, fearful of weakening a President in wartime, would have rallied to the Commander-in-Chief, and at their backs would have been the military and the police. The United States would have been lucky to emerge from the ensuing strife as a Constitutional republic. But the kids have stayed out of these recent events altogether. Having checked the progress of an unjust war, they have retired to their campuses and left the new job to elder dragon-slayers—men like Senator Sam Ervin, Senater Barry Goldwater, and Judge John J. Sirica. Their weapon has been an intimate knowledge of our Constitutional system—not a strong point with the kids, and, for that matter, not a strong point with the men of the present Administration. And once the underbrush had been cleared away by the inquiries it was not the liberal Democrats but the conservative Republicans who became the chief advocates of a full showdown. It was good ethics for the Republicans to do this, and also good politics. Republicans have no wish to be married to Watergate in the public mind for the next thirty years.

We were warned when the revelations began that if they were to implicate the President directly and thereby force us to take steps to remove him from office, the country might bog down in "mutual recriminations." A few years ago, such a warning would have made sense. But in recent weeks what has materialized before our eyes, far from being scenes of mutual recrimination, has been a succession of undreamed-of reconciliations. We have seen the President's press secretary, Ronald Ziegler, apologize to the Washington *Post*. We have seen Barry Goldwater join with liberal Democrats to call for an independent prosecutor. We have even seen President Nixon congratulate the men of the press and the judiciary (though not of the Congress) who set the stage for his present troubles. Watergate has brought us together. The deeper truth, though, is that we simply are no longer the divided nation we once were. What is there to divide us? For the public, the war is over. (One solemnly trusts that soon it will also be over in fact.) The rigid mind-sets that embittered ordinary people against each other have dissolved. The discord of the nineteen-sixties ended several years ago, and now the manufactured discord of Administration propaganda and provocation has been ended. To be sure, the scene around us is not one to gladden the heart. The neglected work of a decade that was half turbulence and half torpor has piled up on the doorstep of the public: a public that may lately have been undivided but has also been dead to the world—a public lost, for the moment, to public affairs. Now, though, a prevailing atmosphere of compulsion has been lifted from the country. The Congress is getting up off its hands and knees and onto its feet. (Its first job will be to put an end to the bombing in Cambodia and Laos.) The men on television are blinking awake; their frozen "objective" expressions are giving way to smiles and frowns. According to the latest polls, the public has begun to stir. The rule of fear has been broken. We may be exhausted, but we are free.

A NEW DIRECTOR FOR THE FBI

(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, I have been gravely concerned, as have other Members of Congress and the American public, that more than a year has elapsed since the death of J. Edgar Hoover, and no person has yet become the permanent Director of the FBI. Our experience thus far with Acting Directors has been most unsatisfactory; the standing of that great organization has suffered, its world-wide reputation has been blemished and the status of the FBI as the standard of the world for excellence in investigation has been diminished.

As a former special agent of the FBI, and as a member of the Society of Former Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I am especially concerned. The time has long since come and gone for the President to select an outstanding person to head the organization. Contrary to the opinion apparently held by a few that the FBI is the personal and private investigatory arm of the President, the FBI belongs to all the people of the United States.

At a meeting held in Cincinnati on April 28, 1973, the board of directors of the Society of Former Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon the President to take immediate steps to select, as the permanent Director of the FBI, a person representing the highest traditions of the FBI, with the qualities of integrity, loyalty, high moral fiber, leadership, and freedom from partisan involvement which have long been the hallmark of the FBI. The text of the resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Society of Former Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Inc. is composed of a membership of selected former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in excess of 5,700,

Which membership has contributed to the FBI's prestige, stability, respect and reputation for integrity and dedication to public service and

Which membership has helped earn for the FBI its exemplary national and world wide reputation, and

Whereas the prestige and accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation were gained through firm, forceful, fair and politically impartial leadership, and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been without a permanent Director for the past year and the continued absence of a permanent Director is not in the best interests of this nation,

Now therefore be it resolved by unanimous vote of the Board of Directors of the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Inc. in meeting assembled April 28, 1973 at Cincinnati, Ohio that the President of the United States and the

Senate of the United States Congress take immediate steps to select a permanent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and

Be it further resolved that such Director should be a person representing the highest traditions of the Service including qualities of integrity, loyalty, moral fibre, leadership and freedom from partisan involvement, and

Be it further resolved that the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Inc. is prepared to offer its services and assistance in achieving this objective, and places itself at the call and request of the President of the United States and the United States Senate—all for the best interests of our country.

REFUSAL TO FURNISH INFORMATION TO SUBCOMMITTEE REQUIRES AN EXPLANATION

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 I informed the House that the Department of Labor had refused to supply subcommittee No. 1, immigration and nationality, of the Committee on the Judiciary, with information it needs to write new legislation to govern immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

At that time I stated that the Department's original response to the committee's invitation that it send a representative to testify was that it needed more time to prepare its statement so the committee delayed its hearing on this matter for 3 weeks.

When that time limit had almost expired, the committee was informed that the Department would not send a witness to testify because it was the Secretary of Labor's opinion that the committee had gotten all of the information it needs from other witnesses. We had previously heard from representatives of the Justice and State Departments.

I have since learned that the Labor Department's decision was based on advice from officials of the Office of Management and Budget.

There is no plausible reason for the Labor Department's decision. Certainly national security is not involved in the setting of preferences for immigration from the Western Hemisphere or establishing rules for the issuance of temporary work permits for residents of Western Hemisphere countries.

I am also at a loss to understand why the Office of Management and Budget has advised the Secretary of Labor not to permit his assistants to testify before my subcommittee unless its Director, Roy Ash, has been ordered by the White House to enforce the administration's policy of noncooperation with Congress.

The decision not to comply with the subcommittee's request is obstructing our effort to produce meaningful legislation.

We will be holding another hearing on this subject on June 6. I believe that at that time it will be incumbent upon the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Labor to explain their actions.

A SOLUTION TO THE WAR POWERS CRISIS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which, after very careful study, I have determined is the best solution to what many have termed the "war powers crisis" now plaguing the executive and legislative branches of our Government. The Founding Fathers attempted to avoid a centralization of power in any one branch of Government dividing the warmaking powers between Congress and the President. It appears that the power to make war as opposed to declare war has gradually centralized in the executive branch of our Government. The central purpose of my bill is to reaffirm and clarify what I believe was the intent of the Founding Fathers—that Congress and Congress alone has the power to declare war and that phrase in the Constitution encompasses the shared power "to make war."

I have studied the various bills introduced by my colleagues in the House and bills introduced in the other body and have frankly drawn upon the thoughts of several of my colleagues. Essentially, my bill is identical to Mr. DENNIS' bill with the very important exception that my bill includes in it a section delineating procedures whereby legislation to authorize the making of war or the terminating of actions begun can be moved through the Congress expeditiously.

In brief, my bill leaves it to the elected Executive of our country, the President, to determine when an emergency exists and is of such a nature that would justify the employment of the military forces of the United States at any place outside of the United States, its territories, and possessions. Absent a declaration of war by the Congress or a military attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, the Armed Forces of the United States could not be committed to combat or introduced in any situation where combat would be imminent or likely without prior notice to and specific prior authority by the Congress.

Whenever, absent a declaration of war, or a military attack upon the United States, the President did determine when an emergency existed and did commit Armed Forces of the United States to combat, the President would be required to report such action to the Congress in writing within a 24-hour period. In the event the Congress were not in session, the President would be required to convene the Congress in an extraordinary session to receive such a report. Congress would be required to act, either approving or disapproving the President's action within 90 days after receipt of the President's report. If the Congress acted in approval of the President's action, the President nevertheless would be required to report back to the Congress at intervals of not more than 6 months detailing the progress of the hostilities involved. Within 30 days from each such report, the Congress would be required to affirm or disapprove of the President's action. If, however, the Congress disapproved of the President's action and required the discontinuance of the hostilities then those forces which had been deployed would have to be withdrawn as expeditiously as possible, but with due regard to the safety of the forces deployed and the necessary defense of the country. In all cases, should Congress fail to act, either in approval or disapproval of the action of the President within the time specified, such failure would be deemed to be approval and confirmation of the President's action. As I have stated, my bill also contains procedures whereby action by both Houses of Congress either in approval or disapproval of the President's action could be moved through the Congress in expeditious fashion.

I think a bit of history is important in explaining why I believe this bill is necessary and is the proper method of dealing with the war powers crisis.

I therefore revise and extend my remarks by inserting at this point in the RECORD the research results of a student, Mr. Ken Krantz, from Wooster College, which is in my congressional district, who spent a semester here in Washington working in my office while participating in the Wooster College Washington program:

RESEARCH RESULTS OF MR. KEN KRANTZ

The original draft of the Constitution vested in Congress the power "to make war." It was objected that a body as large as the proposed U.S. Congress would be unable to make the day-to-day tactical decisions necessary in time of war with the necessary efficiency. A proposal was made to vest the war-making power in the Senate, the smaller body and, by virtue of its treaty-ratification power, the body more concerned with foreign affairs. Finally, the present language was adopted. Citing the need for swift action to, in Madison's words, "repel sudden attacks," the Convention made the President Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. The powers of Congress, meanwhile were changed by an amendment offered by Madison and Gerry, striking the words "to make war" in favor of "to declare war." It should be noted that taking the broad power "to make war" from the Congress did not indicate any desire on the part of the Framers to give it to the President. When an amendment to do exactly that was offered, Gerry described the proposal as one he "never expected to hear in a republic" and it failed to get the support of any other delegate. Significantly, the original wording "to make war" is not to be found anywhere in the present language of the Constitution. This broad power is thus not made the exclusive province of either Congress or President, but divided between them, as part of the general separation of powers idea. What bias there was, was clearly in favor of the legislative branch. Even Hamilton, one of the early Republic's staunchest supporters of a strong executive in other areas, had this to say about the war power, in *The Federalist*, No. 69:

"The President is to be commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the confederacy, while that of the British king extends to the declaring of

war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies, all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature."

This statement reflects the prevailing view of the generation of American statesmen directly familiar with the writing of the Constitution. Their view, and that which prevailed through the nineteenth century was that the President was to have tactical command, as "first general and admiral," over forces committed to action by Congress. That the power was not dependent on a formal declaration of war was established in the new nation's first foreign war, the Naval War of 1798 with France. This precedent-setting conflict was, like most of those which were to follow, undeclared. It was not, however, unauthorized by Congress. Hamilton again showed what was, for him, an unusual regard for the prerogatives of Congress when he advised President Adams that "in so delicate a case, in one which involves so important a consequence as that of war, my opinion is that *no doubtful authority ought to be exercised by the President* (emphasis added)." Adams, taking Hamilton's advice, waited for Congress to act rather than moving unilaterally on the "doubtful authority" of his powers as Commander in Chief. Congressional action was forthcoming, establishing the Navy Department abrogating treaties and consular conventions with France, and authorizing the seizure of armed French vessels on the high seas.

This conflict brought, early in our Constitutional history, the issue of undeclared war, which is not dealt with in the explicit provisions of the Constitution. The Supreme Court dealt with the issue in a series of cases growing out of this war. In the 1800 case of *Bas.* v. *Tingey* the Court ruled that the seizure of a French vessel pursuant to the acts of Congress noted above was legal despite the claim by the owner of the ship that France and the United States were not officially at war. The Court distinguished between what it called "solemn" and "imperfect," i.e. declared and undeclared, wars. Imperfect wars, however, were for Congress to authorize, as it had in the French war. This point was driven home in subsequent prize cases arising from the war. Speaking for the Court in *Talbot* v. *Seeman*, Chief Justice Marshall noted that "the whole power of war being, by the Constitution of the United States, vested in Congress, the action of that body can alone be resorted to as guides in this inquiry." Finally, in the 1804 case of *Little* v. *Barreme*, the Court dealt with a conflict between the war powers of the President and Congress. The authorization noted above had included authority for the President to instruct the Navy to seize American vessels sailing to French ports. The President ordered the seizure of vessels "bound to or from French ports." The court ruled that the seizure of an outward bound ship pursuant to such orders was illegal, since such authority was not included in Congress' authorizing legislation. Thus, the Supreme Court determined that an Act of Congress under its war-declaring power was superior to the actions of the President pursuant to his power as Commander in Chief. It should be clear from these precedents that the judicially-determined legality of undeclared war, far from being the broad grant of authority to the President which it is sometimes claimed to be, is in fact an enlargement of Congress' power to declare war, from which it is inferred.

Unlike the French conflict, in which war was never formally declared by either belligerent, in the First Barbary War of 1801–1805, war was declared on, but not by, the United States. Although a state of war was thus initiated without the volition of the United States and Congressional action arguably rendered unnecessary, Jefferson felt he could authorize only defensive actions until Congress acted to authorize a counterattack. In one extreme case, an American vessel under attack fought back only until its attacker was sufficiently disabled to prevent further hostilities, and then let ship and crew escape rather than press its advantage. In requesting Congressional authorization for offensive action, which authorization was forthcoming, Jefferson acknowledged that "this important function (has been) confided by the Constitution to the Legislature exclusively."

Until the Vietnam conflict took away that dubious distinction, the Mexican War of 1846–48 was the most unpopular war in American history. It was formally declared, although under extremely questionable circumstances. President Polk, under his own authority, ordered troops into the region between the Nueces and Rio Grande rivers, disputed area claimed by both the United States and Mexico. Forces of the two countries exchanged hostilities and Polk asked Congress to acknowledge the existences of a state of war between the United States and Mexico. This was done, but opposition to the war was widespread, in Congress and throughout the nation.

After the war the House actually agreed to what amounted to a censure resolution against the President. In the course of voting a resolution of thanks to General Winfield Scott, the House accepted an amendment stating that the war Scott had won had been "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally" begun by the President. Among the Congressmen supporting the amendment were former President John Quincy Adams and future President Abraham Lincoln. The latter, commenting on the course of events by which Polk had involved the nation in war, said:

"Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion . . . and you allow him to make war at his pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect, after having given him so much power as you propose. . .

"The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing oppression upon us."

Lincoln himself, as Commander in Chief, called for 75,000 volunteers to suppress the 1861 rebellion and ordered a blockade of Southern ports. Lincoln acknowledged that these actions, taken while Congress was out of session, were extra-Constitutional and justified only by the extremity of the emergency. Their applicability to the present debate over war powers is limited by the fact that that debate centers around foreign war, not the very different issue of domestic insurrection.

The next major foreign military engagement was the Spanish-American War of 1898, fully declared. The new century began with an engagement of less clear-cut Constitutional status. The 1900 Boxer War took place while Congress was out of session and thus had no official legislative sanction, although there was little protest when Congress reconvened. President McKinley ordered 5,000 troops to China as part of an international force to relieve the beleaguered Peking foreign delegation. Such missions of rescue have provided the rationales for a great many of the scores of overseas troop deployments in our history, but never on such a scale. The international force ended up waging a *de facto* war on the Chinese government, and an indemnity, in which the United States shared, was imposed on that government.

Since the turn of the century the United States has been engaged, in addition to the two fully declared World Wars, in a great many unilateral Presidential actions overseas, of which the most prominent have been the Korean and Vietnam Wars. President Truman committed troops to Korea pursuant to a call by the U.N. Security Council for member nations to assist South Korea against the invasion by the Communist North. This was done in accordance with Article 43 of the United Nations Charter, which provides for member nations to make available to the Security Council "on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements" military resources, including troops. The Charter has the status, in U.S. internal law, of a treaty, and was duly ratified as such by the Senate. American participation in the U.N. was additionally dealt with in the 1945 United Nations Participation Act, Section 6 of which provides that, while the President may supply troops to the Security Council in accord with the "agreement or agreements" noted in the passage of the Charter noted above, the "agreements" themselves must, unlike treaties, be approved by majorities of both House of Congress.

This was not done in the case of Korea (and, in fact, no such agreements have ever been entered into between the United States and the Security Council). President Truman, in other words, ignored the "agreements" provision of Article 43 of the Charter and Article 6 of the Participation Act, and thus bypassed the role of Congress spelled out in the Act, making his action, although arguably necessitated by the urgency of the situation, of dubious legality.

There have been, generally, three different sources of authority claimed for the pursuit of hostilities in Vietnam. These are, in the order in which they will be dealt with here, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, and the President's powers as Commander in Chief.

1. The SEATO Treaty provides that—

"Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."

Attached to the Treaty is a Protocol in which the parties to SEATO unanimously designate "the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Viet Nam" for purposes of the above provision. Thus, by ratification of the SEATO Treaty, the United States recognizes an attack on South Viet Nam as a danger to its own security. The Treaty does not, however, automatically commit the United States to hostilities. The phrase "in accordance with its constitutional processes" makes explicit the right of each party to allow its domestic law with regard to armed hostilities to take effect. The SEATO Treaty, in short, is not self-executing (nor, according to a State Department document drawn up at the request of Senator Robert Taft, is any other treaty to which the United States is currently a party). Prior authorization of hostilities by treaty, rather than Act of Congress, bypasses the role of the House, which is not involved in treaty-making, in the war-making process. For this reason the "constitutional processes" clause found in current defense treaties is interpreted as requiring action by both Houses.

