for not to exceed 45 minutes with statements limited therein to 5 minutes.

It is intended by the leadership on Tuesday next to call up nominations on the executive calendar, namely those of Mr. Elliot Richardson, Mr. William P. Clements, Jr., and Mr. James R. Schlesinger.

I would anticipate there will be some discussion and possibly a rollcall vote or rollcall votes on one or more of those nominations. I cannot say with absolute assurance that there will be such votes. However, I think it would be well to anticipate them and that Senators schedule their day accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT TO SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1973, AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. Saturday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2:48 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Saturday, January 20, 1973, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Frederick B. Dent, of South Carolina, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Claude S. Brinegar, of California, to be Secretary of Transportation.

Egil Krogh, Jr., of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Transportation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

John C. Whitaker, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, January 18, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul.—Psalm 25: 1.

O Thou eternal and gracious God, make us receptive to Thy spirit and responsive to Thy love as we seek diligently to find ways to lead our people in the paths of peace and justice and good will.

We acknowledge that at times our efforts to build a better order of life seem so futile and our endeavors so fruitless. Inspire these Representatives with Thy great spirit that they may now and always labor to do that which is good for our Nation, generous for our people, and genuine in establishing peace in our world.

Grant that amid the persistance of perplexing problems we may seek to make Thy will our will, Thy way our way, Thy love our love, and Thy life our life.

In the spirit of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life—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 agrees to the amendment of the House to an amendment of the Senate to a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution extending the time within which the President may transmit the budget message and the Economic Report to the Congress and extending the time within which the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-944, appointed Mr. BAKER and Mr. DOMENICI to the Senate Office Building Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1024 of title 15, United States Code, appointed Mr. SCHWEIKER as a member on the part of the Senate, of the Joint Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 91-510, appointed Mr. TAFT and Mr. WEICKER as members of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations in lieu of Mr. CASE and Mr. SCHWEIKER, resigned.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1973, AND FROM SATURDAY UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 138) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 138

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, January 18, 1973, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m., Saturday, January 20, 1973; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1973.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS ON MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1973, TO RECEIVE APOLLO 17 ASTRONAUTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Monday, January 22, 1973, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber the Apollo 17 astronauts.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader what the program for the rest of this week will be, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of making a statement to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to alert my colleagues that when we adjourn today, we will meet on Saturday at 10:30 o'clock. I urge all the Members to be here promptly because the procession for Members of the House will leave in a body promptly at 10:35 a.m., so that the inaugural exercises on the platform at the east front might start precisely at 11 o'clock. There will be no opportunity for Members to join the procession after it leaves the House Chamber.

Members must display their official tickets in order to get a seat on the platform. There are no seats available for former Members on the platform. Therefore, former Members may not join the procession.

The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover and the area is unheated. Members are urged to dress appropriately for the weather.

No children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

So, if you expect to be in the procession and get a seat on the platform, you must be in the Chamber at 10:30 a.m., on Saturday.

The procession will be headed by the Speaker pro tempore, then the chairmen of committees, and then the other Members in order of seniority.

Following the inaugural ceremonies on the east front, shuttle buses will be available east of the Cannon House Office Building, at First Street and Independence Avenue SE., to take Members and their wives, who have purchased tickets for the inaugural parade, to the parade reviewing stands at the White House. The first buses will depart at 12:30 p.m. and the last will leave at 1:15 p.m., promptly. The buses will also be available

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to bring Members back to the Capitol after the parade.

When we adjourn today, we will adjourn to meet on Saturday morning at 10:30. I will offer a resolution later in the day that when we adjourn on Saturday we adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that if there is any program for next week, it will be announced at the Monday session. At the present time we do not have any definite knowledge of any legislative program.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts said we will meet on Monday. As I understood it, it was to be Tuesday.

Mr. O'NEILL. No. We have invited the astronauts for Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I see.

Mr. O'NEILL. If there is any further program for the week, it will be announced at that time, but at the present time we have no definite plans.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the anticipation, if I understood it correctly, that if the Committee on Rules meets and hears the witnesses that are interested in the Bolling-Martin resolution, that if it is approved by the Committee on Rules, it will be brought up next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. There is a great possibility that that could happen, but it will be announced on Monday if it will happen.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE ON SATURDAY, JANUARY 20

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, to act as Speaker pro tempore on Saturday, January 20, 1973.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule, on January 24, be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

NEW ENGLAND HEATING OIL CRISIS

(Mrs. GRASSO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Nixon signed a proclamation which suspends controls on imports of No. 2 heating oil during the January 1 through April 30, 1973, period and establishes the 1973 import program for crude and unfinished oils and finished products into all areas east of the Rocky Mountains.

This action by the President is an inadequate response to the present fuel oil crisis in New England and across the Nation. It is another sad example of a policy of "too little too late."

While this action will relieve a chronic shortage of heating oil for a short time, it will also trigger a price increase that could have been avoided with intelligent planning. Donald Craft, vice president of the New England Fuel Institute and a member of the Connecticut Petroleum Association, said:

> Higher prices could have been avoided if the President had acted last summer when he was so urged by the oil dealers. Now, it is too late to negotiate long-term, lower-priced contracts.

We need a long-range action which would be provided by enactment of a bill I am introducing today.

We need a more enlightened short-term program, which would also be provided by enactment of a resolution I am cosponsoring today.

Mr. Speaker, for years the New England delegation has been beating the drum—a nearly empty home heating oil drum.

For years we have been rewarded with, at best, a few thousand barrels per day.

The predicted heating oil crisis has finally occurred. It is strangling the Midwest and shackling New England with the threat of insufficient No. 2 heating oil supplies to meet the needs of mid and late winter.

As one step in the process of alleviating this crisis, today I am cosponsoring legislation which would temporarily suspend the oil import quota system and allow independent distributors to import sufficient No. 2 home heating oil to meet the increased demand. Specifically, this resolution would suspend the quota on crude oil for 90 days and suspend the quota on No. 2 heating oil until April 1, 1974. To prepare for next winter, fuel oil distributors would then have time to secure adequate supplies for consumers at more reasonable rates.

To help meet the long range situation, I am also introducing today the New England States Fuel Oil Act. This bill, identical to the bill introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and the entire New England delegation in the Senate, would allow the uncontrolled importation of No. 2 home heating oil into the six New England States. A second provision removes the tariff on all oil imports into the United States from non-Communist countries. The third section directs the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations with Canada for the establishment of a "Northeast Regional Oil Area." Within this area—encompassing New England and eastern Canada—all restrictions on trade in oil and oil products would be eliminated.

The present import quota system—with its restrictions on the amount and source of imports—has forced the citizens of New England to pay artificially inflated prices for a product needed for their very survival. The New England winter never considers the available supply of heating oil before sending a chilling "nor 'easter' " over the region. For years the members of the New England Fuel Institute have stated that the present unrealistic level of oil imports leaves little, if any room for an unusually intense and long cold spell. Each year they are told that existing supplies are sufficient,—that is, unless the winter is especially cold.

Those of us in the Congress and the private sector who have pleaded for a change in the import policy have been viewed as alarmists. Yet, last September 19, Robert DeBlois, chairman of the board of the New England Fuel Institute, appeared before the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. He warned the subcommittee:

> Make no mistake about it: a crisis will occur unless imports are substantially increased.

Even the administration's watchdog on the oil import situation was less than optimistic about this winter. In a December 11 interview in U.S. News & World Report, Gen. George A. Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness and head of the Oil Policy Committee, stated:

> Fuel oil for heating is a matter of real concern. Inventories of heating oil are below normal for this time of the year, and U.S. refineries have not been operating at capacity or turning out as high a proportion of heating oil as they could.

This is exactly what we in New England were saying last June when we asked the President and General Lincoln to increase the level of No. 2 fuel oil imports for independent deepwater terminal operators in District I from 40,000 to 100,000 barrels per day. Finally, the administration responded with a minor increase, including a provision allowing operators to borrow 10 percent of their 1973 quota and apply it to 1972 imports.

Mr. Speaker, it is this discriminatory oil import quota system that has created the desperate situation this winter for the people of New England. Now is the time for us to take legislative action to prepare for future needs, while the winter chill reminds us that our responsibilities remain unmet in this critical area.

THE CAREER AND SERVICE OF RICHARD HELMS, DIRECTOR, CIA

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about Richard M. Helms, who is soon to leave his post as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and become Ambassador to Iran. Earlier this week Mr. Helms made his last appearance before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations in his capacity as Director of the CIA.

I have great admiration for Richard Helms. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I had occasion to be closely associated with the Central Intelligence Agency at the time of its formation in 1947. Since 1947 I have been one of the Members of Congress who has dealt regularly with the funding of the CIA. I have followed the career of Mr. Helms as he has risen through the ranks to the position of Director and as he has served in that capacity since 1966.

Mr. Helms over the years has per-

formed an outstanding service to the Nation. He has worked closely with several administrations. In his capacity as Director since 1966, he has borne a heavy burden of responsibility. He of course has not been charged with the responsibility of making national policy. His duty has been that of providing intelligence information to policymakers in Government.

Before the creation of the CIA, Mr. Helms as a young naval officer served with the Office of Strategic Services in Washington, England, France, and Germany during World War II. Following his discharge in 1946, he went to work as a civilian in the Strategic Service Unit, War Department which was the successor organization to a major part of the Office of Strategic Services. From there he transferred to the Central Intelligence Group, and then to the Central Intelligence Agency when that Agency was established in 1947.

Within 5 years, he became the Deputy to the Deputy Director for Plans under the then Director of Central Intelligence, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith. He was elevated to the position of Deputy Director for Plans by John A. McCone and in 1965 was nominated by President Johnson to be the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence. In 1966 he was confirmed by the Senate as the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. Helms' intelligence career typifies excellence in Government. In 1965 the National Civil Service League awarded him the Career Service Award for combining the best characteristics of a strong leader skilled in the complex arts of foreign intelligence operations, an able administrator, and a dedicated career officer devoted to the public service.

I have heard Mr. Helms testify for many hours each year for a number of years. I have been impressed with his ability, objectivity, and sincerity. I have never heard him make a statement which tended to cause me to question his sincerity. He has been totally objective, totally disinclined to color the facts, absolutely reliable in presenting the facts as he saw them. That has been his job and he has done his job superbly. He has left a heritage of excellence for the CIA and the intelligence profession.

Many view foreign intelligence in the context of military operations solely, but it is also essential that we have accurate intelligence to forestall conflict. In March of 1969, President Nixon referred to CIA:

As one of the great instruments of our government for the preservation of peace, for the avoidance of war, and for the development of a society in which this kind of activity would not be as necessary, if necessary at all.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for providing objective facts and detached analysis in these crucial areas is the only way that we can be assured that those individuals responsible for making critical judgments concerning our Nation's security have available to them a basis of knowledge for the action they take or, perhaps more important in some instances, for not taking any action at all.

The heavy burden upon the shoulders of Richard Helms and the Central Intelligence Agency, has not been limited to ferreting out, correctly analyzing, and disseminating information to the appropriate officials. These are not simple tasks in themselves, but no matter how well done, their value is naught unless the information is believed and used by those who have the responsibility to make decisions. Credibility within the Government community is the lifeblood of CIA. Without it, its work is ineffective and its cost is extravagant.

Mr. Speaker, under Mr. Helms' stewardship, credibility has been the trademark at the Central Intelligence Agency. Integrity and objectivity have been the watchwords. Abstinence from any possible policy involvement has been the rule. These were the creeds that brought the professionalism which Mr. Helms has persistently pursued.

At the swearing-in ceremony of Mr. Helms as Director in 1966, President Johnson said:

Although he (Mr. Helms) has spent more than twenty years in public life attempting to avoid publicity, he has never been able to conceal the fact that he is one of the most trusted and most able and most dedicated professional career men in this Capital. No man has ever come to this high critical office with better qualifications.

I think it was Patrick Henry who said, "The battle is not to the strong alone, it is to the vigilant and to the active and to the brave," and it is to Dick Helms and to the Agency that he will now head that we must look for this vigilance. His own record and the past achievements of his Agency give us full confidence in the future operation of the Central Intelligence Agency with judgment, with intelligence and above all with great public integrity.

Mr. Helms has lived up to these exacting expectations. He will give a full measure of devotion to his new job as Ambassador to Iran, and we will be wishing him well.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I now insert two editorials concerning Mr. Helms' tenure at CIA:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 6, 1972]

EXIT RICHARD HELMS

It isn't official yet, but our usually impeccable official sources tell us that Richard M. portant assignment in the Nixon administra- Agency, presumably to take on a new and im- Helms will soon be stepping down after six years as director of the Central Intelligence tion. Whatever his future job may be, he will be sorely missed in the one which he is leaving.

Of the men who have headed the CIA since its inception in 1947, Helms stands out as the one truly professional intelligence expert. His career in the spy business covers a span of 29 years, beginning with a four-year stint with the Office of Strategic Services in World War II. After transferring to the newly-formed CIA, he served as deputy director for plans under General Walter Bedell Smith and John A. McCone, previous CIA heads.

As director, Helms brought a coolness of judgment and great administrative talent to one of the most sensitive and difficult jobs in the federal government. Under his leadership, the performance of the agency, in contrast to past years, has been highly discreet and, to the extent that such things can be judged, effective. It is suggested that his departure from the CIA may have resulted in part from a dispute within the intelligence community regarding the deployment of Russian nuclear missiles. Yet from all the available evidence, his assessment of the world situation—and particularly in Indochina, where the CIA has borne heavy responsibilities—has been remarkably accurate.

The highly essential business of intelligence-gathering, being necessarily secret and to some minds distasteful, requires the kind of public confidence that Helms has been able to provide. As President Johnson remarked at his swearing-in ceremony: "Although he has spent more than 20 years in public life attempting to avoid publicity, he has never been able to conceal the fact that he is one of the most trusted and most able and most dedicted professional career men in this Capital." As director of the CIA, Richard Helms has fully justified that assessment.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 26, 1972]

THE CHANGE AT CIA

There are such strict limits to what is knowable about the Central Intelligence Agency and its workings that any discussion of Mr. Helms' departure from the directorship and Mr. Schlesinger's appointment to replace him must necessarily rest on a comparatively small store of information. Even so, one or two things are plain. And chief among these is the fact, evident from what is known about the two men themselves, that one highly qualified and eminently capable official is being replaced by another.

Richard Helms has spent most of his professional life in intelligence work, and he has acquired a reputation among those qualified to judge, as a man of great honesty and tough-mindedness. The term "tough-minded" in this connection can only summon forth imaginary zither music for some people and visions of grown men running around endlessly shoving each other under trains. But Mr. Helms—unflappable, personally disinterested, and beyond the reach of political or ideological pressures where his judgment is concerned—earned his reputation for tough-mindedness in an intellectual sense. As Agency Director, he has been far less a public figure or celebrity than some of his predecessors—Allen Dulles, for example, or John McCone—evidently preferring to maintain a certain becoming obscurity. He has worked very eeffctively with some of his overseers on the Hill. And, if the leaked (not by CIA) material, such as the Pentagon Papers, that has been appearing in the press is any guide, he and his Agency have also served their executive branch leaders with some distinction. One gets the impression that from the presumed efficacy of bombing the North Vietnamese to the presumed necessity of responding to very wild surmise of what the Russians were up to in nuclear weapons development, Mr. Helms, has offered a practical, dispassionate and rigorously honest—if not always popular—view.

That the Congress will be pushing for some greater degree of responsiveness from the CIA in the coming session seems pretty certain. And there also is at least a chance that internal bureaucratic difficulties at the Agency will require some managerial rearrangements. In a way, solely because he comes to CIA from outside (not from up the ranks), James Schlesinger may be specially suited to take on both. But he has other qualifications. At the Rand Corporation in California, Mr. Schlesinger did analytic work that gave him more than a passing familiarty with the intelligence estimating business. At the Budget Bureau—as it was then known—in the early days of the Nixon administration he proved himself a very astute, not to say downright cold-eyed, scrutinizer of military budget requests. His brief term at the AEC was notable in several respects. Mr. Schlesinger bucked the pressure of the atomic energy establishment to insist that the AEC take note of and respond to the claims of its

ecological critics. And he attempted to push the agency back from its political role toward the more disinterested service role it was meant in the first place to fulfill. He, like Mr. Helms, is demonstrably a man of talent, dedication and impressive intellect. We should have been content to see them stay on in their present jobs. But if Mr. Helms is to leave the Central Intelligence Agency, we think Mr. Schlesinger is a first class choice to replace him.

THE SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, DR. RUFUS J. PEARSON

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take note of the departure from Capitol Hill of Dr. Rufus Judson Pearson, our distinguished attending physician. He has performed a notable service during his tenure at the Capitol. He is not only an outstanding man of medicine; he is a helpful and understanding friend.

All Members of Congress and others who have known "Jud" Pearson will miss his wise and helpful counsel, his warm and gentle manner. Jud Pearson's door was always open to those who sought him out. He counseled generously and wisely. His engaging personality and helpfulness on all occasions were to one and all a good tonic unto themselves.

Jud Pearson exerted a calming influence in this hectic environment. His dedication to excellence of service was also reflected in the daily operations of his excellent staff of assistants and technicians.

I am pleased to count Jud Pearson as my good friend. I know of the esteem in which he is held by others. We are all going to miss him, and we are going to welcome him back to this area at every possible opportunity.

Good luck, Jud. May the Lord's blessings be upon you and yours in your future undertakings in behalf of your fellow man.

CONGRESS ABUSED AGAIN BY EXECUTIVE BRANCH

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must again regain its control of the lawmaking process. The abuse extends far beyond the veto of legislation and the impoundment of appropriations. The executive department has constructed such impediments to the participation in programs that the intent of the law, even to the amount of funding appropriated for various States, is lost.

I ask my colleagues to review but one instance of the redtape which hinders conscientious State officials.

The director of the Wyoming State government's mental health and mental retardation services wrote to me recently regarding the arbitrary guidelines being imposed by the Special Action Office of the Drug Abuse Prevention Office of the President.

I enter here in the RECORD some of the pertinent portions of that letter:

I am greatly concerned about what SAODAP is doing; it has very arbitrarily established a heroin addiction to constitute a single national priority in the battle against drug abuse. I am aware that the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare said the illicit use of heroin is causing the most damage to our society, but the Committee also declared that the abuse of non-narcotic drugs is more wide spread than the abuse of heroin, and the committee said that it is deeply concerned about the need for adequate funding for all types of drug abuse prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs.

Furthermore, in Public Law 92-255, the Congress spoke consistently to the universe of drug abuse, narcotics and non-narcotics and inferentially to a national strategy which focuses on five distinct groups: experiments, casual or recreational users, involved users, and disfunctional users, as well as the non-using but a risk population, and concluded that prevention and rehabilitation techniques using medical, social welfare, and other community resources must be mobilized with these problems. This is the approach we have taken in Wyoming and we think accurately so, and when we have spoken of drug abuse and drug dependence we have included narcotic and non-narcotic drugs. In our opinion, there is no such thing as a "soft" drug.

The second problem of which I am greatly concerned is the guidelines for developing State Plans. These guidelines are very arbitrary and the States were not consulted in their development. Areas for which we are most concerned relate directly to the composition to the State Advisory Council, to the requirements of maintenance of effort, to the data collection processes and the fact that research has been left totally to the Federal Government.

The third area in which we are concerned is the matter of Federal funding. Public Law 92-255 stipulates that the minimum allowance to *any* State would be $100,000. However, SAODAP has arbitrarily decided that Wyoming would receive only $50,000 because we do not have a highly visible heroin addiction population nor have we had sizable numbers of reported cases of serum hepatitis. It is on that formula, primarily, that SAODAP has established the amount each State is to receive. When I approached Dr. Jaffe of SAODAP with the statement that we do not have large heroin addiction problems in Wyoming, nor do we see the needs for developing methadone clinics at this time, his reply was, "Then I assume you will not receive any money." This arbitrary decision of SAODAP seems to me to be in direct conflict with the intent of Congress.

Those things listed above are brief, but important, because they have destroyed the credibility of the State appointed Drug Abuse Authority, the Governor's Advisory Council on Drug Abuse, and all other persons within the State of Wyoming who have been diligently working in this area for several months.

First of all, the "scare tactics" at the Federal level that experimentation with marihuana and other drugs would result in the legs falling off or something worse did not happen, therefore, we lost the credibility and we have lost our youth.

Secondly, we at the State level have been telling the population of Wyoming for some time that we will receive $100,000 to develop a comprehensive drug abuse plan, including narcotic and non-narcotic drugs, concentrating in the areas of prevention, treatment and rehabilitation. As a result of SAODAP's action we must now go to the people of Wyoming and say, "We are sorry, we will receive only $50,000 and that only narcotic drugs are being considered in the national drug abuse strategy." Thus, our credibility is once again shattered and Wyoming, as too often happens, has been left dangling at the mercy of some very arbitrary Federal bureaucrats.

In addition to the letter from Dr. Munsey, I have also received word from the wife of Wyoming's Governor, Mrs. Bobby Hathaway, who has given freely of her time in many areas, but especially in the area of drug rehabilitation.

I think Dr. Munsey's arguments are advanced by including portions of Mrs. Hathaway's letter of January 12:

I have worked an untold number of hours on drug abuse problems within the State of Wyoming. I am on the National Board of Advisors to the National Awareness House Program, which should indicate that I am not unfamiliar with this problem.

I have traveled to many different parts of the country assessing different types of programs. The entire Hathaway family was called to Washington, D.C. at the request of the President and were requested to help with the drug problems with their own state. I feel that I have answered the President's request, and then suddenly to have program monies and grant requests refused because we do not have bottom-of-the-barrel heroin addicts or many serum hepatitis cases is an enigma to me.

The confusion in drug abuse programming within the states is a direct result of too many agencies in Washington trying to put their fingers in the pie. How many appointments I have had and how many trips we have made to Denver and to Washington, D.C., trying to get some idea of where the money is and how we get it! Within the last month four people from regional offices in Denver have made appointments with me, and each of these gentlemen has told me a different story each time I have met with them.

My inconvenience and my confusion are not the essential facets of our problem. The essential facets of the problem are the socially alienated youth and young drug abusers and the subsequent social problems which are burdening our state. While the drug abuse problem is probably a bottomless pit, I still cling to the belief that if we can do anything possible in the line of prevention, treatment or rehabilitation, I believe that is worth the effort.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these letters very specifically point out how bureaucrats downtown are making laws and how those actions impede States trying to comply with the law as originally passed by Congress. I believe we have to be alert to this problem and to correct it in every instance. I would hope that any of my colleagues, whose States face similar problems, will join in demanding that all States receive the full allocation under Public Law 92-255 and that the drug program not be limited to heroin, but rather broadly based to include prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation, under guidelines which the States can help determine.

CONTROLLING COMMERCIAL TELEPHONE SOLICITATIONS

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major nuisances today to American householders is the

commercial solicitor who operates by telephone.

Mr. Speaker, this breed—which seems to have a propensity for operating during the dinner hour—utilize telephone books and call individuals at random peddling quarter acres of swampland in Florida, cemetery lots after a cheerful reminder that one never knows when the grim reaper will strike and other items that the telephone subscriber may or may not have any interest in acquiring.

One of my constituents put it in very basic language to me recently: "Congressman, who needs these guys?" I cannot agree more, who indeed does need these guys?

Perhaps there are individuals who are lonely or take some joy in being solicted over the telephone. To these people I leave them with their pleasure. There are, however, other Americans who do not wish to be disturbed, and my bill is directed to those who do not wish to be disturbed at all hours of the day and night by telephone hucksters.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would require the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate rules under which each telephone subscriber would be asked annually if he desired not to be solicited via the telephone. Lists of such persons would be made available by Ma Bell to telephone solicitors.

Under my bill the FCC would be required to prescribe the specific method by which compliance would be accomplished. They could, for example, require the telephone companies to put an asterisk beside the name of subscribers who do not wish to have their privacy invaded by telephone solicitors.

I have specifically exempted from this bill provisions for churches, bona fide charity organizations, political candidates and organizations, poll takers and debt collection agencies seeking payment for a preexisting debt.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is not one of the cosmic issues of the day, but it is one of the many minor annoyances that 20th-century householders live with. I think that in this small area we can assist householders to be secure in their own homes. I think the thought of fines of up to $1,000 for each offense and jail sentences of up to 30 days for each offense will cause the telephone solicitors to be wary of disturbing those who have no wish to be disturbed.

PRIDE IN PENSACOLA

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, west Florida takes pride that our principal city, Pensacola, is an All-America City finalist. At once one of the oldest and one of the newest and most progressive of Florida cities, Pensacola is a strong candidate to capture one of the 10 All-America City awards. This is a tribute to great city and even more to those who have understood Pensacola's progress and its achievements, and who have effectively presented Pensacola's case.

Pensacola's application for consideration for All-America City status was based on three major projects: The Actions 1976 Program, the Gulf Islands National Seashore, and the Community Central Services Program of United Way. All of these are significant steppingstones to a better tomorrow for Pensacola and its people.

Pensacola's case was fully presented in the presentation speech which Warren Briggs, a very able civic leader and successful businessman, made at the National Municipal League meeting in Minnesota in November. His impressive speech contained this significant summation:

It is the spirit of our community which prompted our citizens to take action at a crucial time to save our most precious natural resources—43 miles of snow-white beaches. We have now dedicated these beaches to America for all posterity.

It is the spirit of our community which has provided a centralized welfare referral service for our needy citizens and devised a unique method of funding needed programs.

It is the spirit of our community which has helped our citizens to capture the real meaning of the 200th birthday of our country. We have resolved to commemorate the American Revolution Bicentennial in 1976 by achieving goals in a program set for ourselves after thousands of hours of citizen effort involving a complete cross-section of the entire community.

The presentation included other claims to fame for which Pensacola can be justly proud. It spoke of Pensacola's active participation in people-to-people programs, the Ecuadorian Hospital, the help given Chimbote, Peru, following the earthquake there, the trip of young Pensacolans to the Dominican Republic to help in the immunization program, and the student delegation which went to Paris to petition the North Vietnamese to release our prisoners.

It is good to know that this type of work is constantly in progress in Pensacola. These are things of which every citizen of Pensacola can be proud.

Particular mention should be made of the fact that the Pensacola Chamber of Commerce is leading in the fight to have Pensacola designated an All-American city. However, this is just one of the highlights in the long and notable history of the Pensacola chamber. I applaud its leadership and its members for their work in bringing forth the fact that Pensacola is indeed an All-American city.

I was very much impressed with an article by Jackie Brooks in the Pensacola News-Journal on Sunday, January 7, on this subject. It was entitled "Pensacola May Be Honored" and I include it for printing in the RECORD:

ALL-AMERICA CITY FINALIST: PENSACOLA MAY BE HONORED

(By Jackie Brooks)

The ripples set off by the actions of a few citizens often cause waves of nationwide scope—the bad more often than the good.

But if Pensacola and Escambia County capture one of the 10 All-America City awards this year, it will definitely be a tribute to the handful of people who started the first small ripples for the Gulf Islands National Seashore, the Action '76 Goals Program and Community Central Services.

And it will be no less a tribute to those thousands who were infected with the spirit of the few which gradually engulfed the entire community and brought the projects to full tide.

Citizen-initiated action for community betterment is the basis set forth by the National Municipal League and the Saturday Evening Post for the annual competition, held this year in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in connection with the League's National Conference on Government.

Fifteen civic minded citizens, involved in the three projects presented for judging, formed the team which flew to Minneapolis to present this community's story to the 12-man jury last month.

Recommendations from the jury, led by Dr. George Gallup, chairman of the American Institute of Public Opinion, and investigations conducted in the 21 finalist cities will determine the winning communities.

"Pride and prejudice" was the phrase used by Chamber of Commerce President G. Carl Mertins to temper the team's extreme confidence of winning the award. Pride and prejudice aside, all 15 were elated following the presentation by Action '76 Chairman Warren Briggs to the jury.

"We're going to win," has been the rallying cry of the local delegation from the time it was announced that Pensacola was a finalist, through the Minneapolis visit and to the present time.

Chamber of Commerce Manager Don Wylie and the Pensacola Jaycee Coordinator Don Partington put together the team and made all the arrangements for a bid for the award.

Everything was planned down to the last detail, including the display to be set up in the mezzanine of the Radisson Hotel, Beggs' formal presentation, and concise informative answers to questions anticipated from the jury.

Thanks to the careful planning and the determination of each team member, the Pensacola and Escambia County story was presented without a hitch and gained full attention from the distinguished jury.

At the end of 1972, the Seashore has been established and is planning for the millions of visitors expected this summer; the Action '76 Goals Program is complete, with many of the projects recommended already underway or being planned; and Community Central Services is functioning to coordinate public assistance programs with the people who need the services.

The tiny ripples which began these important programs may or may not receive national recognition when the All-America awards are announced in the spring, but the waves of pride in the accomplishments of the community's citizen will flood this section of the county for many years to come.

NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to sponsor legislation in the House last year designating the fourth Saturday of September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." I was joined by 53 Members in the House and, Senator MCINTYRE who sponsored the bill in the Senate, was joined by 38 Senators. The legislation passed both the House and Senate unanimously and was signed into law by the President. September 23, 1972, was a day of national celebration in special recognition of more than 55 million hunters and fishermen for their contributions to conservation and outdoor recreation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing this bill and I want to again welcome

and urge our colleagues to join with me in sponsoring this important measure. Congress should recognize the services of the sportsman to the wise use of our natural resources and for their participation in healthful recreation and its encouragement.

Since the turn of the century hunters and fishermen have consistently been in the forefront of every conservation crusade. Our Nation's early conservation leaders, such as Theodore Roosevelt and Gilbert Pinchot, were hunters and fishermen. Outdoorsmen were the first to decry the destruction of America's forests, streams, soils, and wetlands. They were the first because their love of the outdoors had made them aware of the beauty of nature and the necessity of protecting wildlife habitat and scenic grandeurs.

Hunters and fishermen were the first to plead for conservation because they were the ones who were hiking the mountains and fishing the streams. For more than 50 years outdoorsmen carried a lonely crusade to manage our natural resources wisely. They were the ones behind every major conservation action in Washington and State capitals. They created their own publications to warn all Americans of what would happen to the environment.

It is only in very recent years that Americans were awakened to the threats of the destruction of their environment. The news media suddenly popularized ecology and environment. The total American citizenry became aware of the serious need for conservation. This is not news to hunters and fishermen who gladly welcome the public to help with a crusade that outdoorsmen have conducted since 1900. All Americans are needed to join the campaign to use our Nation's resources wisely.

In order to campaign more effectively for their sport and our Nation's environmental needs, hunters and fishermen have formed many national and State organizations. They have led or participated actively in every major conservation crusade. The names of these organizations are familiar to all of you—the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, Ducks Unlimited, and many others.

It is important to the spiritual and physical survival of our people that Congress encourage hunters and fishermen and other outdoor sportsmen to continue their conservation crusade and their enjoyment of outdoor recreation. I urge the Congress to honor the hunters and fishermen of America by again adopting my resolution.

ADM. FREEMAN CARY—FLORIDIAN

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Florida delegation takes note with special pleasure of the fact that a distinguished son of our State has been designated to serve as the attending physician to the Congress.

Adm. Freeman Cary has been selected to succeed Adm. Rufus Pearson, Jr., who has served with distinction and ability in this important position. Admiral Pearson is a graduate of the University of Florida and was a practicing physician in Jacksonville prior to his return to active naval duty in 1950.

In selecting Admiral Cary to assume the duties of the attending physician to Congress, we have a man eminently qualified for the position and, happily and proudly for the citizens of our State, a man whose legal residence is in Florida.

Admiral Cary was born in La Grange, Ga., and is a graduate of Emory University. He completed his internship, residency, and fellowship in cardiology at Grady Hospital in Atlanta.

But it was to Florida that he went to make his home. Admiral Cary served as clinical professor of medical education at the University of South Florida, and as clinical professor of allied health sciences at Florida Technical University at Orlando, where he now makes his legal residence. He was director of medical education at Orange Memorial Hospital at Orlando and is a past president of the Florida Heart Association.

Those of us who have had the pleasure to know and work with Admiral Cary know him to be a man of the highest personal and professional integrity. With his lovely wife, Sara, he now lives in Kensington, Md.

It is only natural, of course, that we are sorry to see Dr. Pearson leave us. We have come to rely on him and confidently to place our health problems in his care.

But I am certain that the man who now takes his place, Adm. Freeman Cary, will carry on the traditions of the attending physician's office in a most admirable manner. Unquestionably, the health of those who work on Capitol Hill is in good hands.

RED CHINESE GAINING INFLUENCE IN AFRICA

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a very revealing article concerning Communist activities in Africa, written by Jack Penn, appeared in the October 28, 1972, issue of Human Events. It contains significant information about guerrilla warfare and economic exploitation by Red powers and how that activity is being used to topple politically shaky African governments.

The article follows:

RED CHINESE GAINING INFLUENCE IN AFRICA

(By Jack Penn) *

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—Red China is thrusting a great steel arm deep into Central Africa. This is the Tan-Zam Railroad, stretching 1,100 miles from Dar-es-Salaam in Tanzania on the East Coast to the copper belt in Zambia. Scheduled for completion in 1975, construction is proceeding at such a pace that the track may be completed as early as the end of 1973. It is being financed by China at a cost of $400 million (repayable by Zambia over 30 years, interest free), and constructed by Chinese laborers and technicians.

The railroad is being built despite the fact that adequate rail connections for carrying Zambian ore to ports on both the Atlantic and Indian Oceans already exist, and despite the fact that the World Bank in 1965 and 1967, and Great Britain in 1965, had rejected Zambian requests for aid on the grounds that the project was not economically justified.

It is certain that the justification for the project is political: Zambia wishes to be free of her dependence on ports in the Portuguese provinces of Angola and Mozambique. At the same time, the railroad is symbolic of Red China's new and energetic thrust for influence in Africa, and of the growing threat posed by the Communists powers to Western interests in that continent.

China's activities in Africa must be seen against the background of the present Chinese campaign to become the leader, spokesman and patron of the so-called non-aligned world. The Chinese view is that in this loose grouping Africa occupies the central position. A Chinese Army document states:

"The center of anti-colonial struggle is Africa, the center of struggle between East and West is Africa. At present Africa is the central question in the world."

Africa can also easily be accommodated in the Chinese strategy according to which the "rural areas" the underdeveloped world must promote the revolution against the "cities" the industrialized Western powers and the Soviet Union. Within the African context, the developed South Africa and Rhodesia form the "cities" against the rest of the continent.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

China would benefit greatly by having access to the vast natural resources of the African continent, and, in particular, to the mineral resources of the relatively developed area of Southern Africa. It is feared that a strong Chinese presence would be able to take advantage of the continuing political unrest and instability of the continent. Even where political stability does exist, in Southern Africa, resistance to Chinese-backed aggression is hampered by the adverse world opinion toward that area.

Tanzania represents China's most important foothold in Africa. China has become a notable participant in Tanzania's economic development, and in addition to financing the Tan-Zam Railroad, has assisted with road construction and the construction of a naval base at Dar-es-Salaam.

Conservatively estimated, there are approximately 20,000 Chinese in Tanzania. While most of these are trained technicians engaged in the construction of the railroad, much of the impact of the Chinese presence is being felt in the defense force. The Tanzanian Army is being trained and expanded by other Chinese who have supplied large consignments of modern military equipment, incuding an anticipated 24 MIG–17 jets.

TANZANIA OVERTURES

In November 1970 a Tanzanian military mission visited China and North Korea and an agreement was reached to the effect that a permanent North Korean military mission would be situated in Tanzania. The mission would cooperate with the training of sections of the Tanzanian Army and would install its own base for "freedom fighters."

In 1971 President Nyerere opened a "school for revolution" at Tabora, which will probably function on the same basis as the mother school in Pyongyang. It is clear that China has decided in this way to utilize North Korea as a subversive tool in the Third World, since this facilitates China's efforts to normalize her international relations.

Because of Zambia's close ties with Tanzania, it is considered by China to be one of the best propositions for further extension of influence. In addition to the construction

*Dr. Penn is a prominent Johannesburg physician who has made a special study of the African guerrilla movement. He is a trustee of the South Africa Foundation.

of the Zambian portion of the railroad, aid has been concentrated on the construction of two major strategic roads, and the provision and building of three radio transmitters.

Zambia is committed to repay the railroad loan by the purchase of Chinese goods and by the supply of agricultural products for Chinese consumption. This will impose a severe strain on the already struggling Zambian economy, which has been hit by low copper prices (the country's principal source of wealth), and by sharply diminishing agricultural output. (As recently as a year ago, Zambia had to import large quantities of corn from Rhodesia because of food shortages.) Zambia has, moreover, undergone a period of political upheaval, with President Kaunda jailing nearly all his political opposition.

In February of this year, Dr. Kaunda outlawed the five-month-old opposition party, the United Progressives, and ordered the detention of 123 of its backers without trial. Among those seized was the party leader, Dr. Simon Kapepwe, a former Vice President, who had criticized the President for the failure of his domestic policies.

YUGOSLAV AID

It should be pointed out that China is not the only Communist power competing for influence in Zambia. President Kaunda visited Yugoslavia in 1970 and concluded an agreement whereby Yugoslavia would assist Zambia in developing a "peoples army" and would provide Zambia with an efficient air force.

Chinese aid has also been extended to other African countries. Various interest-free development loans have been made to other states, including $80 million to Ethiopia, two $40-million loans to the Sudan, and a $20-million loan to Mauritania.

China has also, by agreement signed in 1971, undertaken to reorganize and arm the army of the Congo (Brazzaville). Military equipment and jets have already been supplied. The Congo has already proclaimed itself a "peoples republic," has adopted Marxist-Leninism as its creed, and in the words of President Ngouabi, has joined the "great world proletariat revolution."

China is particularly well suited to provide the sort of aid needed in Africa; e.g., the provision of technology and training, and even as in the case of the railroad, the actual supply of labor. The Chinese have created a favorable impression by hard work, by frugal living, and by keeping to themselves. In addition, the Chinese can be identified as nonwhite and perhaps be more easily accepted in anti-colonialist Black Africa than Westerners and even the Russians, who have lately seemed to lose some ground.

U.S.S.R. INFLUENCE WANING

The Soviet Union established herself as the foremost Communist power in Africa in the '60s, but with recent setbacks to her influence in the Sudan and Egypt, the Communist leadership seems to be passing to the Chinese. While Russian priorities in Africa would at present seem to be the consolidation of her positions in the areas adjacent to the Near East, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the northern half of the Indian Ocean, indications are that she is actively concerned about the gaining Chinese influence in Central Africa, and the consequent erosion of Russian influence in those countries and with the terrorist movement that are based there.

This may be one of the main reasons for the appearance during the last few years of a considerable standing Soviet naval force in the Indian Ocean. The number of ships in this force is normally about 15, but at times it has grown to 30.

Concern has arisen from uncertainty as to just what the Soviet objectives in the Indian Ocean are. Most observers feel that the Soviets have a number of objectives.

Firstly, they wish to counter the growing Chinese influence in Africa. Another likely objective is the acquisition of Soviet influence along the Indian Ocean littoral. Lawrence Martin, professor of War Studies at the University of London, has said that it is hard to define the exact relationship between a particular level of military presence and consequent political influence, but it does seem that the connection is real and significant. It is made all the more significant by the instability of the area.

The Communist powers have for years made considerable political gains by taking advantage of local crisis situations. Crisis situations have been a feature of Black Africa in the last decade: there have been over 30 military coups d'etat and a series of distressing civil wars, some of which are raging at present. In the 19th Century Turkey was described as the "sick man of Europe"; by comparison, this area is a veritable hospital ward of sick men. Governments have tended to be unstable and of short duration. In other words, conditions are ideal for the spread of Communist influence.

Most important, perhaps, is the Soviet desire to control the flow of Middle Eastern oil to the West. Despite the discovery of oil in the North Sea and in Africa, the dependence of Western countries on oil from the Middle East will certainly grow over the next decade.

Much has been written about the looming energy crisis in the United States. The U.S.A., which has relied largely on its own oil in the past, may have to import half of it by 1980-85. Moscow Radio says pointedly that up to a third of this "will be carried from the Middle East to the United States—but the scale of the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia and the Middle East is inflicting blows on the predatory plans of the American monopolists." On this point the Soviet position is clear, as is the implication for the United States.

IMPORTANCE OF CAPE

There are only three ways in which that oil can be supplied: through the Suez Canal, by pipeline through politically unstable countries, and around the Cape. The Suez Canal is closed, and there is no immediate prospect of any change in that situation, but even if the canal were to be re-opened, the growing use of modern supertankers would mean that much of the oil would still have to be shipped around the Cape. The importance of the Cape route is emphasized by the fact that yearly over 20,000 ships round the Cape. About half this number are tankers, while more than 5,000 are vessels flying a Communist flag.

The significance of this fact was emphasized recently when, in a report issued as a result of a conference on the Indian Ocean, held under the auspices of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University, the editors summarized their conclusions as follows:

"A recurrent theme of this report has been the fact that the trading pattern of the Indian Ocean area is still primarily external rather than intra-regional. For this reason, much attention has been focused here upon the entrances to the Ocean: from the Pacific, Atlantic and Mediterranean regions. It was noted that several of the littoral states, and particularly those grouped near these vital entrances, are areas threatened with internal unrest and instability.

"The opportunities for Great Power intervention are increased by the fact that the navies of the litorral states, in global terms, are very weak. For all these reasons—a central geographic position, the network of vital trading routes, the number of potential conflicts in and between the littoral states—it would appear that the Indian Ocean is destined to play an important strategic role in future world politics."

It is obvious that South Africa's position on this route as a pro-Western, anti-Communist country is one of great importance. Her ports provide the only suitable bunkering, provisioning, drydock and graving-dock facilities, while the Simonstown Naval Base near Cape Town is the only fully equipped naval base in the South Atlantic-Indian Ocean area, and is, in addition, being developed as a submarine base.

In addition, South Africa is the only African nation with the industrial and technological capacity to maintain a proper servicing of these facilities, a reflection of the fact that nearly half of the entire industrial output of the African continent is produced in South Africa.

No less important is South Africa's concentration of strategic minerals. South Africa produces 70 per cent of the world's gold. She has vast resources of coal and iron ore, and in addition is a major producer of nearly every strategic mineral with the exception of aluminum and petroleum.

Rhodesia and South Africa together possess more than 90 per cent of the world's resources of chrome. It was interesting to note that the United States recently voted to import chrome ore from Rhodesia in violation of a Security Council resolution imposing sanctions on that country, because the United States had become too dependent on Russia for her supplies of this metal. The strategic implications were obvious.

At the same conference mentioned above, Prof. Charles Issawi of Columbia University used a phrase of Nikita Khrushchev to emphasize the strength of South Africa: "You cannot take a camel and a sparrow," said Mr. Khrushchev, "and call them two head of cattle." In Africa, said Prof. Issawi, South Africa is the camel, and the rest are sparrows.

But this strength is only in terms of the African continent, and is dwarfed by the threat posed by the presence of the two Communist superpowers. These powers are aware of the strategic importance of South Africa, the wealth in the country, and the fact that adverse world opinion has rendered it vulnerable in terms of its Western ties.

The element of competition in Africa that exists between the two major Communist powers does little to diminish this threat, and a clear pattern emerges. A "belt" of countries subject to strong Communist influence is forming in Central Africa, which has the effect of isolating the southern region, and which provides an ideal springboard for the various terrorist organizations in their forays to the south.

The professed aim of the terrorist movements is to "liberate" the black peoples of Southern Africa from white rule. They have, of course, not chosen to establish whether these people wish to be "liberated" or not, an assumption which, to say the least, is questionable. Current evidence could not lead anyone to that conclusion.