2. The authority missing from the SEATO Treaty was allegedly supplied by the 1964 Southeast Asia (more commonly known as Tonkin Gulf) Resolution. This resolution was regarded by the Johnson Administration

as, in the words of Assistant Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, "the functional equivalent of a declaration of war."

Such an interpretation, although fiercely resisted by many Members of Congress, is not without merit. It is clear from nearly 200 years of Constitutional history that an Act of Congress, even if it does not formally declare a state of war, can indeed be "the functional equivalent" of such a declaration. The Resolution states that "Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take *all necessary measures* to repel an armed attack against the forces of the United States and *to prevent further aggression.*" "The United States is," according to another section, "prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, *including the use of armed force,* to assist any protocol or member state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

It is claimed that Congress was fooled into giving the President a blank check in Indochina and, while it is probably true that no Member dreamed of the sort of military commitment that was to result, it is also true that the reference to "use of armed force" was there for anyone to read. If Congress was deceived, it was because it allowed itself to be. Note, as an example of this, the following floor exchange between Senators Fulbright and Cooper:

"Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator consider that in enacting this resolution we are satisfying that requirement [i.e. the 'constitutional processes' provision] of Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty? In other words, *are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary* respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. *I think that is correct.*

"Mr. COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force *as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?*

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. *That is the way I would interpret it.*"

Section 3 of the Resolution provided that it could be terminated by the President on his determination "that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured," or by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. Neither of these courses was followed in the repeal, which was effected by an amendment proposed by Senator Robert Dole to the Foreign Military Sales Act which was signed by the President on January 12, 1971.

3. For the more than two years between the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the Vietnam cease-fire, the only authority claimed for pursuit of hostilities has been an inherent power of the President as Commander in Chief. Since assuming office, President Nixon gradually withdrew the troops that had been placed in Vietnam by his predecessor. The Administration claim was that, as Commander in Chief, the President has the right to protect the troops which remained while the wtihdrawal was going on. This is the only authority claimed and, since the repeal of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, the only authority the President has had. It would be perfectly legitimate if covering a retreat, the only thing the President claimed authority to do, were the only thing he were doing. Throughout the war, however, he repeatedly rejected this very policy. To compound the paradox, the President, even while claiming authority for no goal other than safe withdrawal of American troops, announced another goal, variously described as peace with honor, the right kind of peace, and Vietnamization. Devoid of rhetorical flourishes, this amounts to insuring the peace and security of the SEATO area, authority for which goal was given by Section 2 of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. Without commenting on the desirability of that goal, it clearly has nothing to do with the purely tactical issue of protecting withdrawing troops. As Senator Sam Ervin said in opposing the repeal amendment, "the President of the United States has no power whatsoever to act as Commander in Chief in that part of the world with the exception of withdrawing the troops, if this repeal carries. It is true that he might have the inherent power to protect them as they wtihdraw. Manifestly, *his power would extend no further than that.*"

This reasoning was not widely accepted and, indeed, repeal of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution had no noticeable effect whatever on American policy in Vietnam. The President continued gradual withdrawal and the pursuit of certain policy goals (to repeat, the desirability or undesirability of those goals is not at issue here, exactly as before. If the presence or absence of Congressional authorization has no effect on the existence or conduct of hostilities, the logical inference is that Congressional authorization is unnecessary, and at best redundant. This is a far cry from the days when the "whole powers of war" were regarded as being vested in Congress and it should be evident from even this extremely brief review that this doctrine of inherent powers is at a variance with traditional Constitutional interpretation. If the President's authority to wage war is unaffected by any consideration of whether or not Congress has authorized it then, in Lincoln's words, "Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power."

HOW TO HOODWINK CONGRESS

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a year since the loudly ballyhooed "TRANSPO '72" exposition folded its tents at Dulles International Airport, but the memory lingers on.

It may be recalled by some around here that this monumental boondoggle started back in the 91st Congress when the TRANSPO promoters told us the exposition would cost $750,000.

Then they came back and said to us that their exposition would actually cost $5 million. I recall that I remarked on December 6, 1971, when the $5 million authorization bill was before the House, that somebody in the bureaucracy had a real T-bone steak appetite.

Of course, the Congress rolled over and played dead for the Department of Transportation, which put on this colossal mess.

But what the Congress did not know was that the TRANSPO promoters were actually engaged in writing a textbook on how to deceive the Congress.

In March of 1972, and because I detected an unsavory smell coming from the Transportation Department in connection with TRANSPO, I asked the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake an investigation of certain aspects of it.

I have today received his report and in it you will find a blueprint on how to hoodwink not only the Congress but the American people.

The General Accounting Office states that whereas the Department of Transportation told Congress that TRANSPO would cost about $8.78 million, it has already cost over $20 million and is likely to cost an additional $1.5 million before the books are closed.

In my request to the GAO I noted that inattention to the project within the Transportation Department, and the crash basis on which TRANSPO planning finally got underway, might well lead to waste and violation of Government procurement regulations.

The GAO fully corroborates my fears.

The TRANSPO bureaucrats awarded contracts for almost $9.5 million worth of goods and services and the GAO states that:

> Competition for most procurements we reviewed was restricted or nonexistent or that procurement procedures and practices did not adequately insure that fair and reasonable prices had been obtained.

It was discovered that TRANSPO officials permitted an "unreasonably short time" for preparing and submitting bids. The need for goods and services was not published in the Commerce Business Daily, where industry customarily learns of Government contracting opportunities. Additionally, TRANSPO officials contacted "only a small group of contractors," thus severely limiting competition.

The GAO report discusses three illustrative cases in which TRANSPO officials spent far more money than was necessary because they had simply goofed around for months instead of taking timely procurement action, or because they simply did not know anything about Government procurement.

For example, in trying to award a contract for a business center building, TRANSPO bureaucrats, having first failed to take timely action, finally awarded the contract to a marginal joint venture which the bureaucrats know was marginal.

The building blew down a month before the exposition was scheduled to open, the contractor defaulted, and another firm was hired to clear away the wreckage and install prefabricated units on the destroyed building's foundation.

Having waited until the last minute, TRANSPO officials asked bids for fencing it estimated would cost $82,000. It received two bids, the lowest of which was $170,000. The officials accepted the low bid "because of time limitations."

The total lack of concern for the public's money that obviously pervaded this project is illustrated by one TRANSPO official's comment to the GAO that "if time had been taken to obtain contractors' cost or pricing data and make detailed cost analyses, TRANSPO would not have opened on time."

The General Accounting Office report also details the muddled manner in which the Department of Transportation went about organizing this exposition. Only 9 months before TRANSPO was to open, internal memorandums complained of such problems as lack of staff.

> We frequently encounter delays or outright refusals for staff assistance we request from (the Department) and operating administrations, with disastrous results to deadlines which cannot sustain further slippage.

TRANSPO officials planned on siphoning money and personnel from other Federal departments and agencies to pay for the cost of the exposition, but they carefully refrained from telling the Congress of their plans.

It is interesting to note—again from internal memorandums—that the rest of the Federal Government simply was not interested in TRANSPO until a great deal of arm twisting was done.

For example, a memorandum of February 28, 1971, states that:

> We continue to be hampered in our overall operations by the apparent lack of understanding by operating administrations and offices outside FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) that the exposition is a Department-wide undertaking and as such, necessitates their contributing on a nonreimbursable basis certain in-house support and resources required to properly develop and stage the exposition.

In September of 1971 the managing director of TRANSPO complained that "our major problem is really that few Federal agencies realize the significance of TRANSPO, or seem to be willing to participate even as exhibitors."

Another memorandum that same month states that:

> In too many areas, our request (to other federal agencies' are treated as matters of annoyance, rather than matters of high priority.

Then came the arm twisting and the GAO states that TRANSPO ultimately received total Federal support in excess of that initially reported to the Congress in November of 1971 when TRANSPO officials were seeking more money.

To illustrate just how many arms were twisted, the GAO provides a list of the Federal agencies that contributed money or manpower to TRANSPO. It is too long to use here in its entirety but it includes such outfits as the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare; Agriculture, State, Commerce, Justice and Treasury.

Also included is the Coast Guard, U.S. Travel Service, Smithsonian Institution, and the government of the District of Columbia.

Their "contributions" were made under a bewildering variety of laws and Executive orders of the President.

Where these various Federal agencies got the excess money I will leave to you. It is obvious to me, however, that they were over-funded by Congress in the first place.

It will be remembered that much of the excuse for this exposition centered around glowing promises that the sales it would generate would all but eliminate our balance-of-payments problem.

Well, the GAO had a word to say about this, also.

It says that the Transportation Department has not determined the economic impact of TRANSPO but it did what bureaucrats favor above all other actions—it hired a consulting firm to find out.

The consultant sent out a survey to some exhibitors which the GAO said was virtually meaningless because "its timing, and the methodology are not good bases for estimating the potential for sales. Exhibitors were invited to reply anonymously, and they did so; thus, there was no way to determine whether the replies used were from exhibitors who sufficiently represented all exhibitors."

The consultant said his survey showed a potential for $82 million in sales. By projection, he estimated TRANSPO would generate a total of $178.2 million in sales for U.S. firms.

But when the GAO questioned the consultant, he "was unable to reconstruct the makeup of the $82 million in reported potential sales or to fully identify which replies to—his survey—were used."

In other words, the consultant could just as well have pulled his potential sales figures out of thin air.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, this TRANSPO project—as shown by the General Accounting Office—is a master blueprint in how to hoodwink the Congress.

I have heard rumblings from the empire builders down in the Department of Transportation that another TRANSPO would be a nice thing to have. I sincerely hope the Members of this House will bear the last one in mind when these bureaucrats come marching up the Hill with their hands out.

SUMMER NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss a matter of critical importance, because I do not know of anything that is more important than keeping our youngsters in school. Last year the Congress saw to it that 753,000 young men and women were employed in the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. Since then however, we have had to suffer through the administration's confusing double talk and budgetary girations regarding these programs for the coming summer.

Mr. Speaker, there is no confusion at the local level. The administration's maneuvering is coming across in congressional districts across the Nation in clear and unambiguous terms. It is simply this—there will be no jobs available for thousands and thousands of young people this summer.

I am talking about ambitious hard-working young boys and girls for whom a summer job is of vital importance. For many in my congressional district and I am sure elsewhere, having a summer job may very well be the difference between forced to drop out of school and continuing in school.

A report from one of the largest county school systems in my district indicates 10 to 20 percent of those who should be participating in the summer employment program may drop out of school if they have no summer employment. In another large county school system in my district, 340 young boys and girls were employed last year in the summer program. Under the administration's scheme of funding, they will be lucky if they have 10 or 15 employment opportunities this summer.

Mr. Speaker, we have already appropriated $239,000,000 for the summer program. However, the budget submission in January asked that these appropriated funds be rescinded. The House has rejected that request. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee stated at that time:

> It is our definite intent that there should be a summer youth program just as there was last summer.

I concur fully with Chairman MAHON'S statement and I urge every Member of this House to join in a concerted effort to see to it that these appropriated funds are spent for the purposes intended by the Congress.

At the same time, we must recognize that this amount is far less than what is needed. It is almost $100,000,000 less than the amount available last summer and it will be far short of what we know to be the national need. An extensive survey shows that more than a million job opportunities will be needed for the summer, aproximately double of what could be provided with the amount already appropriated.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that an effort will be made in the other body to add moneys to the second supplemental appropriations bill specifically for the summer program. I applaud this effort and, if it is successful, I urge the House to concur.

I believe the matter to be of such critical importance, Mr. Speaker, that I urge also that we take the initiative here in the House. We have had an urgent supplemental bill to provide funds for veterans' programs and to provide funds for student assistance programs for needy college students.

The school year is drawing to a close and today and tomorrow, this week and next week, young people will be looking for employment opportunities. The urgency of this matter cannot be exaggerated, and I believe we must move as rapidly as possible to see to it that there is an adequate program available.

LE CABINET—C'EST MOI

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, did Secretary of Defense Richardson declare that we shall continue bombing Cambodia regardless of what action the House of Representatives takes on transfer of funds?

Has he obtained the legal opinion of the Attorney General-designate Richardson on the legality and constitutionality of such action? Perhaps Attorney General-designate Richardson will base his opinion on comments by Secretary of Defense Richardson—resulting from earlier remarks of Under Secretary of State Richardson—in a conversation with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Richardson.

Le Cabinet—C'est Moi.

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

(Ms. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to one of the great ladies of the peace movement and the women's movement. Jeannette Rankin, who died last Friday at the age of 92, was the first woman ever elected to the U.S. Congress. In the early 1900's she was a leader in the suffragist movement and later became field secretary of the National American Women's Suffrage Association. She established a precedent by addressing the Montana State Legislature on the subject. Two years later, Montana passed a suffrage law—6 years before the constitutional amendment gave women the vote. Ms. Rankin said she ran for Congress to repay, and to represent, the women who had worked for suffrage.

She then became an outspoken critic of current election procedures, urging greater diversity among candidates. She said:

> Now we have a choice between a white male Republican and a white male Democrat.

All her life she worked to make the Congress more truly representative.

She will also be remembered as the only Representative who voted against the Nation's entry into both World Wars I and II. Whether or not one agrees, one must respect the consistence of her lifelong conviction that violence has never solved human disagreements.

In 1968, when she was 88 years old, Ms. Rankin led the Jeannette Rankin Brigade in a massive march of women to Capitol Hill, protesting the war in Vietnam. She said:

> The people aren't really for war, they just go along, but war is evil and there is always an alternative.

Throughout her life she continued to work for that alternative, writing letters, making speeches, organizing citizens to work against war and discrimination. She has been a source of strength and inspiration to all of us and she will be sorely missed.

I am planning to introduce a resolution asking that the Postal Service issue a Jeannette Rankin stamp, to commemorate her long and useful life.

THE OMB BILL VETO: MORE SECRECY AND COVER-UP, OR PUBLIC BUSINESS CONDUCTED PUBLICLY?

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session of Congress, I introduced H.R. 204, to require Senate confirmation of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

There was abundant reason for enacting the measure on that date.

Happenings since have made it mandatory.

Congress is now confronted with President Nixon's veto of such a bill.

In view of the current events, his veto is shockingly inappropriate and wrong; wrong for the President, wrong for Congress to accept, and wrong for our country.

With continuing daily developments causing public distrust of the President's staff, with two former Cabinet members under indictment, and with widespread distrust of the President's judgment in personal matters, it is mandatory to restore the people's confidence in government by conducting public affairs openly, and for the Senate to examine major appointments to reassure the people of this Nation that we are getting good men in high positions. That is always the best course. It is absolutely imperative right now.

In the case of Mr. Roy L. Ash, the present Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the necessity for open hearings and Senate confirmation is heightened because serious questions have been raised as to the disposition of his stock in Litton Industries, which he formerly headed, and as to his attitude toward Litton's huge excess cost claims against the Navy Department.

For Mr. Ash's benefit, as well as the public, he deserves the opportunity to lay out publicly his relationship to Litton, his ability to be completely objective in relation to matters that concern the company, and to answer all other normal inquiries that high Government officials should be asked before gaining Senate confirmation.

The President's veto of the bill requiring this in the case of Mr. Ash, probably unfairly, raises a question and casts a shadow over his qualifications for the job and why he should be exempted from the usual confirmation procedure. It must be assumed that Mr. Ash would successfully pass the Senate screening, and thereby lay to rest publicly any possible doubts about his fitness for the position, creating public confidence that a completely acceptable and competent individual is taking this high post.

The President, perhaps without sufficient consideration of the public's right to know, or sensitivity about public confidence in government, has, by his veto, advocated a denial of public examination through Senate hearings on Mr. Ash, his continuing interest in his former company, Litton Industries, and his attitudes toward their huge claims against the Defense Department.

The President has made a mistake which should not be compounded by sustaining his veto. Congress will serve him well by overriding the veto and getting government back out in the open.

At the time I introduced H.R. 204, Watergate was considerably less of a scandal. Top Presidential assistants had not resigned under fire. Two former Cabinet members had not been indicted.

I introduced the bill because I felt that it was Congress' constitutional right and obligation to pass on any appointee to such a high office, particularly if its Director was to be endowed with the authority to abbreviate, modify, or even terminate programs which Congress had approved and directed.

The second part of section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution of the United States, dealing with the Presidency, reads:

> He (the President) shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law; but the Congress may by law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

Part 3 of section 2, article 2 of the Constitution provides for the President to fill vacancies during a recess of the Senate.

It is clear that the Constitution expects Congress to examine and approve the appointment of the major Officers of the Government and that has been the practice throughout our history. It is a responsibility of Congress—not just one of its powers—to advise and consent on the appointments of major Government officials.

Congress did not require confirmation of the Director back when the Budget Bureau was first established because it was assured that this was only going to be a bookkeeping agency which would, in addition, prescribe efficient bookkeeping and office management practices but would have absolutely nothing to do with policymaking.

Congress was then warned that the Bureau might one day come between Cabinet members and the President, arrogating policymaking powers, but this was denied.

As we all know, the Office of Management and Budget has done exactly what was predicted. Even Cabinet members must go to it to get funds to carry out congressional directives. It has become the agency which impounds moneys, abbreviates and terminates long-established Government programs, even telling members of Congress at times what policy is going to be.

I have a rather typical letter from OMB Director Caspar Weinberger, laying out Government policy to me without any ifs, ands or buts. I had written Mr. Weinberger about release of water and sewer grant funds for one of my cities.

Mr. Weinberger's letter back advised me:

> The provision of water and sewer services has always been regarded as strictly local government responsibility—just like fire protection. In fact, prior to 1966, localities provided these facilities entirely on their own, as a matter of course.

He also advised me:

> The water and sewer program has been terminated, effective January 5, 1973, and no further commitments will be made by HUD.

Thus spake Caspar Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in January 1973, pronouncing policy and telling a Member of Congress what would and what would not be done by the Government. He did not say the President had ordered the water and sewer program terminated. He wrote as

Director of the Office of Management and Budget, telling a Member of Congress what Government policy was.

I wrote back and inquired of Mr. Roy Ash, who succeeded Weinberger on February 2:

> Am I to interpret from this very positively phrased letter that Congress has nothing to say about this?

Mr. Ash was somewhat less high and mighty about the subject in his reply, and it might develop in Senate hearings that he has a better grasp of the basis and extent of his power and authorities than Mr. Weinberger appeared to have.

Certainly that should be determined.

In all events, it is apparent that the President has delegated a high degree of policymaking to the Director of OMB, just as Presidential powers are delegated to Cabinet members, and the Director obviously should be confirmed as the Constitution intends.

It is hard for me to conceive of any Member of either the House or Senate voting against conducting public business out in the open at any time.

It is far less conceivable that any Member would cast such a vote during this crisis of confidence in Government to protect a man whose qualifications, rightly, or wrongly, have been questioned.

A vote to sustain President Nixon's veto will be another waiver of the responsibility of Congress to assure the open conduct of public business and prevent cover-up at a moment when the very worst aspects of cover-up dominate our people's minds.

It will be a vote against Congress accepting its responsibilities even in a crisis period.

Our form of government is on trial.

Are we going to make the checks and balances work or let the Executive, in the face of the worst scandal in our history, exercise completely unchecked power.

THE UNITED STATES IN SPACE—INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, in a few days Congress will be asked to consider the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1974. The information I am presenting today represents the fourth article in a series of six which will discuss the United States in space. It is my sincere hope this background I am providing will offer my colleagues a fuller understanding of this country's commitment to space—a commitment leading to a better tomorrow.

Today I want to talk about the field of international achievements and international cooperation—two areas in which our space program has had a highly beneficial impact.

I believe most of my colleagues are aware that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's international activities are based on the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 which provides that U.S. space activities be conducted so that they contribute materially to cooperation with other nations and groups of nations. NASA's record over the past 15 years in meeting this objective has been nothing less than spectacular.

NASA has entered into more than 500 agreements for international space projects; orbited foreign satellites; flown foreign experiments on its spacecraft; participated in more than 800 cooperative scientific rocket soundings from sites in all quarters of the world; and involved more than 340 experimenters from 20 foreign nations in the analysis of lunar surface samples.

One way to convey an impression of the variety and substance of NASA's international space activities is to briefly review their place in the agency's program during the last calendar year. Of the 19 spacecraft NASA put into orbit in 1972, all but three had some significant international aspect and only one lacked any international envolvement. The missions of these satellites ranged from purely scientific to purely commercial.

Aeros, for example, was a German-contributed satellite designed to investigate the sun's influence on the upper atmosphere.

Telsat–A, a Canadian domestic communications satellite, is an example of a purely commercial satellite launched last year.

As a specific outgrowth of international space cooperation, consider the following activities. Today data from U.S. weather satellites is provided daily to 70 countries around the world. In another field, major satellite ground stations in a dozen countries have participated in the experimental testing of communication satellites. Earlier work in this area was the forerunner to our present 83 nation Intelsat commercial communication satellite network. And, just as significantly, foreign nationals participate extensively in the operation of NASA's overseas tracking and data acquisition facilities.

In terms of NASA's second major field of endeavor, aeronautics, cooperative aeronautic projects have been carried out with the Canadian, German, and British agencies. This work has contributed importantly to the development and testing of a variety of new and advanced V/STOL aircraft.

From this brief highlight we can appreciate the number and diversity of international projects and agreements to which NASA has been a party. But I also wish to make abundantly clear the benefits both the United States and our cooperating partners have derived from these international efforts.

The results of this work can be evaluated and measured in a number of ways. To me, one of the most exciting aspects of our international programs is that of the cost savings.

Telsat–A which I mentioned earlier was one of six satellites launched by NASA for international organizations or foreign governments on a reimbursable basis.

In these cases NASA launches the spacecraft into orbit for a fee covering our costs and overhead. The majority of the launchings in 1972, however, involved international participation on a fully cooperative basis; that is, with no reimbursement by either side to the other.

Germany's Aeros satellite, launched last December, is an excellent example of this type of cooperation.

Aeros was proposed, designed, built, and instrumented by Germany at its own expense. In consideration of the satellite's contribution to our program objectives, NASA contributed the launch vehicle. Thus, we received a cost-free satellite—valued at about $30 million—and Germany received a cost-free launch—valued at $4 million.

Nimbus E, OAO–3, and Pioneer 10 are just three of the many satellites launched last year on which experiments designed by other nations were flown by us with no reimbursement from either side.

In the Nimbus case, for example, an instrument was contributed by Great Britain which makes it possible to collect temperature profiles down through the atmosphere on a global basis. The instrument represents an extremely important advance in weather research and yet it was contributed by the British at no cost to us.

Cooperation of a different sort is provided by Brazil, India, and Norway. These countries are responsible for the extensive range support required for sounding rocket projects.

Naturally there are also profound scientific benefits in this field of international cooperation. Over the past few years, NASA has witnessed an amazing increase in the mission sophistication of foreign countries requesting "payload space" on NASA experimental flights.

This is a direct result of the foreign experimenters being required to compete with one another in flying their instruments on NASA satellites. Furthermore, we are now seeing an era in which the foreign experiments flown are providing wholly new data.

When other countries first joined with NASA to gain launch support, many of the missions were duplicative or of questionable value. More and more, however, experiments such as being flown on the German Aeros satellite or on the three European Space Research Organization—ESRO—scientific satellites which we launched last year represent real advances in scientific experimentation.

A very recent example of this Nation's international space cooperation program is the work of the foreign scientific and technical community under NASA's post-Apollo project—the space shuttle.

First, NASA undertook a major international indoctrination program to determine the interest of countries around the world in participating with NASA in this project. The countries of Western Europe, as well as Canada, Japan, and Australia thus became prime participants in NASA's management reviews to gain the planning information necessary for a decision on committing funds.

As it now stands, a number of ESRO member states have indicated their intentions of financing the development of the space shuttle's sortie laboratory module, or spacelab as the Europeans call it.

It has been estimated that the sortie

module will cost between $250 and $300 million, to be funded by the participating ESRO states in return for flight space aboard the shuttle and for other considerations.

European participation in the shuttle program will have a major economic impact on both the European and the U.S. space programs. The sortie module will be developed at no cost to us, and Europe, with ready access to a launching system, may be able to defer its costly launcher development program.

It is also significant to comment upon the particular fields of space study which have been chosen by our international partners.

Similar to the emphasis we have seen by NASA in applications programs, much of the international activity has also been focused on this area. As I discussed in a previous article, one of the most far-reaching application ventures is with India.

In 1974, NASA will make available the ATS–F experimental satellite to India to conduct an experiment in instructional TV broadcasting to some 5,000 remote Indian villages. Moreover, through our earlier work with this nation, India will assume total responsibility for the construction of ground transmitters, the design and production of augmented TV receivers, the planning of instructional programs, and the complete logistics required to implement and support all elements of the system.

I have also previously discussed NASA's first earth resources technology satellite—ERTS–1—but that discussion largely ignored the satellite's vast international implications.

As I see them, the international implications are twofold:

First, the satellite's mission is to gather experimental data which may lead to a system for managing the world's resources on a global scale.

Second, 105 of the 320 experiments onboard ERTS were contributed by scientists from 36 nations.

I am very pleased and encouraged both by the early reports of ERTS's success and by the large number of foreign nations participating in the project.

More than any other space project, ERTS has given me confidence that NASA will achieve its goal to make space a place where men of all nations can work together to improve conditions here on earth.

And what is most important about ERTS is that it is gathering data to help solve some of the world's most pressing problems. Among other things, ERTS's sensors are identifying land areas most appropriate for agricultural development, geological formations indicative of mineral and oil deposits, diseased crops and forests, and sources of air and water pollution.

ERTS's sensors know no national boundries; the technology is available to any nation that wants to use it.

In still other applications areas, NASA is presently reviewing a proposal to launch a French synchronous meteorological satellite as a joint contribution to the international global research program.

Perhaps of more immediate interest is work being done by NASA in bringing together the world's major commercial air carriers to consider implementation of a global air traffic control and navigational satellite system.

Establishment of such a system will not only bring greater economies in operation to the carriers, but offer the elements of greater safety and convenience to the individual air traveler.

Finally, one of the major contributions to international peace and understanding is the United States-Soviet Apollo-Soyuz test project—ASTP—to take place in mid-1975.

ASTP will test the rendezvous and crew transfer capabilities of the United States and Soviet manned spacecraft, but the real meaning of the project goes far beyond the mission objectives. Besides helping to relax East-West political tensions, a successful mission will pave the way to future joint activities which should help both countries gain more in space than they would from separate programs.

ASTP has its origins in the long standing NASA effort to engage the Soviets in a meaningful discussion of the possibilities for cooperative space projects.

ASTP is the most important project agreed upon, but a number of other agreements have been reached which have helped establish a good working relationship and have saved both countries a considerable amount of duplicative effort.

For instance, we have exchanged detailed physiological data from the Soyuz-Salyut and Apollo programs, as well as data from the 1971 United States and Soviet missions to Mars. We have also exchanged lunar samples and continue to work on a common system of lunar coordinates.

In the area of space applications, we have exchanged meteorological data from meridional sounding rocket networks in the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, and have conducted a joint program of microwave measurement of surface phenomena in the Bering Sea.

In summary, when the United States investigated the possibility of space agreements with the Soviet Union in the early 1960's the effort produced only a modest exchange of weather pictures.

With Russia demonstrating an increasingly impressive capability in space and building confidence in her program, the hope is greater than ever that fruitful cooperative efforts between the Soviet Union and this country will continue.

It is vitally important for this Congress to recognize that NASA has established, through its international programs of the sixties a broad base of institutions, facilities, competence, and patterns of cooperation from which it can move forward in the future. NASA is engaged in major new efforts to increase international cooperation in the seventies by extending its activities with the other nations of the world, to include participation in the development and use of the space shuttle and in the experimental development of new applications of space technology.

The NASA objective is also to bring about a greater sharing of both the costs and the benefits of the exploration and utilization of space and to seek new paths of cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Progress as in all matters involving international agreement, will take time, but the next few years should see major advances in international space cooperation far beyond the substantial achievements of the 1960's.

Perhaps through such cooperation and collaboration, a greater common understanding can be achieved that will enable us to solve pressing political, as well as technological, problems.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 20 marked the 71st anniversary of the Republic of Cuba's independence. I believe that it is appropriate that we take this time today to commemorate that historic achievement of the Cuban people and to express our hope that soon they will again be a free and independent nation.

Cuba's first independence day, May 20, 1902, must have been a joyous occasion indeed for it marked the end of a decade of a long protracted and often bloody struggle for freedom. The fact that the effort eventually succeeded in the face of strong Spanish opposition was a credit not just to such brilliant patriotic leaders of the revolution as Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo and Jose Marti but above all to the Cuban people themselves whose perseverance in the cause of freedom was a source of inspiration to many in this country and around the world. For our part, we in the United States can be justly proud of the support we gave to the Cuban people in their hour of need.

Today our celebration of Cuba's independence is muted by the realization that the lamp of liberty no longer burns on the island. It has been snuffed out by Fidel Castro. a leader who came in the name of freedom and justice, but who betrayed those ideals and his nation's heritage once he assumed power. But while our commemoration is a quiet one it is not a hopeless one for the very qualities of dedication to democratic ideals and of perseverance in the face of overwhelming obstacles which produced the first Cuban independence day give us hope that eventually liberty will again become the birthright of every Cuban.

In recent months there has been increasing discussion of the need for a review of this country's policy toward Cuba. While I respect those whose views differ from my own, I want to take this opportunity to reiterate my own opposition to any basic change in our policy toward Cuba at this time. Fidel Castro continues to support subversion in this hemisphere not just with rhetoric but with deeds. He continues to pursue an unremitting policy of hostility toward the United States, a policy often characterized by crude vilification of this country and its leaders. In short, Castro seems to have absolutely no desire whatsoever for better

relations with the United States but chooses instead to ever more closely ally himself with the Soviet Union without regard to the long term implications of Cuba's growing dependence on a nation alien in tradition to Cuba and without any long term need to support such a distant and costly client.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not support any basic change in our Cuban policy, I do not believe that our policy must remain static in the face of unrelenting hostility from Cuba. The world changes and, in so far as possible, the United States and Cuba must continue to adjust to it in our limited relations with one another. In the past, for example, I supported the agreement with Cuba that, until recently, allowed tens of thousands of Cuban refugees to come to the United States and I supported the recent agreement to deter aircraft hijackings. Today I would like to propose that the United States and Cuba explore one further modification in our relations to allow visits by Cubans living in the United States to their families and friends in Cuba and, if agreeable to Cuba, to allow similar visits to the United States. As part of such discussions, the United States might also consider modifying its policy toward attendance by Cuban representatives at technical conferences in the United States, particularly in areas of humanitarian concern such as medicine.

Relations between governments must be based on each nation's perception of how its own interests will best be served. Often such perceptions lead to policies of mutual hostility and frigidity but there is no reason why such national policies must impinge with unnecessary harshness and cruelty on the individual ties of blood and affection which are at the heart of the human experience. East and West Germany have been able to allow Berliners to renew their familial ties and I believe that the United States should initiate steps to allow its Cuban residents to continue on a personal basis their family relationships.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not optimistic that Cuba will soon rejoin the ranks of the free nations of this hemisphere, the recollection of the 1902 triumph of human dignity and liberty in Cuba gives us all hope that in the not too distant future we in this Chamber will be able to pause some May 20 and extend greetings to the citizens of a free and truly independent Cuban nation.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman and join with him in his statement commemorating the 71st anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of sadness and irony that we take this time today to commemorate the 71st anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cuba. It is the thousands of refugees living in this country who can truly celebrate this independence day, while with great sadness 8.2 million countrymen must remain behind, in truth captives in their own land.

And it is with a sense of irony that we commemorate the independence of a once proud country, which is now ruled at the whim of the strictest of dictators, and which has become economically and politically dependent on the most aggressive and powerful of totalitarian systems, the Soviet Union.

But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the proud spirit which enabled the achievement of independent rule in Cuba after decades of struggle, and which pervaded 50 years of independence before Castro, is still very much alive in the hearts of millions of Cubans. It is this spirit of fierce independence which drives the victims of Castro's rule to take to tiny boats and rafts in the middle of the night on the perilous 90-mile journey across the Straits of Florida. And I would suggest to anyone skeptical of this spirit that they visit Key West, and examine the frail crafts which have served as these people's vehicles to freedom.

As we take this time today to stop and mark the anniversary of Cuba's independence, I look forward to the day when this spirit of independence and pride as a people will once again prevail in a free and prosperous Cuba.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for his remarks and for joining in this commemoration of Cuban Independence Day. The gentleman has long been a close and knowledgeable friend of the Cuban people and he has always been in the forefront of those in the Congress kowledgeable about Cuba in particular and Latin American affairs in general. I think it is fair to say that both of us from Florida are very close to the matter not only because of geography but also because of the tremendous influx of Latins, Cubans and others, who have become such an important part of our communities.

Mr. ROGERS. I concur with the gentleman from Florida. They certainly have been hard-working and industrious people and have made a real contribution.

I want to say also that the gentleman has exerted leadership in this area and in this particular work in the Foreign Affairs Committee. I think it has been a real credit to the House to have someone of the gentleman's caliber to help us formulate policies and help bring about the independence of Cuba. I join the gentleman in his comments and associate myself with his work.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The two gentlemen from Florida who have been discussing this matter are recognized as the two leading experts in this Congress in the matter of Cuban independence and Cuba. We, in Louisiana, have also felt and have seen in many areas of our every day industrial and commercial life the contributions these people have made who have come, usually by way of Florida, into Louisiana. The contributions they have made have been helpful to our economy and to our culture in Louisiana.