The African tribes south of the Zambesi have been under European influence for 300 to 400 years. They are therefore Christian by religion, and have the highest standard of literacy on the continent. As their income per capita is also higher, so too is their standard of living. For precisely this reason, something in excess of a million blacks from outside South Africa are working in that country—perhaps the only case in history where people have flocked in large numbers to a country in which they are allegedly oppressed.

The guerrillas are essentially tribal Africans who have taken up arms by conviction or by compulsion. To the world, their enemies are the white men in the south. The *truth* is that they are fighting peaceful black men whose main interest is to keep these intruders out. These are the *real* freedom fighters—assisted as they are in this task by Portuguese, Rhodesian and South African whites.

These people regard the guerrillas as a threat, and this hostility is one of the main

reasons why the guerrillas have made little headway. The support of the rural inhabitants, which is essential to the success of any revolutionary movement of this nature, is lacking. The guerrillas have only succeeded in forcing the governments of Portugal and Rhodesia to undergo the financially exhausting exercise of mobilizing numbers of troops, both black and white.

GUERRILLA SUPPORTERS

The guerrillas are supported by the military African states who provide them with bases, by the Communist countries mentioned previously who provide weapons and training, by international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, who confer international legitimacy upon them, and by such Western liberal institutions as, for example, the World Council of Churches, who provide vital financial support for "humanitarian purposes only."

In other words, they currently enjoy the support of that fickle coalition of self-interest and fashion that constitutes "world opinion." Nebulous as this "world opinion" may be, it still exerts a considerable set of pressures on the governments of Southern Africa, and in particular on South Africa.

These pressures have resulted in South Africa being excluded from many international forums, her achievements being disregarded, and her importance in Africa obscured. Some of the criticism of South Africa's policy of separate development for the various races within the country is valid, but it should be noted that South Africa is a society with a unique structure, a unique combination of heterogeneous peoples, and, not surprisingly, it has adopted unique solutions.

The population is not merely split into about 3.7 million whites, two million people of mixed blood or "coloured" and half-a-million Asians, but the Black African population of 14.9 million is itself divided into some nine major language groups, speaking some 260 dialects. It should also be noted that many of these peoples, historically, have been at war with each other. Some of their languages have no more relationship to one another than, say, English and German. It is to provide for this diversity that the policy of separate development was articulated.

The government has repeatedly said that its policy is not one of eternal white supremacy, nor is it based on any myth of racial superiority. It is a policy of giving each of the major tribal groups its independence in its homeland.

While it is often said that there is no allowance made for the dignity, the legitimate political aspirations, the desire for self-government and the fulfillment of the personal ambitions of the blacks, the government contends that its policy of separate development has been designed specifically to cater for these aspirations. They point out that the policy is based on the concept that no racial group should be allowed to dominate another.

There is no doubt that this system, at present, is discriminatory in its working. It is not, however, inherently discriminatory. The appeal of the government's policy lies in providing a way to realize the legitimate political and personal aspirations of the blacks in a peaceful evolutionary way—in a word, of moving away from discrimination.

COMMONWEALTH IDEA

The intention is to create a commonwealth of states, politically independent and economically interdependent. Four homelands have already achieved semiautonomy, including having their own legislative assemblies and control over their internal affairs. It is expected that others will follow soon.

Perhaps the most encouraging aspect about South African society is that over the last few years it has reflected significant and positive change. This may be seen in the diplomatic overtures to Black Africa, the emergence of articulate and independent black leaders, the acceptance in many areas of multi-racial sport, the willingness of the South African government to reconsider its policy of visas towards hostile black politicians like Rep. Charles Diggs (D-Mich.) and others, and the ferment of opinion within South Africa as a whole and within the Afrikaner people in particular. This change was recognized by Mr. Nixon, who in his third statement of United States foreign policy for the 1970s noted that, "South Africa contains within itself the seeds of change."

It would be wrong to think that the threat of communism in Africa has caused concern only in the white-controlled Southern African region. The heads of a number of Francophobe African states, and in particular, President Houphouet Boigny of the Ivory Coast, have expressed deep concern about Chinese activity in Africa.

President Nimeiry of the Sudan recently purged the Communists there, after they had backed an abortive attempted coup. This is one indication of how far the Communist planners were prepared to go in their attempts to gain power in Africa. Tanzania and Zambia, with their current internal and financial problems, are particularly vulnerable to this type of activity.

The whole Indian Ocean region, then, is in a state of flux. Red China, almost unnoticed by the United States, is making a determined and dangerous attempt to assert control over Central Africa.

The Soviet Union, which four years ago had no ships at all in the Indian Ocean, now maintains a sizable fleet, while the permanent U.S. presence consists of two obsolete destroyers and a converted sea-plane tender stationed in the Persian Gulf. The U.S. has shown some signs that she recognizes the nature of the threat; one wonders whether she will appreciate its full implications in time.

CONGRESS MUST REGAIN ITS LOST POWERS

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

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, the power of the Congress to act as a check and a balance upon the Executive is at the lowest ebb in our history. Further, Mr. Speaker, Congress faces no more serious and important challenge than recovering the constitutional powers that have been usurped by the Executive.

I am today proposing legislation which I believe will take a major step toward that goal. It will at least give the Congress the tools that it needs to fully carry out the responsibilities vested in the legislative branch by the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in what may well be the most important effort to preserve and protect our system of checks and balances, and thereby our free society.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will test whether the will exists in the Congress and the Nation to return to an earlier concept of three separate and coequal branches. If Congress fails to act it could be treated with still greater condescension by the Executive.

My bill breaks new ground. It will create a watchdog which, acting solely for Congress, will assure that the President obtains proper congressional authority for any program or action. The watchdog will be a new Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight in a reconstituted General Accounting Office empowered with the authority to revoke spending authorizations should the President undertake any action not consistent with the express intent of Congress. Disputes between the Comptroller General and the Executive will be resolved by a concurrent resolution of both Houses. The concurrent resolution does not require Presidential approval.

Equally important, the General Accounting Office will have the power to force the Executive to provide Congress with any information that is "necessary and proper to the discharge of the constitutional responsibilities" of Congress. This includes testimony by members of the executive, official documents, reports and the like and Congress will be the sole determiner as to what information meets that test.

In order to assure that the staff of the GAO are completely independent of the Executive and solely the agents of Congress, the Comptroller will be approved by concurrent resolution upon nomination by the Speaker of the House. His deputy will be similarly appointed upon nomination of the President pro tempore of the Senate. The Director of the Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight will be nominated by the Comptroller General.

I want to stress that what we are proposing is a new mechanism, but it is not a new concept. It merely gives Congress the tools which will enable it to carry out the functions assigned to it by the Constitution, functions which have been improperly taken over by the Executive.

The U.S. Constitution did not envisage a President with the power to make and enlarge war without congressional mandate.

It did not envisage a President having the authority to set and implement national policy without congressional authority.

It did not envisage a President with the power to pick and choose among congressional programs, implementing some and ignoring others even when passed over the Presidential veto.

Finally, it did not envisage an Executive with the power to arrogantly refuse to provide information that Congress, in its wisdom, has determined to be necessary and proper to the discharge of its legislative responsibilities.

Nor is the effort to recapture usurped authority new. It is clear to me that Congress believed that it was instituting the same reforms that my bill proposes when it enacted the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

I am submitting for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis and the full text of my bill:

THE CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT ACT OF 1973—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Entitles act "The Congressional Oversight Act of 1973."

Section 2: Statement of findings and declaration that:

(a) The Constitution vests in Congress sole authority to enact legislation, raise revenues, authorize expenditures, and appropriate moneys;

(b) Congress shall have full access to all information available to the Executive necessary to the discharge of Congress' Constitutional responsibilities;

(c) The Executive is directed by the Constitution to faithfully execute all laws enacted by Congress.

Section 3: Establishes in the General Accounting Office (GAO) an Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight (OBEO) and directs that it shall oversee the Executive with respect to the following: preparation and administration of the Budget; raising of revenues; expenditure of moneys; preparation and presentation of legislative proposals; implementation of legislative programs enacted by Congress.

Section 4: (a) Declares that the GAO shall be an agency of Congress;

(b) Provides that the Comptroller General and Deputy Comptroller General shall be officers of Congress and shall be appointed by Congress;

(c) Redesignates "Assistant Comptroller General" as "Deputy Comptroller General;"

(d) Shortens the term of the Comptroller General and Deputy Comptroller General from fifteen (15) to five (5) years, makes them eligible for reappointment, and provides for their removal for cause by Congress;

(e) Conforms existing provisions for Comptroller General's pension to the reduction of his term from fifteen years to five years;

(f) Provides that the Director of OBEO shall be appointed by, and may be removed by, Congress:

(g) Requires that the Comptroller General and Deputy Comptroller General serving on the date of enactment shall be subject to appointment by Congress within sixty days thereafter.

Section 5: Directs OBEO to—

(1) Continuously review the fiscal requirements needed to fund existing programs adequately to achieve their legislative purpose;

(2) Within 45 days after the President submits the Budget or any legislative proposal to Congress, submit a written report to Congress evaluating—

(A) the accuracy of its revenue projections;

(B) the adequacy of proposed funding to assure full implementation of legislative programs of Congress;

(C) the need for proposed new programs or reduction of existing programs, and whether such proposals are consistent with the legislative programs of Congress;

(3) Make a full report to Congress at least twice a year on the implementation of legislative programs.

Section 6: (a) Prohibits the Executive from impounding moneys appropriated for any program unless the Comptroller General has first approved the impoundment (except when an impoundment under specific circumstances is expressly authorized by statute);

(b) Establishes criteria and procedures for Comptroller General's approval or disapproval of a proposed impoundment by the Executive prohibiting approval if the impoundment is not consistent with the legislative intent of Congress concerning the program in question;

(c) Permits Congress to override any decision by the Comptrol' - General concerning impoundment.

Section 7: Requires the head of each department in the Executive to submit to OBEO a duplicate copy of each legislative and budget request submitted by him to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Section 8: Empowers the GAO to issue subpoenas to obtain necessary information.

Section 9: Directs Comptroller General to cut off disbursements from the Treasury for expenditures which he determines are being made for purposes not consistent with the intent of Congress.

Section 10: Maintains all existing functions of the GAO.

Section 11: Authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the Act.

H.R. 2408

A bill to implement the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the legislative branch

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Congressional Oversight Act of 1973."

SEC. 2. (a) Congress hereby finds and declares that the Constitution of the United States establishes three separate branches of Government and expressly vests in the Congress the sole authority to enact legislation, raise revenues, authorize expenditures, and appropriate moneys on behalf of the United States.

(b) Congress further finds and declares that the legislative branch shall have full, prompt and unimpaired access to any and all information available to the Executive as Congress may deem necessary and proper to the discharge of its constitutional responsibilities.

(c) Congress further finds and declares that the Constitution directs that the Executive shall take care that the laws enacted by Congress shall be faithfully executed.

SEC. 3. In order to assure that the mandates of the Constitution shall be fully and effectively carried out, there is hereby established within the General Accounting Office an Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight, which shall exercise oversight over the Executive with respect to the preparation and administration of the budget, the raising of revenues, the expenditure of moneys, the preparation and presentation of legislative proposals, and the implementation of legislative programs enacted by Congress, and shall undertake such other responsibilities as Congress may find necessary or desirable to the maintenance of the independence and constitutional prerogatives of the legislative branch and shall by concurrent resolution direct.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 301 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 41) is amended by inserting after "shall be independent of the executive departments and" the following: "shall be an agency of the Congress,".

(b) Section 302 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. There shall be in the General Accounting Office a Comptroller General of the United States, and a Deputy Comptroller General of the United States, who shall be officers of Congress. The Comptroller General shall be appointed by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress upon nomination by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Deputy Comptroller shall be appointed by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress upon nomination by the President pro tempore of the Senate. The Deputy Comptroller General shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Comptroller General, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as Comptroller General."

(c) Such Act is amended by striking out "Assistant Comptroller General" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Deputy Comptroller General".

(d) Section 303 of such Act (31 U.S.C. 43) is amended by striking out "fifteen" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "five"; by striking out the second sentence thereof; and by striking out "joint" in the third sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "concurrent".

(e) The second and third paragraphs of such section 303 are each amended by striking out "ten" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

(f) The Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight shall have a Director and such other employees as the Comptroller General may deem necessary and appropriate. The director shall be appointed by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress upon nomination of the Comptroller General and may be removed by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress.

(g) A person serving as Comptroller General or Deputy Comptroller General on the date of enactment of the Act may continue to serve after the sixtieth day after such date only if within such 60-day period he is reappointed to his office in the manner provided by section 302 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this section. Any person so reappointed shall be subject to the method of removal and terms of service provided in such section 302.

SEC. 5. The Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight, under such rules as the Comptroller General may prescribe, shall—

(1) conduct a continuing review of the fiscal requirements necessary to fund existing programs at levels adequate to achieve their legislative purpose:

(2) analyze the Budget, supplementary budgetary summaries and legislative proposals transmitted by or on behalf of the President to Congress and, within 45 days of the transmittal thereof by the President, submit a written report to the Congress evaluating—

(A) in connection with the Budget or a revenue proposal, the accuracy of revenue projections therein and the adequacy of funding provided thereby to maintain existing and proposed programs in a manner consistent with the intent of Congress;

(B) the extent to which proposed expenditures conform to the legislative programs of Congress and will assure the full implementation of such programs in a manner consistent with the intent of Congress;

(C) the necessity for any legislative proposal which would create a new function, activity or authority or eliminate, restrict, or expand any existing function, activity or authority approved by Congress and the extent to which such proposal is consistent with the legislative programs of the Congress; and

(D) such other aspects of the Budget or Comptroller General may deem desirable and of such a summary or proposal as the appropriate in order that Congress be provided with all information necessary to the discharge of its Constitutional responsibilities; and

(3) submit to Congress from time to time, but no less frequently than twice a year, a full and detailed report on the implementation of legislative programs, the accuracy of budget projections, the adequacy of revenues and such other information as the Comptroller General shall deem necessary or either House of Congress by resolution may request to assist such House in fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities.

SEC. 6. (a) No officer (including the President) or employee of the United States having authority to expend or obligate funds shall impound an appropriation, unless—

(1) prior to impounding such appropriation, such officer or employee transmits to the Comptroller General a proposal to impound such appropriation and the Comptroller General approves such prosopal in accordance with subsection (b), or

(2) such officer or employee is expressly authorized or directed to impound an appropriation in specific circumstances prescribed by statute.

Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665) shall not be considered an express authorization or direction to impound an appropriation, for purposes of paragraph (2).

(b) The Comptroller General shall approve a proposal to impound an appropriation only if—

(1) written justification for the proposal to impound has been transmitted to him and to each House of Congress by the person proposing such impounding; and

(2) he determines that such proposal to impound is consistent with the legislative programs of Congress and would not result in the failure of a program adequately to achieve its legislative purpose; and

(3) neither House of Congress has passed a resolution stating its disapproval of such proposal to impound by the end of the thirtieth calendar day of session of Congress after the date on which written justification therefor is transmitted to it.

Any disapproval by the Comptroller General of a proposal to impound an appropriation shall become null if both Houses of Congress subsequently by concurrent resolution state their approval of the impoundment in question.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "impound an appropriation" means—

(1) to make or authorize expenditures from any appropriation, during the period (if any) specified by Congress by law for expending such appropriation, in an aggregate amount which is less than the full amount appropriated by Congress for the purpose in question, or

(2) to create or authorize obligations under any appropriation, during the period (if any) specified by Congress by law for obligating such appropriation, in an aggregate amount which is less than the full amount appropriated by Congress for the purpose in question.

SEC. 7. In order to enable the Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight to discharge its responsibilities under this Act, the head of each department and establishment in the Executive shall submit to the Office of Budget and Expenditure Oversight a duplicate copy of all legislative and budgetary requests submitted by him to the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to section 215 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 23) or any other statute or Executive order.

SEC. 8. In order to fully implement the provisions of this Act and to supplement the mandate provided in section 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 313), the General Accounting Office is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such documents, books, papers, and correspondence as it may deem necessary for the purpose of carrying out its duties. In case of a disobedience to a subpena the General Accounting Office may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documents, books, papers, and correspondence under the provisions of this section. Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which an investigation or injury is being conducted by the General Accounting Office may, in the event of neglect or refusal to obey a subpena issued under this section, issue an order requiring the respondent comply with the terms of the subpena. Failure to obey such an order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 9. Whenever the Comptroller General shall determine that moneys appropriated by Congress are about to be, are being or have been obligated or expended in a manner or for purposes not consistent with the intent of Congress, he shall revoke all warrants upon which such moneys were disbursed pursuant to section 11 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (31 U.S.C. 76). Any department or establishment affected by such a revocation may request the Comptroller General to reissue new warrants for the disbursement of moneys for specific purposes (as set forth in such request), and the Comptroller General shall reissue the same, except for moneys for the purposes found by the Comptroller General to have been not consistent with intent of Congress. Such new warrants shall not require the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury. The revocation of any warrant shall remain in effect until Congress otherwise directs by concurrent resolution.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the duties or functions of the General Accounting Office elsewhere provided by law.

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON INTRODUCES CONGRESSIONAL BUDGETARY CONTROL ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to give Congress the means necessary to assert our full control over the budget-making processes of the Government. This bill is known as the Congressional Budgetary Control Act of 1973.

As everyone is aware, the issue of budgetary control was first presented forcefully to us in the 92d Congress when President Nixon demanded the authority to hold spending for fiscal 1973 down to a figure of $250 billion in spite of the fact that the total appropriations already enacted by Congress represented something like $6 or $7 million more than that figure. At that time many Members of Congress were hesitant to give such authority to the President, because to do so would mean that he would then have the ability to negate decisions which Congress had taken in establishing specific spending levels for various programs and departments within the Government. And this, it was felt, would represent a significant abdication of our authority, particularly since the power of the purse is regarded as the principal power of Congress.

Nevertheless, many Members of the House recognized that with staggering deficits facing us in this fiscal year as well as in the previous one, there was an especially urgent reason for holding the line on spending, and many of us also recognized that this was something which the people back home were insisting on, too. So we in the House approved the ceiling legislation, if with some qualms, and we also set about at once to establish procedures to allow Congress to get away from its present piecemeal approach to appropriations and move in the direction of establishing a budget ceiling of our own after which we would then make sure that our appropriation bills remained under the ceiling we had set.

Of course, the spending limitation never won approval in the Senate, but the other portion of the bill providing for establishment of a special committee to develop new budgetary controls was adopted. And today we find the problem even more acute as we face a kind of constitutional crisis over the budget because of the President's action in impounding funds appropriated by Congress even though the spending ceiling he had requested was never enacted.

Regardless of how we may feel about the President's actions, however, it is obvious that our most important and urgent job right now is to establish those procedures which can give us the kind of control we ought to have. This kind of control was originally envisioned in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which directed the development of an annual congressional budget. But over the years that congressional budget somehow never materialized.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced today does, I believe, provide for the basic control we need to establish this congressional budget. Basically, my bill would make three major changes in present procedures in dealing with appropriations:

First. It would require that Congress, within 60 days after the submission of the President's own budget, fix an overall spending ceiling of its own for the upcoming fiscal year.

Second. It would bar Congress from passing any appropriation bill which, when its total was added to the sum of all the other appropriation bills already adopted, would exceed that spending ceiling.

Third. It would move the Nation's fiscal year back 6 months to coincide with the calendar year, thereby giving Congress 6 additional months to complete its annual appropriation activities.

The section preventing adoption of any appropriation bill which would put the combined spending total over the congressionally establishing ceilng represents, I believe, the real teeth in this budget control measure.

It provides that if the final spending bill would exceed the overall ceiling, then this bill could not be passed until Congress had either, first, reduced it to fit the ceiling; second, made appropriate reduction in some of the other spending bills already adopted; third, increased the earlier spending ceiling; or fourth, determined on some combination of all three that would bring total appropriations into line with the congressionally mandated ceiling.

It is of great importance, I believe, that we shift the fiscal year to match the calendar year. Our current budget confrontation with the President underscores how completely idiotic it is for us to be making spending decisions for the Government 6 months after the beginning of the period for which those decisions are supposed to be applicable.

For the past 8 or 9 years now Congress has almost never gotten all of its appropriation bills enacted before the July 1 start of the fiscal year. And here we are now, in 1973, moving into the final 5 months of the current fiscal year with two major appropriation bills still not enacted.

Surely the additional demands of setting a spending ceiling and then later adjusting individual appropriation bills to fit that ceiling, which any workable budget control plan must involve, will require even more time and debate than

we already encounter. So, to do an orderly job we will need the full year.

Of course it is obvious that even adopting the best budget control procedures in the world will not entirely eliminate the possibility of dispute with the White House over budget matters. But it can go a long way in that direction, because the main source of our trouble is the piecemeal manner in which we now appropriate. The pressures to add "just a teeney, weeney bit more" onto this or that individual appropriation are always enormous, and no one has any idea at the time just how these tiny add-ons are going to throw the total spending figure out of whack. It's like the weightwatcher who is sure that just one more chocolate bar cannot possibly make any difference on tomorrow's scale.

My bill will force Congress to do the tough, unpopular job of making choices and setting priorities. And once we have established our willingness to be as tough as the executive in holding spending down, we will be in a much stronger position to assert our particular formula as against his.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that no one has a monopoly of wisdom in such a difficult and complicated matter as this. I certainly claim no special expertise, and I know that many Members have devoted themselves over the past few months to this same question and that many proposals have already been put forward. But I believe my proposal is sound and workable.

One of the problems that beset the earlier attempts under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to establish a congressional budget was the inability of Congress early in the session to arrive at individual spending limitations for specific departments and programs. It turned out that to do this you really had to go through the full appropriation procedure itself, and that required most of the session; it wasn't something that could be done early.

Under my proposal all we undertake at the start is to set an overall spending ceiling. This ceiling would be determined in part on the basis of Federal anticipated revenues, on what we had spent in the last year, on what major changes might have occurred in our situation since then, and of course on the overall spending figure recommended in the President's own budget. There is no reason why Congress couldn't come up fairly quickly with this kind of determination, especially since it would always be open to amendment later on in the light of any changes that might develop. I propose that we arrive at such a decision within 60 days after the President has submitted his own budget recommendations.

I also provide that the initial recommendations for a budget ceiling figure be made by the same committee we created last year to develop the budget control machinery. I would maintain this body on a permanent basis, rather than allowing it to expire, and would not only have this committee submit its spending ceiling figure to Congress, but would also provide that that recommendation go into effect automatically unless either House of Congress voted it down, rather than permitting the matter to be delayed by protracted floor controversy.

My proposal also requires the committee to advise us at the time it makes the overall spending recommendation just how far this ceiling varies from anticipated Federal revenues for the year, either up or down. In this way we will know at the outset whether we are heading into another year of deficit financing, or are likely to be able to live within our income.

Some members have suggested that a decision should also be made at the same time whether any anticipated deficit be made up by additional taxes or by further increases in the national debt. But I do not feel we can realistically expect this kind of decision to be made within the first 30 or even 60 days of a new Congress, any more than earlier Congresses found it practicable to set a spending ceiling in advance for each individual department and program covered in an appropriation bill. I believe it would be sufficient if the House and Senate were simply made aware of the possibility of having to deal with a deficit, and knowing that we should then be better equipped to proceed from there.

There is one final matter that I recognize has not been touched on in my legislation but which should certainly be included in any bill we ultimately adopt, and that is recognition of the fact that spending is not a matter of appropriations alone. We also have backdoor spending, most recently in the case of the water pollution bill adopted over the President's veto in the last Congress; and we always have money in the pipeline which can be spent during a particular fiscal year, as the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) has often reminded us with regard to foreign aid spending. Thus to do an adequate job in controlling spending we must take into account the amounts of spending anticipated in both of these categories and establish appropriate limits for them as well as for appropriations.

These, Mr. Speaker, are my recommendations in the field of realistic congressional budget control. I hope they will be seriously considered by the special subcommittee which is examining this important matter, and I shall look forward to the opportunity of testifying before that committee in support of these recommendations.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of this legislation:

H.R. 2442

A bill to provide for effective congressional controls over the budget by requiring the establishment and enforcement of a ceiling on appropriations for each fiscal year, the notification to Members of Congress of that ceiling and of the current amounts appropriated, the modification of the fiscal year so that it coincides with the calendar year, and the continuation of the joint committee which was created by the Act of October 27, 1972 as a permanent committee

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Budgetary Control Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) Within 30 days after the President transmits the budget of the United States Government to Congress for any fiscal year, the joint committee created under section 301 of the Act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92–599, 86 Stat. 1324), shall determine and report to Congress a recommended maximum limitation of the aggregate amount to be appropriated for such fiscal year. The report of the joint committee shall indicate whether the appropriations limitation is equal to anticipated Federal revenues for such fiscal year, and if not, by what amount the anticipated revenues vary from that limitation. In determining the recommended limitation the joint committee shall take into consideration such factors as the relevant economic indicators, anticipated Federal revenues, the existing rate of Federal expenditure, and the budget recommendations of the President.

(b) Within 30 days after the joint committee reports to Congress its recommendation under subsection (a), the Congress shall establish, by concurrent resolution, a maximum limitation on the aggregate amount to be appropriated for such fiscal year.

(c) If the Congress does not establish a maximum limitation in conformity with subsection (b), then the recommended limitation under subsection (a) shall be the effective maximum limitation as if established under subsection (b).

SEC. 3. (a) No appropriation legislation shall be in order for consideration by the House of Representatives or the Senate if the sum total of the amount of appropriations already made for a fiscal year plus the amount to be appropriated in such appropriation legislation exceeds the limitation on appropriations established for such fiscal year under subsection (b) or (c) of section 2, unless such appropriation legislation contains—

(1) a rescission of unobligated appropriations for such fiscal year by an amount equal to the amount by which such limitation would be exceeded in the absence of such rescission; or

(2) an amendment to such limitation so that it is equal to the sum total of the amount of appropriations already made for such fiscal year plus the amount to be appropriated in such appropriation legislation.

(b) Subsection (a) of this section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively; and they shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relates to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 4. Each edition of the Calendars of the United States House of Representatives, and each edition of the Senate of the United States Calendar of Business, published by the Government Printing Office shall include—

(1) a list indicating the legislative history of each appropriation bill, the fiscal year to which it pertains, and the amount of the appropriation at each stage of its history; and

(2) a compilation indicating the limitation on appropriations established under subsection (b) or (c) of section 2, and indicating the aggregate amount appropriated by each of the following—

(A) appropriation legislation bills passed by—

(i) the House of Representatives,

(ii) the Senate,

(iii) both Houses of the Congress, and

(B) appropriation legislation bills approved by the President.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b)(1), the fiscal year of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall be the calendar year, effective with the second calendar year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b)(1) Notwithstanding section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11), the budget which the President shall transmit for the fiscal year starting July 1 of the calendar year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act shall cover the period beginning July 1 of such year and ending December 31 of the following year.

(2) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall conduct a complete investigation and study of the Federal budgetary process, and shall report to Congress his recommendations for administrative and legislative action necessary to provide for an orderly transition of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States affected by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Effective on January 1 of the second calendar year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, section 237 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 1020) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", except accounts of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives for compensation and mileage of Members and Delegates,", and

(2) by striking out "July" and inserting in lieu thereof "January".

SEC. 6. Section 301 of the Act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-599, 86 Stat. 1324), is amended by striking out subsection (e).

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LIFE AND CAREER OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, A GREAT AMERICAN AND A GREAT DEMOCRAT

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest living Americans today is James A. Farley, a former Postmaster General and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Perhaps we in political life could all gain something by reflecting again on the career and achievements of Jim Farley as one whose political successes were always based on a keen understanding of the thoughts and aspirations of the American people.

In that connection I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on Jim Farley that was published in the autumn 1972 issue of Vermont Life.

The article follows:

LIVING HERITAGE—PREDICTING A BRIGHT FUTURE FOR VERMONT

(By Charles T. Morrissey)

Thirty-six years have passed since James A. Farley made his famous prophesy, on the eve of the 1936 presidential election, that Franklin D. Roosevelt would defeat his Republican opponent, Alfred M. Landon, in every state in the nation except two. Those states were Maine and Vermont.

Earlier in that campaign Farley had estimated that Roosevelt would win by a large majority, but he defined a large majority as Roosevelt winning 37 of the 48 states and Gov. Landon carrying eleven. His last-minute prediction that only Maine and Vermont would remain in the Republican column was widely dismissed as extravagant political oratory; Farley was Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, after all, and party leaders are not known to understate their prospects of victory.

For Farley the prediction wasn't easy. He spent the day before Election Day in 1936 compiling confidential reports from all over the nation, and late in the afternoon he told the press what he foresaw as the outcome. Only those two New England strongholds of staunch Republicanism, he announced, would vote their traditional allegiance, Democrats in Maine and Vermont thought they had better chances to win than their national Chairman was willing to concede, and tried to talk Farley out of making his announcement.

"I'll never forget," Farley recalled recently, "when I decided I was going to predict, that I called up the Democrats in the state of Maine and told them about it and also called up Frank Duffy, who was the Democratic leader in Vermont, about what I was going to predict. But Frank always called me James, talked like all Vermonters, very stiff. He said, 'James, I wish you wouldn't *do* that. We have a chance to elect a Democratic governor and if you predict Vermont is going Republican it will hurt us.' And I said 'Frank, it's my job to make a prediction on what I think is going to happen nationally, and I don't think it's going to hurt your state at all insofar as the election of a governor is concerned if the same trend is going along in your state. I've just got to make the prediction that I'm going to.'" Farley added: "He was very much annoyed with me, but I made it nevertheless."

On Election Eve, when the votes were being counted across the nation and the accuracy of Farley's prediction was proving to be amazingly correct, President Roosevelt said he was sorry he had not campaigned in Vermont. "He might have carried it too," Farley insisted later that night to a newspaper reporter.

The next day Roosevelt described Farley's forecast as "the most uncanny prediction in the history of the country." Indeed, when Roosevelt ran again for the Presidency in 1940 and 1944 he always entertained hopes that he might carry Vermont. We know this from reading the diary of Roosevelt's White House assistant, William D. Hassett (a native of Northfield, Vermont), which was published as a book, entitled *Off The Record With F.D.R.*, by the Rutgers University Press in 1958. In fact, Roosevelt remarked the day before his election in 1944 that if he ran for the Presidency often enough he would eventually carry Maine and Vermont. This was not so, of course; Vermonters and their Maine neighbors voted Republican all four times that Roosevelt ran.

Jim Farley, similarly, has always been awed by Vermont's stubbornly Republican political allegiance. In the summer of 1939, after leaving his son, Jimmy, at an overnight camp in New Hampshire, Farley drove through Vermont to met with Roosevelt at the President's family estate in Hyde Park, New York. Farley feigned relief to the President, explaining "I just left Vermont without getting into difficulty." He elaborated with mock seriousness: "You know, ever since Vermont and Maine got out of step with the rest of the country in 1936, I don't like to walk around up there, especially after dark."

Farley's famous words about Maine and Vermont on Election Day in 1936 seems especially pertinent these days because predicting the future has become such a popular pastime. This new mode of research often has several fancy names, some of which are futurism, futurology, futuristics, futurecasting, futures research, prognostics, and prospections. There are now 6,000 members (from 45 countries) in the World Futures Society, and more than eighty American colleges and universities now offer courses about exploring the future. Journals like *The Futurist*, and *Futures*, serve these forecasters, and a special jargon, always a sign of a profession taking itself seriously, has emerged among those who try to predict what lies ahead.

What lies ahead for Vermont? This state has never suffered a lack of prophets who felt they were blessed with a knowledge of the future. Some have been incredibly clairvoyant. Consider Zadock Thompson (1796–1856) of Bridgewater, Vermont, who put himself through the University of Vermont by selling an annual almanac. One year his printer called his attention to the fact that he had omitted to make a weather prediction for July. "Snow about this time," Thompson replied absent-mindedly. You can guess what happened: it *did* snow in Vermont that July, and Thompson earned quite a reputation for prophecy.

On the other hand we shouldn't forget about William Miller and his followers, the Millerites. Miller was a farmer in Poultney, Vermont, who became a Justice of the Peace and a sheriff. He also became a prophet, predicting that the world would end in 1843. The Millerites became pretty excited about this likelihood, putting on white sheets and awaiting Judgment Day by climbing to the hilltops so they would be closer to heaven. Several Vermont towns were disrupted by the frenzy of the Millerites. For example, a town historian in Jamaica later wrote that "farmers neglected their fields, alleging that the world would end before harvest, and crops that had matured were left to waste." The world continued to turn after that anticipated Doomsday, needless to say, and the disappointed Millerites had to slink home sheepishly.

A current prophet has made a prediction as dramatic as Miller's. He is R. C. Gordon ("Doc") Anderson, a seer who lives in Rossville, Georgia, and who claims a dormant volcano will erupt and destroy Vermont. The flames from the flowing lava will leap so high, says Anderson, that Midwesterners will gather along the shore of Lake Michigan to marvel at the fire-red skies over the Green Mountains. All this is forecast in a recent book entitled *Doc Anderson: The Man Who Sees Tomorrow*, by Robert E. Smith. Anderson, a former carnival roustabout, has a reputation for being 95% accurate, Smith asserts.

By golly, there's something to worry about for a while. Vermont may have a bright future, but does the brightness have to come from an erupted volcano? Time will tell.

SOME EDITORIAL COMMENTS FROM THE AMSTERDAM EVENING RECORDER ON THE CURRENT CHAOS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we in this Chamber, I am sure, have all been reminded by our constituents of the terrific chaos that now exists in the independently operated U.S. Postal Service. Never have I seen a greater crisis of confidence with respect to any basic function of government.

Some of the flavor of these protests and complaints can be gathered from an editorial that appeared in the Amsterdam Evening Recorder on December 20, 1972.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of that editorial:

NOR ALL HO-HO-HO

Memories of Christmas 1972 will not be entirely of the ho-ho-ho variety. It seems to us

that there will be quite a few people who will remember the long lines in front of a single service window in the Amsterdam Post Office. More than a few people who wanted only to buy stamps will remember the 45 minutes or more they spent in the same line with people who were trying to mail packages. And quite a few people will remember their trip to the Post Office on Saturday afternoon, Dec. 16, with an armload of Christmas mailing to accomplish, only to find everything but the front door closed.

We really don't know what the Postal Service is trying to prove. It set out to make a federal department, beset by political pressures, into a business-like, efficient organization to handle, transport and deliver the mails. But a public-be-damned attitude isn't really businesslike, is it? And is it businesslike to decrease the service at the same time you are increasing its cost? Hardly.

What the Postal Service is doing is retrenching. If it continues down this path, one doesn't need a crystal ball to foresee the final result. One need only to look at what happened to the railroad passenger and telegraph services to get the idea.

Perhaps without realizing it, the Postal Service is giving real impetus to competing private enterprise parcel services, and its present direction is certain to speed the coming of the facsimile (by wire) letter.

It seems to us that the public has a real stake in what happens to the Postal Service. If it does not like the mail slowdown, the curtailment of service and increased cost, the public had better make itself heard before it's too late. We hope and trust that the issue is not being clouded by anything less than a 100 per cent performance by local postal workers.

POWERS OF CONGRESS OVER WAR AND PEACE

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the role of the Congress on issues of war and peace, and the President's powers to engage in warfare in the absence of a congressional declaration of war, remains a matter of great importance and interest. A most thoughtful and comprehensive analysis of this issue by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Schweitzer professor of humanities, City University of New York, appeared in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs. The article, entitled "Congress and the Making of American Foreign Policy," follows:

CONGRESS AND THE MAKING OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The problem of the control of foreign policy has been a perennial source of anguish for democracies. The idea of popular government hardly seems complete if it fails to embrace questions of war and peace. Yet the effective conduct of foreign affairs appears to demand, as Tocqueville argued long ago, not the qualities peculiar to a democracy but "on the contrary, the perfect use of almost all those in which it is deficient." Steadfastness in a course, efficiency in the execution of policy, patience, secrecy—are not these more likely to proceed from executives than from legislatures? But, if foreign policy becomes the property of the executive, what happens to democratic control? In our own times this issue has acquired special urgency, partly because of the Indochina War, with its aimless persistence and savagery, but more fundamentally, I think, because the invention of nuclear weapons has transformed the power to make war into the power to blow up the world. And for the United States the question of the control of foreign policy is, at least in its constitutional aspect, the question of the distribution of powers between the presidency and the Congress.

II

On December 21, 1936, in the days when the Nine Old Men of the Supreme Court were, it was supposed, hellbent on confining the power of Presidents, the Court, speaking through one of its most conservative justices, conferred rather greater power on Franklin D. Roosevelt than it had denied him when in the previous 18 months it had vetoed such New Deal experiments as the NRA and the AAA. The decision in the case of *U.S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp. et al.* came as a ringing affirmation of inherent and independent presidential authority in foreign affairs.

The case arose because Congress in 1934 had passed a joint resolution authorizing the President to stop the sale of arms to Bolivia and Paraguay, then fighting each other in the Chaco jungles, if, in the presidential judgment, such an embargo would help restore peace. President Roosevelt immediately imposed an embargo by executive proclamation. Subsequently the Curtiss-Wright Corporation was discovered in a conspiracy to violate the embargo. Brought into court, Curtiss-Wright contended that Congress, when it gave discretionary power to the President through the joint resolution, had made an unlawful delegation of its authority. The Federal District Court accepted this argument, pronounced the resolution an "attempted abdication of legislative responsibility" and dismissed the charges. The government then took the case to the Supreme Court.

Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, himself a former Secretary of State, assigned the opinion to George Sutherland, a former member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. With only the intractable McReynolds dissenting, the Court saw a "fundamental" distinction between the President's power in domestic affairs and his power in foreign affairs. Sutherland found the two classes of power different both in their origin—"the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution"—and in their nature. In particular, "participation in the exercise of the power [over foreign policy] is significantly limited. In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the nation. . . . Into the field of negotiation the Senate cannot intrude, and Congress itself is powerless to invade it."

In reversing the lower court and affirming the "very delicate, plenary and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the federal government in the field of international relations," the Court concluded that "congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved."

Several points must be made about this decision. It involved the power over foreign commerce, not the power over war; it did not free the executive from the necessity of acting on congressional authorization; its actual holding was restricted; and its more expansive contentions were in the nature of *obiter dicta*. Still the Court claimed "overwhelming support . . . in the unbroken legislative practice which had prevailed from the inception of the national government to the present day" for delegation to the President in the field of foreign relations; and the decision was the judicial culmination of the long drift of control over foreign policy into the hands of the executive. Certainly for another generation the mood here registered even by an anti-presidential Supreme Court and thereafter strengthened by 30 years of world crisis encouraged a succession of Presidents in the conviction that there were few limits to executive initiative in the making of foreign policy. Now the tide has turned; and, nearly 40 years after the Curtiss-Wright case, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is striving to recover for Congress the role in foreign policy that a one-time member of that committee appeared to take away in 1936.

The Constitution itself is cryptic and ambiguous in its allocation of powers affecting foreign policy. Its authors were great men because they knew what they did not know as well as what they knew. *"It 's impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national exigencies,"* Hamilton wrote with due emphasis in the 23rd Federalist. ". . . . The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite, and for this reason no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed." But the rejection of shackles did not mean the rejection of processes and standards; it meant rather the establishment of a system which did not try to solve all problems in advance and would be capable of responding to unforeseen contingencies.

The intentions of the Founding Fathers may be better understood against the background of their own experience. That experience led them to seek more centralization of authority than they had known under the Continental Congress or the Articles of Confederation. So the Constitution in Article II bestowed general executive authority on the President; and, as the Federalist Papers emphasized, the characteristics of such an executive—unity, secrecy, decision, dispatch, superior sources of information—were especially vital to the conduct of foreign affairs. The President was expressly empowered to receive foreign envoys and, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors and make treaties. In addition, he was designated Commander in Chief of the armed forces. "Of all the cares or concerns of government," said the Federalist, "the direction of war most peculiarly demands those qualities which distinguish the exercise of power by a single hand."

But experience also led the Founding Fathers to seek less centralization of authority than they had known under the British crown. The presidential prerogative was to fall significantly short of the royal prerogative. Hence the qualification of the treaty power: where the British King could conclude treaties on his own motion, the American President had to win the support of two-thirds of the senators present before a treaty could go into effect. "The one can do alone," said Hamilton, "what the other can do only with the concurrence of a branch of the legislature."

Above all, the Founders were determined to deny the American President what Blackstone had freely conceded to the British King—"the sole prerogative of making war and peace. As Hamilton carefully explained in the 69th Federalist, the President's power as Commander in Chief "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 the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces . . . while that of the British king extends to the *declaring* of war and to the *raising* and *regulating* of fleets and armies,——all which, the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature."

An early draft of the Constitution had even given Congress the power to "make war"; but Madison and Elbridge Gerry persuaded the convention to change this to "de-

clare" in order to leave the executive "the power to repel sudden attacks." While this amendment allowed the President to respond when war was imposed on the nation, it was certainly not understood as giving him the power to initiate hostilities. Hamilton's dry comment on the treaty power would apply all the more forcibly to the war power: "The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human virtue which would make it wise to commit interest of so delicate and momentous a kind, as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of a magistrate created and circumstanced as would be a President of the United States." As Madison put it in a letter to Jefferson in 1798: "The constitution supposes, what the History of all Govts demonstrate, that the Ex. is the branch of power most interested in war, & most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war in the Legisl."

The Constitution conferred other relevant powers on the Congress: the power to make appropriations, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to raise and maintain the armed forces and make rules for their government and regulation, to control naturalization and immigration, to debate, oversee and investigate. But the allocation of powers could hardly be, in its nature, clear-cut; and particularly in the case of the war power and of the treaty power it was a matter, in Hamilton's phrase, of "joint possession." In these areas the two branches had interwoven responsibilities and competing opportunities. Moreover, each had an undefined residuum of inherent authority on which to draw—the President through the executive power and the constitutional injunction that "he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed," Congress through the constitutional authorization "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all . . . Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States." In addition, the Constitution itself was silent on certain issues of import to the conduct of foreign affairs: among them, the recognition of foreign states, the authority to proclaim neutrality, the role of executive agreements, the control of information essential to intelligent decision. The result, as Edward S. Corwin remarked 40 years ago, was to make of the Constitution "an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy."

The struggle began in the silences of the Constitution. Thus President Washington turned his constitutional power to receive foreign envoys into the assertion of diplomatic recognition as a prerogative of the executive; by receiving Citizen Genêt, he thereby recognized the revolutionary republic of France. Congress did not, however, abandon interest in recognition policy. In later years members of Congress tried various ways to force on reluctant Presidents the recognition of newly independent Latin American states—Argentina, for example, in 1818 and Cuba in 1898. In still later years Congress sought by concurrent resolution to dissuade Presidents from recognizing the People's Republic of China.

On the control of neutrality, Washington asserted the presidential prerogative by proclaiming American neutrality in the war between France and Britain in 1793. Congress recovered ground by passing a neutrality act of its own next year; and a century and a half later, in the nineteen-thirties, it triumphantly succeeded in imposing mandatory neutrality policies on the resistant Roosevelt administration.

On the control of information, Washington rejected a request from the House of Representatives that he turn over copies of instructions and other papers relating to the Jay Treaty. Though he based his refusal on the narrow ground that the House was not involved in the treaty-making process and that "all the papers affecting the negotiation with Great Britain" had already been laid before the Senate, he established a larger precedent that future Presidents used to deny information to the Senate as well. By 1936 Justice Sutherland could write in the Curtiss-Wright case that the wisdom of Washington's original refusal "has never since been doubted," adding that the success of presidential action in international relations may well depend "upon the nature of the confidential information which he has or may thereafter receive;" this, Sutherland said for the Court, was another proof of "the unwisdom of requiring Congress in this field of governmental power to lay down narrowly definite standards by which the President is to be governed."

But the main battlegrounds lay in the critical areas of "joint possession"—the war power and the treaty power—and the changing contours of the struggle for control are best displayed in relation to these complex and contentious questions.