I am not nearly as knowledgeable on this subject as the two gentlemen from Florida, and I wonder if they could give us the benefit of their thinking about what the situation really does look like now. Do we see a movement getting started or do we see perhaps a little movement of the leadership and present administration in Cuba toward a closer relationship with the United States?

Mr. FASCELL. I will tell the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana I appreciate his asking the question at this time. It is an important and valid one. As far as we can detect, both from our own information and from what is coming to us by radio and press from Cuba itself, there is absolutely no disposition on the part of the present administration of Cuba and its leaders at this time to do anything with respect to a change in posture toward the United States. This seems especially true as far as the very important substantive matter of Cuba's support for subversion in the hemisphere. That is at the root of the problem.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield further, those of us who follow this on a peripheral basis rather than a day to day basis, as the man in the well, the gentleman from Florida and the other gentleman from Florida do, I think have noticed two things that perhaps would lead us to believe some progress is being made in this regard. One is I have seen recently in national publications articles that were favorable toward the economic progress that Cuba is making and the economic plight of individual Cubans as distinguished from what their situation was prior to the present regime taking over, which sort of surprised me.

The second is the fact that the willingness of the Cuban administration, the Cuban Government, to at least discuss, perhaps through a third party, but discuss with the United States the matter of air hijacking and the returning of hijackers. Will the gentleman be good enough to comment upon these?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, let me take hijacking first. I would have to agree with the gentleman from Louisiana that those of us who are all involved and concerned about hijacking as such and other terrorism around the world, welcome that agreement with Cuba. It is a clear example of how two adversaries or two governments hostile to each other on a whole range of subjects, can find agreement because it is in their mutual national interests to do something about a subject such as hijacking.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that is definitely a plus. It is in that same vein, for example, that I suggest we might go on and continue in a humanitarian way by allowing families to visit each other because of the heartlessness that is involved there. I think it is a matter which we ought to reconsider.

Mr. Speaker, on the other subject, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana that there is considerable dispute about the economic benefits which have resulted from the totalitarian political system in Cuba. The best judgment I can make after reading the contrasting views on

this subject, and trying to be as objective as possible, is that economically the Cuban political system has been an outright failure.

They have achieved some of their objectives in the sense that they have run gringo, or North American, investment and political and economic power out of the island. If that is a plus, they have been successful. The only thing is that they have done it at the price of imposing upon themselves another totalitarian system, namely, the Russian system and substituted for their ties with the United States an even heavier reliance on the Soviet Union.

As far as individual benefits for the campesino are concerned, that is the clear test. I doubt that this man is really any better off except in rhetoric and some ideology. He is still standing in line and not getting the benefits. He still does not get what he has to have for a day's work.

Besides that, Mr. Speaker, all of his freedoms have been curtailed. He has a block leader in every block who reports on every single family. It is a horrible price to pay, and I doubt if the economic benefit is anywhere near worth paying that kind of price.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Florida and our other colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cuba. Cuba's independence was not achieved without tremendous struggle, enormous sacrifices, and extreme dedication to the principle of freedom.

The United States was deeply involved in the Cuban quest for independence, and it is fitting that we in the House today recall this great event in history. After the Spanish-American War, the United States took on the responsibility for helping to rebuild a land and people ravaged by war. At that time the fields were without crops; the houses and buildings were in ruin; the courts and local police were not functioning; and bandits ran wild. The army, tired from war, was ragged and disorganized, and not able to take control.

Our country furnished food and clothing to thousands of men, women, and children. We helped reorganize the government. We helped cultivate the fields. We helped build new roads, bridges, houses, hospitals, and schools. We helped restore order. We did these things because we knew that freedom in any country is a delicate thing to protect, but should have a chance to grow.

On this anniversary of Cuban independence, we in the House and in the country must take the time to remember those brave patriots of Cuba who fought so gallantly for freedom. It is our hope that the people of Cuba will again enjoy that freedom which we all cherish and I have faith that her people can and will endure until that time.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, once again, what should be a day of rejoicing in the free world—Cuban Independence Day—is quite the contrary.

Again, the recognition of this day is clouded with the realization that Cuba is no longer the free land it became 71 years ago.

Instead, we find that the island country which gained its independence on May 20, 1902, is laboring under a dictator, its government is Communist, and the life of its people is anything but free.

Instead of the free and prospering country it was established to be, our neighbor 90 miles away is a satellite of the Communist world.

The situation is even more depressing when we remember how bravely these people fought for their independence in a revolution led by Jose Marti, the apostle of Cuban independence.

Marti, as is typical of the Cuban community desperately desired a life with freedom of choice, but his efforts to attain that freedom resulted in imprisonment and exile.

During his exile Marti studied law and endeavored to educate others about the oppression in his beloved Cuba.

Marti returned to Cuba a short time later but was once again banished for his outspoken criticism of oppression on the island.

This time Marti went to America where he taught in a private school and worked as a bookkeeper, secretary, and as a translator for a pubilshing house.

Marti returned once again to Cuba a few years later and in 1892 founded the Cuban Revolutionary Party and drafted a constitution for the Cuban republic.

His efforts paid off after the revolution of 1895 and in 1902 Marti and his followers finally won the independence for which they had so bravely fought.

The spirit of Jose Marti is still very much alive in Cuba and the United States.

But today, unlike 1895, there is no room for another Marti although the oppression which exists today is perhaps worse than it was in 1895.

The family unit has been destroyed and the Communist dictator allows no dissent.

The Cuban people can only hope and pray that there is a brighter future ahead.

Our industrious neighbors are, indeed, trapped in a web of communism and oppression which has destroyed their country's economic growth and stability and halted the efforts of Cubans to decide for themselves through free and open elections what kind of government will serve them.

In the face of such a depressing situation we must remember, however, that Cuba's past is a glorious one, its people an industrious people and we must continue to look forward to the day when Cuba will be freed and the country returned to its place as an independent nation of the free world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for arranging this special order in observance of the historic achievement of independence by the people of Cuba.

We can all be proud that the United States participated in the Cuban struggle for independence from the tyranny of Spanish colonial rule. From the very beginning of our history as a democratic nation we have recognized a special affinity for Cuba and the Cuban people. We have had this identity since the early days when our leaders saw the strategic importance of Cuba and proposed annexation to the present time when we still appreciate the island's strategic importance but acknowledge the right of the Cuban people to full self determination.

Regrettably that right of self-determination has been aborted by the imposition of another alien tyranny and we cannot be at ease in this hemisphere until Castro's Communist regime and his Soviet mentors have been driven from Cuba.

I have repeatedly pointed out here the developing Soviet military and naval presence in and around the island of Cuba. I have also called repeatedly for a strong assertion by the Congress and by our Government of our support for the reestablishment in Cuba of a democratic regime reflecting the aspirations of the freedom-loving people of that lovely island.

I am vigorously opposed to suggestions that we "normalize" relations with the present regime in Cuba. While I realize that we may be required to deal with that regime on occasion—as we have done in connection with the Cuban airlift and in the recently negotiated agreement on hijacking—I feel we should be vigilant in avoiding any action or agreement which would imply recognition or acceptance of this antidemocratic regime in Cuba.

I have been especially concerned that the antihijacking agreement not be interpreted as a first step toward recognition of the Castro regime and that it not be taken as a repudiation of the support we have given in the past to the aspirations of Cuban patriots for eventual liberation of their homeland.

It would be highly improper, I feel, to consider the flight of freedom-loving Cubans from their martyred island in the same light as the criminal hijacking of an airplane in the United States. We should not label everyone who seizes a vessel or aircraft as a common criminal, while the Castro regime continues to suppress normal freedom of movement, including the right to emigrate or seek exile.

I also will strongly oppose any interpretation of the antihijacking agreement which would seek to ban the anti-Castro activities of Cuban exiles. It is not a common criminal conspiracy to join with other patriots to seek to free one's country from an alien tyranny, and we should not equate legitimate exile activity with the kind of criminal conspiracy which results in a hijacking.

I believe the people of Cuba will once again know the joy and sweetness of freedom and true national independence. I hope this celebration of Cuban Independence Day will rekindle the patriotic fires and fervor of all those who love Cuba and bring a restoration of freedom and liberty to this gem of the Caribbean.

Let us hope and pray that the time is not far distant when all the hopes and dreams of freedom-loving people will be realized.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AN END TO FARM SUBSIDIES

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

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, during fiscal year 1972 the Federal Government paid more than $4 billion in price supports and farm subsidies. Ironically, the small, struggling farmers are not receiving much of these payments. Instead, the rich corporate farms are getting richer and the price of food continues to rise.

Although originally intended to help the small farmer, farm subsidy programs are based on production rather than income. Therefore, the more a farm produces, the larger the subsidy it receives. As a result, the bulk of the subsidies go to the farmers with the highest income. This amounts to welfare for the wealthy.

It takes a lot of imagination to classify some of the 1972 recipients as farmers. Huge subsidies were doled out to State prison farms, a bowling alley, a railroad, colleges and universities, a State mental hospital, and large national corporations.

While the Federal Government was paying more than $4 billion for these programs last year, the American consumer was paying another $4.5 billion in higher food prices. Estimates show that "farm prices in recent years would have been as much as 15 percent lower had these programs not been in existence."

Abuses are widespread, and the programs are wasteful, expensive, and inflationary. This abuse to the taxpayer and consumer must end. Therefore, I am today introducing legislation to eliminate the farm subsidy program, and I urge its swift enactment.

ELIMINATING A DOUBLE SUBSIDY

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, the Congress passed section 235 of the National Housing Act. This section authorized the Federal Government to subsidize the interest payments on homes purchased by low-income families. The Government, under the program, can subsidize interest down to 1 percent depending upon the income of the recipient. This subsidy payment is made by HUD directly to the lender.

The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that even though the interest payments on 235 homes are being paid by the Federal Government, the taxpayer—235 homeowners—has the right to take the interest payments, including the portion paid by the Government, as a deduction on his Federal income tax. The net effect of this ruling has been to give this homeowner a double subsidy.

I am today introducing legislation which would prohibit the taxpayer who lives in a 235 home to take the portion of his interest payments made by the Government as a deduction on his Federal income tax.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I can state that when the committee reported this bill to the House floor it never was envisioned that this type of deduction would ever be allowed. In fact, an amendment similar to the bill adopted to the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972. At that time, the Committee reaffirmed its position that interest payments paid by the Government should not be used as a deduction on the taxpayer's income tax.

I believe that my bill will correct this misinterpretation of congressional intent by the Internal Revenue Service and urge its early enactment.

THE MEANING OF WATERGATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1973, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Marian College, Indianapolis, Ind.

The degree was awarded in recognition of Congressman BRADEMAS' outstanding leadership in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman BRADEMAS, who serves as chief deputy majority whip of the House, also delivered the commencement address on this occasion and I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of his thoughtful analysis on "The Meaning of Watergate":

THE MEANING OF WATERGATE—THE MOST SCANDALOUS PATTERN OF CORRUPTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

What the Watergate is coming to mean is the most scandalous pattern of corruption in American history.

The revelations of recent days have touched two attorneys general, one just indicted, an acting director of the FBI, the two top ranking members of the White House staff, a former cabinet officer, also just indicted, numerous subcabinet officials, and a high former official of the CIA, now Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps.

And according to the Gallup Poll, fifty percent of the American people believe President Nixon himself participated in a coverup of Watergate.

Now the meaning of Watergate is not so much the corruption of money in politics—bribes and payoffs—although there appears to be some evidence of them as well.

What Watergate means is that the closest associates and supporters of President Nixon resorted to spies and the apparatus of espionage in a campaign for the highest office of the land. They violated the law in handling millions of dollars for the Nixon Reelection Committee . . . And high officials of an Administration that promised the nation "law and order" committed crimes and broke laws in the effort to reelect the President.

So Watergate means something brand new in American political history, something never before seen: a calculated attempt, involving the White House itself, to undermine the legitimate processes of our constitutional system of government.

This is no partisan matter. Senators Goldwater of Arizona and Percy of Illinois have led Republicans in Congress in condemning the tactics of Watergate. They have insisted, rightly, that a special prosecutor, totally independent of the Nixon Administration, be named to direct a full investigation of the Watergate affair.

And Democrats can take no partisan joy in what has happened. For by what President Nixon's closest associates have done, the Presidency has been demeaned, the nation's security weakened and the profession of politics stained.

It will not be easy to bind up the wounds those responsible for Watergate have inflicted on our country. But the process of healing cannot even begin until the American people have all the facts, know all the truth, about this grave assault on the free political institutions of our land.

But while the inquiry into the facts goes ahead—through Senator Ervin's Select Committee hearings and grand jury proceedings, I believe we all ought to take some lessons from Watergate.

For Watergate should drive us back to a consideration of first principles about our nation and especially about our system of government. Watergate compels us to ask the question: What is the purpose of politics in a free society?

For those engaged in or associated with the events taken collectively under the symbol of Watergate, the purpose of politics is clear. It is to win and retain power, by any means, and the question of the principles on the basis of which the power once gained is to be used are at best secondary and at worst nonexistent.

And I believe it is this almost total lack of any moral or ethical convictions about the purpose to which the awesome power of the government of the United States should be put that explains why the persons associated with Watergate—and this means the highest officials in our land—did what they did.

Having no commitment other than the retention of power, they felt few inhibitions on how they used power.

In short, they had no sense of the moral basis of politics in a free society.

For there is a central purpose to politics and that purpose, in my view, is the pursuit of justice.

Now in my view, it is justice that is the link between the practice of politics in a democracy and the law of love which is the essence of the Christian faith.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY

Because we meet today in a time of crisis for our country and its institutions and because we meet as members of a Christian community, I think it appropriate that I talk to you today about the relationship between the Christian faith aid political responsibility.

Most of us can give at least tacit assent to the proposition that every citizen in a democracy has some obligation to participate in politics.

But why should we as Christians be concerned about politics? Is there a religious responsibility incumbent upon Christians for action in the political world?

Some say no, that the Christian as an individual and the Christian church as an institution must stand aside from the hurly-burly of politics. Separation of church and state, they argue, is the same as separation of politics and religion.

I strongly disagree with this contention. Moreover, I often find it a thinly disguised argument for maintaining the status quo. I am profoundly afraid of preachers who never preach on anything but how to find personal happiness.

The theme of the great World Conference of Christian Youth in Oslo some years ago was "Jesus Christ: Lord of All Life". This means that our religious faith must touch every dimension of man's existence—social, economic and political as well as private and individual.

If this is true, we must then have a specifically Christian perspective on responsibility for action in the political order. Surely one of the reasons Christians have such a difficult time coming to grips with politics is that they lack a perspective which is intellectually honest, theologically consistent, and realistic in the world.

Some Christians suggest—in a kind of sentimental, utopian way—that if only all men were to become Christians, we would be able to resolve the many social and political problems that afflict mankind. But even if we were all Christians, there would still be Republicans and Democrats, business and labor, black and white. We still would have problems, for there still would be conflicts of geography, of interest, of viewpoints.

The core of the dilemma, as I view it, is that many Christians do not understand how they can relate the law of love to the world of politics.

On the one hand, they see Christian love, *agape*, represented by Christ on the cross—utterly self-sacrificing, self-giving, other-regarding love. On the other hand, they see the calculating world of politics, where "accommodation", "negotiation" and "compromise" are the words we characteristically use to describe what happens, for example, in a Congress composed of 435 Representatives and 100 Senators, working with or against one President—not to mention the other participants in the governmental process. And these, of course, are exactly the words we ought to use if we want to get something done.

But many Christians view these seemingly irreconcilable realms of religion and politics—of the selfless Christ on the cross and the horse-trading Congressman—and conclude that there can be no link, that the two worlds can have nothing to do with each other.

Arthur E. Walmsley, an Episcopal Church leader, has written that Christians, aware of the extraoordinary complexity of the modern age, look with nostalgia to a simpler era when men and women made most of their important decisions face to face, and felt a sense of personal choice and personal accountability.

But we live in a time when men's lives are determined in large measure by corporations, by government, by unions, rather than by their next door neighbors or the family who lives down the road a piece.

What, then, has the law of love—of utterly un-self-regarding love—to say to such a world, to a President or a Congressman?

Does it say to withdraw? Does it say we must reject making decisions about the use of power in such a world? My answer is "No". My answer is that there is a link between the law of love and the practice of politics, a concept. which relates the two.

THE CONCEPT OF JUSTICE

And thus we come round to the idea of justice, as I earlier suggested.

The concept of justice varies in human history, but at the very least justice means guaranteeing to every person his due, assuring that he gets what is coming to him—what he is entitled to as a human being.

Justice, of course, is not the same as love. Love does not count or reckon, but justice does. Justice must be calculating. It is not love, therefore, but justice that should be the immediate objective of political action.

For the very stuff of politics is the balance of rights and responsibilities of competing groups.

As Walmsley says: "Justice . . . is not a crude approximation of love but the means by which the Christian cooperates with the will of God precisely in the midst of life."

As the theologian Reinhold Niebuhr put it, "Justice is the instrument of love."

And as the late Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, said "Associations cannot love one another; a trade union cannot love an employers' federation, nor can one national state love another. The members of one may love the members of the other so far as opportunities of intercourse allow. That will help in negotiations; but it will not solve the problems of the relationships between the two groups. Consequently, the relevance of Christianity in these spheres is quite different from what many Christians suppose it to be. Christian charity manifests itself in the temporal order as a supernatural discernment of, and adhesion to justice in relation to the equilibrium of power."

It is the conviction that Christians must seek justice in society and the world that undergirds the famous encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*, of Pope John XXIII.

It was justice that Martin Luther King had in mind when he used to say, "I'm not asking for a law to make the white man love me, just a law to restrain him from lynching me."

Is love then irrelevant to political action? No. On the contrary, it is our love for our fellow man—commanded us by Christ—that generates in us a concern that our fellow human beings be treated justly, Love is the force that motivates our commitment to justice.

So we have in the concept of justice, I believe, a link that binds together the worlds of Christian faith and political action—and does so in an intellectually honest, theologically consistent and realistic way.

THE FOUNDING FATHERS AND HUMAN NATURE

There is another reason which imposes upon Christians a religious responsibility to strive for justice among men.

It is that we tend to put ourselves, rather than God at the center of life.

This is not to say that human beings are evil, through and through, but rather that, as Niebuhr says: Men are good enough to make democracy work. Men are bad enough to make democracy necessary.

This is a skeptical, rather than a cynical, view of human nature.

And the events of Watergate—where men of arrogance pretended to play God and committed the ultimate sin of pride—must surely remind us why the Founding Fathers wrote into the fabric of our American Constitution a system of checks and balances. The Founding Fathers understood human nature; they believed in original sin.

For we do elect Members of Congress and entrust them with certain powers, but for only two years. And even Senators of the United States are required to have their credentials reviewed every six years. The President has the veto power, but he can be overridden.

Men are good enough to make democracy work but bad enough to make democracy—with all its checks and limitations on the rulers—necessary.

It is this propensity of men to injustice—to unwarranted self-seeking—that it is a chief purpose of political action to curb and channel while at the same time promoting a wider degree of justice, a fair share for all persons.

PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE ASSAULT ON CONGRESS

Yet—to return to where we are in America today—for a Constitutional structure rooted in a division of powers to function effectively, there must be a considerable degree of comity among the powers, each with respect to the other. And it is this lack of comity on the part of the President and his associates with respect particularly to Congress that has in large measure imposed such a strain on the system. I think the columnist David Broder, who last week received the Pulitzer prize for political analysis, put it well when he said, before Watergate, of President Nixon's efforts to weaken the role of Congress in our system:

"Even if the President 'wins' such a struggle, his real purposes lose. One-man government in this country is not just unconstitutional; it's impossible. The kind of policy shift the President is seeking literally cannot work without the understanding and cooperation of Congress, the bureaucracy, state and local officials and the public."

For, until the most damaging Watergate disclosures forced him to modify his stand, the President was asserting the most sweeping interpretation of executive privilege, contending that neither present nor past White House aides could be compelled to testify before Congress, nor, according to Attorney General Kleindienst, any employee at all of the Executive Branch. And it was this President, while mounting a vigorous attack on the news media, whose closest supporters were flaunting the laws on campaign contributions and engaging in political espionage.

For those who take the nation's liberties seriously, these are not matters to be taken lightly.

For the issues of political espionage, as represented by Watergate, and of apparently widespread resort to illegal campaign financing, are both daggers that drive at the heart of free government.

As one who has ten times been a candidate for Congress and who has served as an assistant in a Presidential campaign, I must tell you, in response to those who say of the resort to wiretapping of one's opponents, 'They all do it,' that they don't all do it.

President Nixon's associates and supporters have, with the panoply of their illegal and underhand activities, undermined the very existence of free political institutions.

As to the Administration's assault on the communications media, may I say that we have always had battles between politicians and the press. And may we always have them.

But so broad in scale has been the effort of the Administration to intimidate the Nation's newspapers and television stations that one may legitimately express alarm.

It was not a Democratic politician but Walter Cronkite who said, again before Watergate, "that this Administration, through what I believe to be a considered and concerted campaign, has managed to politicize the issue of the press versus the Administration."

Cronkite added, "We have now come to that dangerous state . . . with the press in a position that to defend the right of the people to know—that is, to defend freedom of speech and press—is to now somehow or other be anti-Administration."

THE REDRESS OF THE IMBALANCE OF POWER BEGINS

In the light of these actions of the Administration, and of other actions with which you are so familiar I need not repeat them here, I believe it not too much to say that had the shocking range of activities summed up in the word "Watergate" not become known, the American democracy might not have long endured. For there were other strains that were also being imposed in it by the Administration. I here cite but two: the executive impoundment of funds duly appropriated by Congress, a usurpation of legislative authority; and the aggrandizement of the warmaking power, making war without Congressional approval.

But each day's disclosures of the extent of involvement of the Administration in the ugliness of Watergate have brought a lessening of Mr. Nixon's authority to continue

this pattern and a reassertion of Congressional prerogatives. As the New York Times said yesterday, "The White House is slipping and Congress is rising as the balance of power in Washington is being altered perceptibly by the Watergate conspiracy."

Only last week, for example, the Senate passed legislation forbidding the President to impound appropriated funds.

Just last week, too, in an historic vote, the House broke with the Administration's Indo-China policy as a coalition of Republicans and Democrats told President Nixon to stop bombing Cambodia.

And a Federal district court last week ruled against the Administration's assertion of the right to impound, by directing the Environmental Protection Agency to release 6 billion dollars President Nixon had withheld for cleaning up our nation's waters.

Judge Matthew Byrnes' dismissal this week of the case against Daniel Ellsberg in the Pentagon Papers trial was based on sharp criticism of the actions of the Executive Branch of the government in resorting to wiretapping and other wrongful activities, including burglary authorized by high White House officials.

And of course the very reporting of Watergate for which the Washington Post won its Pulitzer Prize attests both to the vigor of at least a few of our newspapers, and to the crucial need for a free press in order to keep our nation free.

WATERGATE: SUMMONS TO RETURN TO THE CONSTITUTION

So Watergate is a summons to us all to return to a central idea of our Founding Fathers, a separation of powers Constitution, and to demand that those we elect to represent us obey it. For the Founding Fathers did not trust a monopoly of power. If you did not before understand why, Watergate should surely serve to tell you.

I said earlier that for the people who became involved in Watergate the purpose of politics is to obtain and retain power, period, with no sense of the purposes to which the power should be put.

Knowing that about them, we should not be surprised that these same people would pursue policies here in our own country that seem devoid of a sense of justice.

For the task of a politician is, I have argued, to seek, in the given circumstances, with all the skill and imagination he can muster, the greatest measure of justice for all concerned.

And Christians surely have a particular responsibility to seek justice for the disinherited, the weak, the vulnerable. As John C. Bennett of Union Theological Seminary once remarked, "Christ himself concentrated on the people of greatest need, the people whom respectable society neglected or despised."

Yet the present Administration in Washington has twice vetoed bills to help the handicapped, vetoed others to help the elderly and young children, sought to destroy the Federal agency charged with fighting poverty—one could go on and on.

And here my mind turns back to that first, booming chapter of the prophet Isaiah, who warned, in tones written as if for today:

"Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah.

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? Saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.

"When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts.

"Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with iniquity, even the solemn meeting.

"Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them.

"And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.

"Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil;

"Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

THE MEANING OF WATERGATE IS TWOFOLD

So the meaning, for me, of Watergate is twofold: first, that we must vigorously protect and defend, not alone in words but in deeds, the Constitution of the United States and the liberties of the American people.

For Watergate means more, much more, than men in high places breaking laws and committing crimes. It means a direct attack on the established processes of the American constitutional system.

And the second meaning of Watergate is that politics in a free society must have a purpose beyond the achievement of power—a moral purpose—and that purpose is justice.

Now I have said that Christians have a religious responsibility, motivated by love, to seek justice for their fellow men. I conclude therefore that if the Church of Christ is to say anything to men and women today, it must speak to them not only in their individual and family capacities but also to the social, economic and political dimensions of their lives.

And this means that Christians must be concerned about the political life of their country.

Watergate, a name, to paraphrase President Franklin D. Roosevelt after Pearl Harbor, that will live in infamy, should compel all Americans, Christians and non-Christians alike, to rededicate themselves to the task of building a truly free and just society.

And as I close these remarks to you today, I think of the words with which, on January 9, 1961, the then President-elect of the United States addressed the legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, shortly before his inauguration.

Said President-elect John F. Kennedy:

". . . I have been guided by the standard of John Winthrop set before his shipmates on the Flagship Arabella 331 years ago, as they, too, faced the task of building a new government on a perilous frontier.

" 'We must always consider,' he said, 'that we shall be as a city upon a hill—the eyes of all people are truly upon us.'

"Today the eyes of all people are truly upon us—and our governments, in every branch, at every level, national, state and local, must be as a city upon a hill—constructed and inhabited by men aware of their great trust and their great responsibilities."

Let us now all resolve to build our nation as a city upon a hill.

THE CONDUCT OF THE PRESIDENT

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, yesterday's New York Times carried an advertisement suggesting that President Nixon should demand impeachment if he really wants to be cleared of any suspicion of wrongdoing in office. The item quite properly points out that—

A bill of impeachment is not a verdict. It is a proceeding for bringing a public official before the proper tribunal in order to question his conduct in public office. It does not mean dismissal from office.

The sponsoring committee, the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Government, suggests that an investigation into Mr. Nixon's conduct in office should consider not only the Watergate scandal, but also Presidential behavior with respect to "Executive privilege," U.S. military activity in and over Cambodia, impounding of duly appropriated funds, and the Ellsberg-Russo case.

The advertisement constitutes a reasoned and thoughtful statement of the situation and a possible avenue of action, and I include its full text at the conclusion of my remarks:

IF PRESIDENT NIXON WANTS TO BE CLEARED, HE SHOULD DEMAND IMPEACHMENT

It has been claimed by some that impeachment of a President is an attack on the Presidency, and on our institutions.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Impeachment is a remedy expressly provided for in the Constitution, thanks to the wisdom of our Founding Fathers.

It has been said that if the Watergate Scandal had occurred in England, France, Italy, or under any other parliamentary government, that government would have changed hands immediately, before any indictments could be handed down.

Our system is more resilient.

It provides that if a President is suspected of wrongdoing, the House of Representatives can investigate whether there seems to be any truth to the charges.

That is called impeachment.

A bill of impeachment is not a verdict. It is a proceeding for bringing a public official before the proper tribunal in order to question his conduct in public office. It does not mean dismissal from office. That would follow if misconduct is proved.

If President Nixon is not completely cleared of implication in the Watergate Scandal, his administration will be irreparably damaged for the next three and a half years of his remaining term.

The Republican Party, and therefore our two-party system, will be seriously hurt.

And our national honor will be under a cloud.

President Nixon can clear himself, his party, and his country by demanding a full investigation from the House of Representatives.

In a word, impeachment.

What questions would be examined in this impeachment proceeding?

1. Did President Nixon have anything to do with the 1972 election frauds or the crimes committed at the Watergate, or their cover-up? (Senator Goldwater said that if Mr. Nixon had been "dishonest about this, then I think the impeachment would certainly come.")

2. Is President Nixon's position on "executive privilege" an abuse of Presidential power? (Richard Kleindienst, President Nixon's former Attorney General, stated: 'If the Congress doesn't agree with the President on executive privilege, it can impeach him.")

3. Is President Nixon impeachable for waging a war in Cambodia without congressional authority? (The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has stated that Congress has a duty to consider whether the President should be impeached for waging an illegal war.)

4. Has the President committed an abuse of Presidential power by impounding funds voted by the Congress? (Recent court decisions have held that the President lacks the Constitutional authority to so act.)

5. Has President Nixon improperly interfered with due process in the Ellsberg-Pentagon Papers trial?

If the House draws up a Bill of Impeachment, listing the charges, and if after in-

vestigation it clears the President, he is then exonerated.

If the House acting as a Grand Jury finds (by majority vote) merit in the charges, they would send an indictment to the Senate for trial. The Senate acting as a court of impeachment would then decide whether the President is innocent or guilty. A two-thirds vote would be necessary for conviction and removal from office. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presides over the Senate in Presidential impeachments.

If the Senate then found him innocent, he would be exonerated.

In this system, an innocent man has nothing to fear.

If the President is innocent, his Administration, his party, and the Presidency will be the stronger for it.

And if he were found guilty, he would be removed from office, and our government, with its ingenious Constitutional system of separation of powers and checks-and-balances among the Executive Branch, the Legislative Branch, and the Judicial Branch would emerge stronger than it is right now.

The point is that impeachment is not a process designed to tear the fabric of our society.

It is a process designed to protect that fabric, and to preserve our system of government from the consequences of human frailty.

The Presidency of the United States is much bigger than any President.

And it is the Presidency which must be protected.

PRECLUDING FUTURE "WATERGATES"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of our colleagues in this Chamber, I thought it might be helpful to elaborate publicly on some brief conversations I have had with you and other Members, relative to legislation I intend to introduce—as soon as it can be drafted—which might roughly be described as having the purpose of precluding future "Watergates."

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate my belief that the people are looking to Congress for leadership. The President has lost credibility in this area, for obvious reasons, and I have no doubt that his proposal for a "study commission" is widely regarded as a stall and a smokescreen. We do not need any more "studies." For legislative purposes, we already know the facts—and have known them for a long time. The central fact is the problem of money in political campaigns. What we need—now, not next year or later—is a plan that will convince the public we mean to come to grips with this problem.

Basically, I will be making two proposals. The first is that we establish a new, air-tight governmental mechanism to draw campaign contributions out of subterranean channels, forcing the flow of cash to the surface, where the press and public can observe it. The second is that we build into this mechanism a capability for strict enforcement of our new rules—in fact, not only a capability but also a virtual certainty that the rules will be enforced because those being policed—the President and Congress—will not be policing themselves, as they are now—but only in theory—doing. I would like to add at this point that both of my proposals, as I now see them, could be enacted directly by Congress without resort to constitutional amendments.

I will propose that Congress establish a new governmental agency—a special depository, perhaps known as the "political campaign bank," that will take custody of all funds used to finance campaigns for the Presidency, the House and the Senate. It would work this way:

Candidates for Federal office would be required to establish accounts at the bank. The candidates and committees making them then would be barred from receiving campaign contributions directly. Instead, the contributors would have to pay whatever they decide to give into the candidate's account at the bank. The candidate in turn would be free, as he is now, to spend these campaign funds as he sees fit, but he would never lay his hands on the money. The funds would be released by the bank only when the candidate authorized it—in writing—to pay his campaign bills for him. He would not be billed himself—the bank would be billed.

For example, the candidate would solicit contributions and then decide to use some of this money to buy, say, a half hour on television. The bank would receive the contributions and then, on being presented with the bill and the candidate's authorization to pay it, would send its own check to the broadcasting station. In this way, a record would be published for examination by the press and public. The transactions would be reported as they occur. Under this system, it would be illegal for anyone running for Federal office, or for his agents, to receive or spend any campaign contributions without having the exchange of money recorded and cleared through the bank.

In addition organizations and groups supporting a candidate or candidates would have to open accounts of their own at the bank. Such organizations would be the Democratic and Republican National Committees, the Democratic and Republican Congressional Campaign Committees and so forth. Each would have its own account and operate under the same restrictions as the candidate himself. How these groups apportion their funds among the candidates they support would become a matter of public record. Campaign accounts would be opened, too, by special-interest groups for that portion of their budgets allocated to electioneering. For example, campaign kitties established by lobbying organizations would have to be deposited in the bank, with a listing of all contributors to the kitty. Then the lobbying executives would direct the bank to pay out one sum to candidate A, a second sum to candidate B and so forth.

I will propose, too, as I have said, a mechanism for strict enforcement of these regulations. Because I am considering several alternatives at this time, I will not detail in this memorandum my views on this aspect of the problem. However, pending consultations with the Office of Legislative Counsel, I do want to emphasize that this new system will not work unless we make it work—by showing that we mean business. This means, necessarily, that we must no longer rely on our own employees—the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate—to review our compliance with the new rules. Obviously, there is an inherent conflict of interest in this regard for the Clerk and the Secretary, both of whom serve the public and yet owe their tenure to us.

I would add that the Comptroller General falls into the same category, since his General Accounting Office is a creature of Congress—and therefore we should no longer rely on him, either. Furthermore, we cannot depend on the Attorney General—a Presidential appointee—to prosecute the President or his campaign officials if and when they violate the law. What I have in mind, then, is an agency to take charge of the bank that would have an arm's-length relationship with the executive and legislative branches—and yet one that would not be so isolated from the centers of power in government as to lack clout and visibility. On this point, as soon as some questions are resolved, I will again be communicating with House Members.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate your keeping these proposals in mind as you and other Members consider what Congress ought to be doing about the Watergate scandal.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of May, Rumanians everywhere in the free world observed the national holiday of the Rumanian people, recalling the achievements of the nation's independence and the founding of the Kingdom of Rumania.