III

The war power has historically involved a competition between the power of the Congress to authorize war and the power of the President as Commander in Chief. It is important to state the issue with precision. The issue is not the declaration of war in a strict sense. Long before Under Secretary Katzenbach startled the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1967 by pronouncing the declaration of war "outmoded," Hamilton had written in the 25th Federalist, "The ceremony of a formal denunciation of war has of late fallen into disuse." One study of European and American wars shows that between 1700 and 1870 hostilities began in 107 cases without declaration of war; in only ten cases was there a declaration of war in advance of hostilities. Though the United States has engaged in a number of armed conflicts in the last two centuries, it has only made five formal declarations of war (of which four—all but the War of 1812—recognized the prior existence of states of war).

The real issue is congressional authorization—whether or not by declaration of war—of the commitment of American forces in circumstances that involve or invite hostilities against foreign states. One aspect of this issue emerged clearly during the undeclared naval war with France in 1798–1801. Mr. Katzenbach injudiciously testified that "President John Adams' use of troops in the Mediterranean" (by which he presumably meant Adams' use of the fleet in the Atlantic) was "criticized at the time as exceeding the power of the Executive acting without the support of a congressional vote." Others, before and since, have cited this conflict as an early precedent in the cause of presidential warmaking. In fact, when trouble with France began, Adams called Congress to meet in special session "to consult and determine on such measure as in their wisdom shall be deemed meet for the safety and welfare of the said United States." In due course, Congress turned more belligerent than the President and in the spring of 1798 passed some 20 laws to encourage Adams to wage the war. Adams' Attorney General described the conflict as "a maritime war *authorized* by both nations," and in 1800 the Supreme Court, called upon to define the conflict, drew a distinction between "perfect" and "imperfect" wars. As it concluded in a unanimous decision, if war "be declared in form, it is called solemn, and is of the perfect kind. . . . But hostilities may subsist between two nations, more confined in its nature and extent; being limited as to places, persons, and things; and this is more properly termed imperfect war. . . . Still . . . it is a war between two nations, though all the members are not authorized to commit hostilities such as in a solemn war."

Both sorts of war, whether solemn or non-solemn, complete or limited, were deemed to require some mode of congressional authorization. When John Marshall assumed leadership of the Court in 1801, he reinforced the point in a second case arising out of the trouble with France. "The Congress," he ruled, "may authorize general hostilities . . . or partial war."

Jefferson similarly acknowledged the congressional right to license hostilities by means short of a declaration of war, while at the same time he affirmed the right of the executive to repel sudden attack. When an American naval schooner was fired on by a Tripolitanian cruiser in the Mediterranean, it repulsed the attack with signal success; but, Jefferson instructed Congress, its commander was "unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense," so the enemy vessel, having been "disabled from committing further hostilities, was liberated with its crew." Jefferson went on to ask Congress to consider "whether, by authorizing measures of offense also, they will place our force on an equal footing with that of its adversaries." Again, fearing incursions into Louisiana by the Spanish in Florida in 1805, he declined to broaden defense against sudden attack into defense against the threat of sudden attack and said in a special message: "Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force. . . . The course to be pursued will require the command of means which it belongs to Congress exclusively to yield or to deny."

In this case, Congress chose to deny. But half a dozen years later a more belligerent Congress led a more reluctant President into war. In 1812 Madison, now that he was the executive and the War Hawks of the legislature were demanding hostilities with Britain, may well have reflected ruefully on his argument of 1798 about the supposed greater interest of the executive in war.

When the Seminole Indians were conducting raids into American territory in 1818, President Monroe chose not to consult Congress before ordering General Andrew Jackson to chase the raiding parties back into Spanish Florida, where Jackson was soon fighting Spaniards and hanging Englishmen. But tangling with foreigners was incidental to Jackson's ostensible objective, which was punishing Indians. We would now call the principle on which he and Monroe acted "hot pursuit." Where direct conflict with a foreign state was the issue, Monroe was more cautious. When he promulgated his famous Doctrine, he neither consulted with Congress nor sought its subsequent approval; but, when Colombia requested U.S. protection under the Monroe Doctrine, John Quincy Adams, Monroe's Secretary of State, carefully replied that the Constitution confided "the ultimate decision . . . to the Legislative Department."

Jackson himself as President meticulously respected this point. Though he enlarged the executive power with relish in other areas, on the question of the war-making power he followed not his own example of 1817 but Jefferson's of 1801. Thus in 1831, after ordering an armed vessel to South America to protect American shipping against Argentine raiders, he said, "I submit the case to the consideration of Congress, to the end that they may clothe the Executive with such authority and means as they deem necessary for providing a force adequate to the complete protection of our fellow citizens fishing and trading in these seas." When France persisted in her refusal to pay long-outstanding claims for damage to American shipping during the Napoleonic wars, Jack-

son, instead of moving on his own, took care to ask Congress for a law "authorizing reprisals upon French property, in case provision shall not be made for the payment of the debt." (Albert Gallatin observed that this "proposed transfer by Congress of its constitutional powers to the Executive, in a case which necessarily embraces the question of war or no war" was "entirely inconsistent with the letter and spirit of our Constitution," and Congress turned Jackson down.) When Texas rebelled against Mexico and sought U.S. recognition as an independent republic, Jackson referred the matter to Congress as a question "probably leading to war" and therefore a proper subject for "previous understanding with that body by whom war can alone be declared and by whom all the provisions for sustaining its perils must be furnished."

Still the executive retained the ability, if he so desired, to contrive a situation that left Congress little choice but to give him a declaration of war. James K. Polk demonstrated this in 1846 when, without congressional authorization, he sent American forces into disputed land where they were attacked by Mexican units who, not unreasonably, considered it Mexican territory. Polk quickly obtained a congressional declaration of war, but many members of Congress had the uneasy feeling that the President had put something over on them. Two years later, with the war still on, the House resolved by a narrow margin that it had been "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." Perhaps so; but, unlike some later Presidents, Polk did have behind him not just a congressional or U.N. resolution, but a formal declaration of war by the Congress. In any case, this was the situation that provoked Congressman Lincoln of Illinois into his celebrated attack on presidential warmaking:

"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 pleasure. Study to see if you can fix *any limit* to his power in this respect. . . . If, today, he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada, to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us,' but he will say to you, 'Be silent; I see it, if you don't.' "

IV

The prevailing view in the early republic, it has been suggested, was that congressional authorization was clearly required for the commitment of American forces overseas in circumstances that involved or invited hostilities against foreign states. But what if the hostilities contemplated were not against foreign governments but were in protection of American honor, law, lives or property against Indians, slave traders, pirates, smugglers, frontier ruffians or foreign disorder? Early Presidents evidently decided as a practical matter that forms of police action not directed against a sovereign nation did not rise to the dignity of formal congressional concern. These were mostly trivial episodes; and, when Senator Goldwater, with such fugitive engagements in mind, said, "We have only been in five declared wars out of over 150 that we fought," he was stretching the definition of war in a way that could comfort only those who rejoice in portraying the United States as incurably aggressive throughout its history.

Jackson in Florida was an early example; but the commitment of armed force without congressional authorization was by no means confined to North America or to the Western Hemisphere. American naval ships in these years took military action against pirates or refractory natives in places as remote as Sumatra (1832, 1838, 1839), the Fiji Islands (1840, 1855, 1858) and Africa (1820, 1843, 1845, 1850, 1854, 1858, 1859). As early as 1836, John Quincy Adams could write, "However startled we may be at the idea that the Executive Chief Magistrate has the power of involving the nation in war, even without consulting Congress, an experience of fifty years has proved that in numerous cases he has and must have exercised the power."

Adams, who in any case (at least till the Mexican War came along) regarded the power of declaring war as "an Executive act," mistakenly turned over by the Founding Fathers to the Congress, somewhat exaggerated. Still the spreading employment of force overseas by unilateral presidential decision, even if not yet against sovereign governments, was a threat to the congressional monopoly of the war power. In the meantime, the demonstration by Monroe of the unilateral presidential power to propound basic objectives in foreign policy, the demonstration by Polk of the unilateral presidential capacity to confront Congress with faits accomplis, the demonstration by Pierce of the unilateral presidential power to threaten sovereign states (as when he sent Commodore Perry and a naval squadron to open up Japan in 1854)—all these further diminished the congressional voice in the conduct of foreign affairs. Congress continued to fight back, particularly on the question of the war power. It took, for example, special pleasure in rejecting half-a-dozen requests for the authorization of force from the punctilious Buchanan, who believed that "without the authority of Congress the President cannot fire a hostile gun in any case except to repel the attacks of an enemy."

Perhaps it was Buchanan's strict constructionism that led to the drastic expansion of presidential initiative under his successor; for Lincoln may well have delayed the convocation of Congress till ten weeks after Fort Sumter lest rigid constitutionalists on the Hill try to stop him from doing what he deemed necessary to save the life of the nation. In this period of executive grace, he reinforced Sumter, assembled the militia, enlarged the army and navy beyond their authorized strength, called out volunteers for three years' service, disbursed unappropriated moneys, censored the mail, suspended habeas corpus and blockaded the Confederacy—measures which, as he said, "whether strictly legal or not, were ventured upon under what appeared to be a popular demand and a public necessity; trusting then as now that Congress would readily ratify them." He added that it was with deepest regret he thus employed what he vaguely called "the war power;" however, "he could but perform this duty, or surrender the existence of the Government."

No President had ever undertaken such sweeping actions in the absence of congressional authorization. No President had ever confronted Congress with such a massive collection of faits accomplis. Benjamin R. Curtis, who had been one of the two dissenting justices in the Dred Scott case, wrote that Lincoln had established "a military depotism." But Congress gave retroactive consent to Lincoln's program, and two years later the Court in the Prize cases found constitutional substance (narrowly; the vote was 5–4) for his idea of "the war power" by attaching it to his authority as Commander in Chief and to his right to defend the nation against attack. Throughout the war Lincoln continued to exercise wide powers independently of Congress. The Emancipation Proclamation, for example, was a unilateral executive act, pronounced under the war power without reference to Congress. But Lincoln's assertion of the war power took place, it should not be forgotten, in the context of a domestic rebellion and under the color of a most desperate national emergency. There is no suggestion that Lincoln supposed he could use this power in foreign wars without congressional consent.

V

The presidential prerogative has not grown by steady accretion. Nearly every President who has extended the reach of the White House has provoked a reaction toward a more restricted theory of the presidency, even if the reaction never quite cuts presidential power back to its earlier level. When Lincoln expanded presidential initiative, Congress took out its frustrations by harassing him through the Committee on the Conduct of the War, impeaching his successor and eventually establishing a generation of congressional government. In this period of relative military quiescence (there were only 17 instances of American military action abroad in the 20 years after the Civil War as compared to 38 in the 20 years before the war), the locus of conflict shifted from the war power to the treaty power. The Senate's constitutional right to consent to treaties—even though it had long since lost to George Washington its claim for a voice in negotiations and to his successors its power to confirm the appointment of negotiators—turned out to be more solidly embedded in the structure of government than the constitutional right of the Congress to declare war.

In the years after the Civil War the Senate freely exercised its power to rewrite, amend and reject treaties negotiated by the President. Indeed it ratified no important treaty between 1871 and 1898. Writing in 1885, Woodrow Wilson observed that the President was made to approach the Senate "as a servant conferring with a master. . . . It is almost as distinctly dealing with a foreign power as were the negotiations preceding the proposed treaty. It must predispose the Senate to the temper of an overseer." Wilson grimly noted that the treaty-making power had become "the treaty-*marring* power," and a dozen years later John Hay told Henry Adams that he did not believe "another important treaty would ever pass the Senate."

Secretaries of State regarded the assertion of senatorial prerogative as the mindless expression of institutional jealousy. As Secretary of State Richard Olney observed in one case, "The Treaty, in getting itself made by the sole act of the executive, without leave of the Senate first had and obtained, had committed the unpardonable sin. It must be either altogether defeated or so altered as to bear an unmistakable Senate stamp . . . and thus be the means both of humiliating the executive and of showing to the world the greatness of the Senate." Hay regarded the one-third veto as the "original," the "irreparable" mistake of the Constitution, now grown to "monstrous shape," and wrote, "The attitude of the Senate toward public affairs makes all serious negotiations impossible."

Ways had to be found to evade the veto. One was the use of the joint resolution, which required only a majority of the Congress as against two-thirds of the Senate; by such means Texas was annexed in 1845 and Hawaii in 1898. Another was the use of agreements entered into directly by the President with foreign states. The "executive agreement" had the legal force of a treaty; and, though largely confined in the nineteenth century to technical matters, it could be the vehicle of large purposes. It was, for example, the means by which Britain and the United States agreed in the Rush-Bagot accord of 1817 to disarm the Great Lakes and by which the United States in 1898–99 developed the policy of the Open Door in China.

Still, Congress remained in the saddle. As Henry Adams put it in a famous complaint:

"The Secretary of State exists only to recognize the existence of a world which Congress would rather ignore; of obligations which Congress repudiates whenever it can; of bargains which Congress distrusts and tries to turn to its advantage or to reject. Since the first day the Senate existed, it has always intrigued against the Secretary

of State whenever the Secretary has been obliged to extend his functions beyond the appointment of Consuls in Senators' service."

But, just as executive domination had produced a shift in power over foreign policy toward Congress after the Civil War, so congressional domination was beginning to produce a shift back to the presidency. And, in clamoring for war with Spain, Congress became its own executioner. Writing in 1900, Wilson eloquently portrayed the impact of that war upon the lodgment and exercise of power within the federal system. When foreign affairs dominate the policy of a nation, he said, "its Executive must of necessity be its guide: must utter every initial judgment, take every first step of action, supply the information upon which it is to act, suggest and in large measure control its conduct. The President of the United States is now . . . at the front of affairs, as no president, except Lincoln, has been since the first quarter of the nineteenth century."

VI

Oddly Congress, in its salad years, had not asserted itself on the question of the war power, perhaps because it so generally agreed with the use the executive made on his own motion of American forces abroad. Victory over Spain now made the United States a world power; and in 1900 President McKinley set the tone for the new century by sending 5,000 American troops to China. The pretext was the protection of American lives and property; in fact, the Americans joined an international force, besieged Peking and helped put down the Boxer Rebellion. This was done without reference to Congress and without serious objection from it. The intervention in China, resulting among other things in the exaction of an endemnity from the Chinese government, marked the start of a crucial shift in the use of the armed forces overseas. Where, in the nineteenth century, military force committed without congressional authorization had been typically used in police actions against private groups, now it was beginning to be used against sovereign states. In the next years Theodore Roosevelt and Taft sent American forces into Caribbean countries and, in some cases, even installed provisional governments—all without prior congressional sanction.

In 1912, in an effort to meet the constitutional problem, J. Reuben Clark, the Solicitor of the State Department, offered a distinction between "interposition" and "intervention." Interposition meant simply the insertion of troops to protect lives and property; it implied neutrality toward the government or toward contesting forces within the country; and, since it was a normal exercise of international law, it did not, Clark argued, require congressional approval. Intervention, on the other hand, meant interference in sovereign affairs; it implied an act of war and required congressional authorization.

Whatever merit this distinction might have had in the nineteenth century when the United States was a small power, by the twentieth century a great power could hardly interpose anywhere without intervening in sovereign affairs. On the other hand, it could be argued that the superior force of the United States was now so great relative to the Caribbean states that intrusion, whether interposition or intervention, did not invite the risk of war and therefore did not require congressional consent. Still, whatever the nuances of arguments, limitations were evaporating. The executive was becoming habituated to the unconstrained deployment of American forces around the world, and Congress chose not to say him nay. Though Wilson received retroactive congressional approval for an incursion into Mexico in 1914 and the approval of the Senate for another in 1916, he did not seek congressional authorization when he sent troops to Siberia after the First World War. Congressional resolutions of protest perished in committee.

Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson provoked the predictable reaction. The Senate, reasserting its prerogative, rejected the Versailles Treaty (though when the elder Henry Cabot Lodge claimed in his second reservation that Congress had the "sole power" to "authorize the employment of the military or naval forces," his fellow isolationist William E. Borah called it "a recital which is not true"). By the thirties the Congress, regarding the First World War as the malign consequence of presidential discretion in foreign affairs, imposed a rigid neutrality program on the executive and remained generally indifferent when Germany and Japan set out on courses of aggression. The reassertion of the presidential prerogative in the years since must be understood in part as a criticism of what happened when Congress tried to seize the reins of foreign policy in the years 1919–1939.

The outbreak of war in 1939 found the President restrained both by the neutrality laws and by the balance of power in Congress from doing what he deemed necessary to save the life of the nation. Roosevelt responded, as Lincoln had 80 years before, by pressing to the utmost limits of presidential power. But, though doubtless encouraged by Justice Sutherland and the Curtiss-Wright decision, he did this without grandiose claims of executive authority. When he exchanged American destroyers for British bases in an executive agreement of 1940—Senators Fulbright and Church have both said that Roosevelt "usurped the treaty power of the Senate"—he did not found his action on novel authority claimed as Commander in Chief nor on inherent powers of the presidency but on the construction of laws passed by Congress in 1917 and 1935. Nor did the transaction involve promises of future performance, and Roosevelt's circle of prior consultation included even the Republican candidate for President.

When in 1941 he sent American troops to Greenland and later to Iceland, this was done in agreement with the Danish government in the first case and the government of Iceland in the second; moreover, the defense of Greenland and, less plausibly, Iceland, could be considered as part of hemisphere security. Senator Robert A. Taft declared that Roosevelt had "no legal or constitutional right to send American troops to Iceland" without authority from Congress. Few of his colleagues echoed this protest. The Selective Service Act of 1940 had contained a provision that draftees could not be used outside the Western Hemisphere (except in American possessions); but the younger Lodge, who sponsored this provision, evidently doubted its force and called it "a pious hope."

In instituting a convoy system and issuing the "shoot-at-sight" order to the navy in the North Atlantic, Roosevelt was bringing the nation without congressional authorization into undeclared naval war with Germany. Senator Fulbright has latterly charged that he "circumvented the war powers of the Congress." But the poignant character of Roosevelt's dilemma was made clear when in August 1941 the House of Representatives renewed the Selective Service Act by a single vote. If Congress came that close to disbanding the army at home, how could Roosevelt have reasonably expected congressional support for his forward policy in the North Atlantic? His choice was to go to Congress and risk the fall of Britain to Hitler or to proceed on his own with measures which, "whether strictly legal or not, were ventured upon under what appeared to be a popular demand and a public necessity; trusting then as now that Congress would readily ratify them."

Roosevelt did not, like later Presidents, seek to strip Congress of powers in the name of the inherent authority of the Commander in Chief. The most extraordinary prewar decision—Lend-Lease—was authorized by Congress following intensive and exacting debate. After America entered the war, Roosevelt asked Congress for authority to send military missions to friendly nations. Both Roosevelt and Hull, remembering the fate of Wilson, made elaborate efforts to bring members of Congress from both parties into the discussion of postwar policy through the Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy and through congressional representation at Bretton Woods, San Francisco and in the delegations to the United Nations. The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 took express care to protect the war powers of Congress.

VII

The towering figure of Franklin Roosevelt, the generally accepted wisdom of his measures of 1940–1941, his undisputed powers as Commander in Chief after Pearl Harbor, the thundering international agreements pronounced at wartime summits of the Big Two or the Big Three—all these factors, combined with the memory of the deplorable congressional performance in foreign affairs during the years between the wars, gave Americans in the postwar years an exalted conception of presidential power. Moreover, Roosevelt's successor, a man much read in American history and of doughty temperament, regarded his office, in the words of his last Secretary of State, as "a sacred and temporary trust, which he was determined to pass on unimpaired by the slightest loss of power or prestige." Dean Acheson himself, though an eminent lawyer, was impatient with what he saw as constitutional hair-splitting and encouraged the President in his stout defense of high prerogative. Nor were they alone. As early as 1945 Senator Vandenberg was asserting that "the President must not be limited in the use of force" in the execution of treaties; and, when Vandenberg asked the retired Chief Justice, Charles Evans Hughes, whether the President could commit troops without congressional approval, Hughes replied, "Our Presidents have used our armed forces repeatedly without authorization by Congress, when they thought the interests of the country required it." It must be added that American historians and political scientists, this writer among them, labored to give the expansive theory of the presidency due historical sanction.

Above all, the uncertainty and danger of the early cold war, with the chronic threat of unanticipated emergency always held to require immediate response, with, above all, the overhanging possibility of nuclear catastrophe, seemed to argue all the more strongly for the centralization of the control over foreign policy, including the use of armed forces, in the presidency. And the availability of great standing armies and navies notably enlarged presidential power; before the Second World War, Presidents (Lincoln excepted) could call on only such limited force as was already in existence.

Where Truman required congressional consent either because of the need for appropriations (the Marshall Plan) or for treaty ratification (NATO), he rallied that support effectively. But he decided not to seek formal congressional approval for the commitment of American forces to hostilities in Korea (though he consulted congressional leaders informally before American troops went into action) lest he diminish the presidential prerogative. This was followed by his decision, also proposed without reference to Congress, to send four divisions to reinforce the American Army in Europe. These initiatives greatly alarmed conservative members of Congress. On January 3, 1951, Congressman Frederic Coudert of New York introduced a resolution declaring it the sense of the Congress that no "additional military forces" could be sent abroad "without the prior authorization of the Congress in each instance." Two days later, in a full-dress speech

before the Senate, Taft returned to the argument he had made against Roosevelt ten years earlier. "The President," he said, "simply usurped authority, in violation of the laws and the Constitution, when he sent troops to Korea to carry out the resolution of the United Nations in an undeclared war. . . . I do not believe the President has the power without congressional approval to send troops to one country to defend it against a possible or probable attack by another country."

Tom Connally, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, responded with a stirring assertion of high prerogative. "The authority of the President as Commander in Chief to send the Armed Forces to any place required by the security interests of the United States," he said, "has often been questioned, but never denied by authoritative opinion." Secretary of State Acheson went even further:

"Not only has the President the authority to use the Armed Forces in carrying out the broad foreign policy of the United States and implementing treaties, but it is equally clear that this authority may not be interfered with by the Congress in the exercise of powers which it has under the Constitution."

Acheson added irritably: "We are in a position in the world today where the argument as to who has the power to do this, that, or the other thing, is not exactly what is called for from America in this very critical hour."

The debate also divided scholars. Henry Steele Commager wrote, "Whatever may be said of the expediency of the Taft-Coudert program, this at least can be said of the principles involved—that they have no support in law or in history." The present writer, with a flourish of historical documentation and, alas, hyperbole, called Taft's statements "demonstrably irresponsible." In reply Professor Corwin, who had studied the constitutional position of the presidency for many years with sardonic concern, pronounced Commager and Schlesinger (with some justice) "high-flying prerogative men" who ascribed to the President "a truly royal prerogative in the field of foreign relations . . . without indicating any correlative legal or constitutional control to which he is answerable."

The Great Debate of 1951 ended inconclusively in the passage of a "sense-of-the-Senate" resolution in which the Senate approved the sending of Truman's four divisions but asserted that no additional ground troops should be sent to Western Europe "without further congressional approval." The administration opposed this ceiling; Senator Nixon of California was among those who voted for it. Where Acheson noted that the resolution was "without force of law" and "had in it a present for everybody." Taft applauded it as "a clear statement by the Senate that it has the right to pass on any question of sending troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact." Both were right; and since no subsequent President has tried to increase the American Army in Europe, the resolution has never been tested.

In areas more clearly dependent on the appropriations power, notably in foreign aid, Congress neither then nor later hesitated to tie up executive programs with all manner of hortatory prescriptions, rigid stipulations and detailed specifications, often against executive desire. In 1948 it forced an additional $400 million in aid to China; in 1950, over strong executive objection, it imposed a mandatory loan to Spain. Nor did it hesitate in 1951–52 to go beyond the administration in using economic aid to encourage not only economic cooperation but political integration in Western Europe. This congressional effort to shape foreign policy through appropriations did not relent in subsequent years; and the greater dependence of foreign policy on appropriations has meant that, in this sector at least, the presidency has lost power to Congress. When Monroe issued the Monroe Doctrine, he did not seek congressional assent, but when Kennedy called for the Alliance for Progress, he was at the mercy of Congress every step along the way.

The postwar argument between the Congress and the presidency spilled over to the treaty power as well. Members of Congress feared that the executive agreement, which had started out (with notable exceptions like Rush-Bagot) as a vehicle on minor matters, was now threatening to supersede the treaty as the means of major commitment. In December 1950, when Prime Minister Attlee came to Washington, a resolution sponsored by, among others, Senator Nixon, declared it the sense of the Senate that the President not only report in full to the Senate on his discussions but refrain from entering into any understandings or agreements. The Secretary of State dismissed this (as President Nixon would today) as "plainly . . . an infringement of the constitutional prerogative of the President to conduct negotiations." Still the resolution received 30 votes. Concern over the abuses of the executive agreement, already set off by hysteria among conservatives about the Yalta records, soon flowed into the movement for the Bricker Amendment.

This Amendment went through a succession of orchestrations; but the pervading theme was that treaties and executive agreements should become effective as internal law only through legislation valid in the absence of a treaty. This would mean not only that a treaty could not authorize what the Constitution forbids but that action by the House of Representatives and, in some cases, by state legislatures might be necessary to give it full effect. One version specifically empowered Congress "to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization." When moderate conservatives joined with liberals to resist the Amendment, Senator Knowland plucked out the section on executive agreements and offered a bill requiring that all such agreements be transmitted to the Senate within 60 days of their execution. Though the Senate passed this bill in July 1956, the House failed to act. In 1972, when Senator Case of New Jersey, a liberal Republican, revived the Knowland idea, the Senate, with liberals in the lead, passed it almost unanimously, and a liberal Democrat, Senator Pell of Rhode Island, recently remarked that the Bricker Amendment, "if put up today, I think, would be voted overwhelmingly by all of us."

VIII

The congressional protest soon subsided, in part because the election of a Republican President in 1952 seemed to promise a period of executive restraint and congressional influence and in part because Congress, no less than the executive, accepted the presuppositions of the cold war. Moreover, as so often, the acquisition of power altered perspectives. Secretary of State Dulles opposed the Bricker Amendment as strongly as any Democrat; and, while the Eisenhower administration was active in seeking joint resolutions at times of supposed vital decision in foreign affairs, it did so not because it thought Congress had any authority in the premises but because the resolution process, by involving Congress in the takeoff, would incriminate it in a crash-landing (this valuable aerial metaphor had been invented by Harold Stassen in 1946). The resolution process now became a curious ceremony of propitiation in which Presidents yielded no claims and Congress asserted few but which provided an amiable illusion of partnership; it was in domestic terms what someone had said of the Briand-Kellogg Pact—"an international kiss."

Sometimes even members of Congress considered such resolutions superfluous. When President Eisenhower, recalling Truman's omission in 1950, asked in 1955 for a resolution to cover possible American military activity around Formosa, Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House and presumably an incarnation of the congressional prerogative, said, "If the President had done what is proposed here without consulting the Congress, he would have had no criticism from me." The Formosa Resolution at least contained language by which the President was "authorized to employ the Armed Forces," however lightly the executive regarded that language, but Congress loosened even that pretense of control by adding that he could use these forces "as he deems necessary" in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. When Eisenhower sought a Middle East Resolution in 1957, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this time deleted the idea of congressional authorization. Senator Fulbright even expressed the fear that any resolution might limit the President's power as Commander in Chief to defend the "vital interests" of the nation. And when Eisenhower, in what in retrospect seems a mysterious and, indeed, hazardous mission, sent 14,000 troops to Lebanon the next year, he cited as authority for this action, not at all his own resolution but the now capacious presidential prerogative.

On the other hand, Eisenhower had acknowledged the practical importance of congressional support when in 1954 he yielded to congressional (as well as British) opposition and declined to commit American forces to the relief of Dien Bien Phu. At the same time, however, he reduced the significance of the troop-commitment issue by confiding an increasing share of American foreign operations to an agency presumed beyond the reach of Congress, the Central Intelligence Agency. In the Eisenhower years the CIA became the primary instrument of American intervention overseas, helping to overthrow governments in Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954), failing to do so in Indonesia (1958), helping to install governments in Egypt (1954) and Laos (1959), organizing an expedition of Cuban refugees against the Castro régime (1960). Congress had no oversight over the CIA. It even lacked regular means of finding out what it was up to. There was a joint congressional committee on atomic energy but none (none to this day) on secret intelligence operations.

The cold war created both a critical environment and an uncritical consensus; and these enabled even a relatively passive President, a "Whig" like Eisenhower, to enlarge the unilateral authority of the executive. Nor did either the President or the Congress see this as a question of usurpation. During the fifties and much of the sixties most of Congress, mesmerized by the supposed need for instant response to constant crisis, overawed by what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee later called "the cult of executive expertise," accepted the "high-flying" theories of the presidential prerogative. In early 1960 Senator John F. Kennedy observed that, however large the congressional role in the formulation of domestic programs, "it is the President alone who must make the major decisions of our foreign policy." As late as 1961, Senator Fulbright contended that "for the existing requirements of American foreign policy we have hobbled the President by too niggardly a grant of power." While he found it "distasteful and dangerous to vest the executive with powers unchecked and unbalanced," the question, he concluded, was "whether we have any choice but to do so." Republicans were no less devoted to the thesis of executive supremacy. "It is a rather interesting thing," Senator Dirksen, then Republican leader, told the Senate in 1967, "—I have run down many legal cases before the Supreme Court—that I have found as yet no delimitation on the power of the Commander in Chief under the Constitution." "I am convinced," said Senator Goldwater, "there is no question that the President can

take military action at any time he feels danger for the country or, stretching a point, for its position in the world."

In this state of political and intellectual intimidation, Congress forgot even the claim for consultation and was grateful when the executive bothered to say what it planned to do. ("The distinction between solicitation of advice in advance of a decision and the provision of information in the wake of a decision would seem to be a significant one," the Senate Foreign Relations Committee finally commented in 1969. Pointing out that in the cases of the Cuban missile crisis and the Dominican intervention congressional leaders were informed what was to be done only a few hours before the decisions were carried out, the Committee added dryly, "Such acts of courtesy are always to be welcomed; the Constitution, however, envisages something more.") In this mood, too, Congress acquiesced in national commitment through executive agreement—as, for example, in the case of Spain where the original bases agreement of 1953 was steadily escalated by official pronouncement through the years until the Foreign Relations Committee could conclude in 1969 that the sum of executive declarations was a virtual commitment on the part of the United States to come to the aid of Spain. Senator Fulbright recently remarked a little bitterly, "We get many treaties dealing with postal affairs and so on. Recently, we had an extraordinary treaty dealing with the protection of stolen art objects. These are treaties. But when we put troops and take on commitments in Spain, it is an executive agreement."

The case of Thailand is equally astonishing. In 1962 Secretary of State Rusk and the Thai Foreign Minister expressed in a joint declaration "the firm intention of the United States to aid Thailand . . . in resisting Communist aggression and subversion." While this statement may have been no more than a specification of SEATO obligations, the executive branch thereafter secretly built and used bases and consolidated the Thai commitment in ways that would still be unknown to Congress and the electorate had it not been for the indomitable curiosity of Senator Symington and his Subcommittee on Security Arrangements and Commitments Abroad. The Subcommittee also uncovered interesting transactions involving the executive branch with Ethiopia (1960), Laos (1963) and South Korea (1966). The case of Israel is even more singular. Here a succession of executive declarations through five administrations have produced a virtual commitment without the pretense of a treaty or even an executive agreement.

In this mood also Congress accepted the Americanization of the Vietnam War in 1965. "If this decision was not for Congress under the Constitution," Professor Bickel has well said, "then no decision of any consequence in matters of war and peace is left to Congress." As for the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, though President Johnson liked to flourish it as proof that Congress had indeed made a decision, he himself really did not think, as he later put it, that "the resolution was necessary to do what we did and what we're doing." As he unfolded his view of presidential power in 1966: "There are many, many, who can recommend, advise and sometimes a few of them consent. But there is only one that has been chosen by the American people to decide."

Listing 24 statutes facilitating the fighting in Vietnam, Senator Goldwater said in 1971, "Congress is and has been involved up to its ears with the war in Southeast Asia." The argument that Congress thereby "authorized" the war, especially by voting appropriations, has a certain practical strength up to the point (as Judge Frank Coffin put it in a 1971 decision of the First Circuit Court) where Congress asserts a conflicting claim of authority, which it has not done. But, also as a practical matter, it is rare indeed for parliaments to deny supplies to fighting men, and too much cannot be inferred from the refusal to punish the troops for the sins of those who sent them into the line. It is true that members of the British Parliament voted against supply bills during the American Revolution, but this was before the Reform Acts had created constituencies broad enough to include large numbers of relatives of men in combat. At the height of his opposition to the Mexican War, Congressman Lincoln said, "I have always intended, and still intend, to vote supplies." Still, though Congress has placed restrictions on troop deployment, it had not by the middle of 1972 interposed a decisive obstacle to presidential escalation of the war.

IX

If President Johnson construed the high prerogative more in the eighteenth-century style of the British King than of the executive envisaged by the Constitution, his successor carried the inflation of presidential authority even further. In asserting that his power as the Commander in Chief authorized him to use American ground troops to invade Cambodia, and to do so without reference to or even the knowledge of Congress, President Nixon indulged in presidential war-making beyond a point that even his boldest predecessors could have dreamed of. Those who had stretched the executive war power in the past had done so in the face of visible and dire threat to national survival: Lincoln confronted by rebellion, Roosevelt by the Third Reich. Each, moreover, had done what he felt he had to do without claiming constitutional sanction for every item of presidential action.

But, in justifying the commitment of American troops to war in a remote and neutral country, Nixon cited no emergency that denied time for congressional action, expressed no doubt about the total legality of his own initiative and showed no desire even for retroactive congressional ratification. All he was doing, he told the Senate Republican leader in June 1970, was fulfilling "the Constitutional duty of the Commander-in-Chief to take actions necessary to protect the lives of United States forces." This was no more, he implied, than the routine employment of presidential power; it required no special congressional assent, not even the fig-leaf, shortly repealed and abandoned, of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. William Rehnquist of the Department of Justice, himself soon escalated by the President to the Supreme Court, called it "a valid exercise of his constitutional authority as Commander-in-Chief to secure the safety of American forces"—a proposition that might not have deeply moved the Nixon administration had it been advanced by the Presidium to explain why the Red Army was justified in invading a neutral country to secure the safety of Russian forces. "The President's authority to do what he did, in my view," Rehnquist concluded, "must be conceded by even those who read Executive authority narrowly." It was, in fact, challenged by even those who read executive authority broadly.

The government thus committed armed forces to hostilities first in Cambodia, then in Laos and North Vietnam (for the air force remains a part of the armed forces) on the basis of a theory of defensive war so elastic that a President could freely and on his own initiative order armed intervention in any country housing any troops that might in any conceivable circumstance be used in an attack on American troops. If this seemed an extraordinary invasion of the congressional war power, there seemed a comparable invasion of the appropriations power when Henry Kissinger informed Hanoi in secret negotiation that the United States "could give and undertake, a voluntary contribution by the President, that there would be a massive reconstruction program for all of Indochina, in which North Vietnam could share to the extent of several billion dollars."

Congress appeared increasingly impotent in the face of the size and momentum of the postwar institutions of American foreign policy—an institutional array spearheaded by an aggressive presidency and supported by a military and intelligence establishment virtually beyond congressional reach. Indeed, large sections of the electorate were coming to feel that foreign policy had escaped from democratic control and that the institutions would have their way however the voters might vote.

Excess, as usual, invites reaction; and the Senate, with due timidity, reacted. What Versailles had done to the congressional prerogative, Vietnam now did to the presidential prerogative. But Congress did not react by frontal attack on the means by which the President continued the war, though various members of Congress urged this course on their colleagues. The Senate reacted rather by passing in June 1969 by 70–16 the National Commitments Resolution, described by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as "an invitation to the executive to reconsider its excesses, and to the legislature to reconsider its omissions in the making of foreign policy." Neither invitation was accepted.

The Senate also reacted in April 1972 by passing a War Powers bill, from the workings of which Vietnam was specifically exempted. This bill, conceived and bravely promoted by Senator Javits, has, from some views, substantial defects. Had it been on the statute books in past years, it would surely have prevented Roosevelt from responding to Hitler in the North Atlantic in 1941 and would surely not have prevented Johnson from escalating the war in Vietnam (for Johnson would have received—indeed, did receive—overwhelming congressional support for escalation at every point till the middle of 1968). If passed by the Congress, the bill might be more likely to become a means of inducing formal congressional approval of warlike presidential acts than of preventing such acts. Moreover, the principle on which the bill is based—that the President must carry out the policy directives of Congress in the initiation and prosecution of military hostilities—might itself have bellicose consequences the next time War Hawks dominate the legislative branch. Still the Senate's passage of the bill—especially by the impressive margin of 68–16—might have been expected to have some cautionary influence in reminding the President that Congress in its pathetic way thought it had some voice in the determination of peace and war. It had no such effect. A fortnight after its passage, President Nixon, again without reference to Congress, threw the American Air Force into devastating attacks on North Vietnam.

If there is an imbalance of powers, if Congress has lost authority clearly conferred on it by the Constitution, it can only be said that Congress has done little to correct the situation. Its complaints have been eloquent; its practical action has been slight. Its problem has been less lack of power than lack of will to use the powers it has—the power of appropriation, the power to regulate the size of the armed forces, the power through joint resolutions to shape foreign policy, the power to inform, investigate and censure. As late as the summer of 1972, the Senate, in declining Senator Cooper's amendment to the bill, which proposed to cut off funds for American troops and bombing in four months, relinquished, in the words of *The Washington Post*, "the only opportunity it has ever dared afford itself to make an independent and conclusive judgment on the war."

In the present as in the past, Congress has preferred to renounce responsibility—which is why the presidency has retained power.

"We may say that power to legislate for emergencies belongs in the hands of Congress," said Justice Jackson in the Steel Seizure case, "but only Congress itself can prevent power from slipping through its fingers." The situation today, for all the wails of congressional self-pity, is much the one that Lincoln feared in 1848: "Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation [or, today, a nation on the other side of the world], whenever *he* shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion . . . and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix *any limit* to his power in this respect."

x

The Abraham Lincoln who had thus challenged the presidential prerogative of Polk was the same Abraham Lincoln who a dozen years later gave the presidency greater powers over war and peace than ever before, as the Andrew Jackson who showed such deference to Congress in the eighteen-thirties was the same Andrew Jackson who a dozen years earlier had charged without congressional authority into Spanish Florida. This is a critical point in understanding the nature of the issue. For nothing has been more characteristic of the perennial debate than the way in which the same people, in different circumstances and in different points in their lives, have argued both sides of the issue.

Richard M. Nixon had one set of views in 1951 on the question of whether Congress could control troop commitments and executive agreements. By 1971 he had an opposite set of views. Senator Fulbright, moving in the reverse direction has long since repented his belief that the President needs more control over foreign policy. Professor Corwin's "high-flying prerogative men" of 20 years ago have zoomed downward on this question in recent times. Professor Commager has, in effect, accepted the Taft-Coudert case in his testimony in favor of the War Powers bill; and this writer, while remaining skeptical about the War Powers bill, would freely concede that Senator Taft had a much more substantial point than he supposed 20 years ago. But to make that point Senator Taft had to explain away the views of *his* father, the Chief Justice, who had written in 1916 that the President as Commander in Chief "can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation." And, while the younger Senator Taft has followed his father rather than his grandfather, such heirs of Taft as Goldwater and Rehnquist are today very high-flying prerogative men. For that matter Professor Corwin's own record was not all that immaculate. While he defended the congressional prerogative in 1951, in 1940 he had raised the question "whether the President may, without authorization by Congress, take measures which are technically acts of war in protection of American rights and interests abroad," and replied: "The answer returned both by practice and by judicial doctrine is yes." Even as late as 1949, Corwin described the power "to employ without congressional authorization the armed forces in protection of American rights and interests abroad wherever necessary as "almost unchallenged from the first and occasionally sanctified judicially."

There are several reasons for this chronicle of vacillation. For one thing, the issues involved are ones of genuine intellectual difficulty, about which reasonable men may well find themselves changing their minds. For another, power usually looks more responsible from inside than from outside. For another, general questions often assume different shapes in different lights. It is agreeable to claim constitutionality for policies one supports and agreeable too to stigmatize policies one opposes as unconstitutional. All these reasons tend toward a single conclusion: that the problem we face is not primarily constitutional. It is primarily political. History offers the lawyer or scholar almost any precedent he needs to sustain what he may consider, in a concrete setting, to be wise policy. There is simply no absolute solution to the constitutional issue. This is no doubt why the Supreme Court has been so skittish about pronouncing on the problem. In our long and voluable judicial history, the decisions bearing even marginally on the question can be numbered on the fingers of one hand, and the illumination they provide is, at best, flickering if not dim.

If this is so, we must restrain our national propensity to cast political questions in constitutional terms. Just as in other years we went too far in devising theories of spacious presidential power because we agreed with the way one set of Presidents wanted to use this power, now we are likely to go too far in limiting presidential power because we disagree with the projects of another set of Presidents. We must take care not to convert a passing historical phase into ultimate constitutional truth. Professor Bickel has even suggested that "Congress should prescribe the mission of our troops in the field, in accordance with a foreign and war policy of the United States which it is for Congress to set when it chooses to do so. And Congress should equally review and settle upon an appropriate foreign policy elsewhere than in Vietnam, and reorder the deployment of our forces accordingly." There is no great gain in replacing high-flying presidential men by high-flying congressional men, nor is James Buchanan necessarily the model President.

As the guerrilla war between the presidency and the Congress for control over foreign policy has dragged along through our history, the issue is sometimes put as if one or the other were the safer depository of authority. Congressional judgment, Adolf Berle once argued, "tends to lag behind the facts in an international case to which the President must address himself . . . Defense means seeing trouble in advance and moving to prevent it. The President's estimates of what will happen have usually been better than those of men who do not live with the problems." Senator Goldwater opposed the War Powers bill because, as he said, "I would put more faith in the judgment of the Office of President in the matter of warmaking at this time than I would of Congress." But Senator Fulbright, who in 1961 feared the "localism and parochialism" of Congress, now believes "the collective judgment of the Congress, with all its faults, could be superior to that of one man who makes the final decision, in the executive."

History does not support any general assignment of superior virtue to either branch. In spite of Madison, the Congress is not always a force for restraint (as he himself discovered in 1812) nor the executive always a force for bellicosity. One need go back no further than the Cuban missile crisis to recall, as Robert Kennedy has told us, that the congressional leaders, including Senators Russell and Fulbright, "felt that the President should take more forceful action, a military attack or invasion, and that the blockade was far too weak a response." Those of us who hate the Indochina War may see more hope today in the Congress than in the presidency; just as those who grew up in the days when Congress rejected Versailles and promulgated the neutrality acts saw more hope in the executive. But it would be folly to regard either presidential or congressional wisdom as a permanent condition. Neither branch is infallible, and each needs the other—which is, I guess, the point the Founding Fathers were trying to make.

There is no worse fallacy than to build final answers on transient situations. The questions of the war power and the treaty power are, and must remain, political questions. This is not a zone of clear-cut constitutional prescription. It is rather what Justice Jackson in his brilliant opinion in the Steel Seizure case described as "a zone of twilight in which [the President] and Congress may have concurrent authority, or in which its distribution is uncertain. Therefore, congressional inertia, indifference or quiescence may sometimes, at least as a practical matter, enable, if not invite, measures on independent presidential responsibility. In this area, any actual test of power is likely to depend on the imperatives of events and contemporary imponderables rather than on abstract theories of law."

While the Constitution sets outer limits on both presidential and congressional action, it leaves a wide area of "joint possession." Common sense therefore argues for congressional participation as well as for presidential responsibility in the great decisions of peace and war.