Since, in the homeland, the traditional observance of the holiday has been suppressed by the Communist regime—with the obvious intent of weakening the people's will for freedom—our commemorations have the added meaning of protest against the country's enslavement, expression of hope in its liberation, besides keeping alive sacred tradition.

The 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people, celebrating three great events in its history.

On May 10, 1866, Charles, Prince of Hollenzollern-Sigmaringen, an offspring of the southern and Catholic branch of the Prussian royal family, was proclaimed in Bucharest Prince of Rumania, and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was the successful outcome of the nation's long struggle to acquire the right of electing as its sovereign a member of one of the western non-neighboring reigning families in order to put an end to the strifes and rivalries among native candidates to the throne. This ardent wish, though officially expressed as far back as 1857 by the Moldavian and Wallachian Assemblies—the "ad-hoc Divans"—convened as a result of the Paris Treaty of 1856, was nevertheless opposed by the Russian and Austrian empires, equally disquieted by the growth in power and prestige of the young bordering nation they both secretly hoped to absorb

some day. It was due to unrelenting efforts made and wise steps taken by Rumanian patriots, and also to the constant diplomatic assistance of Napoleon III, Emperor of the French—to whom Prince Charles was related through the Beauharnais and Murat families—that all political obstacles were gradually removed and what was to be the prosperous and glorious reign of Charles I could be inaugurated on May 10, 1866.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish War, the principality of Rumania, until then nominally a vassal of the Sultan, proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds that linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian Army, as an ally of Russia, played a noteworthy part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 confirmed Rumania's independence and conferred Europe's official recognition, a bright page in the country's dreary history though marred, unfortunately, by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Czar Alexander II and his government from the ally who helped them obtain victory over the Turks.

Another 4 years elapsed after the Rumanian people had proclaimed their independence and a further step was taken as they decided to raise their country to the rank of a kingdom. On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned, by the will of his people, King of Rumania. A prosperous era, which lasted over six decades, opened on that day for the nation. Its apex was attained when national unity within the historic boundaries was reached after World War I. The socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the Southeast of Europe.

During all these years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as their national holiday, the anniversary of happy and glorious events in their history, in which achievements of monarchy and people were interwoven. It remains the symbol of their permanency and perseverance through woes and hardships to reach the ultimate end of freedom and well-being.

The ruthless foreign rule which now oppresses the Rumanian nation has not been able to uproot the people's attachment to the traditional celebration of the 10th of May. In order to try and alter at least its significance, official celebrations were shifted from the 10th to the 9th of May, anniversary of the Soviet victory. But, even though flags are now hoisted on May 9th, Rumanians in their captive homeland celebrate in their hearts on the following day, awaiting with faith and courage of new times, when freedom shall be restored to them.

CONGRESSMAN RODINO URGES CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, our colleague, PETER RODINO, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, testifying before the Select Committee on Committees, noted the growing public dissatisfaction with the Congress, proposed that the congressional committees be realigned in accordance with the overriding national concerns, and urged that all committee processes must be opened up.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have been gratified by the fact that Chairman RODINO has been vigorous in his efforts to open all Judiciary Committee meetings to public scrutiny. Furthermore, he has taken additional steps to promote further progressive reforms within our committee. Chairman RODINO has appointed a special ad hoc subcommittee to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the full committee's internal structure and to study the full committee's entire jurisdictional structure with the ultimate goal of making recommendations as to how the overall committee workload might best be distributed among the subcommittees. Chairman RODINO named me to head the special ad hoc subcommittee, and in selecting members of this group, he demonstrated his particular concern with the need to assure effective participation by newer and younger committee members by appointing junior members of the full committee who, despite their lack of seniority have, in Chairman RODINO's words, "the advantages of a new and fresh vision."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend that all Members take the time to read Congressman RODINO's remarks before the Select Committee on Committees:

STATEMENT OF PETER W. RODINO, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1973

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to appear here today before the distinguished members of the Select Committee to Study House Rules X and XI. As you know, I strongly supported the creation of this committee and I strongly support its work. When the House was debating its creation, I took the floor to describe the then just potential Select Committee as "a major step forward in our efforts to breathe a new and vigorous life into the organization of the Congress." I remain equally so convinced today.

I think the overwhelming majority by which the resolution creating the Select Committee was passed amply attests to the fact that many of our colleagues share my convictions about the importance of your work. And I think the rising public discontent with our governmental institutions—Congress prominently among them—attests to the felt need by the general population for a reinvigoration of the Congressional structure.

I think it safe to say that both our own internal concern, and that of the public, is well-placed. Democracy is a fragile institution, and those elements—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—which combine to maintain it have the enormous responsibility of recognizing that fragility and respecting it, always mindful that the underlying tenet of democratic government is the finest to which a nation can aspire. Increasingly in this century, however, that responsibility has been unsuccessfully met by the Congress, which has been aptly described as "the keystone in the governmental arch."[1]

I want to make clear that I intend no injection of partisanship here. The conflicts between the executive and the legislative branches which are so much before us these days are no doubt in part due to the White House being occupied by an executive of a party other than that which possesses a majority in both houses of the Congress. But more important for the long term are those conflicts which are the result of competing institutions—one vested with the obligation to legislate and to oversee, the other lodged with the responsibility of executing the laws of the land. Unless each branch of government effectively and responsibility fulfills its constitutional obligations—and obviously conflict is a necessary component of this process—the public weal is ill served.

I would venture to say that the Congress—the legislative arm of our democracy—has not performed without significant failings. I would venture to say also that these failings are becoming more apparent, and exacerbated, in recent years. As one recent student of Congress has observed:

"[T]he Congress has abandoned much of its earlier power, has all too often been the mere attender to legislative details while the President exercises nearly the whole of national leadership, and has displayed an unhealthy inability—or, more accurately, unwillingness—to organize and function as a contemporary institution of government."[2]

Confronted with an executive branch exceeding 2 million individuals, we have a staff miniscule by comparison. Confronted with a national population exceeding 200,000,000 individuals, we must cope with innumerable problems ranging from the difficulty of an elderly citizen in receiving his Social Security check to issues of profound national import. Confronted with a society characterized by increasingly complex interrelationships and technology, we are, in the main, generalists.

These conditions in part explain, if they do not justify, the posture in which we find ourselves. We have become supplicants to the executive, awaiting its decisions and its dispositions. For example, we call upon the Administration to submit tax reform legislation. Yet the Congress is the legislative body, and it is only in this century that we have increasingly surrendered our legislative initiative, which used to account for the Congress, not the executive, drafting and preparing legislative proposals. We question the aggrandizement of power by the executive, yet we turn over to it authority to set wage and price controls, couching guidelines in only the most general of terms and in effect mandating the executive to govern the economy free of legislative restraint and constraint.

I do not happily make these observations. I certainly intend no personal criticism. What I am concerned about is the decay of this institution in which we serve. We cannot seek responsibility unless we can bear its burdens, and in too many cases that does not seem to be feasible.

Compounding these difficulties, some of which perhaps just cannot be resolved by a legislative body of 435 members attempting to cope with our present-day society, is our poor preparation for even essaying such an attempt.

We have devised a committee structure, and that is proper and even essential. As two students of the Congress have written. "Through its extensive committee specialization the House of Representatives at its best performs as a persistent and often bothersome accountant for the activities of governmental agencies."[3] We must be able to de-

---

[1] CED—Making Congress More Effective.

[2] Hopkins, 47 Notre Dame Lawyer 442, 443–4 (1972).

[3] Bibby, p. 29.

vote particularized attention to issues, and committees enable this. We must be able to develop expertise among members, and service on committees enables this.

But we must also have a committee structure which enhances the advantages of such an approach. In some respects, at least, we do not. For example, in a nation wherein almost 80% of the populace lives in urban areas, we have no single committee devoted to urban problems. Rather, those problems peculiar to urban areas—or at least most pronounced in urban areas—are scattered throughout the House committees, with housing in one committee, waste treatment in another, health care delivery in another.

Now I do not mean to unequivocally condemn this situation. I think there is welcome utility in having a certain fertility of views and insights, and having a structure which allows for the contributions of several committees, and the members thereof, does encourage this fertility. Moreover, I don't know that any problem in our cities can be discretely isolated from its analogue in rural areas, thereby warranting labeling a given issue as "urban." But I do know that Congress, well aware of the crisis in our cities, has concerted, identifiable entity attempts to cope with this crisis.

There is another aspect to this issue, and one with which I am particularly familiar as Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. This is the problem of overlapping jurisdictions. For example, the Committee which I am privileged to Chair has jurisdiction as to corrections. Yet, jurisdiction as to employment of offenders in prison is lodged with the Education and Labor Committee; jurisdiction as to Social Security coverage of these offenders working in prison resides in the Ways and Means Committee; and jurisdiction as to the use of excess food commodities for contribution to prisons is reposed in the Agriculture Committee.

Perhaps an even more egregious situation exists with regard to the issue of drugs. The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction in this area. But so too does the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Education and Labor Committee. Now, the President has proposed aligning the drug endeavors of the executive branch in one agency—the Department of Justice—and as to this agency, the Judiciary Committee has oversight jurisdiction. This even further confuses the House's posture vis-a-vis this issue, and I must confess that I, for one, am most concerned about the at least seemingly diffuse structural manner by which the House is dealing with what I consider a most serious issue for All Americans.

Still another example of this dispersal of jurisdiction exists with regard to the Administrative Procedure Act, an exceedingly important body of law which sets the parameters of how the executive deals with the public and with the Congress. This legislation was originally brought to the Floor of the House more than 25 years ago by the House Judiciary Committee. Yet today, legislation to substantively change this Act may be referred either to the Judiciary Committee or the Government Operations Committee.

These are just a few examples of jurisdictional confusion, and I am sure that the distinguished members of this Committee are far more aware than I of the magnitude of this problem. Nevertheless, even knowing of your appreciation of this problem, I want to make clear that I consider it a most serious one and one which must be addressed and resolved. The assessment made by the Committee for Economic Development in its 1970 statement, entitled "Making Congress More Effective," very cogently sums up this situation:

"Too many committees and subcommittees fragment broad policy issues into bits and pieces of legislation. There is inadequate communication between separate, independent power centers. The coordination essential to consistent and coherent decision making is lacking. Review of agency performance is badly subdivided and variable in quality, often focused upon trivia while neglecting evaluative inquiries into over-all achievement. Continuous feedback review of agency progress on approved projects and ongoing programs is the exception rather than the rule."

A third component of the House's difficulty in coping with the responsibilities placed upon us lies in our inability to obtain all of the information which we need to act wisely. This situation has several facets. First, we must rely upon the executive for most of the information which we receive. Yet, often this means that the Congress, which has a responsibility to monitor the executive, can become its plant cohort. Knowledge is power, and he who controls the input of knowledge will inevitably control the exercise of power. Of course, a resistant executive will exacerbate this situation, but we cannot merely shuffle all the blame off to the executive branch. The basic problem lies in our having to seek the beneficence of the executive branch by the bestowal of information, not in the reluctance of the executive to inform us.

A second facet lies in the inability to utilize effectively the information we do have. In part, this stems from inadequate staff—both in terms of numbers, and sometimes in terms of ability. In part, it stems from a given Member serving on numerous subcommittees, if not different committees. Given a finite amount of time, there is no way to attend three subcommittee meetings all scheduled at one time, nor to absorb the information necessary to act with full knowledge in each of these subcommittees.

I know that computerization is a popular topic, and I support the efforts of the House to introduce modern technological advances in information gathering and disseminating. But I would caution that the ultimate issue is one of digesting information, and that requires time—something beyond the reach of computers to provide us.

A third facet of the information absorption problem lies in the fragmented approach which we take. Each us, as a committee member, concentrates on these aspects of government and society which lie within the jurisdiction of our committee. While this concentration has obvious merits, it also. I fear, has the result of sometime obscuring the forest by surrounding us with a lot of trees. Someone must put all the separate pieces together, and I fear that the Congress has failed to effectively achieve such a synthesis.

I mentioned the problem of staff earlier, as one component of the information issue, and I want to focus on this for a moment. By and large, I would say that Congressional staffs are capable. Often, they are invaluable to us. But, there is a certain paradox in the way we go about things. I would suggest that there is inherent in most people a need for recognition and appreciation. And certainly, the more able the individual, the more deserved is such recognition. Yet, by the nature of things, Congressional staff are nameless individuals, the alter egos, so to speak, of the Members for whom they work. Consequently, often those who are most able also are most likely to leave Congressional service most quickly, for they do not in fact receive recognition. Nor do they have the power to effect events, save through persuading their employer to act as they, had they the power, would act. Finally, they do not even have security, since they can be fired at a Member's whim.

I think this is a serious situation. I am not sure that there are solutions, but I do know that the departure of able staff is a constant in the Congress, and this constant contributes to diminishing our institutional effectiveness.

Finally, there is the matter of procedural reform. One of the most readily identifiable defects of the House has been its tendency towards secrecy. The attitude, whether consciously felt or just developed through the accretion of tradition, seems to have been that what the public does not know cannot hurt us. I think it imperative that the committee process be opened up to public scurtiny and public awareness.

I think, also, that there is a sometimes unremarked, but important, aspect to this process of openness—one which hopefully will be more or less a fall-out from open meetings and publicly disclosed votes. This is the accomplishment of public education. In certain respects, there is little that we can do about heightening public awareness. Our body consists of 438 Members; the Senate has only 100. Our constituents now approach the 500,000 mark; Senators represent entire States; and the President has a national constituency. Thus, the focusing of public attention on our doings—largely a role fulfilled by coverage by the media—is a difficult enterprise. I think the result is unfortunate, because there is nothing like the invigorating air of public scrutiny to encourage responsible action. While there is little we can do directly to generate that media coverage which will open the doors to this public concern, hopefully by opening our own doors, the media, and thereby the public, will be encouraged to enter.

In one thing, at any rate, I can be content. The litany of woes which I have recited is no arcane incantation, privately devised and only personally perceived. The very existence of your Committee is concrete testimony to the fact that we all, to a greater or lesser extent, share a deep concern about this institution, the Congress, which we inhabit and which we help to shape. The major burden is, at least formally, upon your shoulders to respond to that concern, but I would say that I have confidence that the burden will be met.

Of course, each of us bears responsibility, as well, for fashioning a better institution. And I would venture that those of us who are honored to be chairmen of committees of the House have a somewhat greater share in this, for by the nature of things, we have the obligation to encourage our colleagues to join in making the committee structure—the base of the Congressional system—vital and meaningful.

In my own Committee, I have had the privilege of helping to bring about changes which I think the present circumstances compel and which should be welcomed. For example, I encouraged and supported the establishment in our rules of a provision to conduct all Committee meetings—whether of the full Committee or subcommitee, whether hearings or mark-up sessions—in public. In light of what I said earlier, I should think my concern for this positive step forward would be apparent.

In addition, as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I feel a deep sense of personal responsibility to do everything in my power to bring about, within the Committee itself, a comprehensive evaluation of our own internal structure. Ultimately, if a meaningful change is to be brought about in the workings of the entire Congress, it is essential that each of us as individual Members must seek improvements in the manner in which we are able to contribute to the work of our Committees.

To encourage and facilitate this type of important self-appraisal within our Committee, I have appointed a Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the Majority party to undertake a study of the Committee's entire jurisdictional structure and to make recommendations as to how our overall workload might best be distributed among our own

Subcommittees. Representative Robert W. Kastenmeier, who is accompanying me today, was appointed by me as Chairman of this group. The group also includes Representatives James R. Mann, Barbara Jordan, Elizabeth Holtzman, and Wayne Owens.

In selecting this group I have been especially concerned with the need to assure effective participation by the newer and younger Members of Congress who, despite their lack of seniority, have the advantages of a new and fresh vision.

Subsequently, the ranking Minority Member of the House Judiciary Committee, my distinguished Colleague, the Honorable Edward Hutchinson of Michigan, designated three Republican Members to work closely with the Subcommittee: Representatives Robert McClory, Trent Lott and Harold V. Froehlich.

This Subcommittee was worked diligently and has issued a draft report which the full Democratic Caucus of our Committee will soon consider. I, for one, am deeply impressed by the wisdom embodied in the Subcommittee's recommendations. I am hopeful that with some modifications which we are now considering we can use the report in this Congress to begin an orderly reorganization in this Congess.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the report of the Kastenmeier Subcommittee will be of interest to your Committee and I would like to submit it for your consideration. In addition, I will also be very pleased to keep this Committee abreast of the organizational changes which we are continuing to bring about in the Judiciary Committee.

In discussing changes which have already been brought about in the Judiciary Committee, I would like also to mention the matter of Minority staff. Because I am convinced of the need for expert and adequate staff, I have strongly supported the Minority's staffing needs, and they have in this Congress already hired 4 additional professionals. In fact, the ratio of Minority professional staff to Majority is now in excess of 1 to 2.