To restore the constitutional balance, it is necessary in this period to rebuke presidential pretensions, as it has been necessary in other periods to rebuke congressional pretensions. Perhaps Tocqueville was not so profound after all (for once) in his theory of the antagonism between democracy and foreign policy. Perhaps Bryce (for once) was more to the point when he argued that the broad masses are capable of assessing national interests and of sustaining consistent policies. So far as judging the ends of policy is concerned, Bryce said, "History shows that [the people] do this at least as wisely as monarchs or oligarchies, or the small groups to whom, in democratic countries, the conduct of foreign relations has been left, and that they have evinced more respect for moral principles."

We are still told about the supposed structural advantages of the executive as portrayed in the Federalist—unity, secrecy, superior sources of information, decision, dispatch. These advantages seem less impressive today than they must have been 180 years ago. Our sprawling executive branch is often disunited and is chronically incapable of secrecy. Its information is no longer manifestly superior and is often manifestly defective. The need for decision and dispatch has been greatly exaggerated; apart from Korea and the Cuban missile crisis, no postwar emergency has demanded instant response. Moreover, there was far more reason for unilateral executive action in times when difficulties of transport and communication could delay the convening of Congress for weeks than there is in our age of the telephone and the jet aircraft. What remains to the President is his command of the institutions of war and his undeniable ability to create situations which make it hard for Congress to reject his request. Here it might be well to recall the warning of the Federalist: "How easy would it be to fabricate pretences of approaching danger."

But in demythologizing the presidency we must take care not to remythologize the Congress. If it is extreme to say that the President can send troops anywhere he pleases without congressional authorization, it is equally extreme to say he cannot do so short of war without congressional authorization (even Senator Taft proposed no limitations on presidential deployment of the navy and air force). In this area, John Norton Moore and Quincy Wright have proposed a test worth careful consideration: that the President must obtain prior congressional authorization in all cases where regular combat units are committed to what may be sustained hostilities or where military intervention will require congressional action, as by appropriations, before it is completed. This would leave the President with independent authority to deploy forces short of war (and, of course, to repel attack), while it would assure congressional authority to limit or prohibit presidential commitment

when war impends. But this provision, however attractive, would not have stopped escalation in Vietnam where President Johnson would have had no difficulty in getting the necessary authorization. The War Powers bill, though excessively rigid in its definition of situations where the President is authorized to act and unconvincing in its reliance on a 30-day deadline, contains valuable provisions for presidential reporting to the Congress once hostilities begin. Congressman Jonathan Bingham has proposed a simpler approach, which would avoid the rigidities of the War Powers bill but retain its affirmation of congressional control of undeclared hostilities. Citing the Executive Reorganization Act as a precedent, he would give either house of Congress power to terminate such hostilities by resolution. Some declaration of congressional power in this area would serve as a useful check on Presidents.

As for the treaty power, Senator Case's efforts to bring executive agreements within congressional purview and to induce the executive to submit major agreements in the form of treaties are long overdue. But the notion that executive agreements must be rigorously confined to minor matters and that all important international undertakings must be subject to senatorial veto would bring us back to the frustrations of Olney and Hay. Does anyone seriously suggest that every time a President meets another chief of state their understandings can be extinguished by one-third of the Senate? Would even high-flying congressional men contend that the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Fourteen Points and the Atlantic Charter were cases of presidential usurpation? And in the period ahead, with the bipolar simplicities of the cold war giving way to the shifting complexities of a multipolar world, the executive simply cannot operate just on the leading strings of Congress. There has to be a middle ground between making the American President a czar and making him a puppet.

Senator Fulbright once distinguished between two kinds of power involved in the shaping of foreign policy—that pertaining to its direction, purpose and philosophy; and that pertaining to the day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs. The former, he suggested, belonged peculiarly to Congress, the latter to the executive. The trouble was that Congress was reversing the order of responsibility. "We have tended to snoop and pry in matters of detail, interfering in the handling of specific problems in specific places which we happen to chance upon. . . . At the same time we have resigned from our responsibility in the shaping of policy and the defining of its purposes, giving away things that are not ours to give: the war power of the Congress, the treaty power of the Senate and the broader advice and consent power." Perhaps it would be well to recall the hope expressed by Senator Vandenberg in 1948 that the habit of senatorial intervention in foreign affairs would not become "too contagious because . . . only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the Executive."

XI

Vandenberg was everlastingly right in his emphasis on information; for a flow of information to Congress is indispensable to a wise use of both the war and the treaty powers. And in no regard has Congress, until very recently, been more negligent than in acquiescing in executive denial of information. As Woodrow Wilson said long ago,

"Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct."

In Wilson's judgment, "The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function." The executive has devised no more effective obstacle to the democratic control of foreign policy than the secrecy system which has grown to such appalling proportions since the Second World War.

It is time for Congress to reject the "if-you-only-knew-what-we-knew" pose by which the executive deepens the congressional inferiority complex. Members of Congress, at least those who read *The New York Times*, know more than they think and, in general, would not receive blinding illumination if they read Top Secret documents too. While the executive, through its diplomatic, military and intelligence operatives, has an abundance of short-run information not easily available to Congress, experience shows that this information is seldom essential to long-run judgments. Nor is executive information all that infallible; one has only to recall the theory prevailing in the executive bureaucracy a few years back that Hanoi and the Vietcong were the spearhead of a system of Chinese expansion in Southeast Asia. If the executive "had been subjected more quickly and more closely to the scrutiny of informed public and congressional opinion," Senator McGovern has said. ". . . it may not have fallen prey to its own delusions and fantasies."

And, as former government officials readily concede, there is no reason in most cases why Congress should be denied classified information. Thus George Ball: "I think there is very little information that Congress should ever be denied;" McGeorge Bundy: "I do not believe most of what is highly classified . . . should be kept from responsible members of the Congress at all. Indeed I believe the opposite." Nor should members of Congress be denied the opportunity to interrogate public officials presently shielded from them by the promiscuous invocation of executive privilege. Ball, calling executive privilege "a myth, for I find no constitutional basis for it," contends it should be invoked only when the President makes the decision himself and communicates that decision to Congress. George Reedy would even take the position "that the President has no executive privilege whatever in any public question." This is going a little far. The executive branch must retain the capacity to protect its internal processes of decision, and the President must on occasion assert a power to resist the disclosure of information against what he seriously believes to be the public interest. But Senator Fulbright's bill to restrain the flagrant abuse of executive privilege surely deserves enactment.

If Congress really wants to reclaim lost authority, it can do little more effective than to assure itself a steady and disinterested flow of information about foreign affairs. More than ever, information is the key to power. That is why the MacArthur hearings were so valuable in 1951; why the hearings conducted in recent years by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senator Fulbright's leadership have done more to turn opinion against the Vietnam War than other more tangible weapons in the congressional arsenal. Perhaps the flow of information could be usefully institutionalized—as in Benjamin V. Cohen's proposal for the establishment by Congress of a commission of eight: two from the House, two from the Senate, four from the executive branch, empowered to exchange information and views on critical questions of foreign affairs.

XII

Structural change can effect only limited improvements. The greater hope perhaps lies in increasing sensitivity to the problem of "joint possession" of constitutional powers. Greater awareness of the problem, to which so many for so long were oblivious, has recently led serious men into serious consideration of the issues of constitutional balance. In the future such awareness may both restrain conscientious Presidents and reinvigorate responsible Congresses.

Nor can structural change save us from the exasperations of choice. We must recognize both that our government must operate within constitutional bounds and that, within this spacious area, questions involved in the control of foreign policy are political rather than constitutional. If we do this, we will perhaps stop turning passing necessities, or supposed necessities, into constitutional absolutes. For a self-styled strict constructionist, President Nixon has gone very far indeed in anoiting manifest excesses with the lotion of constitutional sanctity.

In this regard he compares unfavorably with such Presidents as Jefferson, Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt. Faced with infinitely more genuine emergencies, they had considerably more excuse for expansion of the presidential prerogative. But they did not claim that they were doing nothing more than apply routine presidential authority. Lincoln, particularly, in his troubled justification for the suspension of habeas corpus, said, "Would not the official oath be broken if the government should be overthrown, when it was believed that disregarding the single law would tend to preserve it?" Jefferson put the case more generally:

"To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law, would be lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means. . . . The line of discrimination between cases may be difficult; but the good officer is bound to draw it at his own peril, and throw himself on the justice of his country and the rectitude of his motives."

A conscientious President must distinguish between the exception and the rule. Emergency may compel him to abandon the rule in favor of the exception; but he must not pretend—as Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt declined to pretend and as Johnson and Nixon have pretended—that the exception *is* the rule. Rather, like Lincoln in 1860, the executive may at his own peril undertake measures about whose strict legality he may be in doubt, and do so, not under an illusion of constitutional righteousness, but in terms of a popular demand and a public necessity. In the end, he must rest such acts on the assent of Congress, the justice of his country and the rectitude of his motives. Only Presidents who distinguish emergency from normality can both meet emergency and preserve the constitutional order. As Justice Jackson said in the Korematsu case: "The chief restraint upon those who command the physical forces of the country, in the future as in the past, must be their responsibility to the political judgments of their contemporaries and to the moral judgments of history."

PHASE III: NO TIME FOR PERMISSIVENESS

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, in announcing his phase III economic policy last week, President Nixon moved from the uncomfortable to the unknown. The de-

cision to abandon administered wages and prices brought cheers, jeers, and crossed fingers.

The success of phase III will depend on how hard, how soon, and how often the Nixon administration cracks down on violators of what are now essentially voluntary guidelines. If phase III fails, then we may inherit the whirlwind of 1969–71: soaring prices and rising unemployment.

DID PHASE II WORK?

Phase II did not "work." It helped. The wage, price, rent, and interest controls were aimed at only one of the Nation's economic difficulties, inflation. Unemployment, the balance of trade, and income distribution were not the focus of the phase I freeze nor the phase II administered controls. During the 15 months of the first two phases, the rate of inflation was slowed from 5 percent to slightly over 3 percent.

To be sure, phase II had some built-in defects. Raw agricultural commodities were exempted, and each trip to the market became a cruel and unusual punishment. There were wide disparities in wage hikes, and many wage raise applications took months to process. In the Pacific Northwest Pay Board foul-ups frustrated meatcutters, electrical workers, and woodworkers.

As an early and persistent advocate of wage, price, and interest rate controls. I believe that phase I and phase II can be labeled a modest success. Food prices have been the glaring exception, and no citizen is happy about devastating medical costs.

PHASE III FADE AWAY

A few days after the Government announced that the December wholesale price index had increased by 1.6 percent and that its food component had advanced 5.2 percent—or a 62-percent annual rise—President Nixon scrapped the Pay Board, junked the Price Commission, and paroled the economy on good behavior. The man who had displayed a lifelong aversion to Government interference in wages and prices showed the American people that the period of August 15, 1971, to January 10, 1973, was only an aberration. Except for processed food, construction, and health care, the new program would be largely voluntary and self-enforcing. He then asked that Congress extend his wage and price control authority to April 30, 1974. The Nation's economists, who have never agreed on anything, offered predictions of success and doom.

In my view, the phase III system has a number of defects that raise serious doubts. Take food prices, for example. The thrust of the administration's efforts will be to increase our commodity supplies by lifting meat import quotas, easing production controls, and perhaps even attempting to eliminate or reduce the farm subsidy programs. The authority for these programs expires on December 31, 1973.

But these steps will take months to show any effect. In the meantime, even the administration admits that food prices will continue to wage a war of attrition against our paychecks. Contained in the President's program is a sleeper that pleases Mr. Clarence Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains. This devise will ease what Mr. Adamy terms "harassment of management."

To monitor food prices under phase II, the Internal Revenue Service requires merchants to show how increased costs were responsible for price increases on each item. Eggs cost more because of these costs, bread more because of this factor.

That has been changed. Now the rules allow food dealers to calculate percentage markups on the basis of total sales. The IRS under phase II had opposed this type of practice since it made it almost impossible to track down cost increases for the thousands and thousands of items we find in our modern supermarkets. So how can you enforce a price standard if you cannot find the lack of rationale for it? And phase III still exempts entirely raw agricultural commodities. We should seriously consider a 90-day freeze on food prices.

CONSOLIDATING INADEQUACY

Food prices, wages, and other items were supervised by 4,000 total Federal employees who served on the Pay Board, Price Commission, and Internal Revenue Service. As the functions of the Pay Board and Price Commission are transferred to the Cost of Living Council, the total number will be halved to 2,000. But they will have less to do. Phase II lacked enough players on the field; phase III shrinks the size of the field.

As mentioned before, only processed food, construction, and health care will be subject to the old phase III requirements of obtaining prior approval for wage and price hikes. Under the new setup, the Cost of Living Council will issue guidelines which are supposed to be followed. The guidelines will be targets of not more than a 2.5-percent increase in prices, based on increased costs, and a 5.5-percent boost in wages. Some 800 very large firms will have to report quarterly, and a total of 4,300 will have to keep records. No firm with fewer than 1,000 employees will have to keep records under phase III.

Secretary of the Treasury George Schultz observed that restraint would be obtained because union and management would know that—

People who don't abide by the program may get clobbered.

That may is a big if. We will have to see what happens. A key difference is that except for the three controlled industries, the Government cannot fine violators. Only the rollback authority remains.

THE PROFIT MARGIN MISTAKE

Phase II's main approach to restraining prices was to limit them to cost increases and also to a company's profit margin. Companies were not permitted to raise their profit margins—by raising prices—above an average of their 2 best fiscal years of the 3 years ending before August 15, 1971.

The hand that picks the consumer's pocket is the new rule on profit margins. An added goody is that companies can also use the profit margin of any fiscal year since August 15, 1971. Since profit margins were big in an expanding economy in 1972, this rule will permit higher prices.

BIG YEAR AT THE BARGAINING TABLE

Five million American workers are involved in labor contracts that expire in 1973. Included are meatcutters, teamsters, electrical workers, postal employees, and auto workers. These are extremely critical contracts, especially so in the auto industry, for this contract is often a pace setter for American labor. Moreover, the unions whose contracts are expiring have a reputation for tough, hard bargaining.

Reviewing the 5.5-percent pay hike guidelines will be the Cost of Living Council's Labor-Management Advisory Council. Appointing this Council was and is essential to making phase III work, since the compliance will rely on labor-management cooperation. But we find that many members of the Council also represent unions or companies with labor contracts that expire in 1973.

RENT FIASCO, "ALLOCATION" LOOPHOLE

Incredibly, the phase III program will totally eliminate any controls of supervision of rent. This will hurt many less-affluent Americans who cannot afford to own their own homes. Worse, the administration has just announced that federally subsidized housing will be cut back severely. Fewer housing units will naturally bring pressure on rents.

Like phase II, the new program is supposed to regulate prices by: First, making them reflect only cost increases; and second, making them conform to a given profit margin. Yet there is a loophole that is open to just about any interpretation. Price hikes above the standard will be permitted if necessary for efficient allocation of resources to maintain adequate levels of supply. How will the Cost of Living Council handle this piece of cotton candy?

BLAME IT ON THE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, the President has presented us with a wage and price program that has most of its former teeth pulled. How, may I ask, is it going to function better than phase II's supervised system? At this time we cannot judge the determination of the Cost of Living Council nor its Chairman, Mr. Dunlop. As I have outlined here today, I have grave reservations about lifting controls at a time when prices are still rising and when major labor contracts are expiring.

In his January 11 message to Congress, Mr. Nixon sounded a familiar theme. He said:

We cannot keep inflation in check unless we keep Government spending in check.

He cautioned:

The stability of our prices depends on the restraint of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the shocking attacks being leveled against Congress. Mr. Nixon and his followers are attacking a Congress that cut Mr. Nixon's overall, total budget each year that he has been in office. We have reduced his four budgets by nearly $20 billion. Yet he blames us for the deficits which he planned and which he created by mismanaging the economy so

that fewer revenues were obtained. On top of this, he steadfastly refuses to send us a tax reform program that would close loopholes such as the oil depletion allowance and thus narrow the deficit. Incredible.

So here we have it. Our economy is producing something on the order of $1,050 billion, and only a part of this is spending by the U.S. Congress. Will spending $10 billion less for social programs affect the total picture? Do not kid yourself. Yet we are pressured, scorned, and otherwise abused for not relinquishing our constitutional powers over spending to the President so that he, sitting alone atop Catoctin Mountain, can cut, chop, and determine the spending priorities of the Republic.

I hope and pray that phase III can stem inflation and promote stability. If it does not, then let us not surrender the powers of Congress, and let us not return to the tight money-high interest rate policies which proved so disastrous for our economy in the period 1969–71. No section of the country was hurt more by these policies than Washington State. The success of phase III, as I said previously, depends on how hard, how often, and how soon the administration cracks down on violators. It is no time for permissiveness.

BABY, IT'S COLD OUTSIDE

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to file what has already shown itself to be a joint resolution with a proven track record of success. I am referring to legislation to authorize emergency importation of oil into the United States: The suspension for crude oil would extend through the current winter season or 90 days while the suspension for heating oil would remain in effect through next year's winter season or April 1, 1974. I am happy to join my esteemed colleague and senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and Senator ADLAI E. STEVENSON from Illinois, as well as my good friend and hard-working colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI of Illinois in introducing this legislation. As a matter of fact, the legislation will be introduced today in the Senate, as well as in the House. It would have been introduced yesterday in both Houses had they been in session.

I said in my opening statement that this legislation already has a reputation for producing results. The White House, perhaps sensing the support in Congress for a move such as this, announced a suspension of import ceilings on No. 2 home heating oils for the next 4 months. While this move does not go far enough in tackling the underlying problem behind this year's crisis as well as previous years' crises, it is a step in the right direction and does indicate that the administration is at last taking seriously the fuel crisis facing whole sections of this Nation. No longer can whole sections of this Nation be held hostage to a fuel policy which protects producers at the expense of consumers—producers who have just not kept up with the demand.

The immediate reaction in some quarters upon hearing of this announcement was to ask me whether or not it was now necessary to file the Burke-Kennedy bill. Had not our purpose been achieved and the immediate crisis been met? My answer is "no." What we are being treated to is really more of the same stop and go, stopgap measures that have characterized this Nation's import policies for the past several years. The net result of these stop and go, stopgap policies has been to prevent adequate stockpiling of oil supplies in advance of peak demand periods. Oil distributors have been unable to anticipate or plan ahead to adequately meet the shortages of the winter months. It is because I feel one of the most important features of the Burke-Kennedy joint resolution is its year long moratorium on import quotas for heating oil that I feel the joint resolution is still necessary. It would allow our oil distribution industry to plan ahead for at least a year instead of reacting to crisis situations as they have had to in the past. For the first time, if this resolution were to pass, these distributors would be able to anticipate shortages and be ready for a winter season. The fact of the matter is with the best will in the world the administration's action has come too late to prevent some real inconveniences in the immediate days ahead this winter season. I feel we should prevent this from happening again.

Hardly a day has gone by in the last few weeks when the press has not carried front-page stories relating to the fuel crisis in either the Midwest or the Northeast. Across the Nation, there is a real possibility that supplies of jet aviation fuel are insufficient and already this has had an impact on scheduled flights and departures. Plants have been forced to reduce work weeks and homes have had to cut down on their use of fuel and families shiver a little bit more because of delays in oil deliveries. Has this Nation progressed so far into the age of technology and speed that our citizens are no longer able to feel secure in the knowledge that they will have protection against the winters cold, one of man's most basic needs and concerns from time immemorial?

Mr. Speaker, I feel the legislation I am filing today definitely deserves the title of emergency legislation. I only regret that it took a widespread crisis to bring the fuel shortage which New England has been experiencing for so many years now to the attention of the rest of the Nation. Let us hope that the discomfort and disruption being experienced by people from coast to coast this winter will be the last we hear of this problem, and action will be taken which should have been taken years ago and that our present fuel policies be reconsidered and revamped. I urge my colleagues sharing our sense of urgency to indicate their support for this legislation by cosponsoring it at their earliest convenience. For the need for this legislation is still great indeed. The following is the text of the joint resolution:

H.J. RES. 200

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that—

(1) the level of supplies of home heating oil has not been adequate to meet the needs of homes across the nation,

(2) the major cause of the inadequate supply of such oil is the limitation on imports of petroleum and petroleum products established by Presidential Proclamation 3279, as amended, and

(3) a suspension of the provisions of that Proclamation and the provisions of section 232(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to petroleum and petroleum products will permit home heating oil to be imported, or produced in adequate quantities by domestic refineries, and thereby relieve the critical shortage of such oil.

SEC. 2. Beginning on the date of enactment of this Resolution, the provisions of Presidential Proclamation No. 3279, as amended, and of section 232(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 shall not apply to the importation of crude oil or number 2 fuel oil (home heating oil) until the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this resolution (in the case of crude oil) or April 1, 1974 (in the case of number 2 fuel oil).

POLITICAL HEADACHE OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the press recently, there has been much about Howard Hunt and his involvement in the Watergate bugging incident. However, little, if anything, has appeared in the press about his involvement as program director in a sole-source contract funded by the Office of Education on the day after the Watergate incident first broke in the press. The program proposal was entitled "Proposal for More Effective Help From the Federal Government in Assisting Handicapped Children To Become National Assets." First funded at $140,456, through contract modifications and extensions, this multiyear contract has been bucked today to a total cost to OE of $738,548. The latest addition to the contract came on June 21, 1972, when OE's sole-source board approved a $158,600 1-year extension through June 15, 1973. In approving this contract extension, on June 21, the sole-source board overrode a number of key flaws in the contract and in the firm's past performance, in the process electing not to open the lucrative contract to competitive bidding. The purpose of OE's sole-source board, according to then Commissioner Marland, is to cut down on the large number of sole-source contracts given out each year—90 percent according to OE's own figures. This relatively new management device, however, was really not used as intended in this case as in many others.

The beneficiary of this exception given by OE's sole-source board was Rober R. Mullen & Co., a public relations firm located at 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue

which allegedly has strong ties to the White House.

Howard Hunt was linked to the break-in and attempted bugging of the Democratic National Headquarters the day before the sole source board reviewed and approved continuation of the $738,548 Mullen contract with OE with Howard Hunt as program director. My information from individuals attending the sole source board meeting is that discussion of the Watergate incident occurred. Part of the discussion that day centered around the Watergate link and the report that while Hunt was working as a $100-a-day consultant to White House aide Charles W. Colson he was also listed as Mullen's project director for the OE contract. It was suggested that approval of this sole source contract could prove to be an embarrassment to the administration. Nevertheless, the continuing contract was funded.

Another report which should have had a bearing on the decision to continue with Mullen, but did not, was an audit report on the same contract by HEW for the period July 1, 1969, to October 31, 1970. Of the $203,979 spent under the early phase of Mullen's contract with OE, the HEW audit agency questioned $34,472. Of the questioned costs, $14,137 represented charges billed to OE but not yet incurred by Mullen as of October 31, 1970, and $20,335 was in excessive overhead costs. In addition, the HEW audit report examined a subcontract Mullen let for the production of a 60-second film. HEW found unreasonable the cost of producing the 36-foot film—$6,500. The report added:

We viewed the film and the only prop noted was a blackboard although the cost estimated for props was $500.

Part of the contract requires Mullen to produce a number of TV spots publicizing education for the handicapped. The most recent spot, "Campaign '72 Closer Look," will be discussed a bit later.

While the written minutes of the sole source board meeting are cleansed of information on Hunt's connection with the break-in and bugging incident and contain nothing on the HEW audit report, there is mention of one flaw: lack of a proposal to continue the contract. I would like to quote from this section of the minutes because it led directly to the unanimous vote by the sole source board to continue the contract:

At this point, one man present again asked where the copy of the proposal required by the board's rule was. No one knew. He proposed that the vote on the case be deferred until the board could have an opportunity to review the proposal:

A reasonable and responsible request, it seems to me—

J. Evans (Acting Deputy Commissioner for Planning, Evaluation, and Management and a member of the board) proposed that the board vote without further review since the facts in the case seemed clear after the oral presentation.

Two days after the sole-source board approved continuation of the contract, the Washington Star carried a story on the political angle and failed to mention the role the sole-source board played in the rubberstamp affair. Marland and Ottina, at the hearings and at our private briefings in March, stressed that the recently created sole-source board would sharply examine proposals and sole source contracts individually to determine whether OE should open the contract to competitive bidding. This was cited as the key method by which OE would seek to cut down on the large percentage—I repeat: 90 percent—of noncompetitive contracts.

A quarterly report submitted by Mullen to OE covering the period September 16 through December 15, 1971, indicates that OE used Hunt to lobby for funds:

At Dr. Martin's suggestion, Mr. Hunt met with Fred Weintraub of the Council for Exceptional Children to plan a special approach to the White House. This involves inclusion of education for the handicapped children as a highlight of the President's FY 1973 budget message, and careful parallel coordination with congressional referents will be required.

On Hunt's efforts to get Julie Nixon Eisenhower in the TV spot, Mullen's quarterly report adds:

During the period, Howard Hunt suggested to Mr. William Rhatican of the White House the desirability of creating a *closer look* (the name dubbed Mullen's project) around Mrs. Julie Nixon Eisenhower who is known for her interest in, and graduate studies involving, children. Initial reaction from Mrs. Eisenhower was favorable, and we will continue pursuing the subject with the White House.

The film was produced with Julie, one of a number of films produced by Mullen for TV.

Conclusion:

Hunt did play a key role in this project. In addition, he was a vice president at Mullen. We can presume that Hunt and Mullen's influence at the White House vis-a-vis funds for OE's handicapped budget made it imperative that this Mullen contract be continued on a sole source basis for another year.

From the 2-year study of contracts and grants at the Office of Education, I am persuaded that, at times, the sole source board has been rigorous with the sole source contracts it has reviewed. At many other times, as in this case, it has not. The board is made up of upper level officials within OE, most of them long accustomed to issue sole source contracts. As to the past reputation of a firm, OE has traditionally ignored the character of an organization. As cited in the GAO report of August 16, 1971—

Need for improving the administration of study and evaluation contracts:

There seemed to be a lack of understanding within the Office of Education concerning what could and should be done when a contractor performed poorly, which caused Office of Education officials to deal inconsistently and ineffectively with problem contractors.

In this case, OE has again asked for its political headache and deserves no sympathy because of the irresponsible manner in which it continues to spend taxpayers' dollars in questionable ways while school districts are desperate for funds to continue basic programs.

As long as Congress abandons its own reponsibility in evaluating and monitoring programs, I might well ask who is going to see that funds are spent in the way Congress intended. It is during such a time that Federal departments and agencies decide they will do exactly as they please. Our studies continue to show that there should be as much public concern over the fast-developing educational-poverty-industrial complex as the military-industrial complex.

THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to recognize the accomplishments of a former Member of the House who went on to serve his country for 4 years as Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird.

January 20 will mark the 47th time that our country has inaugurated a President. It will also bring to a close the 4-year tenure of Mel Laird in the Defense Department. Since he earned his spurs in these vary Halls, I think that it is only fitting that I make a few remarks for the record.

To say that Mel took the Defense helm at a troubled time would be the understatement of this young year. There were difficulties at home as well as overseas but the most critical problem was a lack of confidence and trust in the Defense establishment. The American people were becoming quite cynical toward the Defense Department. But Mel Laird was used to serving the people. It was his constituency that elected him to nine terms in the House and it was to his constituency that Mel was responsive. With his appointment as Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird continued his responsiveness to the American people. So in 1969 when the people had a basic mistrust of the Defense Establishment, the new Secretary of Defense began his term in office by bringing the facts to the people. He opened the communication channels vital to an era of understanding. He has made great strides in this area and I commend him for it.

A very popular phrase recently has been "reordering national priorities." While it is a very broad phrase its meaning is quite specific—more domestic spending and less defense spending. So Mel Laird was given the herculean task of charting a course between Scylla and Charybdis; he had to hold a tight rein on defense spending while keeping our country strategically superior. The bulk of the Defense budget was going to fight the Vietnam war so that's where the new Secretary started. "Vietnamization" became the watchword in the Pentagon. While some may have scoffed initially at the concept, there is no scoffing at the reality that our troop strength in Vietnam has dropped from 545,000 to 23,800. There is no scoffing at the reality that the Defense budget for fiscal year 1968 constituted 44 percent of the Federal budget; in fiscal year 1973 it was 31 percent and for the first time in 20 years we are spending more on human resources

than we are on defense. The key here is that while defense spending was being curbed, our strategic position in world affairs did not suffer. Again I commend Mel Laird.

While the Vietnam issue was the largest of the dark clouds on the horizon in 1969, a great many other problems weighed heavily on Mel. He had to contend with accelerating inflation, severe manpower shortages, an inequitable selective service system, questionable procurement policies, suspect force readiness, and intolerable living and working conditions for many in the defense population. To realize how complicated his task was you have to look at the environment that prevailed in 1969. Soviet momentum was growing in all fields; there was pressure from all sides to reduce defense spending; manpower was becoming more and more expensive; there was immense political pressure transcending the whole spectrum of defense problems.

To have to face so many complex and vexing matters may have broken a lesser man but Mel Laird attacked these problem areas with the same ferocity and thoroughness that marked his dedicated service in the House. One by one, he analyzed and solved those problems. For this, we all commend Mel Laird.

I know that I speak for all my colleagues when I salute Melvin R. Laird for a job well done and when I wish him good luck and Godspeed.

MAURICE H. THATCHER

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 6, the House of Representatives lost its oldest surviving Member; Kentucky, one of its most distinguished sons; and the Nation, an able and patriotic servant.

Maurice H. Thatcher of Kentucky was 102 years of age when death came to him at his home in Washington.

He served in this House for five terms—a decade of service which could have been counted a successful career in its own right. But Maurice Thatcher had already had a distinguished career of public service before he came here—as a county official, as a brilliant attorney, as a builder of the Panama Canal through his membership on the Isthmian Canal Commission from 1910 onwards to its completion and after.

His service in this body long antedated my own, but I remember him well as an energetic, inventive, useful Kentucky Congressman when I was but a boy in law school in Louisville, which was the area he served.

Later, when I came here in 1949, I got to know him well. Although he was already past the allotted three-score years and ten, he was very much in evidence around the Hill, and remained active in the practice of law up until last year.

He came to the Hill to greet some of his old colleagues on Former Members Day just last session.

Mr. Speaker, I include the obituary notices in the Washington Post and in the Evening Star-News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Evening Star-News, Jan. 8, 1973]

MAURICE THATCHER DIES; EX-CONGRESSMAN, 102

Former Rep. Maurice H. Thatcher, 102, the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and once civil governor of the Panama Canal Zone, died Saturday at his home on 16th Street NW.

Mr. Thatcher also was the oldest surviving former member of Congress. A Republican, he represented the Kentucky district that included Louisville from 1923 to 1933. He was nominated for reelection to the House in 1932 but gave up that nomination to seek his party's nomination for the Senate instead. He failed to win the Senate nomination.

After leaving Congress he practiced law here until about two years ago.

Mr. Thatcher was born in Chicago, but when he was 4 years old his family moved to Butler County, Ky., and settled near Morgantown.

After working as a farmer he was employed by a newspaper and by several county offices. From 1892 until he resigned in 1896 to study law, he was clerk of the Butler County Circuit Court.

KENTUCKY OFFICIAL

He began practicing law in Frankfort, Ky., in 1893 and later that year began serving as assistant attorney general of Kentucky. He moved to Louisville next and from 1901 to 1906 was assistant U.S. attorney for the western district of Kentucky. From 1908 to 1910 he was the state examiner and inspector for Kentucky.

President William Howard Taft appointed Mr. Thatcher to the Isthmian Canal Commission in 1910 and also as head of the department of civil administration of the Canal Zone. The canal opened in 1914. The only bridge over the canal carries his name.

Mr. Thatcher next returned to his law practice in Louisville, where he later served on the board of public safety and as department counsel for Louisville.

While in Congress, Mr. Thatcher was active in supporting legislation providing Canal area improvements. He returned to the Canal Zone on a number of visits, including a 1956 trip and another in 1958 that was held on the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. Thatcher also sponsored legislation that expanded the foreign and domestic airmail services, converted Camp Knox, Ky., of World War I into the permanent military post there, created the Mammoth Cave National Park and expanded the Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historical Site and the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery.

He also sponsored legislation establishing a free ferry across the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal and a highway connecting it to the Panama road system.

Mr. Thatcher was the author of legislation in 1928 that established and continued operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City. Named for his friend, Col. William C. Gorgas, a pioneer in yellow fever work, the laboratory is prominent in tropical disease research.

Mr. Thatcher served seven terms as president of the District Society of Mayflower Descendants and also was counselor and deputy governor of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants.

His wife, the former Anne Bell Chinn of Frankfort, Ky., died in 1960. At one time she was a member of the governing board of the League of Republican Women of the District.

Services will be held at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow at the Lee Funeral Home, 4th Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW. It is requested that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the Scottish Rite Foundation, 1733 16th St. NW., for an educational fund.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1973]

EX-REP. MAURICE THATCHER, 102, DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Maurice H. Thatcher, who helped supervise construction of the Panama Canal, served five terms as a congressman from Kentucky and practiced law here until he was 100 years old, died here yesterday at 102.

Mr. Thatcher died in his home at 1801 16th St. N.W., where he had been bedridden almost constantly since suffering a fractured thigh on July 15.

From 1910 to 1913, during the period of peak activity, Mr. Thatcher served as one of the seven members of the Isthmian Canal Commission appointed to superintend and carry out the construction of the Panama Canal.

In his four years on the commission, Mr. Thatcher headed the department of civil administration of the Canal Zone, and was known as the Zone's civil governor.

In recent years, he was reported to be the last surviving member of the canal commission, the chairman of which had been Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, the celebrated Army engineer who brought the project to completion in 1914.

When Mr. Thatcher returned to Panama in 1964 at the age of 95 to help mark the canal's 50th anniversary, he was hailed by a local newspaper as the "Grand Old Man of the Panama Canal."

While serving as a Republican congressman from Kentucky from 1923 to 1933, Mr. Thatcher continued to take an interest in the development of the canal and in the welfare of those who built and operated it.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he helped make available funds for improvements in the Canal Zone, and for annuities for construction workers and other canal employees.

A ferry across the Pacific entrance of the canal, for which he obtained federal funds was named the Thatcher Ferry. The bridge, dedicated in 1962 on the site of the ferry, was named the Thatcher Ferry Bridge.

In addition, an important highway in the canal area was named for him.

Moreover, it was Mr. Thatcher who is credited with enactment of the measure creating in Panama the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine.

It is named for William Crawford Gorgas, the Army doctor who helped make possible the construction of the canal by destroying the mosquitoes that carried yellow fever and malaria. Mr. Thatcher and Dr. Gorgas served together on the canal commission.

After closing his congressional career by making an unsuccessful race for the Senate in 1932, Mr. Thatcher went into the private practice of law here in 1933.

On his 99th birthday, although his activity had declined, he was still in practice, with an office in the Investment Building at 15th and K Streets, N.W.

"I don't eat meat," he told an interviewer who was interested in his secrets of longevity. "I eat vegetables, eggs and milk. I don't drink, I don't smoke and I don't drink tea or coffee.

"Of course," he added, "You can't escape meat altogether, meat products creep into a lot of things."

Said Mr. Thatcher, who could still hear well, read without glasses, and make himself heard across a room:

"It's not a religious thing. I just wanted

to live what I considered a sound, biological life."

A slender, white-haired man with bushy eyebrows, he said, "I just noticed that the smokers and chewers and drinkers had a hard time quitting when they wanted to.

"I just quit early. I'm a good sleeper, always was, and I still get about eight hours' sleep a night."

Mr. Thatcher was born in Chicago, and grew up in Butler County, in the western part of Kentucky. An official congressional biography said that he "attended public and private schools; engaged in agricultural pursuits; (and) was employed in a newspaper office and in various county offices."

His formal career in public life began at the age of 22 when he was elected clerk of the Butler County Circuit Court. He later studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1898, and became an assistant state attorney general.

After moving to Louisville in 1900, he became an assistant U.S. attorney, and later was named to what has been described as the state's chief appointive office: state inspector and examiner.

In that job, he was credited with saving thousands of dollars for the taxpayers and with bringing about numerous needed reforms. He left it in 1910 to join the Isthmian Canal Commission. After leaving Panama, he held municipal posts in Louisville before being elected to Congress.

In addition to championing measures designed to improve the canal, during his House service Mr. Thatcher was responsible for much other legislation, including that establishing Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky.

In later years, when he interested himself increasingly in the writing of poetry, he memorialized the park in verse:

"Caverns immense, wrought thru the endless ages:
What lessons for the human soul and mind!
The great Lord God, in those arresting pages,
Hath writ a matchless story for mankind . . .

While in Congress, Mr. Thatcher was also credited with writing legislation for federal appropriations for Braille books and equipment for the nation's blind students.

In later years, besides serving as vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Institute, Mr. Thatcher maintained contact with his old colleagues by attending meetings here of the Panama Canal Society.

But, as he announced in 1958 at the group's 23d annual meeting, "the ranks are thinning . . ."

Looking back on the occasion of his 99th birthday, he told an interviewer: "I don't lay any claims to a great career. But I've done some useful things. I tried to be useful wherever I was, whatever I did. I've lived a busy and useful life."

His wife, the former Anne Bell Chinn, died in 1960.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT MORE FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress will soon be embroiled in battles over the appropriations for Federal education programs. We will not only have to pass an appropriations bill for this present school year—because of Mr. Nixon's vetoes—but we will also have to begin work soon on the appropriations bill for the next school year.

Before we begin these arduous tasks I thought it would be appropriate to bring to the attention of the House a recent survey conducted by Mr. Louis Harris on the question of which Federal programs ought to receive greater appropriations. This survey, which was conducted last December, found that 66 percent of the people believe that there ought to be increased spending on Federal aid to education and only 27 percent of the people opposed increases in spending for these programs. I believe that this fact is extremely important to us as Representatives of the people: The American people by a more than two to one margin favor increased spending for Federal education programs.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an article which appeared in the Washington Post on the Harris survey at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—MORE DOMESTIC SPENDING IS BACKED

(By Louis Harris)

Despite President Nixon's pledge to put a lid on government spending during his second term, majorities of Americans believe federal outlays should be further increased for programs to curb air and water pollution, aid education and help the poor. Voters favor spending cutbacks, at the same time, on such things as highway construction, farm subsidies and welfare payments.

The public is becoming increasingly selective about its spending priorities in light of the conviction shared by 74 per cent in the nation that federal spending is the single greatest cause of continuing inflation. While the public might want federal spending held in check generally, however, broad, popular constituencies remain in support of specific programs slated to come before the 93d Congress.

Mr. Nixon himself has indicated that a majority source of his problem in keeping spending in check has been a lack of cooperation from Congress, which, of course, will once again be under Democratic control for the next two years. For its part, the Congress has criticized the President and the Executive Branch for encroaching on its fiscal prerogatives. In the contest between the President and Congress over the former's veto and embargo of expenditures to control water pollution, the public backs Congress, 48 to 27 per cent.

A majority opposes any increases in federal spending for research and development of the nation's defense system by 55 to 34 per cent.

The public expressed the view that Congress was right last fall when it overrode a veto of the water pollution control bill by President Nixon and that Mr. Nixon was wrong in holding up part of those appropriations.

Emerging loud and clear from results of this survey is that while the public might want federal spending held in line generally, the heart of the problem is not so much spending as such but rather the priority of values governing where spending is to be trimmed or increased.

Between Dec. 17 and 21, a nationwide cross section of 1,501 households was asked:

If you had to choose, would you rather see increased spending (READ LIST) or no further increase in this area by the federal government?

[In percent]

	Increase spending	Oppose increase	Not sure
To curb air and water pollution	66	27	7
On Federal aid to education	66	27	7
On helping the poor	62	31	7
To help State and local governments	41	51	7
To improve highways	37	50	8
For research and development for defense	34	55	11
For subsidies for farmers	22	69	9
For people on welfare	22	69	9

These results are highly revealing, for they indicate that the public draws a line between some of the sacred cows of congressional appropriations committees of the past—such as highways, defense and agriculture—and programs oriented toward the quality of the environment or social improvements.

SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on January 3 the School Finance Act of 1973, H.R. 16. The purpose of this act is to define precisely the role which the Federal Government is to assume in the area of the financing of elementary and secondary education.

This act is needed today because school districts all across America are in serious financial trouble. Rural, suburban, and urban school districts are all being forced into laying off teachers and into cutting back on the number of days in their school years because of a lack of basic operating money.

I believe that this nationwide problem results from the following facts: Local governments collect only 17 percent of the tax revenue in the country and yet must pay for all local governmental functions including more than one-half of the cost of education, while the Federal Government which collects 64 percent of all tax revenue pays for only 7 percent of the cost of education. This fiscal imbalance is causing enormous strains on local governmental budgets and is the prime reason for the property tax revolt which has been occurring across the country. More than one-half of all school bond issues were defeated last year by the voters because people on the local level have simply reached the limits of their capacity to support the schools from real property taxes.

I am introducing the School Finance Act of 1973 in order to help relieve local property taxes and to bring the Federal Government into full partnership with the States in supporting our elementary and secondary schools.

My bill contains three basic principles. The first principle is that the Federal Government must support at a level of at least $3 billion a year the compensatory education program under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act before any new Federal general aid program can be funded. This provision makes clear that the first responsi-

bility of the Federal Government in the area of elementary and secondary education is to provide sufficient funding for compensatory education programs for educationally deprived children.

The second principle in the bill is that once the Federal Government has fulfilled this responsibility for the educationally disadvantaged then a Federal general aid program can go into effect to improve the quality of education for all children. This new program will provide every school district with a grant of $100 for every school-age child within the district to be used for the establishment of educational programs of high quality. Although during the course of hearings the Committee on Education and Labor or the House may desire to refine this formula, I have included it in my bill in this form in order to emphasize that once there is adequate funding for compensatory education then as many children as possible, whether middle class or poor, should participate in any substantial Federal general aid program.

The third and last principle contained in my bill is that the Federal Government ought to provide larger grants to States undertaking programs to equalize among school districts the expenditure of all State and local funds for education. This provision is meant to encourage the States to implement the Serrano decision.

That decision, handed down by the California State Supreme Court in August of 1971, states that the quality of a child's education cannot depend upon the wealth of the school district in which he lives but rather must depend upon the wealth of the State taken as a whole. The objective of this decision is to avoid the present situation where parents in property-poor school districts are taxing themselves two or three times the rate of parents in property-rich school districts and yet they are raising less than one-half the amount per pupil raised in the richer school districts. This situation results from the fact that the States have allowed school districts to exist which contain a very high level of real property wealth and have not provided for compensating State aid programs for the property-poor school districts.

The School Finance Act will assist States which desire to implement a 5-year plan of equalization of their State and local expenditures. Instead of the $100-per-pupil grant mentioned above, a State can receive $200 per pupil the first year of its plan and increasing amounts every year thereafter up to $600 per pupil in the fifth year. In addition to equalizing expenditures among school districts, the States applying for these larger grants must agree to provide greater State aid for students with greater needs such as the handicapped, the disadvantaged, and vocational students. Greater amounts must also be spent in school districts with higher costs, such as in rural districts with widely scattered populations and in urban districts with highly concentrated populations. Lastly, these States must provide that by the end of their 5-year plans none of their citizens will pay more than 5 percent of their incomes for property taxes.

The U.S. Supreme Court is now in the process of deciding whether to uphold the concept of the Serrano decision. The Court's ruling will obviously have a great impact on any congressional action in this field and my bill may therefore have to be revised at that time to reflect the nature of the ruling. But since we do not know the Court's decision yet I believe that my bill's provisions deal as well as we can now with the issue of equalization.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the three principles contained in my bill can form a sound basis for a substantial Federal general aid program for elementary and secondary education. The enactment of the School Finance Act will guarantee compensatory education for the educationally disadvantaged, will provide quality education programs for all students, and will assist the States in providing a fairer system of educational expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a short summary of the School Finance Act and the text of the bill:

SUMMARY OF THE SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF 1973

The School Finance Act of 1973 would authorize two Federal general aid programs: Basic Grants and Equalization Grants. No grants could be made, however, in any year in which appropriations for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act did not reach the level of $3 billion.

TITLE I—BASIC GRANTS

Every local school district would be entitled to a basic grant for each of the next five years (fiscal years 1974–1978). This grant would be computed by multiplying the number of school-age children in the district by $100. These Federal funds would have to be used for quality education programs for all children.

TITLE II—EQUALIZATION GRANTS

Instead of participating in the Basic Grant program, a State could decide to receive Equalization Grants for five years. These State grants would be computed by multiplying the number of school-age children in the State by—

$200 per child the first year,
$300 per child the second year,
$400 per child the third year,
$500 per child the fourth year, and
$600 per child the fifth year.

In order to receive these Federal funds which could be used to supplant State and local funds, a State would have to adopt a State plan to equalize State and local expenditures among its school districts by the end of the fifth year. In addition to equalization, this State plan would have to provide for higher expenditures commensurate with their needs for disadvantaged, handicapped, and vocational students and also would have to provide for higher expenditures in school districts with higher costs, such as in rural districts with widely scattered populations and in urban districts with densely concentrated populations. This State plan would also have to provide for the adoption of a State program which would offer a rebate to anyone in the State who paid more than five percent (5%) of his household income for property taxes by the end of the five-year plan.

SUMMARY OF A POSSIBLE GENERAL AID BILL

A trust fund would be created to make payments to local school districts and to States for Basic Grants and for Equalization Grants. No grants could be made, however, until appropriations for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reached the level of $3 billion.

TITLE I—BASIC GRANTS

Every local school district is entitled to a basic grant for each of the next five years (fiscal years 1974–1978). This grant is computed by multiplying the number of school-age children in the district by $100.

These Federal funds are to be used as supplementary to State and local funds for quality education programs.

TITLE II—EQUALIZATION GRANTS

Instead of participating in the Basic Grant program, a State can decide to receive Equalization Grants for five years. These State grants are computed by multiplying the number of school-age children in the State by—

$200 per child the first year,
$300 per child the second year,
$400 per child the third year,
$500 per child the fourth year, and
$600 per child the fifth year.

In order to receive these Federal funds which can be used to supplant State and local funds, a State must adopt a State plan to equalize State and local expenditures among its school districts by the end of the fifth year. In addition to equalization, this State plan must provide for higher expenditures commensurate with their needs for disadvantaged, handicapped, and vocational students and also must provide for higher expenditures in school districts with higher costs, such as in rural districts which must provide for extensive busing and in urban districts which have high land costs. This State plan must also provide for the adoption of a State law which would require that no one in the State would have to pay more than five percent (5%) of his household income for property taxes by the end of the five year plan.

MEDICREDIT—A NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 2222, a three-part approach to providing health insurance protection for all Americans.

The bill contains modifications and improvements on the medicredit bill which I and a large number of my colleagues introduced as H.R. 4960 in the 92d Congress. It was my privilege in that Congress to be associated with what grew to be a total of 174 cosponsors of medicredit.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would do three things:

It would pay the full cost of health insurance for those too poor to buy their own.

It would help those who can afford to pay a part of their health insurance cost. In a fair way, based on a sliding scale, the Government would share in these costs. The less an individual could afford to pay, the more the Federal Government would pay.

Finally, this legislation would insure that no American would have to bank-

rupt himself because of a catastrophic illness. The bill would pay every American's premium for catastrophic expense coverage.

I continue to be concerned about the devastating effect of catastrophic illness on the American worker and his family. The financial disaster of such illness can economically cripple a family for years; even into the next generation.

This bill goes a long way toward relieving Americans' well-justified anxieties about the threat of such financially ruinous illness. In addition to regular health insurance coverage, it offers a clear picture of just how much a family or individual could expect to be helped in the event of a catastrophic illness. The bill sets out a "financial corridor" for catastrophic coverage, a limitation of liability. This would be a maximum of 10 percent of the combined taxable income of a beneficiary and his dependents.

It would apply after the payment of customary deductibles, which I shall explain in a moment, and the exhaustion of regular health insurance coverage.

Medicredit's coverage would be provided through private health insurance. A choice of enrollment in prepaid groups would be included.

To participate in the program, however, a carrier would have to qualify under State law, provide certain basic coverage, make coverage available without regard to preexisting health conditions, and guarantee annual renewal. The great advantage of such private coverage is the flexibility, choice, and efficiencies it offers to both the individual and the Federal Government.

A qualified policy would offer comprehensive insurance against the ordinary and catastrophic expenses of illness. Preventive care would be stressed. Such things as physical examinations, well-baby care, inoculations, and X-ray, and laboratory work in or out of the hospital would be covered.

Basic benefits in a 12-month period would include 60 days of hospital care or 120 days in an extended care facility. Other basic benefits would provide emergency and out-patient services, and all medical services provided by osteopaths or physicians.

Important additions to this year's bill include basic coverage for home health services, dental care for children, and emergency dental services for all.

The catastrophic protection would pay expenses in excess of the basic coverage, including hospital, extended care, inpatient drugs, blood, prosthetic appliances, and certain specified services, including those of physicians.

Psychiatric care would be covered without limit.

There would be a deductible of $50 per hospital stay, and a requirement for 20 percent coinsurance—to a maximum of $100 per family per year—on medical expenses, emergency or outpatient expenses, and dental services. A beneficiary's maximum coinsurance would be no more than $100 per family per year.

Enrollment would be handled this way: A beneficiary eligible for full payment of premium by the Federal Government—that is, someone with no Federal income tax liability for the year—would be entitled to a certificate acceptable by insurance carriers. The certificate would be for health care insurance coverage for himself and his dependents. The Federal Government would pay all of these health insurance costs.

Beneficiaries with whom the Government would be sharing the premium cost would have a choice. They could elect between a certificate or a credit against income tax.

The Government would pay all of the premium for low-income people—those with no income tax liability. For others, the Government would pay between 10 and 99 percent, based on the family or individual income. The Government would pay everyone's premium for catastrophic expense coverage.

This bill would help equalize some of the tremendous health costs that now burden some families unequally. It would insure that all receive adequate health insurance coverage. Its provisions insure that this could be done efficiently, at a cost that taxpayers can bear.

POWER OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN, NOT THEIR SENIORITY, IS THE ISSUE

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, with the opening of the 93d Congress, we once again direct our attention to the method by which we organize ourselves into committees for the purpose of dealing with specialized legislation and the authority given to chairmen of those committees.

Two years ago, all we could hear were great public demands from some quarters for the end of the seniority system. At that time, I suggested that the seniority of the chairmen should not be an issue, but that the discretionary power we grant the chairmen should be subjected to serious debate and question.

Having served 6 years in the Congress, I have observed the operation of its committees, and I have had the opportunity to follow the tortuous path of legislation from introduction of a measure to its consideration by a subcommittee, then on to the full committee and action on the floor of the House. After this time-consuming process, the measure is sent to the Senate where some changes are usually made, thus necessitating a conference between House spokesmen and Senate spokesmen. Based on this experience and observation of the workings of the Congress, it is my opinion that the current criticism is misdirected.

The true significance of a person acting as a committee chairman does not lie in his actions as presiding officer during committee hearings or during markup sessions. However, as the presiding officer, a chairman can sometimes affect the substantive course of legislation. Nevertheless the real villain in the present operation of the committee is the enormous discretionary power granted to a committee chairman. The complete freedom to abuse this discretionary power—whether for his own personal ends or to serve the ends of his political party and its members—is the area of my concern.

For example, the chairman has the dominant voice in the hiring of committee staff personnel. Thus, these employees many times feel that their primary obligation is to serve the committee chairman rather than to serve the committee as a whole. Oftentimes, committee personnel work in the office of their favored or acquiescent committee member while failing to respond to requests of other members of the committee.

The committee chairman schedules hearings upon bills being considered by the committee. He usually finds time for hearings on those bills which he favors but never finds time for hearings on bills for which he has no personal sympathy. He can delay hearings on vital measures so that he can attach riders not favored by the administration. Thus, the administration may be forced to approve measures necessary for continuing the operation of essential services of government despite the fact that the legislation contains language unpalatable to the administration.

In scheduling hearings, the committee chairman can arrange for full discussion from witnesses favorable to the chairman's own personal feelings. He may relegate those witnesses unfavorable to his views to only a few brief seconds of testimony, thus cutting short the opportunity to fully develop both sides of the question and thereby reducing the effectiveness of their testimony to a bare minimum.

A committee chairman recommends to the Speaker of the House those committee members he—the chairman—wants to serve on conference committees. It is this conference committee which has the responsibility of reconciling differences between House-passed and Senate-passed legislative measures. You can be confident that the chairman finds it more expedient to recommend persons not likely to disagree with his own individual views. Thus, legislation formed after hours or days of debate on the House floor can be completely remolded in conference committee by a strong committee chairman and a handful of his lackeys.

In an effort to achieve certain reforms, I, with a number of my colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee, proposed several changes to the rules of our committee. We were successful in making only one change and that was to prohibit proxy voting.

I feel that this has a very salutary effect upon our committee since the chairman can no longer vote the proxies of the absent majority members. However, we lost all of the other proposed reform on a straight party line vote. It is indeed interesting that some of those who most enthusiastically called for reform during the consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 rejected all attempts to control the unbridled power exercised by certain committee chairmen.

All of us will represent approximately 500,000 people after this election. Each of

us should have the same responsibility and same authority in determining the flow of legislation and the witnesses who will appear before our respective committees. Unfortunately, we find that certain members' constituency has a more favored position because of the power exercised by a particular member.

Democratic institutions are supposedly based upon the theory that all people should be represented equally. My proposed changes would only help to bring a little more democracy to our legislative processes.

For this reason, I am today introducing a House resolution amending the rules of the House to carry out my suggestion. I hope that the Members of the House will study my resolution and consider joining me in working toward reform.

IT IS TIME TO TERMINATE TUNG NUT PRICE SUPPORTS

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, Bob Stevens of Copley News Service presented me a framed copy of a political cartoon he had drawn. As good political cartoons always do, this one conveys a meaningful and serious message.

The cartoon depicts a contented cow perched on a pedestal and labeled "farm programs." Gathered about the cow are caricatures of several Congressmen. One is feeding the cow a basketful of money. Another fans it in the style befitting royalty. Two are kneeling before the cow and one is saying to the other:

I dunno . . . it's just always been sacred.

As Bob Stevens so accurately states in this cartoon, we in Congress treat our farm programs as if they are sacred cows. First we create them, and then we continue to appropriate taxpayer dollars to support them without regular scrutiny to determine if they are still needed and beneficial.

Today, I am introducing a bill that could reverse this trend and help one of these "sacred cows" back into a mere mortal bovine. This bill, which has the support of the Department of Agriculture, would phase out the unneeded and costly mandatory price support program for tung nuts.

Many may not know what tung nuts are, much less that we have for years been appropriating taxpayer dollars to subsidize their production.

Tung nuts grow on trees in moderate climates. In the United States production is limited to the Gulf Coast States. These nuts yield an oil that was once popular as a drying agent in paints, lacquers, and varnishes. Before the development of synthetic substitutes, tung oil was an important commodity.

Prior to World War II, the United States was a net importer, largely from China. When Pearl Harbor cut off incoming supplies, tung oil was officially declared a strategic commodity for defense purposes. All available supplies were controlled for use by the military. Although there is a 5-year lag between planting and oil production, output of tung in the United States was greatly expanded but not subsidized.

In the immediate postwar period, an average of 100 million pounds of tung flowed into the United States from China each year, at prices well below American production costs.

As a result, the still expanding U.S. tung industry appealed to Congress for a mandatory support program. Congress granted this request.

All products from Communist China were embargoed in 1950, stopping the heavy flow of tung oil. With supplies available only from South American sources and U.S. producers, the support program worked reasonably well.

Despite serious freeze damage about every third year, U.S. production increased from about 5 million pounds of oil a year during World War II to a peak of 45 million pounds in 1958.

Since 1959, rising production costs, coupled with a succession of freeze damage and hurricane disaster years, have almost destroyed the tung industry in the United States. Most of the tung groves still in existence are well past their prime.

The 1971 tung oil crop was only 100,000 pounds because of serious freeze damage. With favorable weather conditions in 1972, the crop was still only about 4 million pounds.

Tung oil currently is being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation through loans at $74.74 per ton or 27.6 cents per pound. This is 65 percent of parity, the lowest level permitted by the Agriculture Act of 1949. Last year's support rate was $73.45 per ton or 27.2 cents per pound.

The world price for tung oil is currently between 12 and 13 cents per pound, less than half the loan rate. As has been the case for the past several years, the Commodity Credit Corporation has assumed ownership of the entire 1972 crop by paying the producers the loan rate. As the CCC liquidates its stocks of tung oil, it is unable to recover even half of its costs.

Since the tung oil price support program's inception, it has caused over $12 million in losses to the CCC, at the taxpayers expenses. Since 1967, losses have been running between $1 and $3 million per year.

Tung oil is no longer considered a strategic commodity. The chemical industry has developed substitutes that have reduced the U.S. market from over a hundred million pounds annually to less than 30 million pounds. In addition, tung production in South America has increased sufficiently to supply the needs of Europe and the United States.

Most of the U.S. tung groves have now passed their 11 years of peak production. The owners must now decide whether to replant their groves. If we continue this program, we will encourage them to do so—at the taxpayers' expense.

Clearly, now is the time for Congress to terminate the mandatory support for tung oil through the 4-year phaseout program proposed in this bill.

Passage would clearly establish that farm programs once put into effect by Congress, can be terminated by Congress. If we want to get out from under the costly specter of the "sacred cow" farm programs, this could be a major step in that direction. That sacred cow that we blindly support with annual appropriations could be transformed into a useful critter that helps us build a better society.

MFN FOR RUMANIA

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, with seven of my colleagues, I am introducing the Rumanian Trade Relations Act of 1973. This bill is similar to one which I first introduced in August 1969, and reintroduced in July 1971. Those who have joined with me are all prominent members of the Ways and Means Committee and sponsored similar legislation in the last Congress also. They are: BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., of New York; JAMES C. CORMAN, of California; RICHARD H. FULTON, of Tennessee; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota; JERRY L. PETTIS, of California; and CHARLES A. VANIK, of Ohio.

All of us feel that irrespective of what happens to general trade legislation in this Congress, Rumania deserves separate and early consideration. It is for this reason that we have introduced this bill so early in the 93d Congress.

On February 9, 1972, in his state of the world message, President Nixon called for Congress to grant most favored-nation tariff treatment to Rumania. Speaking of both Rumania and Yugoslavia, the President said:

We base our ties with both these countries on mutual respect, independence, and sovereign equality. We share the belief that this should be the basis of relations between nations regardless of divergence or similarity in social, economic, or political systems.

We are supporting legislation to grant Most Favored Nation tariff treatment to Rumania. Our Export-Import Bank credits and Rumania's new membership in GATT will facilitate our economic relations.

On March 23, 1972, Secretary of State William P. Rogers added his Department's support in the following letter to Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1972.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to refer to H.R. 10076, a bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate a commercial agreement with Romania, including the granting of MFN (most-favored-nation) tariff treatment in return for equivalent benefits to the United States.

MFN treatment for imports from Romania along with those from other Communist countries (except Yugoslavia) was withdrawn pursuant to Section 5 of the Trade

Agreement Extension Act of 1951 but was restored to Poland in 1960. Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as amended, provided for mandatory continuation of the prohibition against MFN for those countries not then receiving MFN treatment at the time of the enactment of Subsection (b) of Section 231.

As you will recall, Acting Secretary of State Irwin wrote you on December 14, 1971 that the President would welcome and support legislation giving him the authority to negotiate an MFN agreement with Romania. We therefore support the enactment of H.R. 10076 since it provides discretionary authority to the President to negotiate an agreement to extend MFN tariff treatment to Romania, a country which has repeatedly manifested its determination to pursue an independent foreign policy and one with which it is United States policy to encourage further the development of trade and other relations. U.S. exports to Romania have increased rapidly from $6 million in 1965 to $53 million in 1971, which is almost four times the level of U.S. imports. Further significant expansion of our exports to Romania is likely to depend importantly on Romania's ability to increase its exports to the United States. H.R. 10076 would enable the U.S. to offer Romanian exporters improved access to the U.S. market.

It should be noted that on November 15, 1971 Romania became a party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which is one of the conditions of Section 3 of the bill. The U.S. favored Romanian accession to the GATT but because of Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act could not grant MFN treatment to Romania and thus could not accept GATT obligations toward Romania. The U.S. therefore invoked GATT Article XXXV so that the GATT does not apply between the United States and Romania. However, in the event that an MFN agreement were concluded with Romania, we would wish also to be able to enter into a trade agreement relationship with Romania under the GATT. It would, therefore, be desirable if the provisions of H.R. 10076 did not require limitations on the duration of agreements that might be difficult to fit into the GATT framework. Accordingly, we would suggest the deletion of provisions (a) and (d) of Section 5 of the bill, the deletion of the proviso to Section 6(a), and the deletion of the second sentence of Section 6(b). The President would have sufficient authority under Section 6(b) of the bill, revised as suggested above, to terminate most-favored-nation treatment as a matter of domestic law, in the event that such action were required by the national interest, while also having sufficient flexibility to select the appropriate means for adjusting our trade agreement obligations.

We note that the bill would provide authority to grant MFN treatment to "one or more of the products of Romania." We understand that this would permit the extension of MFN treatment to all products of Romanian origin as would be required for a trade relationship under the GATT and as is our uniform practice toward countries granted MFN rights.

Since it is not possible at the present time to anticipate with precision the particular benefits and commitments that might be included in a commercial agreement with Romania, it also would be desirable to provide somewhat more discretion for negotiation of an agreement than the bill as introduced appears to contemplate. The Department of State would be pleased to cooperate with the Committee in its consideration of this and other aspects of H.R. 10076.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

The bill which I have introduced today has been carefully drafted to meet the suggestions raised in the Secretary of State's letter. The 3-year limitation on the length of the initial agreement has been abandoned, although section 5(a) still provides for "suspension or termination upon reasonable notice." In addition, the provision for granting MFN on a product-by-product basis has been eliminated as being not in accordance with our obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The bill would not grant a privileged status to Rumania. Rather, it would permit the President to eliminate the discriminatory high tariffs which presently limit trade, and in their place would substitute tariffs equivalent to those we charge most other countries of the world.

Presently, Rumania's largest trading partner is Russia. Consequently, it can ill afford to disregard Moscow's wishes and desires when to do so might result in severe and crushing economic repercussions. If, on the other hand, Rumania has a trade potential with the United States, it can continue to strike a more independent course which would benefit the U.S. national interests, as well as its own.

Since 1969, Rumania has continued to expand its political, economic, and social contacts with the United States and the Western world. Most recently, in December, Rumania joined Yugoslavia as the only two Communist countries which are members of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. To do so necessitated a commitment of gold to these western international financial institutions. Among other things, it evidences an independent foreign economic policy being pursued by the Rumanians.

Currently, Rumania is negotiating a standard operating agreement with the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under enabling legislation which I supported in the 92d Congress. OPIC guarantees American investments in foreign countries against various business hazards. These negotiations are made possible because of recent changes in Rumania's domestic law to permit foreign investors to retain an equity interest in investments in Rumania of up to 49 percent.

In foreign policy, as in economic policy, Rumania has pursued an independent course.

At the recent Helsinki talks on European security, Rumania demonstrated fierce independence which has characterized its foreign policy for a decade. On the opening day, the Rumania representative made it clear that his country was not participating as a member of any military bloc or social grouping. He insisted that all participating nations must be treated equally and suggested that the conference should adopt this as a fundamental principle of relations among all nations.

Recalling the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Rumanian representative called for the conference to adopt the principle that countries must not interfere in the internal affairs of other sovereign nations. He also called for a declaration of nonuse of force.

Rumania's impact on the conference so far has been quite dramatic and significant—far out of proportion to its small size.

Even in Vietnam, Rumania has been restrained in its support of Hanoi. Rumanian trade with North Vietnam has been quite small, and dwindling for years. It consists only of a minimal amount of nonmilitary goods. No Rumanian ships have called at North Vietnamese ports in official Washington's memory.

All of this, and many other acts of independence, make it appropriate for this Congress to give priority consideration to equal trade status for the Rumanians.

It would be a mistake of historic proportions for the Congress of the United States to force the Rumanians to wait for MFN in the shadow of their big brother in Moscow.

To wait for general trade legislation would show little recognition of the valiant independence already displayed.

To wait would delay once again fulfilling a long-standing commitment by President Nixon to accord Rumania equal tariff treatment.

To wait would be to risk miring down MFN for Rumania in the fight over protectionism which is certain to accompany, and delay, general trade legislation.

In my view, Rumania has waited long enough. Congress should act, early in this session, to accord this small East European country the equitable trade status it deserves.

Text of bill follows:

H.R. 2304

A bill to promote the foreign policy and trade interests of the United States by providing authority to negotiate a commercial agreement with Romania, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. Short Title.

This Act may be cited as the "Romania Trade Act of 1973."

SEC. 2. Statement of purposes.

The purposes of this Act are to promote constructive relations with Romania, to contribute to international stability, to promote international trade, to provide a framework helpful to private United States firms conducting business relations with Romania, and to promote the expansion of United States exports.

SEC. 3. Authority to enter into commercial agreements.

The President may enter into a commercial agreement with Romania under this Act whenever he determines that such agreement—

(a) will promote the purposes of this Act, and

(b) is in the national interest.

SEC. 4. Commercial agreement provisions.

A commercial agreement entered into under this Act may include provisions concerning:

(a) arrangements for the promotion of trade between the United States and Romania.

(b) the extension of most-favored-nation treatment with respect to duties or other restrictions on the import of products of the other country;

(c) arrangements for the protection of industrial rights and processes;

(d) arrangements for the settlement of commercial differences and disputes;

(e) arrangements for establishment or expansion of trade and tourist promotion offices, for facilitation of activities of governmental commercial officers, participation in trade fairs and exhibits and the sending of trade missions, and for facilitation of entry and travel of commercial representatives;

(f) such other arrangements of a commercial nature as will promote the purposes of this Act, provided, however, that any commitments undertaken by the United States pursuant to this section shall be consistent with the laws of the United States in effect at the time of entry into force of the commercial agreement.

SEC. 5. Termination provision.

A commercial agreement entered into under this Act shall

(a) be subject to suspension or termination upon reasonable notice;

(b) provide for consultation for the purpose of reviewing the operation of the agreement and relevant aspects of relations between the United States and Romania.

SEC. 6. Extension of benefits of most-favored-nation treatment.

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may by proclamation extend most-favored-nation treatment to the products of Romania to carry out a commercial agreement entered into pursuant to this Act.

(b) The President may at any time suspend or terminate, in whole or in part, any proclamation made under this section.

SEC. 7. Relation to other laws.

(a) Any commercial agreement made under this Act shall be deemed a trade agreement for the purposes of Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. sec. 1901 et seq.)

(b) Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. sec. 1861) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of Romania, provided that a proclamation is in effect under section 6(a) of the Romania Trade Act of 1973."

SEC. 8. Reports to Congress.

The President shall report to the Congress on any commercial agreement or amendment thereto entered into under this Act. Such report shall include information regarding negotiations, benefits obtained as a result of the commercial agreement, the text of any such agreement or amendment, and other relevant information relating to commercial relations with Romania.

HELMUT SCHMIDT CALLS FOR STRONGER NATO ALLIANCE

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Members of both the House and Senate have reintroduced the Atlantic Union resolution. The resolution, which passed the Senate unanimously last year and died in the House Rules Committee on a 5 to 5 tie vote, calls for the appointment of an 18-member delegation of prominent U.S. citizens to meet with similar delegations from Canada and Europe. Their goal would be to formulate a plan for transition to a federal system of government among those nations in order to meet common supranational problems, such as defense, pollution, trade, and monetary policy.

Last week, the West German Minister of Finance, Helmut Schmidt, spoke at Newberry College in Newberry, S.C., and made a related proposal. In addition to calling for a summit meeting of the NATO countries, much as French President Pompidou did some time ago, Minister Schmidt went on to say:

A useful purpose might also be served by something like an American-European "Royal Commission" consisting of distinguished, experienced and knowledgeable citizens who would meet from time to time in order to analyze the prospective priorities of our common policies.

Minister Schmidt's very excellent speech goes on to outline some of the difficulties which have plagued the Alliance in recent years, and to impress upon his audience just how important it is to solve these mutual problems in such a way as to maintain the cohesiveness and solidarity which has marked American-European relations in the past. I include some of the most important points which Minister Schmidt made:

THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE AND THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

(Address by Herr Helmut Schmidt, Federal German Minister of Finance)

This Alliance, which evolved from the lessons of World War II and which was founded on the firm will to prevent new havoc at least in the Atlantic area of the globe, has a proud record to its credit: Member countries have been spared armed conflict on their territory and the rest of the world has been spared the consequences which such conflicts would have had for them.

At the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held in Washington on 10 April 1969 to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, President Nixon called this record very correctly "one of the great achievements of the post-war era".

This achievement has been possible only because Member countries of the Western Alliance were prepared to recognize in both the political and military fields, the rules imposed by the peace-preserving nuclear stalemate, and to accept the responsibilities which result from it. What has been achieved can in the future be secured and maintained again only if and so far as all Members of the Alliance continue to pursue the same policy as they have done so far.

The greatest challenge of the Atlantic Alliance is the task of guarding against the dangers of tension and conflict and at the same time seizing every opportunity for peaceful cooperation between East and West. We shall be able to meet this challenge only if we tackle the problems of peace on the sound basis of security jointly, not only today but also tomorrow. This is the challenge that I wish to speak about now—as a German European and as a convinced advocate of the Atlantic Alliance between Europe and America whose attitude toward this fundamental issue has remained unchanged, regardless of the position in which I served my country in the last twenty years. All along it has been a source of encouragement for me to know that my views were shared by numerous leaders and friends in the Western world, and particularly in the United States.

In analyzing the present situation, it may be trivial to point out that international affairs have started to move. Indeed, the pattern of international relations, above all East-West relations, is beginning to change. The essential fact is that this change does not mean a revolutionary break with old policies. Rather we see an effort to reach agreement on what is amenable to negotiation. In other words: we are witnessing a process in which the interested parties are trying jointly to find a basis for peaceful coexistence. These efforts may one day lead to a new peaceful order on the European continent, but not only there.

This change and the strategic rules which continue to be imposed by the nuclear stalemate between the two world powers provide the background to both the German question and the European question. But it is not a matter of Germany and Europe alone; in fact, a new pattern can be seen to be emerging in the world at large. Already, the bipolar configuration of international relations to which we have grown accustomed is becoming subject to interference from other centers of power which are emerging, such as Japan and the Chinese People's Republic and the European Economic Community (EEC). Even more centers of power may emerge in twenty years' time. Should this be a lasting development towards worldwide multipolarity we all shall have to re-appraise our own roles before long. This applies to the United States of America as well as to Western Europe and it certainly applies to the relations between the United States and Western Europe.

The year 2000 will soon be at hand and already many of our projections and efforts are directed towards this time. The changes which we are witnessing take place in international relations as well as within the nations which are confronted by serious structural problems of their respective society. We are all concerned to seek to avoid economic and political instability. We therefore have to exercise moderation in order to ensure prosperity, to prevent wars, in short: to work for peaceful change. We shall be able to master the tasks before us only if we do not delude ourselves by mistaking ideology for reality.

There has already been considerable change during the last twenty-five years. But whereas one could afford to treat the problems of security, diplomacy, finance, money, trade and politics separately in the past, we are now well aware of the importance of integration and the weight of interdependence. When I say this, I particularly means the relations between Western Europe and the United States of America. There are, no doubt, many interests on both sides of the Atlantic which differ, but they should be the subject of discussion and negotiation. In view of the many other undeniably common interests nothing would be more disastrous than to strain the relations between Western Europe and the United States by emotional reactions or neglect of mutual information.

Nothing should be left undone that can strengthen what unites us. There have been many promising developments to improve communication not only between our Governments, but also between legislators and private groups so that we can always be sure to be supported by the general public in our countries.

With this in mind, President Pompidou in an interview last December suggested an Atlantic summit meeting to give impetus to the pursuit of our common objectives and to the development of our further relations. Consultations at the highest political level could, if properly prepared, indeed help to forestall new differences of opinion at a time when negotiations about economic, monetary and security matters are impending. There are many indications that particularly in the years to come frank communication between the leading statesmen of the Western world, which is not garbled by bureaucratic intervention, would be of vital importance.

A useful purpose might also be served by something like an American-European "Royal Commission' consisting of distinguished, experienced and knowledgeable citizens who would meet from time to time in order to analyze the prospective priorities of our common policies.

Mutual responsibilities also mean that it can be in the interest of neither to apply any kind of shock therapy. There will continue to be minor trade or monetary disputes and differences of well-considered and justified individual interests; but it just will not do for us to get lost in endless disputes over soy beans, potatoes or Arkansas chicken, and thus in the end to undermine the Atlantic Alliance.

Together Europe and America will have to seek a new approach if political practice is to reflect the interdependence of our political, defense, economic and monetary efforts. After the French elections in March, the American President and the German Chancellor being re-elected very recently, the time is ripe for a thorough-going joint analysis and decision. For some this may be a painful experience because we have to get rid of certain routine prejudgments—for instance the misjudgment of the USA being willing to deal with the Communist world power behind the backs of her European Allies and also for instance the misjudgment, that the European Economic Community is so devised as to counter the economic prosperity of the USA.

The record since 1949 does not allow the Members of the Atlantic Alliance to repose on the laurels won by successfully ensuring peace over a period of twenty years. While in the past our aim was to prevent war, we are now jointly called upon to win peace in a rapidly changing world—which is certainly a more difficult but also a more rewarding task.

What, then, is the challenge we are facing?

First, economic unification of Western Europe should—and probably would—be followed by political unification. There is still a long way to go and setbacks cannot be ruled out.

Second, Western European unification cannot and must not be achieved in opposition to the United States; otherwise, Europe and the Atlantic Alliance would come to nought. As long as Western Europe's integration is in progress, Washington will continue to be faced with the problem of having to act as the main guarantor of Western Europe's external security and, thus, of being the Alliance's leading power without impeding the process of unification which otherwise cannot succeed.

Third, the European Community and the United States must establish firm organic links in their economic relations.

Fourth, Western Europe must shoulder its international responsibilities. It cannot do this, however, to the advantage of the Atlantic Alliance and of East/West relations unless spirit and aims of United States and Western European policies are closely coordinated. Their common security policy has shown how closely the Members of the Atlantic Alliance are capable of co-operating in dealing with difficult and frequently controversial questions. The same degree of cooperation must now be achieved in further fields and the necessary machinery must be provided. The most important of these fields are our trade relations, international monetary reform and aid to the Third World.

Fifth, in order to meet the challenge of the future the Atlantic Alliance will have to look increasingly beyond the confines of NATO. For instance, ways and means must be found to develop close co-operation and common policies in all those spheres where Japanese, Western European and United States interests are similarly involved. Future success will depend on solidarity and joint responsibility.

Let me conclude my attempt to draw a profile of the Atlantic Alliance and to describe the challenge which we will have to face by restating, what I said in the beginning:

Our aim is peace. But a peace that is more than the mere absence of war. This must be the aim of all our efforts—on either side of the Atlantic.

TO END THE VIETNAM WAR

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are now on the eve of inaugurating the President of the United States. The ceremony reaffirms the democratic and constitutional basis of our society and our right to elect the people who govern us.

At the same time, however, we seem to have lost our way and wandered far from the principles of decency and fairness on which this country was founded and which have made it great. We continue to be involved in a frightening and horrible war in Vietnam.

It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that at the time we inaugurate our President we rededicate ourselves to these fundamental principles. That we announce that this country can no longer participate in or condone this brutal and senseless war any longer.

My constituents have almost unanimously conveyed to me their deepest opposition to the continuation of this war. I know that their feelings are shared by millions of other Americans. We in Congress can no longer hide from our responsibility as representatives of the people of this country to end the war in accordance with their will.

I am hopeful, as all of us are, that a peace will soon be achieved in Vietnam. If it is not, the first order of business after the President's inauguration must be action by Congress—in accordance with its constitutional responsibility—to end the war.

THE HONORABLE JOHN N. IRWIN

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the departure from the Washington scene of a very outstanding and dedicated public servant, the Honorable John N. Irwin II, the outgoing Deputy Secretary of State. He has held that post since July 1, 1972, and prior to that was Under Secretary of State from September 18, 1970, to July 1, 1972. We are fortunate, indeed, that his distinguished services will continue to be available to our country, as President Nixon has nominated him to be our next Ambassador to France.

Mr. Irwin, who carved out a distinguished career as a leading member of the New York City Bar before his Government service, is a native of Keokuk, Iowa, and still owns the family residence there.

He graduated from Princeton University with the A.B. degree in 1937, received the B.C.L. degree in jurisprudence from Oxford in 1937, and was awarded the LL.B. by Fordham University in 1941. He served for 5 years as an officer in the Army during World War II, receiving the Legion of Merit and the Medal of Freedom. Separated from the Army with the rank of colonel in 1946, he resumed the practice of law. In 1950 he became associated with the New York law firm of Patterson, Belknap & Webb, later becoming a partner.

His highly successful law practice has been interrupted from time to time by frequent calls to serve his country. He was Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and then Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs from 1957 to 1961. He served as U.S. Special Representative for Interoceanic Canal Negotiations from 1965 to 1967, conducting the delicate negotiation of a new draft Panama Canal Treaty. He further served as the President's Special Emissary to Peru in the dispute over Peru's seizure of U.S.-owned oil properties.

John Irwin was again called to serve when named Under Secretary of State on September 18, 1970. He assumed his present title and position of Deputy Secretary of State on July 1, 1972.

Jack Irwin is a man of many and widely diversified talents, well qualified to represent us in France. He has served as chairman of the board of Union Theological Seminary, as chairman of the executive committee of the board of trustees of Princeton University, and as a trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of New York, the New York Zoological Society, the Lawrenceville School, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and the New York Historical Society. He is a member of the Bar Association of New York, the American Federation of New York State Bar Associations, and the Council on Foreign Relations.

Ambassador-Designate Irwin deserves special tribute for his achievements as chairman of the board of the Foreign Service these last several years. Secretary of State Rogers recently commended him and that board saying they had "steered a delicate and thoughtful course through the problems of personnel reform and employee-management during a time of great change within the Foreign Service; to this process of constructive change [Jack Irwin] has made a distinguished and thoughtful personal contribution."

Iowan Jack Irwin has served with great distinction as Deputy Secretary of State. I am confident he will represent the United States with equal distinction and honor in Paris. Keenly aware of the problems and opportunities in United States-European relations, he has engaged in active and intimate dialog with high officials of France and other Western Europe allies and friends.

Iowans have particular reason to be proud of this renowned native son, but all Americans familiar with his achievements will share our gratitude to Jack Irwin for his continuing outstanding service at the highest levels of government.

THE OMNIBUS JUDGESHIP BILLS

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I join with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) in the introduction of two bills, one of which provides for the creation of 11 new circuit judgeships for the U.S. courts of appeals and the other would provide 51 new permant district judgeships for the U.S. district courts. These bills incorporate the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The recommendation that 11 new circuit judgeships be created was made by the Judicial Conference at its October 1972 session. In October 1971, 10 new circuit judgeships were recommended by the Conference and at the October 1972 session one additional judgeship for the sixth circuit was recommended along with 51 additional judgeships for the district courts. The Congress took no action on the recommendations made in 1971 and 1972.

The basis for the recommendations of the Judicial Conference is a systematic and comprehensive statistical study and review of the judicial business of the district courts undertaken by committees of the Judicial Conference with the assistance of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The study was made in light of the policy adopted by the Conference in 1964 of making a quadrennial survey of the need for additional district and circuit judgeships. Under this policy, the committees of the Conference survey the needs of the district and circuit courts separately and present recommendations separately. Before this policy was adopted by the Conference, it made annual recommendations and numerous bills piled up until the House and Senate Judiciary Committees were ready to act. Now the Judicial Conference makes the study every 4 years and in the interim, considers requests for recommending additional judgeships only on an emergency basis.

The Congress has always acted promptly to fulfill the needs of our Federal courts because the strength of the fiber of this country depends in large part on the quality of the court's work product. Its work product, of course, is justice and additional, qualified, dedicated judgepower is the most important single ingredient to effectively establish and uphold justice. However, the creation of additional judgeships alone will not solve the problems of delay and backlog. The Congress and the judiciary must continue to search for ways to quicken the pace of justice without impairing the quality of judicial output. In the past several years the Congress has attempted to develop innovative ways of assisting the courts in effectively coping with their caseload. Most recently, the Congress established a Commission to Study the Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System (Public Law 92–489, October 1972). The Circuit Court Executive Act (Public Law 91–647, June 1971) is designed to relieve the chief judges of the courts of appeals of administrative burdens that restrict their efficiency. The Federal Judicial Center Act (Public Law 90–219, December 1967) gives the Judiciary a research and development arm. The Judicial Center is presently researching methods to computerize dockets, to reorganize court calendars and to develop screening devices for post-conviction remedy litigation. The Federal Magistrates Act (Public Law 90–578, October 1968) provides the Federal courts with professional judicial officers to help relieve the courts of their minor criminal cases and in screening the post-conviction petitions which annually flood the Federal courts.

The Congress, too, has done much to encourage our citizens to fashion a Federal case out of matters that would have never been brought into a Federal court 10 years ago. Taking a case into Federal court then was a rare event for most lawyers. But the many new Federal laws have given rise to new Federal causes of actions, created new rights and new obligations, which in turn generate diversities and differences of opinion and consequently, more litigation.

Chief Justice Warren Burger, in his report to the American Bar Association last August on the problems of the judiciary, made the following suggestion which, in my opinion, the Congress should give serious consideration. He stated that—

> In recent years, Congress has required every executive agency to prepare an environmental "impact statement" whenever a new highway, a new bridge or other federally funded projects are planned. I suggest, with all deference, that every piece of legislation creating new cases be accompanied by a "court impact statement," prepared by the reporting committee and submitted to the Judiciary Committees of the Congress with an estimate of how many more judges and supporting personnel will be needed to handle the new cases.
>
> This is not to suggest that Congress reject legislation simply because it would increase litigation, but only to suggest that Congress consider the needs of the courts along with the need for new legislation. What we sadly lack at the present time is the ability to plan rationally for the future with regard to the burdens of the courts. It is essential that we do this if our courts are ever to function as they should.

The Congress does not take lightly its constitutional responsibility to establish and maintain inferior Federal courts. The recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States as they are incorporated in these bills are given much weight but they are by no means conclusive. The Senate and House Judiciary Committees will thoroughly and judiciously study the workload of these courts, carefully scrutinize the facts and analyze other requests made in the form of other bills which are pending before the committee. I am confident that the Judiciary Committee will begin work on these bills in the near future.

METRIC CONVERSION BILL SETS 10-YEAR TARGET DATE

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today, together with 20 cosponsors, a measure to provide for a systematic conversion throughout our Nation to the metric system of weights and measures.

Mr. Speaker, it should be recalled that the 3-year study conducted by the Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce completed in August, 1971, recommended an orderly conversion to the metric system and proposed a 10-year period during which our Nation would change over to the metric system.

Mr. Speaker, we are reminded that the United States and Canada are virtually the only remaining great industrial nations in the world which are not today utilizing the metric system—or—as in the case of Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand—are not now in the process of effecting such a conversion.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which my colleagues and I are presenting today would establish a 9-member U.S. Metric Conversion Coordinating Commission which would have principal responsibility for guiding and directing an overall program throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I will not detail the provisions of this measure at this point. Nor do I wish to criticize other proposals directed at the same subject. However, I do want to emphasize that establishing a target date, following which metric would be the sole official system of weights and measures, would appear to provide the kind of impetus that a conversion program requires.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say this in addition. The British have discovered that converting to the metric system does not import the great economic burdens which had been predicted. I would expect in our case that in the course of converting to the metric system, we would be able to adopt many labor- and cost-saving practices that would benefit our industrial and business communities.

Let me add, that the experience of other countries has demonstrated that to blunder along without any time schedule or target date is the most expensive, most confusing, and the most burdensome approach of all.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital for our Nation to be in step with the rest of the world insofar as applying units of weights and measures. This means substantial adoption of the international metric system. We can benefit in terms of foreign trade, improved international understanding, from the safety and efficiency which results from standardization of units of measure, and by finding new, improved and more economical methods of manufacture which adoption of the metric system can provide.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so vain as to suggest that the measure which my colleagues and I have introduced is incapable of improvement. However, I do suggest that of the measures that have come to my attention the approach that we have adopted is superior to the others. We hope that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics will provide an early hearing on this subject, and that the Congress will adopt at an early date a program that can launch the United

States on the path toward general conversion to the metric system of weights and measures.

INTRODUCTION OF 1973 PENSION BILL

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

Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing the private pension reform bill of 1973, formally known as the Retirement Income Security for Employees Act of 1973. This bill is identical to the pension reform bill which I introduced last year, and is the House counterpart of the 1973 Williams-Javits proposal (S. 4), in the Senate.

This essential piece of legislation can well be termed the American workers' bill of rights, for it cancels the glaring inequities visited upon many in our Nation's work force, and guarantees our working men and women protection and peace of mind as they look forward to retirement.

It will require a major bipartisan legislative undertaking to reform this Nation's private pension system, and I am convinced that this legislation is indispensable toward securing the just expectations of the American worker.

This bill will assure that never again will a worker under a private pension plan need to forfeit his pension rights as he moves from job to job. Workers under private pension plans will no longer suffer hardship because of the forced termination of the pension plan on failure or termination of the employer. No longer will a private pension plan be without sufficient assets to pay the promised benefits.

Manipulation and personal aggrandizement at the expense of workers in the handling of their pension funds will be effectively halted. To assure this end, the bill further creates a new arm of the Labor Department to oversee pension funds while setting strict reporting requirements and standards of conduct for trustees of pension funds.

This reform package provides for earlier vesting, full funding, Federal insurance against premature termination, portability, fiduciary standards and disclosure.

Last year, in the 92d Congress, I introduced and fought for the passage of this legislation, testified before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, and buttonholed my colleagues in the House to point up the need for and benefits of this legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to offer their full support for this bill which will benefit not a minority, not a political philosophy, but rather a majority of the work force of this Nation.

TRAVELING AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today I am introducing legislation that would prohibit the Members of Congress who have been defeated in a primary, in a general election, or who have announced their retirement, from traveling abroad at taxpayers' expense unless specifically authorized by a resolution of this House or the other body.

Members are well aware of the unjust, in my opinion, criticism that is leveled against the entire Congress for the travelings of some of our Members, as I said, who have been either defeated in a primary or general election, or who have announced their retirement.

We have 106 cosponsors of the legislation as of today. If those Members who have not yet expressed their desire to join will do so within the next few days, we should have a sufficient number to get an early hearing before the Committee on House Administration. We should take this affirmative step early in this session to eliminate the chance of any more unfavorable criticism that might very well be cast our way at the conclusion of this Congress.

I would urge all those Members who have cosponsored the bill to join in our request of the Committee on House Administration to have an early hearing. Let us at least discuss the problem and if the language of our bill is not perfect, then let us agree on some effective way of getting the job done.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the nearer we are to a cease-fire in Vietnam, the further it seems we are from a cease-fire at home. The same people who for years have been unremitting in their criticisms of the war still will not stop the incessant carping which has delayed the war's end. Even now, as we have the end of war in grasp, they continue to chip away at the integrity of the negotiating process with their chattering interference.

It is simply time to hold the rhetorical fire and allow the negotiating process to proceed. Those who continue their criticizing during the most sensitive of negotiating periods will have to bear on their conscience any failure during this crucial time. Only one conclusion can be drawn of those who will not let the proper conduct of foreign affairs take its course—that they have a vested interest in American failure in Indochina.