Another effort which I think will contribute to a better committee operation is the sharing of significant work, so that no one subcommittee is overloaded with too much work, and so that no one subcommittee is characterized by such mundane matters as to discourage the interest and efforts of the members thereof. I think this approach will generate a heightened interest and concern by Committee members, thereby inevitably producing a better work product.

I do not mean to be presumptuous in outlining some of the reforms undertaken in our Committee. I realize that different times call for different approaches, and that different Committees may require differing operations. But I do think we are moving—and quite quickly, in fact—in the direction of openness, competence, and responsibility, which are the basic premises for the Congress as a whole.

As I said earlier, the major burden is upon your distinguished Committee to cope with the House as an institution. Certainly, the particularized expertise which you will bring to this effort will have a telling effect on what steps the House takes. However, there are some suggestions which I would like to offer, with the confidence that in the context of your extensive deliberations, these will be given due consideration.

First, I would suggest that Committees should be more rationally structured, with overlapping jurisdictions resolved where thfs is possible. I think this would contribute to a more responsive Congress, and that it would enable the public and the Congress to better perceive what in fact is being done with regard to a given issue.

Second, I think consideration should be given to committee alignments in accordance with mutually agreed overriding national concerns—such as urban problems, civil and criminal justice, and the environment. Of course, to a considerable extent, this is already the case. Perhaps, just the mere renaming of committees would adequately reflect a Congressional concern which has already been articulated by virtue of what these committees already do.

Third, I would suggest consideration of a Congressional civil service, much like the civil service which exists in the federal government. Congressional employees are entitled to job security. Moreover, they should be governed by anti-discrimination provisions, much as federal employees already are. I think that these steps could perhaps enhance the stature of Congressional service, thereby attracting and, more importantly, retaining qualified personnel.

Fourth, we must improve our information gathering and digesting resources. As I adverted to earlier, I do not think computerization is the sole answer, but I do think that it can help.

Fifth, I think consideration should be given to enabling members to move from committee to committee without sacrificing seniority. Thereby, a member perhaps better suited for one committee than another would not have a disincentive to remove himself from the committee where he is somewhat misplaced. In addition, consideration should be given to the number of committees on which a member may serve. Perhaps service on more than one committee does not in fact work well.

Sixth, I think the committee processes must be opened up. We have been making significant steps in this direction, and I wholeheartedly support them.

I do not claim to have ultimate answers. The problems which I have been discussing, and with which you are dealing daily on this Committee, have been considered for many years by experts, both within the Congress and outside of it. Were a perfect solution available, I think it would have been heard from by now. But we can do better; we can improve. I think it is incumbent upon us to do so. The times allow for no less, nor should our consciences.

NEW PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I proposed that new Presidential elections called by Congress would be the most constructive solution to the Watergate affair. I pointed out that an impeachment effort would not only be time consuming, but more importantly, would further depress public confidence in government, rather than restore it.

The full nightmare that could develop from impeachment proceedings is vividly described in an article by columnist Stewart Alsop which appeared in the latest issue of Newsweek and was reprinted in the May 20, 1973, issue of the Washington Post. I submit the text of that article for the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, an amendment to the Constitution would presumably be required for Congress to call new Presidential elections, as I have recommended. One might assume that the time required to ratify a constitutional amendment would make this proposal impractical as a response to Watergate. I want to point out, however, that the most recent amendment to the Constitution—voting rights for 18-year-olds—took only 4 months to ratify. The average ratification time for the last four amendments to the Constitution was 15 months.

This illustrates that the constitutional amendment process can be expeditious when the Congress and the public are faced with a pressing problem and generally agree upon a solution.

Certainly the months that might be required to ratify a constitutional amendment to enable the Congress to call new Presidential elections would be preferable to as many or more months of impeachment proceedings. Whereas, as Mr. Alsop notes, impeachment proceedings would shackle and debilitate the executive branch, new elections—or even the propect of new elections—in which the incumbent President and Vice President could run if they so chose, would tend to revive public confidence in our democratic system and, in the end, would create a new mandate for executive leadership.

My proposal for new Presidential elections is spelled out in a resolution, House Joint Resolution 547, which would amend the Constitution to permit the Congress by statute to call for new Presidential elections whenever, in its judgment, "the President has lost the confidence of the people to so great an extent that he can no longer effectively perform his responsibilities."

In view of the considerable interest this proposal has generated, I am circulating it for cosponsorship in the House, and will reintroduce it with cosponsors on or about May 29, 1973. I am hopeful that hearings on this proposal will be held without delay by the appropriate subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Stewart Alsop article to which I referred, entitled "Presidency: Acceptable on What Terms?", follows:

PRESIDENCY: ACCEPTABLE ON WHAT TERMS?

(By Stewart Alsop)

For those who enjoy imagining nightmares (and there are a good many of us), here is one to chill the blood:

All the spring and summer of 1973, and still deep into the autumn, the headlines and the television news shows are dominated by the Watergate affair. The affair becomes a three-ring circus, the main rings being the Sam Ervin show in the Senate, the investigations of the "special prosecutor" and the trials of those indicted by the grand jury. There are also plenty of sideshows, and new and sensational charges and countercharges appear almost daily.

As the complex, tedious, nauseating, fascinating and seemingly endless story unfolds, the President's standing in the polls and his prestige at home and abroad sink inexorably. Circumstantial evidence tends to involve the President directly in the scandal, and so does the testimony of men trying desperately to save their own skins. More and more people come to believe that the President himself was responsible both for the original intelligence and political-sabotage operation and for the attempt to cover it up. By autumn, the people who so believe constitute a decisive majority.

By autumn, what was only whispered in the spring is being advocated openly—impeachment. In late autumn, a move to impeach President Nixon for compounding a felony and for other high crimes and misdemeanors is made in the House. After bitter debate, the impeachment motion passes by a slim majority.

The scene now moves to the Senate. In accordance with the Constitution, it is trans-

formed into a court, presided over by Chief Justice Warren Burger, to sit in judgment over the President. Again the debate is bitter, and this time prolonged. The trial vote is for conviction, by a majority--but a majority short of the necessary two-thirds. Richard M. Nixon is still President of the United States.

That is the nightmare, and for those who understand its meaning, it is about as nightmarish as it could be. Consider the past. In 1868, President Andrew Johnson was impeached, ostensibly for removing Secretary of War Edwin Stanton from office against the express wishes of Congress, in fact for attempting to follow President Lincoln's policy of reconciliation toward the South. The impeachment failed of conviction by one vote, and Johnson remained in office until the end of his term.

The era that followed is, except for the Civil War itself, the most tragic in American history. In the South, "Reconstruction" replaced reconciliation, the southern states were treated as occupied enemy territory, and the Carpetbaggers, the Scalawags and the Ku Kluxers flourished. In the North, the robber barons rode high, and money corruption reached into the White House itself.

But at least when Andrew Johnson was impeached, he had only a few months left in office. Richard Nixon's terms runs until noon, Jan. 20, 1977. At least when Andrew Johnson was impeached, the United States was a minor power, not much involved in the affairs of the world, protected by its oceanic moats. At least when Andrew Johnson was impeached, there were no intercontinental missiles, and no nuclear warheads.

These differences suggest why the notion of the impeachment of Richard Nixon is so nightmarish a nightmare. They also suggest why the odds still favor, not impeachment, but some other outcome—perhaps vindication for the President, perhaps an uncomfortable standoff, perhaps some now unforeseeable outcome agreed upon in advance.

For the nightmare is hardly less than a prescription for the decapitation of the United States, at a time of great danger. A President Nixon who had been impeached, and whose impeachment had failed of conviction by a narrow margin, would be no real President at all. He would be a powerless figurehead, robbed of all power to lead, left only the power to obstruct. And the impeachment and the Senate trial would leave this country divided more bitterly than at any time since the impeachment of Andrew Johnson failed by a single vote.

Given the scenario outlined above, what other outcome might be possible? In considering that question, it is worth recalling the story of the first few days after the hair's-breadth defeat of Richard Nixon by John F. Kennedy in 1960.

The election was on Tuesday, Nov. 8. After he had conceded to Kennedy, Nixon flew from California to Washington, and then to Key Biscayne, with Mrs. Nixon and a little band of hardcore Nixonites—secretary Rose Mary Woods, Robert Finch, Herb Kline, Don Hughes, one or two others.

In Key Biscayne, he got a number of telephone calls from major supporters urging him to contest the election, on the ground that it had been stolen. More important, he got word from J. Edgar Hoover, an old ally that the FBI had proof of massive vote stealing in Illinois, Texas and elsewhere.

According to his book "Six Crises," Nixon did not make the final decision not to contest the election until some days later, when he had returned to Washington. But one of those who was with him at Key Biscayne remembers his first, instinctive reaction. He might win the presidency by demanding a recount, he said, but only at the price of chaos and bitterness, and "I would not want the presidency on those terms."

A few days later, he met with President-elect Kennedy and promised to lead "the loyal opposition."

There are those—and in this respect the lady liberals seem especially venemous—who are quite convinced that Richard M. Nixon is not a human being at all, but the foul fiend himself, in vaguely human form. Such people will automatically dismiss the above episode as untrue, or if true, the outcome of a cold calculation of Nixon's self-interest. And yet it is possible that, in the situation that then confronted him, Nixon considered first the good of the country. It is possible that, in the situation that may soon confront him, he will again put that consideration first.

For the present, nothing is more certain than that the President is determined to fight for the presidency, and for all the prestige and authority that go with the office, with everything he has. As he once remarked to this writer, "When I am attacked, my instinct is to strike back." He will strike back as hard as he knows how.

But suppose it becomes inescapably clear that the fight is lost, that he can hold the presidency only as a discredited figurehead. In that case, it does not seem inconceivable that he might decide, as he decided once before, that "I would not want the presidency on those terms."

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE CITATION FOR HON. STUART SYMINGTON

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the address by Missouri's distinguished senior Senator, STUART SYMINGTON, at the Westminster College convocation in Fulton, Mo., on the occasion of his receiving an honorary doctor of political science degree.

I would also like to include the stirring introduction given the Senator by Dr. Franc L. McCluer, a great leader in the field of education. Dr. McCluer was president of Westminster College when Sir Winston Churchill gave his famous "Iron Curtain" address at the campus on March 5, 1946.

The introductory remarks and address follow:

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE CITATION FOR THE HONORABLE STUART SYMINGTON, UPON THE OCCASION OF CONFERRING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, MAY 3, 1973

(By Dr. Franc L. McCluer, faculty member of Westminster College 1918–33, president of Westminster College 1933–47, life trustee of the college)

Mr. President, it is my privilege to present to you one of America's greatest citizens. Since the days of his youth in 1918 when he enlisted in the United States Army and became one of the youngest men to win a commission as lieutenant, he has been the master of the tasks and responsibilities given him. As president of Emerson Electric Company of St. Louis, in the six administrative posts to which he was called by President Harry Truman, and since 1952 as United States Senator from Missouri, his leadership has won for him the confidence and admiration of the American people.

It is of value to us in this academic community to remind ourselves that he was the son of a Professor of Languages in an environment such as our own. It is also good to remember that he lent enthusiastic support to the funding and establishing at Westminster of both the Harry S Truman Chair of American History and the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library.

But the honor we shall give him is not a "thank you" for a friendship of which we are proud. It is a salute to a great man for the use to which he has devoted his extraordinary abilities in the warmth of his family fireside, in the challenge of the business community, and in the call of a political career. We direct attention to a gentleman of humanitarian impulse, of diplomatic savoir faire, of legislative wisdom, and of administrative genius. He is a happy warrior whose great gifts of mind and spirit, whose deep and genuine faith in democratic institutions, and whose splendid personal integrity have led him to give this nation a service that cannot be measured.

President Davidson, I have the pleasure and the high honor of presenting for the Degree of Doctor of Political Science, at your hand, my friend, Stuart Symington.

WINSTON CHURCHILL—MAN OF VISION

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, Westminster College convocation Fulton, Mo., Saturday, May 5, 1973)

It is a privilege indeed to be with you here today. Thanks very much for asking me; and for the honor you are bestowing on me today.

When speaking at Georgetown University some years ago at his son's graduation, my friend Bob Hope referred to the challenges all undergraduates face when they go out into the world. His advice was—"don't go."

That was in jest; but the challenges are there, and often the road is both long and steep. Nevertheless the men and women of America have made this the greatest of all countries by first facing, and then overcoming, those challenges during the some 197 years of our nation's existence.

So it has been, and so, the Almighty willing, it will be.

And speaking of challenges, let me talk briefly this afternoon about a man who, as the result of one address here at Westminster, made even more famous overnight this outstanding center of learning in the heart of Missouri.

Westminster in turn increased his international reputation for accurate prophecy, because on this campus March 5, 1946, fifteen years before the infamous construction of the "Berlin Wall," Sir Winston Churchill first used the phrase "Iron Curtain" when he asserted that such a curtain had descended across the continent of Europe.

The phrase immediately became world famous; and its recognition, representing both actual and potential danger, contained the thought that had much if not most to do with the development of the foreign policy of this country for some twenty-five years. Mr. Churchill, whom Westminster honored as he honored Westminster, was ahead of his time.

In a talk made at Baylor University in 1950 I mentioned the fact that, despite the warnings of this statesman about the rapid rise to power of Adolph Hitler, the British were still extraordinarily complacent when I visited them in 1937. At that time the press stressed their fondness for horse racing, recording the results of each race in some detail; and whereas Prime Minister Baldwin was without question the most popular Britisher, Mr. Churchill, out of office and out of power, was possibly the most unpopular.

How things can change in just four years. When I returned as a representative of this Government in early 1941 during the Mattle of Britain and the blitz, the British were eating their horses instead of racing them, Mr. Baldwin's house had to be guarded by the police from stoning by angry citizens who felt they had been misled, even betrayed; and Mr. Churchill was far and away the most popular man of his time.

During those terrible nights of bombing, all free men were reassured by the words of Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons on June 4, 1940. These words were placed below his picture in every underground shelter, every street level pub, every place where people gathered all over England:

"We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and on the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

And they never did. For one year, until Hitler made his greatest military mistake—attacking Russia in June 1941—under the leadership of this great man, the people of that little island, all by themselves, carried on the fight for freedom.

When that number one Missourian, President Harry S. Truman, was listening to Churchill's address here at Westminster, he must have been thinking of the tragedy of the latter's rejection by his countrymen the previous year. Sir Winston and his government were turned out in the middle of the Potsdam conference at the very time he and Mr. Truman were discussing the world's future with Marshal Stalin.

On his trip to this country which included his visit to Fulton, Mr. Churchill also visited the Pentagon, where I was then Assistant Secretary of War; and one day my Chief, Secretary of War Patterson, told his assistants and the Service Chiefs to be in his office at five o'clock.

We came in, there was Sir Winston, leaning against the Secretary's desk; and how well I remember his observing at that time that the people who believed the atomic bomb was the greatest miracle of World War II were wrong. The greatest miracle he said was that, after what the United States had done to its military establishment between the two World Wars, the hard core remaining—Marshall, Eisenhower, King, MacArthur, Arnold—nevertheless was so well trained and basically able that in the three years after Pearl Harbor these same men and their assistants built the most powerful fighting force the world had ever known.

On that same to be remembered afternoon Mr. Churchill also quoted a poem, and asked that we be sure to remember it in future years.

"In war, God is adored and the soldier knighted.
In peace, God is forgotten and the soldier slighted."

The next time I saw "this great world citizen," as President Truman termed him in his introduction here at Westminster, was in London eight years later, in February 1954.

By that time nuclear weapons had come into the defense picture and Sir Winston, again Britain's Prime Minister, sent word to me through his Foreign Secretary, Sir Anthony Eden, that the "PM" as Sir Anthony called him, wanted to talk about this new force and its impact on future defense planning.

We did so talk later that afternoon; and again his prophetic vision surfaced. Sir Winston was worried about the relatively exposed position of Great Britain, especially from the sea. He had heard that back in 1948, when Secretary of our Air Force, I had suggested President Truman send the then General Eisenhower to see Marshal Stalin and request—demand if you like—that the latter open up his country to the inspection of Soviet nuclear activities, at the same time assuring Stalin that we would open up our country to him in similar fashion.

Mr. Churchill said, "Barney Baruch told me of your suggestion. I too recommended a showdown in 1948. Did you know?"

I didn't, so he gave me a book which contained his 1948 speeches, and he marked one talk made in September of that year, at Llandudno, Wales.

In that speech Sir Winston said: "The question is asked: what will happen when they get the atomic bomb themselves and have accumulated a large store? You can judge for yourselves what will happen then by what is happening now. If these things are done in the green wood, what will be done in the dry * * * We ought to bring matters to a head and make a final settlement * * * The Western Nations will be far more likely to reach a lasting settlement, without bloodshed, if they formulate their just demands while they alone have the atomic power."

At the time of our meeting in 1954, however, Mr. Churchill's thinking had changed; and in another display of extraordinary vision he stated, "if I made the talk that perhaps I should make tonight I would terrify every man and woman on this island. All of our land is very close to the sea, and we would have little warning indeed of any nuclear attack from the sea."

At the close of this visit, knowing the United States was racing ahead with the development of nuclear weapons, he said, "Don't forget. Think of us all."