President Nixon has bravely refused surrender in Vietnam—a surrender so assiduously urged by critics whose vision was as blind as the President's has been broad. Through countless months of domestic backbiting, it is clear that the President's course is bringing progress. If the peace is to be lasting and permanent, we can do no less than hold back some of our more bitter impulses to attack the man who is bringing the peace.

Those who ceaselessly claim failure seem almost to be wishing failure. There can be no satisfaction in having been proved right if our Nation suffers. But if we see these last hours through successfully, the indulgences in raucous and divisive rhetoric are going to seem small indeed against the measuring stick of history.

INTRODUCTION OF SHORE EROSION CONTROL LEGISLATION

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

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from the congressional district that has more Lake Erie shoreline than any other in the State of Ohio, I am especially aware of the critical need for Federal participation in the cost of protecting privately owned shore property from erosion. The legislation that Congressman VANIK and I and 17 of our colleagues are introducing today would provide just that.

Current high-water levels in the Great Lakes caused by extremely large amounts of rainfall in recent years and further aggravated by the Canadian Government's closing of the Welland Canal for repairs this winter are responsible for enormous losses to private property owners. Massive chunks of land and even homes are tumbling into the lake and there is no Federal assistance program, be it small business, housing, or disaster relief, which adequately meets this constantly worsening situation.

The present law only permits Federal assistance to shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions that are owned by States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, and also to shores other than public if there is a benefit such as that arising from public use or from protection of nearby public property. But the forces of nature do not recognize private property lines. The proposal we are introducing today would permit private property owners affected by erosion to qualify for Federal assistance to be given by the Army Corps of Engineers in accordance with already established procedures for civil projects.

Four years ago, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, recognizing the enormity of the erosion problem, demonstrated admirable initiative by commissioning Stanley Consultants, a Cleveland engineering firm, to investigate and study erosion along a 4-mile stretch of Lake Erie shore, extending from the Cuyahoga-Lake County line, east to the mouth of the Chagrin River in Lake County. This area was previously a part of my 11th District and is now in Congressman VANIK's 22d District. The study included the contributing causes of beach and shore erosion, methods of protection, and cost alternatives for remedial works. Although the Stanley report focused on only 4 miles of shoreline, it is probably applicable to all lake frontages in Ohio and throughout the Great Lakes area.

The Stanley report confirmed what those of us who have lived on the shores

of Lake Erie have suspected for some time—that the lake is quickly eating away a sizable portion of our land. Present high lake levels mentioned earlier are producing an accelerated erosion rate in the area studied and present conditions have exceeded the previously recorded maximum. The spring thaw and accompanying rains will raise the lake level to new and disastrous peaks. No feasible method of artificially regulating the long-term fluctuations of the water levels of Lake Erie has yet been found.

Based on erosion rates over the period of 1938–68, a line of encroachment for the year 2020 has been projected. This line has been used as the basis for determining the amount of private property which will be lost by that year if no additional shore protection measures are undertaken. The Stanley Engineers predict that the total private land loss along the 4 miles they studied will be 535 acres. On this basis, it was estimated that property that 4 years ago had a market value of $6,300,000 would be destroyed during this period. Assuming a uniform increase in real estate values, a total loss of tax revenue to public funds of $3,861,000 will accrue over the study period. I remind you that I am only talking about 4 miles of shoreline.

Largely because of the inability of owners of private shoreline to bear the great expense of projects to restore or protect their property, we do not now have an effective beach erosion control program. The Stanley Consultants estimated 4 years ago that approximately half of the 4 miles of shoreline comprising their study required protection. I would emphasize that the shore damage has accelerated incredibly since the study was made so that undoubtedly all of these estimates would have to be revised upward substantially. In 1969, they counseled that the cost of providing the necessary protection for the study area over the next 50 years would range from $2.5 to $7 million depending on the remedial method used.

Obviously, private property owners cannot be expected to bear this financial burden alone and yet, at present, they have virtually no recourse. The legislation introduced today does not afford financial relief to a few wealthy shore property owners; it would protect our coastal shorelines which, in the final analysis belong to all the people. Surely it must be recognized that a problem which causes the loss of real property, the depletion of tax rolls, the loss of recreational areas and scenic beauty, the further pollution of our water and is responsible for declining values in affected areas, constitutes a loss not only to the private property owner but also to the general public. Public problems require public assistance.

TRIBUTE TO LABOR DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been my distinct privilege to work closely with a number of officials at the Labor Department during the first 4 years of the Nixon administration. Among those with whom I worked most closely have been Secretary James D. Hodgson, Undersecretary Laurence H. Silberman, Assistant Secretaries Malcom R. Lovell, Jr., George C. Guenther, Solicitor Richard F. Schubert, and special assistant for Legislative Affairs Frederick L. Webber.

One of the truly rewarding experiences as a Member of Congress is to work together with dedicated individuals towards common goals. This has been particularly true in working with Larry Silberman in development of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, with Assistant Secretary Lovell in decentralization and reform of manpower programs, with George Guenther who has done an exceedingly good job under difficult circumstances in the implementation of the Williams-Steiger Act, with Dick Schubert who has unfailingly given superior legal advice and with Fred Webber for his very perceptive jobs in legislative liaison. Their dedication and contributions are in large part a personal tribute to the leadership of Jim Hodgson, and unquestionably added greatly to the accomplishments of the first Nixon administration.

I do not want this opportunity to pass by without adding my personal tribute to these very good friends for their service to the Nation.

MOBILE HOME SAFETY ACT

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) in introducing the "Mobile Home Safety Act of 1973" and I wish to associate myself with his remarks on this subject.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the "Mobile Home Safety Act of 1973." Joining me as s sponsor of this bill is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

This legislation is intended to clarify the scope of the Consumer Product Safety Act (P.L. 92–573) to establish that it applies to the safety of mobile home structures. As the Members will recall, the 92d Congress enacted one of the most important pieces of consumer legislation in decades. The Consumer Product Safety Act establishes a new Federal agency, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, whose primary purpose is to protect the safety of consumers in and around their homes and in recreation and other activities. The Commission was given authority to promulgate mandatory safety standards—where necessary—to reduce hazards to consumers, develop educational programs, recall substantially hazardous products and to promote consumer safety through a variety of sanctions.

The legislative history makes it clear that appliances, components and equipment sold with or used around mobile homes—and recreational vehicles—are within the scope of the Consumer Product Safety Act. However, the act does not apply to the basic structure of the mobile home.

The bill which we are introducing today will insure that the Consumer Product Safety Act applies to all of the mobile home and all of the recreational vehicle—other than the aspects of operational safety already covered by the National Traffic and Motor Act—and not merely parts of them.

The safety of mobile homes is a subject of importance to all of us, particularly the 7 million Americans who now live in them and to the millions more who will purchase them in the near future. Last year approximately 25 percent of the new homes produced in the United States were mobile homes. Over 500,000 mobile homes were produced out of a total of 2.1 million housing units started in 1972. This relatively recent form of housing has literally exploded on the market in the past 10 years. Sales have increased sixfold since 1961. The trend is up.

Some of the appeal of the mobile homes lies in the ease of purchase and the fact that it is often difficult to find an ordinary home for much less than $20,000–$25,000. Mobile homes on the other hand are available for $15,000 or less and that price may include such additional items as furniture, rugs, draperies, heating, and cooking appliances. The attractiveness of mobile homes is enhanced by new loan programs established by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration which requires minimal downpayments. This means that more Americans will be able to purchase mobile homes and in many cases improve their immediate living conditions. But, there are some significant safety problems which will be confronting them.

The most imminent danger is fire. The State of Oregon conducted a 6-year analysis of home fires and found that the likelihood of death in a mobile home was 2.74 times higher than a fire occuring in a conventional home. In Alaska the likelihood of death was reported as 3 to 29 times greater. In Ohio last year, for every nine fires in a mobile home, one person was killed; while in conventional homes, the figure was one death for every 46 fires.

A similar pattern emerges as to property damage. A leading insurance company reports that in 1971 the average loss in a mobile home fire was $1,529. During a comparable period the average loss in a conventional home fire was only $690. This, despite the higher cost of most conventional homes. The cause of the greater fire hazard in mobile homes is apparently the flammability of interior components, coupled with the close proximity of the structure and its occupants. When a fire starts in a mobile home, it is more likely to be a very serious one.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Congress will enact the Mobile Home Safety Act, thus evidencing its concern for the safety of the 7 million Americans who now reside in mobile homes and the millions more who will do so in the future.

The text of the Mobile Home Safety Act is as follows:

H.R. 2371

A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to clarify the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission to regulate the safety of mobile homes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mobile Home Safety Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (P.L. 92-573) is amended by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Subject to subparagraphs (A) and (B) and subparagraphs (D) through (I) of paragraph (1) of this section (but notwithstanding subparagraph (c) of such paragraph), the term 'consumer product' includes a mobile home or recreational vehicle except with respect to risks of injury which arise from operation or movement of a home or vehicle on the public streets, roads, and highways.

"(3) The term 'mobile home' means a factory-assembled, transportable structure built on a chassis and designed to be used as a dwelling, with or without a permanent foundation, when connected to required utilities.

"(4) The term 'recreational vehicle' means a vehicular-type unit primarily designed as temporary living quarters for recreational, camping, or travel use, which either has its own motor power or is mounted on or drawn by another vehicle and includes travel trailers, camping trailers, truck campers, and motor homes."

(b) Paragraphs (2) through (14) of such section 3(a) (and all references to such paragraphs) are redesignated as paragraphs (5) through (17), respectively.

SEC. 3. Section 9(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Prior to promulgating a consumer product safety rule applicable to a mobile home or a recreational vehicle, the Commission shall seek the views of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the adequacy of the proposed rule and its probable effect on programs administered by them. The views of the respective Secretaries, if furnished to the Commission, shall be available to the public for examination."

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act (and the amendments made thereby) not to exceed (1) $2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and (2) $2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of its enactment.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Mobile Home Safety Act of 1973.

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

There was no objection.

RESTORATION OF RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which orders the Secretary of Agriculture to reinstate the Rural Environmental Assistance programs as it was prescribed by law.

We all know that this is one of many programs which have in recent weeks been capriciously struck from the books by executive fiat—without consultation of the Congress and without authority of law.

My bill takes steps to see that the laws of this land passed by the Congress and signed by the President are carried out.

This one bill may be the first step of many we will have to take. Mr. Speaker, we may have to wade through the weeds of the OMB and put our legislative program back together blade by blade.

But if this is what proves necessary, then I am prepared to do it.

By no stretch of anyone's imagination can it be claimed that the executive branch has the right or the power to repeal unilaterally a statute by refusing to carry out its terms. But, this is precisely what the President and the Agriculture Department have done with respect to REAP and several other programs.

It is up to us in the Congress to right this flagrant violation of the law. No one else can do it for us.

It is one thing to phase out a program after consideration and debate, but it is another matter entirely to dictate its abolition overnight and without warning or authority.

The President simply does not have this authority and we must make this clear to him and to the people back home.

The REAP program provides payments to farmers to carry out conversation and antipollution measures.

Even this past fall, the President's own Budget personnel approved the expenditure of $140 million for the REAP program—and now the President is reneging on his own commitments.

The REAP program covers many vital areas: establishment of a vegetative cover to retard erosion; tree planting and timber stand improvement; development of livestock water facilities to enable farmers to disperse their stock and thereby reduce erosion and pollution; establishment of conservation systems; conservation and safe disposal of water; establishment of practices to protect wildlife; provision for safe disposal of animal wastes; sediment retention and chemical runoff control; disposal of farm residues and solid wastes; and any emergency conservation practices needed to recover from natural disasters.

Obviously, this is a vital and needed program. And the President simply does not have the right or the authority to eliminate it without full congressional review.

I urge immediate passage of this legislation so that this vital conservation program can get back to work.

ROGER L. PUTNAM: 1893–1972

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1972, when Congress was in sine die adjournment, a very distinguished citizen of this Nation, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and my congressional district, Roger L. Putnam, died.

Roger L. Putnam was a brilliant business executive, an outstanding public servant and a politician in its noblest and finest meaning. Few men who ever lived packed so much activity into a lifetime of concern for so many people and in so many endeavors that laced across his country, State, and community. He had a marvelous understanding of people and their problems—government and its complexities—business and its responsibilities.

His life, interests, and activities deserve to be highlighted in the permanent history of the United States as reflected in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As one of the many who benefited from his advice and counsel, I deem it an *honor to do so* in these remarks.

Roger L. Putnam was born December 19, 1893, into one of Massachusetts' greatest and most distinguished families. He graduated magna cum laude from Harvard University in 1915. He studied at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In World War I, he enlisted as a seaman in the U.S. Navy and was discharged as a lieutenant. Roger Putnam's rapid rise and successes in business, politics, and community life attested to his remarkable intelligence and industry.

Mr. Putnam served as president and chairman of the board of the Package Machinery Co., and on the board of directors of the Van Norman Machine Co. He was the moving force in organizing Springfield Television Corp. Station WWLP and served as its first president. He was also on the board of directors and honorary chairman of the Third National Bank of Hampden County.

Mr. Putnam's public service cut across many facets of local, State, and national fields. He was mayor of Springfield for three successive terms, 1937–42, Democratic nominee for Governor of Massachusetts, 1942, Chairman of the U.S. Economic Stabilization Agency, 1951–52, a member of the commission that drafted the Massachussets unemployment laws, 1934, deputy director of the Office Contract Settlement, 1944, and a member of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education and Massachusetts Board of Community Colleges.

Throughout his extremely busy and active public service, Mr. Putnam always found time to lend his talents and knowledge to local community endeavors: Springfield's Charter Revision Commission, Red Cross, Chamber of Commerce, Citizens' Action Committee, Future Springfield, United Fund, Springfield Hospital Medical Center, Dexter Fund, chairman of the Board of the Holyoke Soldiers' Home, Park Commission, Springfield Library Commission, New England Council, and Petersham memorial Library.

Mr. Speaker, I have listed many of Mr. Putnam's activities and I am sure that the list could be extended. From all of this, it is easy to recognize that this passing has left a void in the community that he loved and served so well. Fortunately, Roger L. Putnam's goals, inter-

ests, and spirit will be carried by his gracious, charming, and devoted wife, Caroline Jenkins Putnam—a remarkable and truly distinguished person in her own right—as well as by their children who have caught the flavor and fervor of their parents. Their feelings are caught up in a moving editorial from Television Station WWLP 22 written and spoken by Roger L. Putnam's son and successor as president of the Springfield Television Broadcasting Corp.

Anyone who ever had the privilege of knowing Roger L. Putnam shares the sentiment and feeling so beautifully expressed by Roger Putnam's son, William L. Putnam:

WILLIAM L. PUTNAM

Had he lived, today would have marked the start of my father's 80th year. Since, I often plan these statements well in advance, I had already planned to comment on this occasion, some months ago. In fact, I had even picked out pretty much what I would say. Though he is now gone, the heritage he ha left to his friends, family and the community he served so long and so well, remains even more impressive in his absence. Thus, he merits the same respectful attention he would have received if here.

Perhaps it is just the pride of a grateful son in a dutiful and honorable father; but I have tried to be detached in my analysis of this matter as in all other subjects. Anyhow, 80 years ago Roger Lowell Putnam was born; and this community was never served more devotedly by any other man in that time.

Even though, as his son, I should remember these things, I cannot begin to list the offices he held, or account for the time he gave to city, state and nation, as leader and follower; as guide and prophet, in war and peace and without ever counting the cost to himself.

A constant example of the right and honorable, a man whose respectful friends would form a line the length and breadth of this state, my father was a real prince. A man whose abilities and interests knew no limits, he could talk geology with me in the mountains and correspond with my brother in Greek. Internationally known in Astronomy a man whose honors were legion, he always showed the path of true humility and understanding.

May we, who his example has touched, be ever mindful of his zest for life, his concept of public interest, his devotion to fair play, and his fond remembrance of friendship.

FIRST-CLASS MAIL SERVICE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Postal Service Corporation recently issued a Madison Avenue-type report, claiming, among other things, that first-class mail service has improved in the 18 months since the corporate operation came into being.

Madison Avenue has long been known for its ability to play with facts and on this occasion it appears that its manipulators have thrown Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen a curve. I say this, because it is difficult to think that Mr. Klassen's own employees had given him erroneous figures.

Last April, harboring a suspician that the Postal Service might put out a glowing claim for improved service before it went to Congress for another subsidy, I asked the General Accounting Office to take a look at what has happened to first-class mail service since July 1, 1971.

The GAO found the service has been "adversely affected by economy measures taken by the Postal Service" and is worse today than it was in the latter half of fiscal year 1969.

The most remarkable fact uncovered by the GAO is that, as far as the Postal Service is concerned, Sundays and holidays have ceased to exist for purposes of computing the time it takes to deliver first-class mail. Sundays and holidays are simply ignored.

The Postal Service also chooses not to count the time it takes for first-class mail to be collected, transported, prepared for postmarking, sorted for delivery by carriers, or delivered.

If this Alice in Wonderland thinking is actually a product of the Postal Service and not that of some Madison Avenue advertising firm, we are in trouble.

For the information of Members of the House, and the citizens whose postage costs have mushroomed under the so-called Postal Service, I include the GAO report for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

DEAR MR. GROSS: In response to your request of April 26, 1972, we examined whether first-class mail service has improved or deteriorated since July 1, 1971, when the postal reorganization provided for in the Postal Reorganization Act (39 U.S.C. 101) became fully effective.

We concluded that first-class mail service—

Had been adversely affected by economy measures taken by the Postal Service; and

Had improved since July 1, 1971, but was still not as good as it was during the last half of fiscal year 1969 when the former Post Office Department started publishing comparable quarterly statistics on mail delivery times.

FIRST-CLASS MAIL SERVICE ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY COST REDUCTIONS

As part of a major cost reduction effort, the Service has substantially changed its mail collection and delivery operations. Some of these changes have adversely affected first-class mail service, but their precise effect cannot be measured by Postal Service statistics.

Prior to the postal reorganization, mail was collected two or three times a day from residential collection boxes. Currently, mail is collected only once a day from most of these boxes. For example, before the reorganization, mail may have been collected from residential collection boxes at 9:15 a.m. and 4:45 p.m. each day and such mail would have been postmarked and dispatched during that day. Under current practice mail may be collected from these boxes only at 11 a.m., and mail deposited between 11 a.m. and 4:45 p.m. will no longer be postmarked and dispatched on the day of mailing.

The number of mail collections in business areas has also been reduced. The former Post Office Department collected mail from collection boxes in business areas as late as 9 p.m. and some of this mail was postmarked and dispatched on the same night. Currently, collections after 6 p.m. are limited to a few designated locations and mail deposited after 6 p.m. in most collection boxes in business areas is no longer processed on the same day.

Collection service is worse in some areas of the country where the Area Mail Processing Program has been implemented. At many of the post offices involved in this program, the last mail collection is at 5 p.m. This program has been implemented in about 200 of the 554 sectional center facilities (SCFs). An SCF is a large mechanized post office that provides various services for a number of associate post offices in a designated area. An associate post office is generally located within 45 miles, or about 1 hour's driving time, of its SCF. Under the Area Mail Processing Program, all outgoing mail from a sectional center area is sent to the appropriate SCF for processing and dispatch. The last mail collection at many of the associate post offices is set at 5 p.m. so that mail can meet dispatch schedules at the SCF.

The former Post Office Department frequently delivered mail two or three times a day in business areas and provided Saturday deliveries, in these areas. However, except for a few designated areas, the three daily deliveries have been reduced to one or two. Postal officials advised us that generally the middle delivery was eliminated in the conversion from three deliveries to two and that in these instances businesses would receive the same amount of mail each day as they did before the conversion. However, when deliveries were consolidated and the last delivery was made at an earlier time, mail not processed in time to meet that delivery would be delayed one day. Also, the Postal Service has eliminated Saturday mail deliveries to business areas in many parts of the country. Therefore mail that would have been delivered on Saturday would not be delivered until the following Monday.

COMPARISON OF FIRST-CLASS MAIL SERVICE BEFORE AND AFTER POSTAL REORGANIZATION

According to Postal Service statistics, first-class mail service has improved since July 1, 1971, when the postal reorganization became fully effective but is still not as good as the service provided during the last half of fiscal year 1969 when the former Post Office Department started publishing comparable quarterly statistics on mail delivery times.

Prior to 1967 the Post Office Department used test letters to measure the quality of mail service between 175 selected post offices. Twice each year 185,000 test letters were sent between these offices, and the delivery times were recorded and compared to previous delivery times. Postal officials told us that this method of measurement was unsatisfactory because postal employees recognized the test letters and gave them priority service and special handling.

In November 1967 the Post Office Department developed a system for measuring mail delivery time by sampling, on a continuous basis, every 10th piece of first-class mail at 2,500 delivery points selected quarterly at 560 post offices and by determining the time between postmarking and receipt at a delivery point. A delivery point, such as a post office box section or a carrier station, is usually the last mail processing point before delivery to the customer. The results of these tests were published quarterly in the National Service Index (NSI) Reports. This system was used until July 1970 when the Department implemented the Origin-Destination Information System.

Under this system the Department increased the number of delivery points selected each quarter to about 75,000, including delivery points in all first- and second-class post offices and in a selected number of third- and fourth-class post offices. The purpose of this system was to reduce sampling errors and thus to provide better data for making the estimates of delivery time more reliable than those obtained under the previous system.

Specially trained clerks, through random sampling, select about 26 million pieces of mail annually, including about 18.2 million pieces of first-class mail. Delivery time is measured from the date mail is postmarked to the date it reaches a delivery point. The results are published quarterly in the NSI Reports.

The Postal Service does not measure the time required for mail to be (1) collected, (2) transported, (3) prepared for postmarking, (4) sorted for delivery by carriers or clerks, and (5) delivered, because it assumes that most mail is postmarked the same day it is mailed and that a carrier delivers the mail on the day he receives it.

We used the NSI Reports to compare the average time to deliver first-class mail before and after the postal reorganization, because these reports provided the only continuing measure of first-class mail service. An official of the Postal Service's Office of Statistical Programs and Standards advised us that data in the NSI Reports before and after the implementation of the Origin-Destination Information System could be statistically compared if minor adjustments were made. We considered these adjustments in our comparison.

The NSI Reports for January 1969 through June 1972 showed that first-class mail service deteriorated to its lowest point in the first postal quarter following enactment of the act (the quarter which ended December 1970) but has continually improved since that time. This data is shown on the enclosed chart.

According to postal officials, the deterioration of service was caused by uncertainties surrounding the postal reorganization, management emphasis on cost reductions rather than on customer service, increases in mail volume, and changes in the processing of first-class mail.

At the beginning of the first postal quarter of fiscal year 1972, the Postal Service discontinued considering Sundays and holidays in computing the average number of days to deliver local first-class mail; at the beginning of the second postal quarter of fiscal year 1972, this procedure was expanded to cover all first-class mail. Eliminating Sundays and holidays in the computations understates the delivery time.

For example, before July 1971, first-class mail postmarked on Friday and received at a delivery point on Monday was counted as receiving 3-day service; however, at the beginning of the second postal quarter of fiscal year 1972, all first-class mail postmarked on Friday and received at a delivery point on Monday was counted as receiving 2-day service. A Postal Service statistician told us that eliminating Sundays and holidays in computing the average time to deliver first-class mail would understate actual delivery time by about 0.05 days for the first postal quarter of fiscal year 1972 and by about 0.15 days for subsequent postal quarters. We computed what the average time to deliver first-class mail would have been if Sundays and holidays had been included in the Postal Service's computations.

Finally, although Postal Service reports show that the average time to deliver first-class mail has been reduced since the reorganization, it should be noted that the average time is computed for the total volume of such mail. The average, therefore, is not necessarily indicative of the average time for a particular part of the country.

Another measure of the timeliness of mail service is the percentage of mail delivered within a certain period. The following table summarizes the percentage of mail delivered within 5 days, as shown in NSI Reports.

Fiscal year and postal quarter	Percentage of mail delivered within 1 day	2 days	3 days	4 days	5 days
1969:					
3	64.4	88.4	97.0	99.0	99.5
4	67.3	89.5	97.5	99.3	99.7
1970:					
1	59.1	83.6	95.8	99.1	99.7
2	52.6	78.7	92.8	97.4	99.0
3	55.2	80.2	93.0	97.5	99.0
4	55.4	77.8	93.5	98.2	99.3
1971:					
1	57.5	79.1	92.1	97.1	98.6
2	49.8	74.3	88.8	94.9	97.5
3	56.3	78.8	92.2	97.3	98.8
4	58.0	80.7	93.2	97.7	99.0
1972:					
1[1]	62.0	83.0	94.0	98.0	(2)
2[1]	61.0	85.0	94.0	98.0	(2)
3[1]	64.0	88.0	96.0	98.0	(2)
4[1]	66.0	90.0	97.0	99.0	(2)

[1] The actual percentages of mail delivered were lower than the percentages shown for these 4 quarters, because Sundays and holidays were not included in computing the days to deliver.
[2] No count was made for the 5th day.

The table shows that service was at its lowest point in the second postal quarter of fiscal year 1971 and that it has improved since that time. As of the fourth postal quarter of fiscal year 1972, service is shown to be slightly better than it was in the third postal quarter of fiscal year 1969. However, because the Postal Service discontinued considering Sundays and holidays in computing delivery time, the data for fiscal year 1972 is not comparable to the data for prior fiscal years. We were unable, therefore, to detemine the exact degree of improvement in the service.

TRIBUTE TO JIM SMITH, ADMINISTRATOR OF FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the special order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) in paying tribute to my good friend, Jim Smith. Jim has served the administration and the Nation most ably these last 4 years as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and those of us who know him well will greatly miss his talents and warm friendship. I have been particularly impressed by the conscientious and personal manner in which he exercised his reponsibilities as Administrator; no problem was ever too small or unimportant to warrant his attention. He has truly been a friend of the farmer and a friend of the Congress, and we are deeply indebted to him for making our jobs easier when it came to any problem involving the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 4 years Jim has compiled an enviable record as Administrator—a record of accomplishment of which he can be justly proud and for which we are most grateful. We are saddened that he will be leaving the Washington area and Government service, but our loss is his native Oklahoma's gain, and I am confident that Jim will do well in whatever he undertakes.

CHARGES BY INAUGURATION COMMITTEE

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members read with shocked dismay the statement in yesterday's newspaper to the effect that Mr. Magruder of the Inauguration Committee made the charge that Congressman RIEGLE, Congressman MCCLOSKEY, and Congresswoman ABZUG were organizing violent demonstrations in connection with the inauguration.

That was an arrogant attack on Members of this House. I want the record to show that there are Members of this House who repudiate that assertion. Anyone who know these Members know that they are dedicated to nonviolence. It would be unthinkable that they would engage in such activities.

I think that this was a totally unwarranted and improper statement for Mr. Magruder to have made.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLARD EDWARDS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time under a special order so that Members can join me in paying tribute to Willard Edwards, a great journalist who joined the Chicago Tribune in 1925 and has been serving in the Tribune's Washington Bureau since 1934. Willard retired on December 31, 1972, after 47 years of service with the Tribune.

Willard served as head of the Tribune's Capitol Hill staff for many years and earned a well-deserved reputation for his penetrating analysis of the Washington scene, his objectivity, and his usual perceptiveness of political and governmental developments.

Willard's career with the Tribune has been a long and illustrious one. Among its highlights is a long association with President Nixon, dating back to 1948 when he worked closely with the then Representative Nixon on the internationally famous Alger Hiss case for which he received the Edward Scott Beck award for excellence in domestic reporting. Willard is renowned for his specialization in investigation of Communist activities and is the winner of a second Beck award for his exposure of Communists and their sympathizers in the Government. Other historic events covered by Willard include the famous "kitchen debate" between Vice President Nixon and the late Nikita Khrushchev and the trial of Bruno Hauptmann, kidnapper of the Charles Lindbergh baby.

Mr. Speaker, in the 14 years I have

served in Congress, I have learned to respect not only the writing skill, but also the penetrating manner in which Willard Edwards reported the Washington scene. He is always able to get to the fundamental point in an issue. His columns and stories were based on his knowledge of the issues and the particular subject matter, not on press releases ground out by the thousands of mimeo machines operating in the Capitol.

One thing I do wish to emphasize is that this great journalist is not really retiring. The retirement applies only to his assignment with the Chicago Tribune, and he will continue to devote himself to special assignments. I expect that he will be writing a book based on his years of observing developments in our Nation's Capital and that he will be one of the most active retired journalists in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD the farewell column to Willard Edwards by Bill Anderson which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Tuesday, January 2, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the many Members who join me this afternoon in expressing our respect for the great career compiled by our dear friend Willard Edwards, and I wish Willard and Leila many happy years of retirement.

MEMORIES OF WILLARD EDWARDS

(By Bill Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—The first good thing that happened to this reporter after coming to Washington 12 years ago was an invitation to dinner from Mr. and Mrs. Willard Edwards.

They live on Capitol Hill in what used to be a grocery store. It is a nice house, with a black iron fence on the corner lot. The living room is very large because that is where people used to buy their food.

Important people from the Congress and Executive Branch filled the room my first night there. It was very heady for a freshman out of Chicago. It became even more so after a knock at the side door. Willard and his wife, Leila, were receiving guests at the front entrance, so I went to see who was outside in the cold.

It was the then Vice President Nixon. John Wardlaw, his driver, had parked at the wrong entrance. But it was just as well because Nixon had a gift tucked under his overcoat for the Edwardses. "Give this to them for me after I leave," Nixon said, whipping out a large bottle of champagne.

Afterwards, Willard invited me to stay on for the champagne. He toasted the Vice President and a relationship that had started in 1946 when Nixon first came to this city as a freshman congressman. Willard was even then a veteran reporter for The Tribune, having worked here since 1935.

Edwards was noted for his investigative ability. He was one of the youngest reporters to cover the 1932 trial of Bruno Richard Hauptmann in the kidnaping of Charles A. Lindbergh Jr. The Edwards star quality of journalism was more than obvious in the later Nixon investigation of Alger Hiss.

The big stories, tho, always came Willard's way from the very start of his career with the City News Bureau in Chicago in 1921—when he was in his early teens. He was so good at the old C. N. B. that The Tribune hired him in 1925 and put him in competition with much older, "Front Page" reporters.

A book or two would be needed just to record his Page One coverage over the years. He traveled to almost every newsworthy place in the world.

Willard could write a smashing book about prohibition days in Chicago, for example. Or about the shooting of Mayor Anton Cermak of Chicago in Miami in what some people doubt was an assassination attempt on President Franklin D. Roosevelt. A book by Willard on Lyndon Johnson's rise from an obscure Texas congressman to President could easily be a best seller.

I suspect Willard knows more about Richard M. Nixon than any other reporter in Washington.

I know he knows more about reporting, hard work, and long hours than any other reporter or columnist of my acquaintance. He has always been a digger. In this newspaper business he is the kind of person known as "hard nosed." Some bureaucrats and politicians in this town really don't like him for those reasons, too.

Willard has always been the champion of the underdog, the people being kicked around by the established, the entrenched. If you read his clippings, you will find he did not always sail with the prevailing winds.

Unfortunately, you will not find a printed record about the hundreds of freshman reporters Willard counseled and helped with stories over the years. This was not something he talked or wrote about, just something he did.

For these reasons and many more, it is a little sad for me to think he has now retired (on a regular column basis) at the age of 70. But the bright side is that he can still write and report circles around most people—and there are many potential articles waiting for his typewriter.

I hope his friends will join me in wishing him a great New Year—and many more.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Congress I have regarded Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune as one of the fixed stars in the firmament of Washington reporters. I supposed that he would go on forever digging into interesting stories that somehow others missed, and reporting on political affairs with a perspective that goes back to the New Deal days of the 1930's. So I was shocked and sorry when I learned only the other day that Willard had formally retired at the end of 1972.

I cannot really believe this is true, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that Willard Edward's superb reportorial talents will continue to be in evidence around Capitol Hill. If he writes his memoirs I hope he will treat me kindly—but one cannot take that for granted. What you can always be sure about Willard is this: He will treat you as well as you deserve, and with the understanding and good temper that has made him one of the best beloved of the "old pros" in the press galleries.

I am sure I speak for all of us who have had the good fortune to work with him when I wish Willard Edwards and his wife Leila a full and happy retirement and congratulate the Chicago Tribune for having one of the world's greatest Washington correspondents for so many decades.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my colleague from the other side of the aisle (Mr. DERWINSKI), in honoring a man that I have known and respected throughout my years in Congress. In his many years with the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards' writing exemplified journalism at its best. He had the experience and the know-how to provide his readers with a truly informative view of the Washington scene.

His penetrating style was nonpartisan. He would acknowledge the good and point out the weakness in any proposal, regardless of the party label it wore. I would often take the time to reflect on his observations, for they often provided me with a fresh new way to approach even the most persistent of problems.

In one sense, I am sorry that Williard has chosen to retire. For we in Congress will no longer be able to benefit from being under his perceptive eye. But the biggest losers shall be his many readers, those in Chicago and those in other cities of this country, for they will lose the benefit of that rare man who could perceive news with a different view and had the special talent to communicate this view to others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, before I was elected to Congress several years ago I had spent a considerable portion of my life in the news business as a reporter, editor and as a news broadcaster.

As a result I believe I know a good newspaperman when I meet one and I can say without reservation that Willard Edwards is one of the best.

In an era when it has become all too tempting merely to rewrite someone's so-called press release, or to build a story solely around a committee's press handout, Willard was never satisfied with surface appearances.

He would go behind the obvious and he could and did give his readers the advantage of his long insight into the workings of Capitol Hill—an insight few of his fellow journalists could match.

Willard Edwards never hesitated to champion the little man or the forgotten cause ignored by too many others of his profession.

Now that he has retired I wish him many years of health and happiness.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the Congressmen who are today paying tribute to Willard Edwards are but a few of the many people who will miss his fine work. We are losing an able and dedicated journalist, and an excellent writer. However, his years of retirement after so much time with the Chicago Tribune is certainly well-deserved, and he and his family can now look back on his career with pride.

Willard Edwards was born in 1902, and, from 1918–1921, attended St. Ignatius Academy. He married Lila Sullivan in 1931, and has one son. He began his distinguished career in the early 1920's at the City News Bureau in Chicago. In 1925, he started working for the Chicago Tribune, and has served in various capacities with the Tribune for the past 47 years. He did a fine job in informing the American public, and I know I speak for all of us here in wishing him well in the years to come.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to participate in this discussion honoring the distinguished Washington columnist of the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards. In my experience with the news media, I have never come into contact with a journalist who possessed in such generous measure the high qualities of persistence, candor and eloquence which characterize Williard Edwards. His complete honesty, his tireless efforts to search out the truth and

his courage in presenting the facts regardless of political or personal consequences combine to describe Willard Edwards whom we honor here on the Floor of the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Speaker, there are some representatives of the press who gain prominence on a single issue or whose careers fluctuate between sensationalism and drabness. However, such a description does not fit Willard Edwards whose resourcefulness and searching have produced news of consistent interest. During the time I have known him, Willard Edwards has also displayed qualities of concern for his fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I had a recent experience with Willard Edwards in connection with the case of Dr. Milton Margoles who was recently granted a presidential pardon in an income tax violation case of some years ago.

Willard Edwards thoroughly investigated the Margoles court proceedings and ran down every conceivable question relating to Dr. Margoles' reputation as an individual and as a doctor. When he determined that Dr. Margoles had paid his full debt to society, he was outspoken and untiring in his efforts in support of a presidential pardon. Just before Christmas, the President granted a full pardon to Dr. Margoles, thus restoring to this eminent physician his full citizenship. Dr. Margoles attributes this act of executive clemency largely to the public notice given to his case in Willard Edwards' columns.

Mr. Speaker, many other individuals whose welfare has depended up bureaucratic and sometimes arbitrary decision-making have found an eloquent voice in Willard Edwards and his Chicago Tribune column. He has reached the pinnacle of his career as an honored journalist in his column entitled, "Capitol Views." In articulating accounts of great national interest, he has made use of his long experience as a reporter and columnist, and of the human insight which he gained through dealing with those who produced newsworthy items from every walk of life.

Mr. Speaker, Willard Edwards recently completed 51 years with the Chicago Tribune, and on December 7, 1972, celebrated his 70th birthday. The winner of two Beck awards for outstanding reporting for the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards reported many of the political and public events during a period of more than 30 years, in addition to many human interest events which aroused national interest.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a personal privilege to know Willard Edwards during my more than 10 years in the Congress, and I salute him as a man and as a newspaper reporter without peer. In one sense, it appears that Willard Edwards is retiring in the prime of his life. At any rate, I am confident that he will be active in many ways for a long time to come. Perhaps he will now find time to compile a book-length account of his Washington experiences, which I am sure would become a best seller. I extend heartfelt best wishes to Willard Edwards and to his wife, Leila, and other members of his family, including his mother, Mrs. Mamie Kilday Edwards of San Diego, Calif., who at 95 years of age is reported to be one of her son's greatest fans and severest critics.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great newspapers of the United States and, more particularly, of the Middle West is the Chicago Tribune. It has been preeminent for more than a century—preeminent because it has been served by a number of good reporters.

One of its fine reporters has recently retired. He is Willard Edwards, whose newsstories and commentaries appeared in the Tribune for 47 years.

His writing has been a particular interest of mine because he came from the district which I represent. His good work during the early years of his newspaper career earned him a place on the Tribune's Washington staff, and his observations have kept Middle Westerners informed about happenings in our Nation's Capital.

He is a talented man who has earned a fruitful retirement.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I heartily join our colleagues today in a salute to Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune who is retiring after many years of service.

As a longtime Tribune reader, I have eagerly looked forward to each of Willard's incisive and thought-provoking columns. He is one newspaperman who has always practiced that vital canon of good journalism—good writing makes good reading. His columns, both clear and concise, have been a pleasure to read. His insight into the workings of government, analysis of important issues, and commentary on the Washington scene have always been refreshing and informative.

As one who has been fortunate to have been interviewed by Willard, I know him to be a true professional. His warmth and charm, and dedicated professionalism, have made him an outstanding credit to the Fourth Estate.

His service with the Tribune spans many years, dating back to the time when Colonel McCormick directed its operation. He has observed and commented on both good and bad times our Nation has lived through, always with the same dedication to insure our citizens are informed about the status of things.

I am sure the Tribune will miss Willard, I know his readers will. For as with all good men, his shoes will be hard to fill.

I wish him the best in his retirement. I sincerely hope he will continue to bless us with an occasional column.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1972, Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune retired after dedicating 50 years of his life to journalism—47 of them with the Tribune and most of that time as head of the Tribune's Capitol Hill staff.

Willard Edwards has the privilege of looking back on 50 of the most fateful years in the history of the world—years in which he himself was a prominent voice speaking out with clarity and discernment. His was a voice dedicated to the maintenance of our Nation's traditional freedoms. He contributed to this freedom by speaking and writing perceptively of the issues which we had to face together as a Nation.

Willard Edwards can be proud of his career, because it is through such civilized discourse as his that a democracy can maintain a balance so that the views of all can be heard and considered. It is because of tireless journalists such as Willard Edwards that the press has proved itself to be such a vital component in our American experiment in freedom.

I wish Willard Edwards abundant good health and many enjoyable years as he begins a new life-style in retirement.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleagues in recognition of the nearly five decades of top-notch reporting of the Washington scene by Willard Edwards. While there is temptation today to reach too soon for superlatives, those of us in Congress from the Midwest know that an era is ending. What a rich career of involvement in the ebb and flow of Washington life Willard Edwards has had. He has observed and written about Presidents of both parties and their administrations, the power struggles in Congress, the triumphs and tragedies of the Washington scene as literally thousands of Federal officials, Members of Congress and party figures have moved in and out of the political carousel.

Willard Edwards was not only a reporter, but an interpreter. His column went beyond chronicling of events; it analyzed, probed for reasons and maneuvers behind the news, and projected future developments. His years of experience enabled him to see events in a unique light. He matched the news of today against the backdrop of Washington history, and emerged with clear-cut deductions and a writing style which bore out the confidence of his years of investigative reporting.

He has been called a "reporter's reporter," and has had his share of "scoops" which he developed through his power of perception, and his constant digging behind surface events to determine why things happened, not just how they occurred. He developed a loyal and appreciative audience throughout the Chicago Tribune's circulation area. He will be missed by those who had learned to look to his writings for the facts behind the story. He will be missed by many in Congress who trusted his judgment, applauded his fairness and even-handed reporting, and followed his stories for their own information.

May I join my colleagues in voicing my appreciation for this remarkable career. In a city where reputations are hard to earn, and difficult to keep, Willard Edwards has been a beacon of integrity, an inspiration for the legions of pressmen who have served with him, and a testimonial to the benefits our people derive from a free and active press. Undoubtedly, Willard has some projects on the burner that retirement will enable him to work on. I doubt that his typewriter will grow cold, even though he would not have the pressure of deadlines to meet. May I wish him a

long, contented, and productive retirement.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have read in the Chicago Tribune that their veteran correspondent, Willard Edwards is retiring. I shall particularly miss his regular reports and interpretive journalism.

His articles contain more than the hard facts of a story. They are brightened with the comments of this Nation's leaders, men and women who know and respect Willard. Journalism has always meant hard work, and Willard knows that better than almost anyone.

Over the almost half century in which he has covered the news, little of the reporter's operating procedures had really changed. However all of a sudden, the sacred principle of confidentiality of information and source is being challenged. The restriction on newsman's privilege comes from those who know what they want to hear and attempt to see that wish and deed are one. As this concept of freedom of the press is tested and defined, we are acutely aware of the reporter's role. Responsible journalism has always been the mark of an Edwards article. While championing the newsman's rights, he has exercised certainty of facts and disdain for personal invective.

I am saddened, therefore, that Willard Edwards is leaving active association with the Chicago Tribune but delighted to learn he will continue to report on topics which particularly interest him. His combination of insight and experience, which provides such a definitive and exciting history of our Republic's past 40 years, should serve him well in this new phase of his career.

Let me then congratulate Willard on his 47 years of preparation for what I know will be a most challenging assignment.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DERWINSKI. 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 my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

A SALUTE TO JAMES V. SMITH

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me to start off this special order with a salute to our friend and former colleague, Jim Smith of Oklahoma.

I have known Jim since he came to Congress in 1967. For the past 4 years it has been my privilege to work with him in his capacity as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

First of all, I think the RECORD should show just a little bit about his personal background. I therefore, include Jim's biographical sketch at this point in the RECORD.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JAMES V. SMITH, ADMINISTRATOR, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

James V. "Jim" Smith, former Oklahoma Congressman, farmer and businessman, was appointed by President Nixon in February 1969, as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, rural credit service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Under Mr. Smith's leadership loan volume of the agency has nearly tripled.

Born July 23, 1926, an Oklahoma product and son of a wheat farmer, Mr. Smith attended Tuttle High School and Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts at Chickasha. In high school he was active in both the 4-H Clubs and the Future Farmers of America.

From 1954 to 1957, Mr. Smith was a member of the Grady County, Oklahoma, Committee of the Farmers Home Administration. He was chosen as the Outstanding Young Farmer of 1958 by the Chickasha Jaycees and won that organization's Outstanding Citizen Award in 1965. He is owner of a wheat, cotton and cattle farm in Grady County, near the land on which he was reared.

In 1966, Mr. Smith was elected Representative to the 90th Congress from the Sixth District of Oklahoma and served on the House Armed Services Committee.

In civic activities and public service, Mr. Smith has been vitally concerned in helping young people. He served on a Grady County School board and the Board of Regents of Oklahoma's four year colleges. Presently he is a member of the Board of Governors of the American Heritage Center at Oklahoma Christian College in Oklahoma City and a trustee of Intercollegiate Studies Institute, Inc.

One of his innovations at FHA is the "Build Our American Communities" program to develop young people as rural community leaders through the vocational agricultural education system. Smith has also established the annual National Farm Family of the Year Award, which through the county, district, state and national competitions, calls attention to the valuable contributions of the family farmer.

Mr. Smith heads an organization which has emerged in the past three years as a leader in the national effort for rural development. Farmers Home Administration is approaching nine billion dollars of credit outstanding, an increase of two-thirds under his leadership.

Administrator Smith and his wife, the former Mary Belle Couch of Tuttle, Okla., have three children: James, 23, a student at the University of Maryland; Sarah, 20, a music student at Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex.; and Lee Ann, 10, a public school student. The Smith family lives in College Park, Md.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I think we should review the outstanding job performance that Jim has done at FHA.

First of all he assembled an able and effective team to direct Farmers Home Administration policy at the State and national levels. These people helped expand program levels—as did the recognition by Congress that the field forces had a rare dedication to their work, and a genuine interest in helping people.

Today all major programs are funded at all time highs. Measures of growth under James V. Smith show: 5 percent more offices than in 1969; 12 percent more people, at the close of 1972 fiscal year. The annual program has had a 28-percent increase in number of loans made and a 100-percent increase in dollar value. On a cumulative basis, the number of loans outstanding is 25 percent higher, the number of separate individuals holding loans has increased 50 percent, and the outstanding dollar balance is 73 percent higher.

At the beginning of Mr. Smith's last fiscal year, $7,869 billion was outstanding. During that year, $886 million was credited on the principal. Of this than 3 percent represented the total of write-offs and judgments. Interest payments totaled $415 million. On June 30, 1972, $9.622 billion was in the hands of borrowers.

On calendar year end, the agency employed less than 7,400 full time personnel. Of these, about 250 were in the national office in Washington, 480 were in the finance office in St. Louis, and 6,600 were located in 42 states and 1,750 county offices.

In 4 years, the Administrator has modernized the organization, with personnel and methods suited to the decade of the 1970's.

Specialist-type assignments have been established as needed, with personnel thoroughly trained to handle duties—such as the State specialist positions to handle water and waste disposal projects.

More decision powers have been given to the field, including higher loan approval authority.

The first training center in the history of the agency has been established at the University of Oklahoma, another step in the upgrading of personnel and their performance.

At no previous time has so much emphasis been placed on cooperation with the private sector, for example:

The entire program is now funded through private investors, with Federal insurance of investor's capital. This includes a new method of selling notes that will bring between $2 billion and $3 billion of private capital into rural areas this year.

A rural development program that involves young people actively in improvement of their own future.

Comprehensive planning for strong community growth.

Use of private firms for credit reports on borrowers.

Arrangement with private lenders that brought them into loans for farm ownership and operating purposes—making 1972 the first year in which farmer programs of FHA ever exceeded $1 billion.

Interim financing of community projects by private lenders.

Packaging of housing applications by builders and others in the private sector, so time and talent of Government people could be used to better advantage in loan approval.

Providing conditional commitments to builders to encourage volume building in rural areas.

His period of administration has brought higher and more realistic ceilings to farm ownership, farm operating, and water and waste disposal loans, to keep them abreast of increased costs and to provide more economic farm and facility units.

There is now better business management of agency assets, improved handling of records, and increased use of the computer loan accounting, reporting and program management. This has followed hard on the heels of heavy emphasis on

speed in converting to computer use, accomplished in the past 4 years.

With the computer has also come a system that permits borrowers to make loan payments directly to the St. Louis finance office, saving an estimated 250 man-years of employee time.

Mr. Smith has insisted that emphasis be placed on farm loans to young people, helping to establish a reservoir of able young farmers who will be ready to take over the chore of producing tomorrow's food and fiber.

Further, to encourage people generally to know more of farmers and their contribution to the national well being, the FHA Farm Family of the Year has been extended to a national program. The two national winners that have been selected have come to Washington and have met the President, and the program has brought untold value in local publicity at county and State levels.

To assure better coordination within Government, effective memoranda of understanding have been executed—and followed—with the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, Small Business Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Economic Development Administration, as well as with the Environmental Protection Agency.

With the private sector, such memoranda have been set up with the farm credit system, the Future Farmers of America, and one the State level, close liaison has been established and maintained with private lenders and builder groups.

Administrator Smith has amassed a strong civil rights record in employment and in program administration.

He has strengthened management capability, and established an internal review system for departmental investigations and audits, capitalizing on their findings to strengthen agency operations.

Under his direction, a national survey has established benchmarks for future rural water needs; a contract has been executed with a private, not-for-profit association to help strengthen management of recreational facilities.

The end result has been economically stronger rural areas, stimulated by the availability of facilities such as water and waste systems, by jobs and construction dollars of the Government programs, and strengthened by the resulting larger tax base.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we can all be proud of the work Jim has done at USDA.

He was an outstanding Congressman and he was an exceptionally able administrator.

I certainly join Jim's many friends in wishing him the very best in the days ahead and want him to know he carries with him the good will of a great portion of Washington officialdom.

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we are prone to criticize public servants and those of us in the Congress are especially prone to see the shortcomings of administrative officials. I suppose this is a good thing because this criticism, like the oversight of our own constituents, does tend to make public servants more alert to their reponsibilities. I am, therefore, pleased when I can conscientiously and sincerely commend the action of a member of the administrative branch of Government and I am especially pleased when such an Administrator is a former Member of this body and is a personal friend.

I think Members of the House of Representatives have set a fine record of administration in this and preceding presidential adminstrations. I believe that on the whole the record has been far above the average. I know of no Administrator who has done a better job in recent years than has our former colleague, James V. Smith, the Administrator of Farmers Home Administration.

Jim has always been a little confused about his politics. Had he lived on the south side of the Red River, I am sure he would have been a good Democrat. Since he lived on the north side, he was, and is, a good Republican. More than that, he is a good man who knows rural America, who wants to do something to improve rural America and who has taken advantage of the opportunity he has had to do exactly that.

Jim Smith has made an outstanding Administrator. He has run a good office. He has sought to serve our rural people. When we passed the rural development bill last summer, we made specific provisions for a new Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to handle this program. I am sure that practically all the membership of both Houses of Congress anticipated that Jim Smith would be named to this position. I was shocked and disappointed when he was not so named but in a few days when it became apparent that the rural development program was to be one of the casualties of the President's plan for a balanced budget, I understood and appreciated the fact that Jim was not so named. I don't want to see Jim in an impossible position. The time will come when we will again take up the tools of rebuilding our rural communities and when that time comes, I know Jim Smith will be ready and anxious to serve.

In the meantime, he will be at home at Chickasha, working among the rural people with whom he has worked so well in the past.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a fine gentleman and an outstanding public servant, Jim Smith of Oklahoma.

We who served in the 90th Congress all came to know Jim as a highly capable House Member representing the Sixth District of Oklahoma. Jim rendered excellent service to his constituents and proved his abilities in many ways.

Now we have seen how during the past 4 years Jim has demonstrated himself to be an excellent Administrator in his capacity as head of the Farmers Home Administration.

I feel Jim did a superb job as administrator of the Farmers Home Administration and I am sure other Members of Congress feel likewise. During his 4 years as FHA chief, Jim maintained the best possible relations with Members of Congress and his service to the public was flawless.

I am certain that I speak for all Members of Congress and for the Nation when I say the American people owe Jim Smith a vote of thanks for a job well done.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a fellow Oklahoman, James V. Smith. Under Jim's leadership, the Farmers Home Administration has made significant contributions to the people of rural America.

In my district, this agency is probably closer than any other to the rural family and rural community. I have seen its good work in State after State. Since 1968 in Oklahoma alone—the number of new housing starts made possible by the Farmers Home Administration has nearly tripled. In 1967, Oklahoma's housing program totaled $10.3 million. In fiscal year 1972 it had grown to $43 million. Nationally, in just 4 years, FHA's delivery of farm credit has jumped from $700 million to more than $1.1 billion a year. The Farmers Home Administration has also compiled an outstanding record of helping the new generation of family farmers and in the development of rural community services such as water and waste disposal systems.

We can all be proud of the work of the Farmers Home Administration and its Administrator for the past 4 years. I can readily attest to the deep sincerity and the extreme conscientiousness that James Smith has continually displayed. He has always given me complete cooperation and valuable assistance. Jim Smith will be missed in Washington and will take with him our good wishes for the days ahead.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today we honor a former colleague and public servant of the highest order, the Honorable James V. Smith of Oklahoma.

For the past 4 years Jim Smith has brought his able leadership to the Farmers Home Administration, and that Agency I know has profited greatly from his wisdom and expertise.

Before that, we were pleased to have him here with us in the House of Representatives where he served with distinction.

Both here on the Hill and as Administrator of the FHA, few people have enjoyed the respect and regard extended by the Congress to this man.

Hundreds and hundreds of people in the 10th District of Texas will attest to the thoughtfulness of Administrator Smith and the outstanding services of the Farmers Home Administration. Jim Smith visited us in Bastrop, Tex., when we dedicated the opening of the Aqua Water Corp. From that modest beginning today that rural water corporation now serves over 1,600 people in some five counties. When we realize that 1,600 families today, for the first time in their lives have fresh running water, we can appreciate the depth of useful service that this program gives to our rural citizens. In several other water projects similar service has been rendered. Over the years, a number of contacts necessarily had to be made with the Farmers Home Administration office

in Temple, Tex. Lynn Futch, Bill Lawson, John Barnes, former State director L. J. Cappleman—all of these contacts have been received with understanding and concern. Few programs in our Government today render more worthwhile and meaningful service than the Farmers Home Administration.

On many occasions, I have visited with Jim Smith about programs under his administration and each time I came away convinced of his personal sincerity and concern. His dedication to this program has uplifted the lives of countless thousands of people.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise to pay tribute to James V. Smith of Chickasha, Okla., who is better known to us as Jim Smith, our former colleague here in the House and presently the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. During his tenure here as a Member of this body. I came to know Jim as a true friend, dedicated to the betterment of his Nation and his home State. Since his departure from the House, he has been missed; and now that he is leaving Washington to return home, he will be missed even more.

While we hated to lose him as a colleague, he continued to serve in the Federal Government at the Department of Agriculture in the same illustrious manner which gained him the tremendous respect of many men and women on both sides of the aisle here in Congress. The Farmers Home Administration, which Jim has headed for the past 4 years, conducts a program vital to the very life blood of this Nation and reaching into every rural area. The program contributes greatly to the economic health of the Nation as a whole. This agency has always been one of the most important in my district, which encompasses a large rural area; and it has also gained the reputation in my part of the country as having the finest and most competent public servants in the entire Federal Government. Jim Smith exemplifies the epitome of this service as does Joe Rhodes, who is Director of the Farmers Home Administration in the State of Louisiana. Jim expects a great deal of the men and women working with him; and I have found in working with Joe Rhodes that he, too, just as Jim, places dedication to the public above selfish interests and personal gain.

In closing, let me simply wish Jim well as he retires to the farm and his native Oklahoma, for I sincerely hope he will enjoy much happiness being back home with his family and his many friends and neighbors.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to joint with my colleagues today in paying tribute to former Congressman Jim Smith on the occasion of his retirement as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. He has done a great service for this Nation at FHA. During his tenure, I have found Jim most helpful to me and my constituents in solving problems peculiar to rural communities and farm families. He certainly put a great deal into his job and this was reflected in the kind of organization he led. He will be greatly missed in Government service.

And for myself and the people of Alabama that I have the privilege of representing, let me express our deep appreciation for his work and wish him well in every future endeavor.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding services of my friend and former colleague, Hon. James V. Smith, of Oklahoma. After distinguished service in the House of Representatives, Jim became head of the Farmers Home Administration, probably the greatest organization which exists in this country for the improvement of our rural areas and the country as a whole.

In his capacity as administrator Jim has done a marvelous job. When we consider the fact that the agency which until recently he headed, among other things, makes direct and insured farm ownership loans, soil and water conservation loans, operating loans, emergency loans in designated areas, and direct rural housing loans, watershed and flood prevention loans, loans for direct resource conservation and development, we must realize it takes a very able man to handle this program in the splendid way it has been handled.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege for many years to conduct the hearings on this agency, and I can assure you Jim Smith has done a fine job, frequently with very limited personnel in view of the tremendous load. Our committee is proud of years ago having changed the title of the housing program from farm to rural housing, making assistance available to rural people as the Federal Housing Administration does for the people of our cities.

In the last few years the biggest work of the Farmers Home Administration has been in building water and sewerage systems. Here Jim has shown real foresight, for under his supervision contracts have been changed so that the cooperative which supplies water systems must agree to serve adjacent areas where feasible. In the past year our committee provided that 20 percent of the funds available would be kept for improved service and service to new customers, thus taking a forward step toward area coverage, which must ever be our aim.

I regret that in recent weeks we have seen the unfortunate action of the Secretary of Agriculture freezing funds approved by the Congress, so that grants in certain programs are no longer available. Rural areas are tremendously affected; and I hope that along the line these grants will be reinstated so that we can keep our people on the farms and overcome the movement to the cities which contributes so greatly to the major problems of our urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, the action by the Secretary was not approved by Jim Smith and had he remained as administrator certainly such move by the Secretary would have been over Jim's strong opposition.

We wish Jim the best of health in the years ahead and hope and trust he will get back to see us as he continues his service to his fellow man.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Congressmen from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and California (Mr. TEAGUE) for arranging for this special order to say goodbye to James V. Smith, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

I first knew Jim as a colleague in the House where he served with diligence and determination as the Representative of the Sixth District of Oklahoma during the 90th Congress.

When he assumed the duties of Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration on January 29, 1969, we continued our warm relationship.

But my regard for Jim goes beyond friendship and comradery. I would like to review briefly a few of the accomplishments of this able, young Administrator during his 4 years at the helm at the Farmers Home Administration.

In 4 years, FHA programs offered our rural Americans have nearly tripled. As the representative of a district in which rural areas make up well over half of the total land area, I applaud that heartily.

Just last month I was privileged and pleased to officially open the first full-time FHA office in Berkshire County. I thank Jim Smith for all of his help in securing this much-needed facility in the western-most portion of my district.

Jim has always had a deep interest in young people. It was Jim who initiated the Build Our American Communities program under the FHA. The new venture is designed to involve youth in community development activities. It is Jim's stated belief that the young Americans who participate in this program will, in the future, work to keep agriculture in its position as the backbone of our American economy.

The FHA Farm Family of the Year program is now in its third year. Started by Jim Smith in 1971, the program operates on the county, State, and National level and recognizes families who exhibit qualities of good citizenship, initiative, and efficient farming operations. Each year, the family who garners the top position in the national competition is received by the President.

Under his leadership, the FHA is becoming one of the more fiscally responsible agencies in the Federal Government. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I extend a "well done" to Jim.

And, certainly a crowning achievement of Jim's tenure as Administrator was the passage by the Congress last year of the Rural Development Act of 1972. I know Jim worked long and hard to see this legislation enacted.

Now Jim is returning home to Oklahoma and I join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in bidding him farewell and wishing him much success. I am confident that with his longstanding commitment to this Nation, its goals, and the development of our farming community we will soon be in official contact again.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real personal pleasure to pay tribute to my good friend and former colleague, James Smith, upon his departure from Washington.

During his 6 years in Washington, Jim has made an outstanding record of service to our State of Oklahoma and to the Nation. He served as a Member of Congress from Oklahoma for 2 years and as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration for the past 4 years. Jim is well known and highly respected by Members of both political parties for the service he rendered as a Member of Congress and for his untiring efforts in behalf of the farmers of our Nation. He can be proud of the record he has made but we will miss his presence in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I join Jim's many friends in expressing appreciation for his fine service and in wishing him the very best in the future.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this deserving tribute to Jim Smith, our former colleague and friend from Oklahoma. I am sorry to see him leave the Washington scene. Jim Smith, as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration for the past 4 years, has made an important and lasting contribution to rural development in America. He has worked hard to better the lives of the good people who reside in our small towns and rural areas. As FHA Administrator, he has been of great help to me, especially in the important area of water development. Jim Smith deserves the gratitude of all of us who are concerned about better homes, economic development, water resources for our rural areas. He is an able administrator who will be missed. It was a pleasure for me to serve with him here in the House prior to his assuming the important position in the Department of Agriculture.

I join in extending best wishes for continued success and happiness to Jim Smith as he returns to his home in Chickasha, Okla.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words about our former colleague, Jim Smith. I have known Jim Smith since we both entered the 90th Congress as freshmen Members.

For the past 4 years Jim has served the country well in his position as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. His untiring energies and assistance have been of inestimable value to the success of the FHA programs and his efforts have been well recognized by many who have come in contact with him.

It was a pleasure to serve with Jim in the House of Representatives and to seek his advice as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. His willingness to be of help will be sorely missed by all Members.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, especially those on the House Committee on Agriculture, with whom I work so closely, in paying tribute today to a most deserving Administrator, Jim Smith, of Oklahoma, who is leaving his position as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Jim Smith has served agriculture and all of the people of our great Nation well as a dedicated, knowledgeable, and efficient Administrator and a fine gentleman.

The Farmers Home Administration plays a vital role in the economy of all countryside America. Many times, its lending programs are all that stand between our producers and financial ruin.

Through the judicious administration of its programs, our producers are helped to feed our growing population for the least percentage of their income of all the peoples of the world.

We will all miss Jim Smith. Our country will miss him. I wish him the very best in the days ahead.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my two colleagues, BOB POAGE and CHUCK TEAGUE, for securing this special order today. It is indeed fitting that we rise to pay tribute to James V. Smith. As a representative of a rural district, I am thoroughly familiar with the outstanding service Jim Smith has performed as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration for the last 4 years. He came to this extremely difficult job well prepared since he is a farmer-cattleman by profession in his native Oklahoma.

I am also pleased that I had the opportunity to know Jim Smith as a colleague during the 90th Congress and had the benefit of his wise and sage counsel. I can assure you the farmers of America will miss his guiding hand and he will be a hard man to replace. My heartfelt thanks to Jim Smith for a job well done.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, Jim Smith joined us here in the House Chambers on January 3, 1967, with the advent of the 90th Congress. He left his mark in the short time he was here, and President Nixon recognized his great ability by appointing him to the important post of Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. While we lost a good and conscientious Member of Congress, the Nation realized a greater gain through his broader service.

The Farmers Home Administration is one of the most successful programs offered by the Department of Agriculture. Under Jim's leadership, immense contributions have been made toward the development of our rural areas and small towns.

But it is Jim, the person, that we will miss here in the Washington area. He was always "as close as your phone"—ready to supply information, to assist with a problem, to answer questions, or just to talk. He is a true friend and colleague, and a dedicated servant of the public.

Now he is returning to his native State of Oklahoma. But a man of his caliber and expertise is not long left to his own pursuits. I predict we will be hearing and seeing more of James Vernon Smith of Oklahoma.

I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this fine public official, and in wishing him good fortune in the years ahead.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, about the time I became a Member of Congress, there was a new Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration—James V. Smith.

I am pleased to say that we soon found mutual interest in the rural people of America. The Farmers Home Administration has some 7,000 borrowers in what is now the Seventh District of Tennessee, with a total accumulated value of very close to $74 million, representing the three major programs of FHA.

Jim Smith has been good for my district, because he has helped many of my people. His influence has brought about twice the funding in the total program, and that has meant rapid growth for us.

Aside from this obvious measure of success, however, I would like to comment briefly on Jim Smith the man. A great part of his interest has involved young people. So Jim is doing more than accomplishing his day-to-day duties, he is building a bridge for tomorrow.

He has traveled this broad continent and at almost every stop has met with young people, particularly those who represent the Future Farmers of America. Working with them and their organization, he has developed a program, "Building Our American Communities," that has taken that organization by storm and is becoming a major part of their national emphasis. Another facet of his planning is his work with young farmers. It has long been said in jest that the cost of becoming a farmer today is so great that the young aspirant to agriculture has, but two ways to enter his chosen field—to inherit a farm or to marry one.

Jim Smith provided three ways through the credit extended to young men of promise by the Farmers Home Administration. He often says that from these young families will come tomorrow's commercial producers with the skill and the will to continue making this the best-fed Nation on earth.

I could say many more good things about James V. Smith, because I believe him to be a remarkable man. I will content myself, however, with these few comments directed to the forward-looking manner in which he approaches his duties at FHA—indeed, that permeates his entire outlook.

As a public servant he has left an indelible imprint on the face of rural America—one that makes its noble face even more handsome. It has been a privilege to work with him; I shall miss his counsel and his help.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pleasure that I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing high regard for a generous public servant on the occasion of his departure from Washington. Jim Smith served ably in this body and his personal friendliness and dedication to his legislative duties certainly were an example to each of us.

Jim and I had the opportunity to become friends during his time in the Congress and I will always be grateful for that. Frequently we get caught up in the hustle and bustle of the daily routine

here and overlook the many opportunities we have to visit with each other and enjoy each other. Jim Smith took those opportunities and we are all much better for it.

We all experienced a sense of loss when Jim left the Congress, but were heartened by his appointment as the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. Under his capable leadership and direction the FHA has grown to meet the challenges of our farms, and to improve the lot of the individual farmer. As a member from a district with a substantial rural population I know firsthand of Jim's dedication to the work of the FHA and how his administrative abilities contributed to an effective and efficient program. We will miss his hand at the helm of a program he understood and managed so well.

I am sure that Jim will continue to make his contribution to government and I join my colleagues in wishing him well.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join my other colleagues in wishing Jim Smith the very best as he leaves his post as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

Jim and I came to the Congress at the same time back in 1967. As a result of redistricting, Jim was in a tight reelection battle in 1968 and did not make it back to the 91st. But those of us in Congress were fortunate that President Nixon wisely saw fit to appoint Jim as Administrator of the FHA.

With his background in agriculture, Jim knew the problems of farmers and smalltown America. What is more, he had served in the House and in his post at the FHA he kept closely in touch with congressional involvement in the whole area of rural and agricultural concerns. My district in Pennsylvania is largely suburban, but whenever I requested assistance from the FHA for those constituents in the rural portion of Bucks, Montgomery, and Lehigh Counties, the efficient cooperation of Jim's office was always forthcoming. I know the other Members of this body also appreciate the attention Jim paid to helping his former colleagues with their problems.

As Jim leaves the FHA, I would like to commend him on his 4 years of service in the Administration and offer him my best.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Jim Smith, who is now leaving the Farmers Home Administration after 4 years. Anyone who has had any dealings with FHA knows Jim and how well he has served as head of that agency, and we are all sorry to see him go.

Jim's background made him eminently qualified for the post of FHA Administrator. He comes from Oklahoma and knows what it means to live and work in a farming community. He also served as a Member of Congress and knows the needs and difficulties which beset the legislative process. To this sound basis Jim Smith added his own special endowments of industriousness, eagerness, and amiability. He was always available to lend his extensive knowledge and personal aid to Members and their constituents.

Rural America sustains a great loss in the resignation of Jim Smith. We know that he will remain a good friend to agriculture, but hope that he will not be tempted to stay down on the farm forever. We have come to rely on his talents and expertise and would welcome his return to public office.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there is an unhappy note about today, because it marks the departure from the Washington area of our good friend and former colleague, Jim Smith of Oklahoma.

Jim is a unique individual, for he has demonstrated exceptional competence as a legislator, when he served in the House of Representatives and particular talents as an administrator, when he served as head of the Farmers Home Administration in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

On top of this, Jim is a cordial person. When he served in the House of Representatives, he and I got along in top-notch manner.

Jim is now returning to private life, and he will, I know, become energetically involved in various types of activities. Whatever he does, I join with a host of my colleagues in wishing him bounteous good health and great success in all of his undertakings.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Jim Smith.

As a Member of the House from Oklahoma, Jim Smith early established a record of outstanding service to this Nation and his home State. His leadership in agricultural matters was recognized not only here, but across the country.

Jim Smith's stature increased in his job as Administrator for the Farmers Home Administration.

The people of Wisconsin and especially the Sixth District have benefited from Jim Smith's dedicated service. Under the leadership of President Nixon, Secretary Butz, and Jim Smith, FHA has grown and has been a key element in revitalizing rural America.

Jim Smith will be missed, but Mrs. Steiger joins me in wishing Jim Smith well and extending our thanks for a job well done.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding to me and for taking this time to honor our former colleague and now the retiring Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, James Smith of Oklahoma. I was one of many that came to Congress the same year Jim came. He was a conscientious and an extremely hard working Member of this House. We all were sorry when he failed to return in the 91st Congress after redistricting in Oklahoma took his home out of the district he had represented. Our loss here in the House fortunately was not also the Nation's loss, because President Nixon selected him to head the very important Farmers Home Administration. In this new capacity, I have had numerous occasions to take problems to him and to work with him to help rural areas and farmers. He always was most understanding and took extra time and effort to work out problems and to help in these rural problems. He fully understood these problems and was dedicated to help.

It is my hope that Jim will continue to contribute his talent and knowledge to make our country a better place to live. We all wish he and his wife, Mary Belle, much happiness and all the best as they return home to Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, it is with much respect that I rise to pay tribute to our former colleague and great public servant, the Honorable James V. Smith, of Oklahoma. While it is a pleasure to participate in honoring a good friend and fine gentleman I deeply regret his decision to leave Washington to return to Oklahoma.

I first became acquainted with Jim as a colleague in the 90th Congress, where he served his State and Nation with distinction. As a Member of Congress and the House Armed Services Committee he always made every effort to act in the best interest of our country.

During the last 4 years Jim has served with equal distinction as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. As the representative of a rural district in Alabama who has many transactions with Farmers Home Administration over the past 4 years, I can assure you that Jim Smith has been a most capable Administrator. His thorough knowledge and understanding of the complex problems faced by rural Americans today will be greatly missed by this agency which he has administered so well, by Members of Congress in both political parties who have relied on his expertise, and by many rural Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Smith is a patriotic American and I know he will continue to be of service to his Nation whether it be in Washington, D.C., or the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. TEAGUE) for seeking this opportunity for those of us who have served with Jim Smith to express, in some small measure, our pride and satisfaction at having enjoyed such privilege.

One of the first persons I met upon my arrival in Washington was Jim Smith, of Oklahoma. Our friendship was early in forming and has become more warm and more permanent with the passage of time. I always found him to be a man of firm convictions, high ideals, possessing a combination of personal charm and intelligence which are admirable qualities in any person.

Mr. Speaker, after his service in this body Jim continued to perform a valuable role in National Government as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. It should be noted here that a study of the housing subsidy programs conducted last year by the General Accounting Office revealed that the structures built under the administration of Jim Smith's office were consistently of higher quality and at less costs than structures built under the same programs, but under the jurisdiction of other Federal agencies. This study only serves to confirm the high regard which I, and his colleagues in Government, hold for Jim's talents as a public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I send to Jim and his charming wife, Mary, my best wishes for continued good health, success, and happiness during the many successful years that I know lie ahead.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak a word of praise and appreciation for my former colleague and friend, Mr. James V. Smith, who is returning to his native State of Oklahoma after spending 6 years in Washington as a public servant.

After serving a term in the U.S. Congress, Jim Smith has served very ably and with great dedication as the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Jim is a rare individual with great personal ability and an unusual devotion to our country and our system of government. Jim is a man who is highly regarded by his former colleagues from both political parties.

It is certainly my opinion that Jim has been very successful in his administration of the large and important work of the FHA with fairness and justice. This, of course, was to be expected from such a fine, talent Christian gentleman as Jim Smith. Jim's presence and contributions will be missed in Washington.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Jim Smith's expertise will be greatly missed when he departs the Farmers Home Administration on January 18, for new endeavors.

For the past 4 years, Jim has served the Nation well in this capacity. His work at FHA has contributed substantially to improving the quality of life in rural America.

Jim grew up on the family's farm outside of Tuttle, Okla. He was a member of the 4–H Club and Future Farmers of America. He graduated from Tuttle High School and attended Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts. He was elected to Congress in 1966, where he served on the House Armed Services Committee.

Throughout his life, Jim has served his community, State, and Nation with dedication.

On February 3, 1969, President Nixon appointed Jim as Administrator of FHA. During his tenure as head of FHA Jim was an outstanding and knowledgeable worker who knew how to get things done.

Those of us who know Jim well, and there are many, will miss him.

I know that Jim will continue to work hard and to strive for his new goals in whatever new challenge he now undertakes. I join all of his many friends in wishing him the very best.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues in saluting a former colleague and good friend, the Honorable James V. Smith. Let me simply say that Jim Smith, as a former Member of the House of Representatives and as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration within the Department of Agriculture, has distinguished himself as a champion for the farmer and for rural and small-town America. His service in Government has truly been distinguished.

The one thing that has impressed me regarding Jim's dedicated work in Government has been his philosophy of helping people to help themselves. This approach to our problems in our rural areas not only makes a great deal of commonsense, but it also gets results. That may well be Jim Smith's legacy regarding his Government service. Again, I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues in these remarks.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to the work of our friend and former House colleague, James V. Smith. For the past 4 years, Jim Smith has served honorably as the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration—FHA. I believe his record in that capacity reflects the genuine concern and faithful dedication he has always had to rural America. He has always been willing to help those who are willing to help themselves.

With respect to the State of Ohio, the influence of the Farmers Home Administration has probably been most apparent in the district I am proud to represent. As of the last quarter of 1972, the FHA was directly involved in financing no less than 55 separate projects for communities, water associations, and townships throughout southeastern Ohio. The status of these projects varied, of course, from the first step of applications being submitted to the final step of programs being in actual operation. The number of persons these projects will benefit can be measured in the thousands. The programs are as varied as the needs of the people they will serve—water distribution systems, sewage facilities, recreation sites, and housing.

Nationally, the FHA leadership of Jim Smith is reflected in the fact that in fiscal year 1972 FHA loans financed the construction and repair of 115,985 individual houses and 3,500 rental units, providing housing for more than 570,000 rural people.

In developing rural water and waste disposal systems, FHA provided some $300 million in loans and $40 million in grants for the construction or improvement of more than 2,200 systems serving more than 2.2 million rural citizens.

I first knew Jim when he came to Capitol Hill as a representative to the 90th Congress from the Sixth District of Oklahoma. During his term, he earned the bulldog award of the National Associated Businessmen as a watchdog of the Treasury, honors from the Federal Land Bank of Wichita for outstanding contributions to agriculture, and an American Legion citation for meritorious service to veterans.

Until elected to Congress, Jim operated a wheat, cotton, and cattle farm in Grady County, near the land on which he was reared. From 1954 to 1957 he was a member of the Grady County, Okla., Committee of the Farmers Home Administration. He was named the Outstanding Young Farmer of 1958 by the Chickasha Jaycees, and won that organization's Outstanding Citizen Award in 1965. He has also been honored for the conservation practices still followed on his farm.

One of his most important innovations at FHA was the "build our American communities program to develop young people as rural community leaders. For this and other contributions to FFA the Future Farmers of America awarded him their Honorary American Farmer Degree in 1970.

On this occasion of his departure from Washington, I want to wish Jim and his family the very best in the future and continued success and happiness.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital is losing an able public servant with the departure of Jim Smith from the post of Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. This distinguished gentleman came to Congress from Oklahoma in 1966. Representing the Sixth District of that fine State, he gave distinctive service in the 90th Congress. For the past 4 years, Jim has served the Nation well in the Farmers Home Administration, an agency which is recognized as one of the most important of all in service to the people and in help for rural areas.

In addition to the normal and highly valuable services associated with the post of Administrator, Jim has worked to develop more young people as rural community leaders through the vocational agriculture educational system. He established the annual National Farm Family of the Year Award which through county, district, and State competition calls attention to the valuable contributions of the family farmer in the United States. Rural Americans deserve more attention throughout our country and this award has directed attention to those people who live and work in rural areas. Mr. Smith has guided the efforts of the Farmers Home Administration so that it has emerged in the last 4 years as a leader in rural development. This is extremely important as the Nation now prepares to move into a meaningful program of rural development.

Jim is returning to his home State, and he can look with pride on his many accomplishments in the Nation's Capital. I have been proud of my friendship and association with Jim and my best wishes go with him and his family in all their future endeavors.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join other Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to my friend and former colleague, James V. Smith of the great State of Oklahoma.

I had the pleasure of serving with him during a part of his tenure as Congressman, but I have been especially impressed with his services as Administrator of Farmers Home Administration for the past 4 years. His understanding of our problems and cooperation with my office was almost unbelievable, for which I shall be eternally grateful. It was with deep regret that I learned of his departure from this important post. Certainly, his loss will be felt by the entire agriculture population of this Nation.

In closing, I want to wish Mr. Smith and his family health, happiness, and success in the years to come; and I am sure whatever endeavor he pursues will be crowned with success and that he will render the same valuable service to those with whom he comes in contact as in the past.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I am hon-

ored to have the privilege of joining my colleagues in eulogizing our former colleague from Oklahoma, Jim Smith. Both in the Congress and while serving for the past 4 years as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, Jim has performed remarkably well. His intimate knowledge of agriculture and the problems associated with it have been put to good use.

It is regrettable that our friend is leaving his present position. Always courteous and affable, he has at all times been available for consultation in his efforts to apply sound judgment to his decisions. His record speaks for itself, and I congratulate Jim for a job well done.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in 4 years of service as Director of the Farmers Home Administration, James V. Smith has brought its programs with their valuable services to our rural people to their height of success.

In a difficult period, which has seen the Farmers Home Administration taking on many useful and new functions in water development and in housing, he has kept it moving effectively.

We in Oklahoma know Jim Smith has worked steadily to help local people develop their projects. Rural water districts, in whose work I have always been especially interested, have brought the benefits of a dependable fresh water supply to thousands of people. This type of program, springing from local initiative with Federal support, is an especially valuable one.

It is with personal regret that I note his departure from this field of activity in the Department of Agriculture because I think his experience could make an even greater contribution to rural America in the years just ahead. Development of rural America, with a balanced approach through its industrialization, its environmental needs and all the other facets of a strong food and fiber production industry for our country requires all the knowledge and skill that we have. I hope Mr. Smith's talents will find an outlet so he can continue to help this American need go forward.

In the meantime I know he will find a great satisfaction in knowing that all across our State of Oklahoma projects he helped bring into being will grow and continue to add to the betterment of rural life for our people.

As he prepares to return to private life in Oklahoma, I congratulate him on a job well done and hope for him continued opportunities to contribute to the growth and betterment of our State and Nation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the work of the distinguished Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, the Honorable James V. Smith.

Our friend and former colleague, Jim Smith is deserving of our commendation for the excellent manner in which he has served his people in whatever capacity he has undertaken. In 1958, he won the Chikaska Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Farmer award. In 1965, he was presented with the Jaycee Outstanding Citizen of Chikasha award. He has also served as a member of the board of regents of Oklahoma 4-year colleges. During his service as a Member of Congress, Jim represented his constituents with distinction, and throughout his 4 years with the Farmers Home Administration, he has always given us his support and cooperation whenever we have called upon him.

I fully believe that when we see a task before us, we must approach it with common sense and with the determination to do that which is right. Jim has never failed to approach his work in this manner, and we can certainly admire him for that.

We wish him well, and we know that he will continue to make significant contributions in the years to come to the well-being of the people of Oklahoma and to the progress of our Nation.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to rise in tribute to a fine statesman and close friend of mine, James U. Smith.

Jim Smith was born in Oklahoma City, Okla., on July 23, 1926. He was educated in Tuttle public schools and attended Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts at Chickasha, Okla.

Before being elected to Congress, Jim operated a farm in Grady County, Okla., and from 1954 to 1957 served on the Grady County Committee of the Farmers Home Administration. He was named the Outstandng Young Farmer of 1958 by the Chckasha Jaycees, and also won the Jaycees Outstanding Citizen award in 1965.

Being a very active figure in community and State affairs, Jim was a member of the Grady County School Board, has served on the Board of Regents of Oklahoma's 4-year colleges, and is presently a Governor of the American Heritage Center at Oklahoma Christian College in Oklahoma City.

Jim Smith was elected to Congress on November 8, 1966, and was a fellow member of the 90th Club. He provided excellent service and representation to his Sixth District of Oklahoma constituency. He was honored by the National Associated Businessmen which presented him an award as Watchdog of the Treasury. He also received awards from the Federal Land Bank for outstanding contributions to agriculture and from the American Legion for meritorious service to veterans.

On January 29, 1969, President Nixon appointed him Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Credit Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Under his leadership the FHA has become a broad-based rural lender and has played a major role in rural development, lending money for homes, water and waste disposal systems, and farm operations. Jim has brought many new innovations to the FHA, one of which is the build our American communities program to develop young people as rural community leaders. He also established the annual FHA Farm Family of the Year award nationally to direct attention to the valuable contributions family farmers make to their communities and to the Nation.

I know that, as Jim Smith now leaves Washington to return to private life, my colleagues join with me in wishing him success in his new venture.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, Jim Smith and I have been very close friends for many years. I first met Jim when I was working for the State committee of the Republican Party in procuring candidates for State and national offices.

My first visit to Jim Smith was at his home on his wheat ranch north of Chickasha, Okla. Jim was the son of a wheat farmer and carried on in that profession. During his elementary and high school days he was very active in 4–H and FFA work; in fact, his greatest concern during his younger days was for the welfare and benefit of the young people he came into contact with in his community.

Jim attended Tuttle High School in Oklahoma, and later the Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts in Chickasha.

Jim is a wheat farmer who was very industrious and acquired many acres of farmland for the use of growing commodities to help feed the people of this country.

Jim has three children—a son, Jay, and two daughters, Sarah and Lee Ann. He and Mary Bell, his wife, are fine parents and have raised their children in the midwestern way of life. Jim is a dedicated individual and has served well in his capacity as Administrator of the FHA Rural Credit Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Jim is to be commended for his service with the FHA, and his actions and activities will be long remembered by the people in agriculture, not only in his home area, but throughout all of agriculture in the United States.

Mr. Smith also served his country admirably as the Representative from the Sixth District of Oklahoma to the House of Representatives during the 90th Congress.

We wish Jim and his wife, Mary Bell, and their family many prosperous and happy years to come.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, a lot of good things are being said today about James V. Smith, of Oklahoma, and I believe the best comment I can make is to say that the compliments are deserved.

For the past 4 years, he has been Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration and, as was expected by everybody who knew him, he has done an outstanding job. I knew him during the 90th Congress, when he served in this House; and I found him perceptive and intelligent.

Agriculture and the Nation have been so well served up to now by Jim Smith that we have high expectations of the future. The song says that Oklahoma is doing OK; the same can be said of Jim Smith.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Jim Smith is going home to Oklahoma and farmers and small-town dwellers throughout the Nation are losing a vigorous and effective champion. Jim Smith has presided over a tremendous period of growth in the Farmers Home Administration including new authorizing legislation that make the FHA the Government's designated rural development agency in our expanded effort to make the advantages of rural living

available to unhappy millions crowded in deteriorating cities. The confidence placed in the Farmers Home Administration by congressional passage of the historic Rural Development Act last year is a tribute to the managerial abilities of its Administrator, James V. Smith.

Those of us who knew Jim Smith when he was Congressman Smith, will remember the judgment and insights which he brought to legislative considerations. I am sure I speak for my colleagues in urging Jim not to abandon such a splendid career of public service. His dedication to improving the condition of others is an example to us all.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a pleasure to join the many friends of Jim Smith of Oklahoma upon his departure from Washington.

It was gratifying to serve with Jim in the House of Representatives and to know of the fine job he did as a Member of Congress.

It meant much to me, and I know to others deeply interested in the Farmers Home Administration, when Jim was appointed its Administrator. His record is one of which I am immensely proud.

As he leaves this position, I wish him the very best in his endeavors.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join many of my colleagues today in paying tribute to a former Member of this body and more recently the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

I refer, of course, to James V. "Jim" Smith, who is leaving Washington to return to his native Oklahoma after having served as U.S. Representative from the Sixth District of Oklahoma in the 90th Congress and then for 4 years as head of the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Under his leadership, the Farmers Home Administration has emerged as a major force in the national effort to develop our rural areas. In addition, Jim Smith's great interest in America's young people was the driving force behind the creation of the build our American communities program, which was designed to develop young people as rural community leaders through the vocational agriculture education system.

I know personally of the great effort Jim Smith made to eliminate discrimination in the administration of programs under his jurisdiction and I want again to commend him publicly for his dedication to this goal.

Mr. Speaker, as Jim Smith leaves Washington, the Federal Government is losing one of its most able administrators. I salute him for the fine work he has done in both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government, and I wish him the very best in whatever future endeavors he undertakes.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion of mixed emotions for me. I am happy to have the privilege of joining with so many of my colleagues in this tribute to my very good friend, Jim Smith. But, his departure brings with it a keen sense of personal loss.

Jim's firsthand knowledge of our farmers and their problems, coupled with his congressional experience, have formed a combination which has made it possible for him to render a truly unique and outstanding service as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

His practical experience found expression in his obvious desire to perform his office to the very best of his ability on behalf of the farmers of our Nation, and we all know how successful that performance has been.

As the Representative of a predominantly agricultural district, and as a close personal friend, I want to commend Jim Smith for a job well done; to extend my thanks for the many acts of assistance he has performed for me and my staff during the past 4 years; and to express the hope that our very pleasant association may find continuance in the not too distant future.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity of adding a welcome home to Jim Smith. As a neighbor from Texas we are delighted to see Jim Smith return to Oklahoma. His friendly, dynamic personality will add impetus to the growth and development of the southwest.

Jim has made a great record in Washington. He served with distinction as a U.S. Congressman from Oklahoma. While he served as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture he has built up one of the best records of achievement in the administrations history. He has administered the FHA under the guidelines of the golden rule. His dedicated Christian leadership carries through with his successful administrative procedures.

Jim, we will miss you in Washington. But we are mighty glad to have you back in the southwest in Oklahoma.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with so many distinguished voices in a salute to our former colleague and an outstanding public servant, James V. Smith of Oklahoma.

Jim Smith and I came to the Congress at the same time, and he became a close friend of mine very quickly, as he did with many of us. He served ably in the Congress, and our President made a wise choice when he chose Jim to take the helm of the Farmers Home Administration 4 years ago.

In one of the key positions at the Agriculture Department during the past 4 years, Jim Smith has left his mark on the Nation in such sensitive areas as rural housing, emergency relief, and the many other programs that relate directly to our great rural American backbone.

We thank Jim Smith for his services, we wish him well, and we hope for the sake of his friends and the Nation, that he hurries back to the arena of public service where he is needed.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a hearty thanks to our former colleague, James Smith, who will be leaving Washington soon to return to his home in Oklahoma.

First as a Representative from the Sooner State, and for the past 4 years as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, Jim has made an outstanding contribution to the people of our country.

Particularly the people of rural America have benefited from his service. In Congress, Jim always defended the interests of farmers and people of rural areas. In his key position in the Department of Agriculture, he has contributed greatly to laying the groundwork of the rebuilding of the depressed rural areas of our country.

Thanks to him, many poor rural people now live in their own homes. Many farmers, desperately in need of assistance to continue their operation, received help under his guidance.

I salute James Smith, a great public servant and a fine gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of California. 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 my special order honoring Mr. James V. Smith.

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

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of hours now Melvin R. Laird will leave the Pentagon, as Secretary of Defense, for the last time. He leaves behind him a great record in the Cabinet and in this House of Representatives and will retire, at least temporarily, into private life.

Mel Laird came to this House in 1953. He put his heart into his work here for the 16 years which ended, early in 1969. I suspect that his heart is still here in the House. He accepted the important assignment as Secretary of Defense with the greatest reluctance, and only after having been convinced by the President-elect that he had a duty and a responsibility to undertake this position for which he was so well qualified.