And surely this we have.

Soon the other super power also became strong in the new weapons; and thereupon Sir Winston coined another famous phrase to illustrate our position against the Soviet Union, namely "balance of terror." This position was also described by a great nuclear scientist as "two scorpions in a bottle."

Today Mr. Churchill's apprehensions have been completely verified. Since that talk in 1954 we have seen the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile—the ICBM's, many in fields in Missouri a few miles from here; and also submarine launched nuclear missiles, apparently Mr. Churchill's primary apprehension.

Any interested and knowledgeable person now knows that his concept of a balance of terror was a reality; knows too that today the only true deterrent to nuclear war is certainty on our part that, if attacked, we can destroy the aggressor; also certainty that our capacity to do so is well known by any possible aggressor.

There is the only remaining true balance of power. No doubt you have noted that our own nuclear policy has gone from one of superiority, to parity, to sufficiency; i.e., certainty on our part that any nation which attacked us would be committing suicide.

Today we are strong indeed. As illustration, during World War II everything the United States dropped in the bombing of both Europe and the Far East, everything during the entire war, totalled just over two million tons of TNT.

Today the TNT equivalent of weapons in our nuclear arsenal amounts to many billions of tons.

In other words, all the force utilized from the air to help America fight and win World War II was but a small fraction of one percent of the force we have today to resist aggression.

As Mr. Churchill pointed out over nineteen years ago, this position is no longer unique. Each spring we are told by our Defense Department that the nuclear strength of the Soviets is now at least equal if not superior to ours.

What all this connotes is known by the general term "Arms Race," which is by far the most expensive race in world history, one which could well wreck the economy of this nation.

Let me illustrate that assertion by quoting from an article written last summer by a famous Missourian who was here in Westminster as a military aid to President Truman on the day of the famous speech, and who later became Secretary of Defense—Clark Clifford of Saint Louis. In this article last July 2 Mr. Clifford said:

"In the last ten years, from the fiscal year 1963 through 1972, the Federal Government has collected a total of $681 billion in individual income taxes. In the same ten-year period, by startling coincidence, the Federal Government has paid out for defense expenditures the sum of $680 billion."

Such expenditure just cannot go on, for two obvious reasons. First, it is becoming increasingly clear what the size of these vast expenditures is currently doing to our weakening economy.

Second is the problem of the number of scorpions in the bottle, a number that can only continue to grow in the years to come. We already know that, relatively soon, there will be another super power.

This being the case, and confident of the deterrent sting in our nuclear weapons, it is becoming increasingly clear that we must pursue another road as against the arms race—and the best road leading towards a just and lasting peace would appear to lie in the second round of SALT talks. The United States already has a treaty with the Soviet Union on defensive nuclear weapons; and also a 5-year agreement with that country on offensive weapons. The latter we hope the SALT II negotiations will develop into a treaty.

Already the Soviet Union and ourselves are working out together agreements in various fields: peaceful cooperation in science, in health, space, oceanography, problems incident to the environment, etc. Surely we can and should work together to prevent a war that in all probability would destroy civilization as we know it.

The philosopher William James spoke with wisdom of the need for a moral equivalent of war. With that in mind, let us strive to make this search for peace an heroic search. Let us, you and I, join together to that end, in the hope we can assure a better world, for ourselves and for our children.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. PERKINS, for 30 minutes, on May 22, 1973, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. HOLT) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUSSELOT, for 60 minutes, on May 22.

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CRONIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. O'NEILL, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HELSTOSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BRADEMAS, for 60 minutes, May 31.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KASTENMEIER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 2¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $382.50.

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

Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. FREY in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. KEMP in three instances.
Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. CRANE in five instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. CRONIN.
Mr. DU PONT in two instances.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. VEYSEY in three instances.
Mr. SARASIN.
Mr. HOGAN in three instances.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California.
Mr. MOLLOHAN in two instances.
Mr. BOWEN.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in 10 instances.
Mrs. SCHROEDER in two instances.
Mr. KARTH in two instances.
Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.
Mr. MEZVINSKY.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. DAN DANIEL.
Mr. BLATNIK.
Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
Mr. HENDERSON.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. BRINKLEY.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. CULVER in six instances.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. MAHON in two instances.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. ICHORD.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles and a joint resolution were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 355. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to promote traffic safety by providing that defects and failures to comply with motor vehicle safety standards shall be remedied without charge to the owner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1672. An act to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week of May 20–26, 1973, as "Digestive Disease Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 22, 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:

924. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on disbursements from the appropriation for "Contingencies, Defense" during the quarter ended March 31, 1973, pursuant to Public Law 92–570; to the Committee on Appropriations.

925. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation (1) to amend section 715 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1973, to extend until December 31, 1973, the date after which members in the rank of colonel or equivalent or above (O–6) in noncombat assignment are no longer entitled to the flight pay prescribed under section 301 of title 37, United States Code; and (2) to amend section 301 of title 37, United States Code, relating to incentive pay, to attract and retain volunteers for aviation crewmember duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

926. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed transfer of the submarine ex-U.S.S. *Marlin* (ex SST 2) to the Greater Omaha Military Historical Society, Omaha, Nebr., pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

927. A letter from the President and Chairman Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to extend for 4 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's loan, guarantee and insurance authority, to clarify its authority to maintain fractional reserves for insurance and guarantees, and to amend the National Bank Act to exclude from the limitations on outstanding indebtedness of national banks liabilities incurred in borrowing from the Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

928. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to foster and promote the establishment, preservation and strengthening of minority business enterprise; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

929. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of an international agreement, other than a treaty, entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92–403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

930. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with Physics International Co., San Leandro, Calif., for a research project entitled "REAM Tests to Extend the Hope Valley Tunnel and to Demonstrate Muzzle Blast Suppression Techniques," pursuant to Public Law 89–672; to the Commission on Interior and Insular Affairs.

931. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with Rapidex, Inc., Boxford, Mass., for a research project entitled "Wedge Longwall Cutterhead Development," pursuant to Public Law 89–672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

932. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., for a research project entitled "High Working Level Alarm," pursuant to Public Law 89–672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

933. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with Foster-Miller Associates, Inc., Waltham, Mass., for a research project entitled "Fabricate and Test a Conical Boring Device", pursuant to Public Law 89–672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

934. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with MSA Research Corp., Evans City, Pa., for a research project entitled "Improved Dust Control at Chutes, Dumps, Transfer Points, and Crushers in Noncoal Mining Operations," pursuant to Public Law 89–672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

935. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 2d Annual Progress Report on the 5-Year Plan for Family Planning Services and Population Research, pursuant to Public Law 91–572; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

936. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to remove the criminal penalty from title XI, section 1101, Hazards of Air Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

937. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of March 31, 1973, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

938. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the meeting of the Judicial Conference held April 5 and 6, 1973 (H. Doc. No. 93–103); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

939. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting the annual report on the Council's preparation of level B plans under the Water Resources Planning Act for river basins, pursuant to section 209(b) of Public Law 92–500; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

940. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the audit of payments from the special bank account to the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., for the C–5A aircraft program, covering the quarter ended March 31, 1973; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 404. Resolution authorizing the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to photograph

the House of Representatives during one of its sessions; (Rept. No. 93–215). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHLEY (by request):

H.R. 7934. A bill relating to collective bargaining representation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. PERKINS and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 7935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates under that act, to expand the coverage of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABDNOR:

H.R. 7936. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota Development Corporation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7937. A bill to repeal the recently added limitation on Federal payments to States for skilled nursing home and intermediate care facility services under the medicaid program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 7938. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service under the civil service retirement system certain additional service performed on a temporary or indefinite basis by employees in regular positions covered by such system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 7939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain homeowner mortgage interest paid by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on behalf of a low-income mortgagor shall not be deductible by such mortgagor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mr. DANIELSON):

H.R. 7940. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to acquire leasehold interests in certain land located in Los Angeles, Calif., in order to provide parking for persons who have business in the U.S. Federal courthouse and for Federal employees working in the courthouse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7941. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7492. A bill to provide for medals of recognition for all police and firemen in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 7943. A bill to discontinue price support programs for agricultural commodities beginning with the 1974 crops of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7944. 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.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 7945. A bill to authorize financial assistance for service, employment, and redevelopment (SER) centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7946. A bill to provide that, after January 1, 1973, Memorial Day be observed on May 30 of each year and Veterans Day be observed on the 11th of November of each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. NIX, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. YATRON, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 7947. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. STARK, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. TEIRNAN, and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H.R. 7948. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 7949. A bill to extend the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 for an additional year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7950. A bill to extend for an additional year the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 7951. 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.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 7952. A bill to authorize the head of an executive department, a military department, an agency, or an independent establishment in the executive branch to render emergency assistance in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 7953. A bill to require that publications of statistics relating to the value of articles imported into the United States include the charges, costs, and expenses incurred in bringing such articles to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 7954. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the U.S. conditions in a deed conveying certain lands to the State of New York and to provide for the conveyance of certain interests in such lands so as to permit such State, subject to certain conditions, to sell such land; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 7955. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the sale or purchase for slaughter of pregnant mares and mares with foals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 7956. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to increase coverage under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7957. A bill to authorize an experimental program to provide for care for elderly individuals in their own homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSPADDEN:

H.R. 7959. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Creek Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 275, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7960. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments to the Creek Nation of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket Nos. 167 and 273, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7961. A bill to require reimbursement of road construction costs at water resources development projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 7962. A bill to repeal certain provisions, which become effective January 1, 1974, of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 relating to eligibility to participate in the food stamp program and the direct commodity distribution program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7963. 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.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Ms. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 7964. A bill to prohibit discrimination against locally recruited personnel in the granting of overseas differentials and allowances, equalize the compensation of overseas teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 7965. 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. PERKINS:

H.R. 7966. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to allow disabled adult members of eligible households to use coupons issued to them to purchase meals prepared for and delivered to them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 7967. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States or of a military attack upon the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7968. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 7969. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to require the establishment nationally of an emergency telephone call referral system using the telephone number 911 for such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 7970. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964 by designating certain lands for inclusion in the National

Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 7971. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to impose, by regulations, certain additional restrictions upon the availability and use of Federal funds authorized for social services under the public assistance programs established by the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 7972. A bill to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and to establish a procedure for executing such limitation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PREYER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 7973. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide improved enforcement of motor carrier safety regulations; to protect motor carrier employees against discrimination for reporting violations of such regulations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 7974. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 7975. A bill to allow individuals a limited carryback of capital losses sustained upon the sale of securities received in certain taxable exchanges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7976. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1965, commemorating certain historical events in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 7977. A bill for the relief of persons who suffered damages as a result of the sonic boom tests over Oklahoma City, Okla., in 1964, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 7978. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Hualapai Indian Tribe, of the Hualapai Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H.R. 7979. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Northern Paiute Nation by the Indian Claims Commission in docker No. 87, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 7980. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 7981. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 7982. A bill to provide reduced retirement benefits for Members of Congress who remain in office after attaining 70 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 7983. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pupfish National Wildlife Refuge of the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. REES, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 7984. A bill to insure the free flow of information and news to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 7985. A bill to provide for the management, protection, development, and sale of the national resource lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7986. A bill to establish a national policy encouraging States to develop and implement land use programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, or the incapacitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to establish a nonpartisan commission on political campaign reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare Sunday, June 3, 1973, MIA Awareness Day to pay tribute to members of the Armed Forces who are missing in action in Indochina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no individual may be seated as a Representative or as a Senator after attaining the age of 68; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CARTER):

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week of May 20–26, 1973, as "Digestive Disease Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Res. 398. Resolution providing for promotions to positions of a supervisory capacity on the U.S. Capitol Police Force authorized for duty under the House of Representatives, to reduce by 15 positions the total number of positions on such force under the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCFALL (for himself and Mr. ARENDS):

H. Res. 399. Resolution authorizing the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to photograph the House of Representatives during one of its sessions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BREAUX, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H. Res. 400. Resolution relating to the employment of student congressional interns in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RUPPE):

H. Res. 401. Resolution relating to the employment of student congressional interns in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H. Res. 402. Resolution relating to the employment of student congressional interns in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HUBER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Res. 403. Resolution requesting the President to enter into negotiations with major oil importing countries to establish an international organization of oil importing countries and to establish common practices and policies affecting oil pricing, importation, and consumption; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 404. Resolution authorizing the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to photograph the House of Representatives during one of its sessions; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

207. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to allowing Nevada to obtain surplus military equipment for use in vocational education programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

208. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the repeal of certain parts of the 1934 Gold Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

209. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to restricting States from withholding income tax of nonresidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

210. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, requesting the Congress to pass legislation to return to the States a por-

tion of the Federal user charges flowing into the aviation trust fund; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

211. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to observing Veterans' Day on November 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

212. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the assignment of students to particular public schools on account of race, religion, color or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

213. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to provide for selection and terms of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the U.S. mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

215. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to nursing homes for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

216. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to adequate hospital, domiciliary, and clinical medical services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

217. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to providing that industries may not move operations to escape environmental protection legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

218. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to recycling metals and other materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to repealing Federal taxes on certain forms of wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

220. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to casino dealers' tip income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 7987. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Morales and his wife, Joyce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 7988. A bill for the relief of Rosalina B. Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSPADDEN:

H.R. 7989. A bill for the relief of Jim A. Egan and Violet A. Egan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7990. A bill for the relief of Denise Newell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7991. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Walker and Edna C. Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

217. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county legislature, Suffolk County, N.Y., relative to restoration of the operating budget of the Brookhaven National Laboratories Associated University, Inc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

218. Also, petition of Edward R. Garcia, Warren, Mich., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO BEN MARGINES

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend Mr. Ben Margines for his many years of outstanding service and leadership in religious, community, and political affairs in Los Angeles.

Ben Margines was born in Poland, emigrated to British occupied Palestine in 1934—where he served in the underground—and then emigrated from Israel to the United States, with his wife and son, in January 1961. He became a citizen of the United States in 1965.

Mr. Margines has been deeply involved in senior citizen activities, including the Senior Citizens Leadership Training program of the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation. He was commended by California Attorney General Evelle Younger for his participation in consumer protection programs for senior citizens and is currently serving as Treasurer of the Attorney General's Senior Citizen Consumer Committee. He is a member of the National Senior Citizens Club of Los Angeles County, Special Vice President for Senior Citizen Affairs of the West Hollywood Community Coordinating Council, has been active in the Wilshire Community Coordinating Council's senior citizen program, and is working with the Los Angeles Police Department in community crime prevention meetings for senior citizens.

Mr. Margines has provided significant leadership in the Jewish community. He has been a leader in the American Jewish Congress, is a past board member of the American Congress of Former Polish Jews, and is a member of the executive committee of the Jewish National Fund.

He has had a long-standing interest in opera, has performed for Israeli troops, and is a member of the Troopers and of the Opera Reading Club of Hollywood.

As a deputy Registrar of Voters in Los Angeles County, Mr. Margines has registered thousands of voters over the last 8 years—4,250 voters were registered by him in 1972 alone. His consuming interest in his adopted country has also manifested itself in assistance provided to immigrants in obtaining citizenship. As voluntary secretary of the Fairfax Adult School for citizenship classes, he has participated in, and been an honored guest at, the biennial "Salute to New Americans" for new citizens in the city and county of Los Angeles over the last 8 years and can be justly proud of his personal contribution to the realization of this goal for many.

There have been a number of political candidates both locally and nationally whose campaigns have benefited from the contributed talents of Ben Margines. His interest and his activities in this field have been directed to candidates in both major political parties. This typifies his dedication to the all-important goal of electing to public offices those individuals he feels will best represent all citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Margines is a humanitarian of the highest order and I consider it a privilege to call him my friend.

SECURITIES LEGISLATION

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, this session of Congress may see the introduction of more securities legislation than at any time since the 1930's. Committees of both Houses of Congress have recently finished detailed reports offering a long list of legislative recommendations on the most important economic and regulatory problems facing the industry. In fact, consideration of this legislation is already underway.

I anticipate that every investor and every securities firm, no matter how large or small, will be touched in some way by the changes brought about by this legislation. Accordingly, I want to take this opportunity to note the efforts of one segment of the brokerage community—the independent broker-dealers—to bring their views on this important legislation to the attention of the Congress. They are just as concerned about and as knowledgeable on the effects of this legislation on the individual investor as are the industry's giants.

Perhaps the role of these firms in this Nation's delicate capital formation process is not as well known as it should be. The independent broker-dealers are firms engaged in the securities business, who, by virtue of their size, fall into the category of small businessmen. They face all the problems of any small businessman and a number of problems that others do not face as well.

Recently, a group of these small firms presented their views on some of the difficulties of the day-to-day business for a small brokerage firm to a joint meeting of the Senate and House Select Committees on Small Business. In addition, Mr. Raymond W. Cocchi has also written to Chairman BIBLE of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business detailing some of the many problems faced by small broker-dealers, and I want to include his letter in the RECORD. Mr. Cocchi has important things to say about the future of securities regulation and its effect on the small businessman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-