I suggest that no Secretary of Defense within our memory has entered into that position with a greater feeling of confidence by his colleagues in the Congress, and that no Secretary of Defense has left that office with his head higher, with greater confidence on the part of the Congress and on the part of the American people than has Melvin Laird. When he took on this assignment, Mel Laird referred to it as "political graveyard." And yet I think it is safe to say that Mel Laird leaves the Pentagon after 4 years with such general recognition of his accomplishments and with such widespread respect, that he leaves it a stronger man than he was when he entered it. This in itself is almost a miracle, for he managed to reduce the Defense budget while at the same time reoriented that Depart-

ment toward modernization. He succeeded in reducing the Defense expenditures in relation to the other expenditures of the Federal Government, to less than one-third.

In terms of constant dollars, the Defense Budget is the lowest that it has been in a score of years. All this, while the portion of defense dollars for personal services has risen to 56 percent.

He left his imprint there. He was the Secretary of Defense. He ran the Department. He used his congressional experience, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for many years, to assure that his control of the Pentagon would not be stymied by the chiefs of the uniform services. Yet, in tactical and predominantly military areas, he gave added responsibility to those who wore the military uniform. He gave the military leaders his confidence, and they responded to the responsibility of that confidence, they devoted themselves to the objectives which Secretary Laird had outlined for them.

As Secretary of Defense, he was the effective architect of the Vietnamization program which has been for all practical purposes completed. He was the driving force behind the concept of an all volunteer force, now well on the way to fruition by July 1. His was an effective voice in the arms limitations, negotiations, and agreements. He was the guiding force in building an effective modernized reserved force. He initiated scores of management changes so that defense dollars would be better spent. It was he who insisted that we pick up the slack from our preoccupation in Southeast Asia, that research development and evaluation be made meaningful, that technological advances be exploited, and that modernization be emphasized. He sold his concepts to his former colleagues of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, before yielding to some of my colleagues who have asked to join in this tribute to Mel Laird, I want to express my personal thanks to Mel Laird for what he has done for the defense of this country, and for our country generally. I cannot help but feel that private citizen Mel Laird will be motivated, in the near future, to be of further service to his country.

I yield first to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in my time in the House of Representatives I do not believe I have known a more able Member than our former colleague Mel Laird. He became an extremely influential member of the House Committee on Appropriations, serving as ranking Republican member on the Defense Subcommittee and on the HEW-Labor Subcommittee. He knew his subject matter as well as anybody in the House of Representatives.

He has been equally effective as the Secretary of Defense.

I read Tuesday in the Washington Post a column by David Broder, an astute political reporter, who concluded his praise for Mel with this observation:

> In his two decades in Washington, there have been few men in either party who have thought harder than Laird about the objectives of government or have worked more skillfully than he has on the politics of party responsibility necessary to accomplish them. If this is in fact his swan song, American politics is diminished by his departure.

In this week's edition of Newsweek there is more evidence of the rapport and credibility which Mel had developed with the news media who cover the Department of Defense. I quote the article:

> It was time for the Pentagon reporters to say good-by to departing Cabinet member Melvin Laird—after four years and 194 press conferences at which the impregnable Defense Secretary had consistently stopped the newsmen's slashing offense for no gain. Their farewell present to him was a football inscribed "Laird 194, Press 0."

Let me assure my colleagues that anyone who has been Secretary of Defense for 4 years and who has ended up with the confidence of the news reporters who cover the Pentagon deserves a great round of applause and appreciation. They are tough news people over there, and they should be. For Mel Laird to leave that hot job with that kind of respect and recognition indicates clearly that he has done a superb job as Secretary of Defense for the past 4 years.

We have missed Mel in the House during this 4-year period, but I have felt better that he was Secretary of Defense during this critical span of time.

In my judgment Mel Laird will do superbly well in any job he undertakes, whether it be in the House, in the Pentagon, or elsewhere. I wish him well in the years ahead, and I thank him for the great job he has done for the country all the time he served in the Congress and as a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I appreciate the comments of the minority leader relating to our mutual friend and a man we jointly admire.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend my colleague from Wisconsin for taking note of the distinguished service to the country of our friend Mel Laird, Secretary of Defense.

The President made a wise decision when he selected Mel Laird, a leader in the House of Representatives, to assume the role of Secretary of Defense. At times Congress is criticized as a body. Some critics tend to believe that the appointees of the executive branch are more competent than the elected officials of the legislative branch. Mel Laird, by stepping from this body into the second most difficult job in the executive branch and performing well, has proved once again the high level of competence of the Members of the House.

No Secretary of Defense was better trained for the position than was Mel Laird. Mel was a member of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations. He participated in the lengthy and detailed hearings of that subcommittee. He wrestled with the major national security decisions that had to be made. He became thoroughly acquainted with the many problems facing the Department of Defense. His background has served him well during his tenure as Secretary.

Secretary Laird has dealt skillfully and effectively with the great problems which have faced the Department of Defense over the last 4 years.

These have not been easy years. The unpopular war in Southeast Asia has continued. The change from a military force composed of personnel acquired through the draft to an all volunteer military force has been implemented in large part. At a time when the unpopularity of the war has led to a lack of popularity in some quarters for all things military, Secretary Laird has kept the Department of Defense on an even keel and has been able to maintain the necessary level of military strength.

Mel Laird coined the term "Vietnamization" and has carried out this program of strengthening the South Vietnamese with military supplies and equipment so that U.S. ground forces could be disengaged from the war. We had supplied much materiel to the South Vietnamese long before Mr. Laird became Secretary but he gave emphasis to this means of winding down the war.

As the war has been winding down, there have been substantial reductions made in military manpower. In 1969 we had 3.5 million military personnel. Today we have 2.4 million military personnel. In times when such reductions are made there is great turbulence among military personnel and difficult situations arise. Secretary Laird has steered the Department through this difficult period of retrenchment with a minimum of adverse effect on the individuals involved.

I have not agreed with everything that Secretary Laird has advocated during his tenure as Secretary but I have never fully agreed with everything advocated by any other Secretary of Defense. In the great and complex arena of Defense spending there is much room for differences of opinion. Congress has made some significant reductions in the defense budgets which have been submitted by Mr. Laird, but for the most part, on the major issues there has been general agreement. Certainly, we have been in agreement on the basic premise that sufficient military strength is the necessary cornerstone of our national well-being.

During his service as Secretary, the cooperation and the mutual understanding between the Department of Defense and the Congress has been of the highest order. The Secretary understands Congress and those of us who have worked with him for so many years understand the Secretary. We have always been able to work out our differences in an agreeable way.

I can understand Mel's desire to step down as Secretary of Defense. It is a job which no man could continue for many years. The demands are relentless and unmerciful. Still, I wish that we could look forward to continued years of working with our good friend. I do not know his future plans but I wish him well. He is a man of great ability and great understanding. He was a valuable national

servant when he served in this House. He has been a valuable national servant as Secretary of Defense.

I wish to salute Secretary Laird as he prepares to leave his important post and wish him great success in his future endeavors in behalf of mankind.

I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the ranking minority member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I count our retiring Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird, as one of my closest friends, dating back to our first meeting after my election to the 84th Congress.

I think of Mel, through our association on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense and later when he left to take over the Defense Department, as a brilliant mathematician and tactician. I was elated to note the recognition accorded to him just the other day by David S. Broder in the Washington Post, which is as follows:

THE DEPARTURE OF A POLITICIAN

(By David S. Broder)

The three most successful politicians in the first Nixon cabinet—John Volpe, George Romney and Melvin Laird—are stepping down this week, taking with them a half-century of public service experience the President has decided he can do without.

Volpe, who might have been Vice President today had he had a powerful advocate in the inner circle when the choice came down to him and Spiro Agnew in Miami Beach, is leaving the Transportation Department to become ambassador to Rome.

Romney, who might have been President today had he been able to articulate his Vietnam views as well as he finally came to understand that tragic war, is quitting Housing and Urban Development to found a vaguely defined public interest group.

And Laird, who at age 50 ought to have more of a political future than any of them, is retiring from the Defense Department saying, "it will be a long time before I do anything in politics or government again."

Because Romney and Volpe both have reached normal retirement age, it is the case of Laird—a man whose whole life has been politics and government—that is most interesting.

He's been in public office continuously since 1946, when he was elected to the Wisconsin state senate seat his father had held before him. He spent 16 years in the House, rising to the No. 3 leadership job and a position of influence in the national Republican party, before his friend, Richard Nixon, recruited him for the Pentagon post, when no prominent Democrat could be persuaded to take the job.

By the consensus of the reporters who have covered him, Laird has shown that a professional politician is no worse equipped—and may be better—to manage the sprawling military bureaucracy than the businessmen and lawyers who preceded him in the job.

If his term was marked by the Mylai controversy and the Lockheed bail-out (both, he notes, the fallout, from actions taken in the previous administration), it also saw significant reductions in Vietnam casualties and military manpower and preparations made for an all-volunteer army.

It takes a degree of cynicism and duplicity to survive in the Pentagon-Congress power struggle, and Laird is a politician who has an ample supply of those qualities. But over the years, he has managed to make clear his central purposes, as distinguished from his short-term tactics, and his central purpose as Defense Secretary has been to end American involvement in Vietnam and save our defense establishment from the public censure that war has surely brought on all things military.

Having lobbied semi-publicly within the administration for four years for faster American withdrawal from Vietnam he was, to put it mildly, distressed at the breakdown of the Paris negotiations last month. So he used his closing testimony to Congress last week to give the congressional "doves" the strongest argument they could use to press for a settlement—a statement by our ranking defense official that the American presence is no longer needed to protect South Vietnam.

Laird's reasons for retirement are several. He believes his identification with Vietnam and military spending a major handicap to a political comeback in Wisconsin, where Democrats now hold his old House seat, both Senate seats and the governorship.

He has also learned—as others have before him, in an aspect of Washington life that is too often overlooked—that public responsibilities can entail heavy personal costs. During the four years Laird has been going up to Capitol Hill to justify the war and justify spending on weapons development, he has been going home to a household that includes three high school and college-age children, who are very much part of their own generation.

"We have no fence to hide behind," Laird has remarked, "and we don't want one." On the contrary, his front lawn has been fair game for anti-war demonstrators and his living room has been open to his children's friends, who have not hesitated to voice their own views.

So having given Mr. Nixon the four years he promised him, having delivered (in his view) on his promise to make Vietnamization work well enough to permit a complete American withdrawal, Laird is leaving—with no regrets and a considerable sense of relief.

He has a pension coming from Congress and some interesting academic and business offers, and during the three month vacation he's promised himself, he'll have time to think again about that judgment that he's finished with politics and government.

In his two decades in Washington, there have been few men in either party who have thought harder than Laird about the objectives of government or have worked more skillfully than he has on the politics of party responsibility necessary to accomplish them.

If this is in fact his swan song, American politics is diminished by his departure.

I have another image of Mel, as a man with a wonderful sense of humor and complete guilelessness. He more than meets the high all-round criteria we in the Midwest use to measure a man. The so-called Eastern establishment may revere Mel's prowess as a lawmaker and a great Government leader. In our area of the country we place great stress on another quality—that of being genuine—and Mel certainly possesses this quality. I can say in all honesty that I have never met a man to whom pomposity and pretentiousness would be more foreign. At one time, his office was across the hall, and my staff still chuckles over the lighthearted raillery played back and forth.

David Broder mentions Mel's prodigy and progeny, but no tribute to him would be earnestly considered by those who know him without bestowing great praise on his charming and gracious wife, Barbara, for she is the powerful and *vital* elixir required to complete this magnum opus.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) for his generous remarks concerning our former colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI), the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our colleague, GLENN DAVIS, for taking a special order to pay tribute to our former colleague, Secretary Melvin Laird. It is indeed a privilege and pleasure to participate in this special order since I have known our former distinguished colleague even before he arrived to join this august body. Indeed, I served with his illustrious father in the Wisconsin State Senate. It is there that I met Mel for the first time. It is also my pleasure to know his mother and entire family, particularly his wife, Barbara.

Melvin Laird's entire adult life has been that of a dedicated politician and government official. At the young age of 25 he succeeded his father as a State senator. In 1952 he was first elected to represent the people of the Seventh District of Wisconsin in Congress, a district which he successfully and ably represented until his appointment as Secretary of Defense in 1969. He was an able member of this House and served well as a member of the Appropriations Committee and Subcommittees on Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare. His dedication to the national security of our Nation is well known. He has demonstrated this as an outstanding Secretary of Defense.

As evidenced by the consensus of the many distinguished Members participating in this special order today, Melvin Laird's more than 25 years of public service capped by the last 4 years as Secretary of Defense were dedicated to serving the best interests of the American people by assuring the safety and security of our country in the years ahead. In such an endeavor conflicts and differences of opinion are inevitable, yet there should be no doubt about Mel's many fine contributions to our society as a Member of Congress from 1952–1969, and as Secretary of Defense from 1969 to his retirement tomorrow. As Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird should especially be noted for his persistent and successful efforts to significantly reduce our involvement and casualties in Vietnam as well as his successful efforts in establishing the groundwork for an all-volunteer army.

With his retirement from political life this week, I am sure that Melvin Laird will bring the same amount of energy and enthusiasm in his private life as he had in his political life.

Mr. Speaker, I noted that our colleague GLENN DAVIS has stated that Melvin Laird is temporarily leaving public office to return to private practice. His past record, his love for his country and certainly since he is a young man, undoubtedly indicate that he will return to serve his community, his State, or the Nation. It is a privilege to join with my colleagues in saluting our former colleague, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird for a job well done. My wife joins me in extending good wishes and Godspeed to Mel, his lovely wife, Barbara, and his family in their future endeavors.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin has made many contributions to the Nation. The Badger State has sent many men and women to Washington who have distinguished themselves in service to their country.

Since the days of Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., no Wisconsin citizen has had such an outstanding and positive impact in the Nation's capital as the man we honor today, Mel Laird. Since the days when I served with Mel in the Wisconsin Legislature and continuing through our service as colleagues in the House for many years, I have come to know and deeply respect the intensity, practicality, intelligence, and basic humanity which are dominating character attributes of our retiring Secretary of Defense.

Today, we are paying tribute principally to Mel Laird for his management of the sprawling Defense Department. "Mission Impossible" it would have been called 4 years ago if some had challenged the then-incoming Secretary Laird to withdraw our half-million-plus men from a deadly engagement in South Vietnamese jungles where 300 were dying every week, or challenged him to convert our unfair and exemption-laden draft system into an all-volunteer army, or challenged him to modernize the Navy and develop a new generation of modern defensive systems while reducing the military budget from 45 percent of the total budget to 31 percent. But Mel Laird has accomplished all this.

Beyond this, his counsel with the President, utilizing his vast knowledge acquired during his distinguished career on the Hill, moved the administration to adopt and push through the Congress the historic Federal revenue-sharing program which he had introduced in the mid-1960's. I am sure that his continuing interest in the health field played a part in persuading the President to press successfully for a broad new program to attack the cancer problem.

I was amused, though not surprised, to read the press accounts of Mel's last news conference when reporters presented him with a football inscribed: "Laird 194, Press 0." This, I took it, was not to mean that the Secretary had been unresponsive to press inquiries, but in admiration of the consistent brilliance and sure-footed handling of a difficult and sensitive role by Secretary Laird. Those of us who have known and worked with Mel have never doubted his capacity to handle what most observers regard as the second toughest job in Washington. He would be eminently qualified to move the one step to the top of the ladder should his services be required.

It can only be hoped that a man of such magnificent accomplishment will continue to offer his talents and his energies through further public service. Many have described the Defense post as a political graveyard. Mel knew this when he accepted the Presidential call 4 years ago. But, under Mel Laird, the orientation of the Defense Department has changed from emphasis on bigger armies and stockpiles of weapons to one of vastly improved conditions for servicemen, reduction of the military forces, and a paving of the way to negotiated mutual arms reduction foreshadowing a generation of peace. It would be a tragedy for our system of government as well as for the future of our country if such an able public servant were discouraged or prevented from making the important future contributions of which he is capable.

Melvin Laird is an extremely able and well-informed advocate of any cause that he undertakes. He was an industrious advocate in his service in the State Senate, as he was in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we in Wisconsin are very proud of his contributions. I am pleased to join in the commendation of his service on the floor of the House here today.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for this privilege, and it is a "privilege" to say to my colleagues and for the record, some of the fine things that my friend Mel Laird so richly deserves.

It was my good fortune to serve with Melvin R. Laird on two different subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations for many, years. I do not know in my experience here with the number of people that I have served with of anyone who has shown more ability, more poise, more devotion to duty with a smile than has Mel Laird.

He has a pleasing personality; he can differ with you without rancor and stand for his position without making you feel bad because you differ.

I did not believe it is possible for anyone to have served with as many people in Congress as Mel Laird and still go to the position of Secretary of Defense with the good will of all of his colleagues, but he did.

Not only did he carry with him a wonderful experience here where he had shown outstanding ability, but he took on what is probably the hardest job in the world and handled it well. He handled it with integrity, ability, and again with that pleasing smile that he has.

He served in an area which is not entirely without controversy with the press and with his colleagues in the Congress and yet with all his many problems, but he handled with credit to himself. He did his job in a fine way.

Those of us who know him are not surprised. We shall miss him in the position that he filled so ably. We can only say that we cannot differ with his choice. It is a 24-hour-a-day job. We can say now that we wish for him and for his family the greatest success, and many years of happiness.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his kind remarks, and I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona, a long-time personal friend of the departing Secretary of Defense and a former colleague of his on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird has done an outstanding job as Secretary of Defense. He took over the Department of Defense in the middle of a very unpopular war, and at a time that the morale of much of our Armed Forces was quite low. There was indirection, because no one had determined the proper course we should take in this war. There was also the feeling on the part of many of us that in prosecuting the Vietnamese war we were allowing our country to fall behind in its state of preparedness as against incursions by the Communist world, both conventional and nuclear.

Secretary Laird acted immediately to set the course which the Department of Defense followed resolutely for the next 4 years. With President Nixon, he announced the policy of Vietnamization which has resulted in more than 500,000 American troops being withdrawn from Indochina. The consideration he has shown for the uniformed services and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as all the members of the defense establishment, has raised morale to a high point. Where there was indirection, he has given direction, and the result is that we are once again moving into a position of deterrence vis-a-vis the Communist world which is best calculated to insure against an attack on us or our allies.

Melvin Laird is many things. He is first of all a good and faithful friend. He is a patriotic American. He is a Republican. He is accomplished in the arts of legislation—a skill which he acquired during his 16 years of service in the House of Representatives. This ability has allowed him to deal effectively and amicably with the Members of the House and Senate

who are most directly interested in defense matters.

Melvin Laird started his tour of duty as Secretary of Defense with a host of friends on Capitol Hill. I can truthfully say that in my opinion this host of friends has multiplied. He leaves behind him the respect and admiration of every Member of the House who knows him well. With him goes our gratitude for the wonderful job he has done for the defense of our country and our way of life.

Mel could not have done the things he has accomplished without the active help of his fine wife Barbara Masters Laird. Barbara Laird is truly one of the great ladies of our time. She has been unswerving in her devotion to Melvin Laird, and to the great task which they assumed jointly and carried out so beautifully together. To both Barb and Mel, Betty and I extend our congratulations and our gratitude for the job they have done, and for their friendship, which we value so highly.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished gentleman for that wonderful tribute, and I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and others in a well-deserved bipartisan tribute to an outstanding former colleague of ours, the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, of the State of Wisconsin.

Mel Laird and I came to the Congress in the 83d Congress. During the time that he and I served together I came to have a marked respect and admiration for Mel Laird, for his integrity, his character, and his ability.

Mel Laird mastered the art and science of the appropriations process as well as any Member with whom I have served on the Committee on Appropriations. He was a recognized expert in the appropriations process as it related to general government, and especially to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Defense, on which two subcommittees he served as ranking member, and whose contributions to the work of our committee and to the entire work of the Congress were recognized then and will be long remembered.

He has served with honor and distinction as Secretary of Defense, which is probably one of the most difficult positions in the executive branch of our Government. He has acquitted himself well. He has reflected the highest credit upon the executive branch of the Government and the Department which he has headed so ably and so well.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here today in wishing Mel Laird success and Godspeed in whatever future endeavors he selects. He has served his country well. He served this House of Representatives well. He has been an outstanding Secretary of Defense. Our best wishes shall accompany him, his wife, Barbara, and their children, as he retires from public life into private life. We wish him well, and we thank him for what he has done for his Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his remarks, and I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it is exceedingly difficult for me to express not only my profound thanks to Mel Laird for a job well done, but my very deep respect and affection to a man who for 15 years has been a close personal friend and one who has been counsellor, guide, and a second father to me.

Mel Laird has served magnificently as Secretary of Defense, and he will be remembered as one of the best Secretaries of Defense that has ever served in that position. More than that, he will always be remembered as a legislator, and one who has done an outstanding job in the House of Representatives from the Seventh District of Wisconsin. I know of no greater tribute that any man can receive than that given by his own constituents who remember him so well. When I talk to people in those counties that I now have the honor to represent that are now in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, but which were then in the Seventh, and as one of them said to me recently, "Bill, we think you will do a good job, but if you are only half as good as Mel Laird then we think you will have done a fine job." That is the kind of man that Mel Laird is.

My wife, Janet, has asked to join with me in extending to Barbara and Mel our very best wishes for their future.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) for arranging this special order in honor of our outgoing Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird.

Mel has successfully completed 4 full years at the helm of the most difficult position in the Cabinet. Not only are the administrative responsibilities staggering, but the Secretary of Defense must also carry the heavy burden of maintaining our Nation's defense capability. In recent years, these duties have been made all the more complex by the need to convert the Defense Establishment from a wartime to a peacetime posture.

Mel handled his responsibilities with dedication, savvy, and consummate skill. He will be remembered best for the innovations he promoted in the manpower field. The Defense Department human goals program stands as a model for any employer. Important reforms were initiated to make the military justice system operate with a greater degree of equity. At his direction, the armed services began paying greater attention to the needs of the individual soldier—improvements in housing, medical, and recreational facilities were accompanied by the growth of enlisted and junior officer streamlined grievance procedures, and an independent inspector general system. History will record that his greatest achievement was to preside over the termination of the draft. Mel was a leader in this effort, educating the country on the need to end compulsory military service. As he told a group of delegates to Boy's Nation:

> Since 1939, the manpower requirements for our national security programs had been fulfilled through the use of Selective Service and this was nothing more than conscript labor and not adequately paying or compensating the young men and women that were in military service. . . .
>
> . . . we are now carrying in the Defense budget for the first time the true labor costs of our Department, and this is how it should be because we want to move away from Selective Service to volunteer service. . . . We believe that the young people that desire to choose a military career should be paid just as adequately as any other person in our society, and that's part of the tradition of our country. Volunteerism is the best manner in which we can provide for the national security requirements of our country in the future. . . .

Mel has succeeded in leading the transition to a peacetime force because he had the political perspective to understand the proper place for defense matters in the post-Vietnam environment. We in the Congress will miss his wise counsel at Defense—but we know his superior abilities will lead him to success in whichever new endeavor he chooses.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun recently carried a column by Mr. Nick Thimmesch praising Mel's tenure as Secretary of Defense. I include it along with a piece from the Milwaukee Sentinel in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 16, 1973]

LAIRD WILL BE MISSED AS DEFENSE SECRETARY

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—This is Melvin R. Laird's last week as defense secretary, and he's relieved in more ways than one. The biggest burden off his shoulders is one he helped place there himself—"Vietnamization" of the war, a method concurrent with the potentially quicker-acting negotiations route.

Turning the war over to the South Vietnamese, and equipping them for it, is a rougher go because it involves military force and a good ration of hope. But Mr. Laird remains convinced that Vietnamization is a credible program. Peace settlements, after all, are written on perishable paper. Indochina, after all, has been warring for 30 years, and some fighting will likely continue.

He can take satisfaction that the United States military is nearly out of the war, that North Vietnam's aggressive school of communism was set back and that communism's "big boys"—the Soviet Union and China—changed their thinking about Hanoi's bloody adventure.

There was a topical fuss here last week when Mr. Laird told Congress that U.S. involvement in the war could be terminated (providing our prisoners of war are returned and the missing-in-action accounted for) because South Vietnam can now provide its own "in-country security."

With the anxious focus on the Paris negotiations, Mr. Laird's view was interpreted as askew of administration policy. Not so. Mr. Laird was only repeating what he had stated many times, that once South Vietnam could defend itself, and the POW and MIA issues were settled, there would be no need for U.S. military involvement. This is the military path to getting the United States out of Vietnam (but not Asia). Henry A. Kissinger's track is negotiations.

South Vietnam's Army numbers more than 1 million, its Air Force is the world's fifth largest and will receive a batch of new jet fighters, North Vietnamese military actions

win headlines but not many battles, Mr. Laird insists. The United States, he says, is careful not to equip South Vitenam with an air force that could raid the North. Similarly, the Russians have not given North Vietnam any planes that could hit Saigon.

Mr. Laird acknowledges that the enormous U.S. bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong last month was a punishing political move to get North Vietnam back to the bargaining table. He sees the renewed bombing as a continuation of the policy enunciated by President Nixon last May 8, says B-52's had to be used because of bad weather conditions. He acknowledges the intensity and the inherent possibility of operational mistakes in such bombing, and that it (the bombing) can go on indefinitely.

If one uses Mr. Laird's yardstick on South Vietnam's ability to defend itself, the B–52 bombing runs in the North are not necessary for South Vietnam's survival. And if the peace negotiations were "99 per cent settled," as Dr. Kissinger announced October 26, that POW issue Mr. Laird cites is an awfully big 1 per cent.

In truth, the B–52 bombing is punishment, and the POW issue deserves a far higher percentage. When pressed though, Mr. Laird draws on his unquestioned political skills to say he can not find anyone in the republic who wants to withdraw all U.S. military forces and leave the POW's and MIA's behind. Moreover, leaving Vietnam, according to Mr. Laird, does not mean leaving Asia. Half of the 1.2 million United States military forces that were in Asia in 1969 are still there.

Mr. Laird is equally artful in explaining the wherebouts of the $24 billion "peace dividend," a result of the Vietnam winddown and other cutbacks. The way he tells it, pay increases authorized by Congress for military and civil service personnel took $16.3 billion, and inflation ate up $6.2 billion.

Mr. Laird also argues that 1973 defense spending is the lowest "in real terms" since 1951, and now only accounts for 20 percent of all public spending, and 6 per cent of the gross national product. He says stories charging billions squandered on defense systems are myths, and says the General Accounting Office reports that defense contractors' return of 4.3 per cent profit before taxes is "significantly lower than on comparable commercial work."

Despite the loud chorus against the military, Mr. Laird was able to sell Congress on about everything the Defense Department wanted in the past three years, including the ABM, the B–1 bomber, two nuclear carriers and new submarine programs. Mr. Laird almost got Congress to purr, and that is some accomplishment when Vietnam is such a wearing subject.

He is the one and only bona fide politician to occupy the defense secretary's chair, and his record shows that political skill remains a powerful tool. You kind of know Mel Laird is putting you on a little bit, and respect him for tipping you in a subtle way that he is doing it. He will be missed around here.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Jan. 15, 1973]

LAIRD HELPED MOLD VIET POLICY

(By Larry Tarnoff)

In August, 1964, the House of Representatives gave its overwhelming support to President Lyndon B. Johnson's actions in retaliation to attacks against US naval forces off the coast of North Vietnam.

Melvin R. Laird, then the Republican representative from Wisconsin's 7th Congressional District, was one of 416 members of the House to vote for what later became known as the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution—the resolution that opened the floodgates to the massive involvement of the United States in the war in Southeast Asia.

A little less than 5½ years after that fateful vote in the House, Laird reluctantly relinquished the seat he had held in Congress since 1952 and surrendered his dream of becoming speaker of the House to take on the ominous task of secretary of defense in the cabinet of Richard M. Nixon.

POLITICALLY ORIENTED

For Laird, an intense, politically oriented man, the decision must have been a difficult one. The job of running the Pentagon was historically a political dead end. As Warren P. Knowles, then governor of Wisconsin, told him, "God, Mel, that's no way to enhance your career."

But Laird, the second ranking Republican in the House, felt he had to accept Nixon's offer. He had recommended Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) for the post, but when Jackson refused, Nixon overruled Laird's argument that he could be more helpful in the House with a Democratic majority, and Laird acquiesced.

Laird, who had a profound influence on Republican ideology during his congressional career, viewed his new job in terms of its political implications. He was the first professional politician ever named defense secretary.

Julius Duscha, director of the Washington Journalism Center, wrote in the New York Times in June, 1971, that Laird's goals were to:

"Wind the war down in Vietnam or Nixon won't be reelected. Reduce draft calls in 1970 as part of the Pentagon's effort to help elect more Republicans to Congress. Advocate an all-volunteer military in response to the increasing unpopularity of the draft. Spend as much time as possible on Capitol Hill damping down brush fires."

POPULARIZED TERM

Duscha wrote that within the Nixon administration, Laird claimed "credit for pushing the concept of turning the war over to the South Vietnameset and for popularizing the term 'Vietnamization.'

"At first, Nixon and his foreign policy, adviser, Henry Kissinger, were skeptical, but Laird persuaded the president that Vietnamization should be pursued, along with efforts to negotiate with the North Vietnamese at the Paris talks as part of a double-track approach to ending the war.

"He has been the principal spokesman within the administration for setting and announcing a firm date for the withdrawal from Vietnam of all but a garrison of perhaps 25,000 to 50,000 troops. Although he has so far lost in his efforts to persuade the president to announce a withdrawal date, he seems to have pushed as hard as he could for such a decision, privately as well as publicly," Douscha said.

It is clear that Laird wanted peace—not just at the altruistic level of peace for the sake of peace—but also at the politically pragmatic level of peace for Richard M. Nixon's sake.

POWER TO MILITARY

When Laird stepped in as defense secretary, he took the reins of power out of the hands of the Pentagon civilians and placed them in the hands of the military.

The Pentagon's top military brass had claimed they could do a better job of weapons procurement and avoid the financial disasters that occurred during the tenure of Robert S. McNamara, Laird's immediate predecessor as defense secretary.

Laird instituted a major change in the manner in which weaponry was purchased. Instead of asking the military what it wanted and making the decision himself, as his predecessors had done, Laird told the military how much it could expect to spend and allowed the services to determine how it should be spent.

But Laird, like his predecessors, was unable to hold down the spiraling costs of weapons systems. Last July, the General Accounting Office reported cost overruns of $28.7 billion on major weapons systems—an increase of $7.8 billion since a similar report was issued by that office in December, 1969.

This was probably the major defeat of his term as secretary.

Laird will earn his place in history, however, for his role in winding down the war. He will be remembered for never losing a battle with Congress over a major weapons system. His tough stance on nuclear deterrence which was used as a pawn in bargaining with the Soviet Union in the successful strategic arms limitation talks will be recalled.

Laird left Wisconsin for Congress in 1953. He took with him to Washington a philosophy molded in the classic cast of the anti-communist.

CLOSE TO GOP LINE

Throughout his career in Congress, Laird stood close to the prevalent Republican Party line. He served on the Republican platform committees at the 1952, '56 and '60 conventions and chaired that committee for the convention that nominated Barry Goldwater in 1964.

That same summer, prior to and after the Gulf of Tonkin incident, Laird's public statements, both in support and in criticism of Johnson's war policies, placed him in the house of the war hawks.

As one of the ranking House Republicans, the chairman of the House Republican conference and a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee, Laird's public statements echoed—if not shaped—the predominant party war policy of the day.

In June of 1964, Laird told newsmen that he had learned that the Johnson administration was planning to carry the war to North Vietnam. Laird said he was in favor of such a move.

"We feel that we should be prepared to move into North Vietnam," he said. "I have felt this way for some time and I am happy to say that the administration takes that same position."

FAVORED PURSUIT

He said he hoped that the administration was considering alternatives to the current war policy, including "hot pursuit" of Vietcong forces into Laos and Cambodia.

Laird also reported that the use of low yield nuclear weapons or chemicals to clear away foliage was being considered. He opposed this—not on a moral ground, but rather because of the propaganda value of such U.S. action to the enemy.

"I think if we used the chemical procedure we would be accused of going into chemical warfare and the propaganda the Communists would gain from this would be a big mistake," he said.

Laird applauded Johnson's retaliation again North Vietnam for its attack in the Gulf of Tonkin, but warned the House the U.S. "must decide whether we have the will, the capacity and the determination to win this war in Southeast Asia. If we cannot now make this decision, then the time has come for us to pull out."

INDICATED POLICY

Laird's public statements criticizing the Johnson administration's war policies and his suggestions for improving the U.S. prosecution of the war gave indications as to the type of war policy he would later develop as secretary of defense.

Early in 1965, Laird urged that the South Vietnamese be given greater authority to strike back at the Vietcong and North Vietnamese.

"It is a very serious situation," he said, "one that concerns the president greatly and all Americans. There are 27,000 Americans in

Vietnam. The policy we have now is one in which we will strike in retaliation for any strike against United States forces but we do not allow the South Vietnamese to strike against the North Vietnamese on their own.

"I believe this policy is faulty and we should allow the South Vietnamese to use the same rules of warfare that the North Vietnamese use," he said.

WARY OF LIMITS

Laird was wary of the US becoming involved in a war in which the military would be handcuffed as to its strategic alternatives. Early in the fighting he urged that the US "either fight or get out." At that time, February, 1965, he said Johnson's policies "will not lead to victory."

He said that if the US chose to remain in Vietnam, it would "have to step up our efforts materially and allow the South Vietnamese to step up their effort."

But in the same breath, Laird said that "based on our present experiences, I believe it would be much better for Americans not to get involved in this kind of shooting war in this particular area of the world."

As secretary of defense, Laird was credited with instigating the great public outcry on behalf of American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam.

However, one of his first public statements on the POW issue, which may or may not have been misinterpreted, was met with criticism.

URGED DECLARATION

In November, 1965, Laird urged that the US declare war against North Vietnam as a measure aimed at guaranteeing the safety of American POWs. He said that this would be a "compelling influence on the enemy" to provide POWs the safety guaranteed by international treaty.

"That's the only reason I would support it (a declaration of war)," he said.

Louis Hanson, then head of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin, termed Laird the "head of the war hawks" in the House and said, in reaction to Laird's statement, that "he (Laird) is so anxious for us to get into war with Red China and Russia that he can't restrain himself."

Laird responded that he was against getting into a land war in Asia, but said it was necessary "to avoid giving the Red Chinese or the Soviet Union any reason for miscalculation as to the intentions of our country."

Whether his motive was purely concern over the safety of the prisoners or was aimed at setting the question of what the US role in Indochina ought to be, is moot.

VOICED WARNING

Laird's ambivalent support of Johnson's war policies continued through 1965, although he warned that summer that Republican support might be withdrawn because of uncertainty as to how far Johnson was prepared to go in escalating the war.

Late that year, he heaped praise upon the administration for its stepped up bombing raids on North Vietnam, but at the same time urged greater use of sea power in the war.

"We think greater consideration should be given to a Kennedy type quarantine which we think would bring about the national goal of unconditional discussions with the North Vietnamese," he said.

It was with similar motives that President Nixon announced last year that he had ordered the mining of the North Vietnamese ports.

Early in 1966, Laird backed away from his support of the Johnson administration war policies. He charged the administration was guilty of "unexplained shifts of policy," citing the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, combined with the failure to see any military progress despite the commitment of 200,000 American troops to Vietnam.

Laird feared a massive American buildup in Vietnam. "Some reports suggest that American troop strength in Vietnam will be more than doubled and could exceed by 60% or more the number of troops sent by this nation to Korea," he said.

(The latter figure would have meant a troop commitment of more than 650,000 men in Vietnam. At its peak, the US had 543,000 men in Vietnam.)

Splits within the Democratic Party over the war were capitalized on by Laird in the spring of 1966 as debate centered on what form of government South Vietnam should have at the end of the war.

He stepped up his attack on Johnson's war policies that May, raising the issue that came to be known as the "credibility gap"—an issue that figured heavily in the growing distrust of the federal government in the waning months of Johnson's term.

Laird charged that the administration was trying to "conceal the hard and unpleasant facts of the conflict from the American people. . . .

END OF SUPPORT

"Grandiose schemes for transferring the Great Society to all of Asia are not straight answers to the questions on the public mind. The people want to know why we are there, how we intend to end the conflict with honor and when we may expect completion of the task," he said.

Whatever support Johnson may have thought he might receive from Laird was ended in September 1967 when Laird said that the current Johnson war policies would sooner or later result in a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

He charged that an offer by the US to withdraw its troops six months after the withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops from the south and a cessation of violence was "tantamount to turning South Vietnam over to the Communists."

Laird vigorously campaigned for Nixon. In the April, 1969, issue of Fortune magazine, Laird recalled how he came to become secretary of defense.

"When the Jackson thing fell apart," he said, "I got the call. I gave the president 20 reasons why I could be more helpful in a Congress with a Democratic majority."

CHANGES DRAMATIC

Perhaps one of the most dramatic changes in policy—and there were many—when Laird became defense secretary was the issue of the prisoners of war.

During the Johnson administration, POWs were a matter of private, delicate negotiations. Laird changed all that with his philosophy of "going public" with the POW issue.

In May, 1969, Laird appealed to the North Vietnamese to release the prisoners or at least start treating them according to the humanitarian standards set by the Geneva Convention.

It was with this beginning that the POW issue became an intense political issue, one of the key issues leading toward the settlement of the war.

Laird will be succeeded by defense secretary Elliot L. Richardson, former secretary of health, education, and welfare. Some observers feel that Nixon's selection of Richardson is a move back to a tough civilian management of the Pentagon.

While Laird's future plans have not been announced, it is certain that he won't be far from the political arena.

FOUR TURBULENT YEARS

Melvin R. Laird, who survived four of the most turbulent years ever endured by an administrator of the nation's defense programs, is now leaving that position.

Laird, whose roots are deep in Wisconsin politics, has submitted his resignation to President Nixon, fulfilling a promise that he would serve only one term as secretary of defense.

He will remain at the post, however, until Elliot L. Richardson, outgoing secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, is confirmed by the Senate as his replacement. President Nixon nominated Richardson for the defense post after Nixon's presidential landslide last November.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his kind remarks, and I now yield to a talented member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. As the only member of the Committee on Armed Services on the floor at the present time, I want to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin and the others who have spoken in paying tribute to Secretary of Defense Laird on the occasion of his departure. I think I can speak for the overwhelming majority of the members of our committee in commending the Secretary for the tremendous job he has done in a very difficult situation.

He appeared before our committee informally the other day, as the Members are aware, and spent some considerable time in discussing the current status of our defense posture, and I think, with only a couple of exceptions, Members on both sides of the aisle were warmly complimentary to him on the job he has done.

As Secretary Laird steps out of office, I feel strongly that we ought not to forget what I regard as four very significant contributions he has made in his 4 years in office.

In the first place, when he became Secretary we were faced with a situation where there had been a good deal of distrust and bitterness between the Secretary of Defense and the Congress of the United States. What Mr. Laird has done has been nothing short of remarkable in re-establishing cooperation and confidence and trust between the Congress and the Department of Defense. He may not have always given us all of the information that we wanted and maybe not always as rapidly as we wanted it; but the contrast between the confidence and cooperation that exists now and what existed under some of his predecesors was nothing short of remarkable.

Secondly, he has also restored a good deal of self-confidence in the military professional leadership within the Department of Defense itself. He did not try to put himself in the position of second guessing military officials on strictly military matters or of having so-called experts or "whiz kids" put their military judgment ahead of the military judgment of trained professional military experts in the Pentagon.

Yet, he did that without allowing a single bit of civilian control to be lost.

You cannot talk to any general or admiral in the Pentagon without knowing that Mel Laird was definitely the boss! but he still did not run roughshod over them.

Thirdly, he was the one man, more than anybody else. I believe, who has been responsible for making the Vietnamization of the Vietnam war a reality.

In recent days Members have been focusing on a number of aspects of the Vietnam war, but there has been a tendency, I am afraid, to ignore the fact that in the 4 years that Mel Laird has been Secretary our forces there have dropped from 540,000 Americans to less than 24,000; and yet he has done that without endangering the safety of the Americans still remaining in Vietnam, or compromising the independence of South Vietnam. In fact the one man who more than any other will be responsible for the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves when, God willing, a cease-fire goes into effect in Vietnam, will be Mel Laird.

Finally, he is the man who more than anybody else led the long fight for a volunteer army. It looks now as though the draft will expire on July 1, 1973. And if, after that time, we still have a force big enough and capable enough to defend our national interests, Mel Laird, once again, will be the man who will be chiefly responsible for having brought that about.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are, I believe, the four major achievements of Secretary Laird over the past 4 years. They are of course very considerable achievements, which the American people and the Members of this House will fully appreciate, and we can be grateful to Secretary Laird for what he has been able to accomplish.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for taking this time to honor Secretary Laird here in the Congress. I want to join in this tribute to Melvin R. Laird, undoubtedly a great Secretary of Defense.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from Wisconsin during one of the most trying times America has ever experienced. I know from personal experience of the magnificent job he has done in the most difficult Cabinet post we have.

Without Mel Laird's outstanding abilities and leadership, we would not be on the verge of ending the tragic Vietnam conflict. Much of the credit for making Vietnamization work, for making it possible for the United States to unravel from Southeast Asia and leave the Vietnamese in a position to handle their own defense belongs to my good friend.

Mel Laird was able to bring management to what many believed was an unmanageable military establishment; he instilled a sense of fiscal responsibility—but not at the expense of our national defense capabilities.

The awesome task of converting from a draft-oriented to an all-volunteer Army was his—and he met the challenge.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, working with Secretary Laird, I have come to admire and respect him very much both a sa person and as a truly dedicated American, and as he leaves now to pursue another career, we wish him Godspeed and the brightest of futures.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM).

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago when Melvin Laird and I came to the 83d Congress it was not long before Mel clearly demonstrated that he was a "straight shooter" and he has remained just that through all these years.

He made himself a strong arm of this body and he became a strong arm of this administration. He has been a great Congressman and a great public official as Secretary of Defense. He is truly a great American and I am so happy to have had the pleasure of knowing him and serving with him in the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend our colleague for taking this special order to pay a tribute to Melvin Laird. I feel Mel Laird has done a great service for our country as Secretary of Defense during a very troubled period in our Nation's history.

Before going to the Pentagon to assume the tremendous responsibilities that have been his for the past 4 years, his office was across the hall from mine and, of course, we got to know each other well.

He is one of the most able, hard-working, dedicated, and sincere persons that I have ever known, and yet he has never lost his feeling for his fellowman. His kindness, his warmth, and his thoughtfulness, as well as his rich sense of humor, have won him legions of friends.

Mel Laird's talents, which are many, will be sorely missed by our government which he has served with such devotion. While no one can deny that he well deserves an extended period of relaxation from the pressures he has so ably borne, it is my hope and feeling that he will again find still another role to serve our country in the years ahead.

No one has attended with greater diligence and energies to the problems that have faced our country than Mel Laird. I think we are all deeply indebted to him for his years of devoted service to our country.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is most appropriate for this body to take official note of the outstanding performance of our soon to depart Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird. He is completing 4 years of energetic, devoted, and successful service in what is called the most difficult and exhausting job in this country or, for that matter, the worst job in the whole world.

During the past 4 years we have observed a changing environment on the international scene. The United States as a leader in the "free world" has played the big part in the reorientation of this environment. The Nixon doctrine has given a new role not only to the United States but to all our allies and friends. Mel Laird has made a magnificent contribution toward the success of our new role in the world power equation by his enlightened leadership in developing and implementing the defense dimension of the Nixon doctrine.

We are no longer the police force of the free world. Through the efforts of this great American we have seen our responsibility for security of most of the nations of the world diminish as each nation has assumed more of the responsibility for the security of its own lands.

In Asia we have seen the success of Vietnamization and the return home of over a half a million of our boys from that war, largely through the capable efforts of Mel Laird. We have seen a complete U.S. Army division come home from South Korea as that Nation was able to assume more of the responsibility for its own defense—much to the credit of Mel Laird.

In Europe we have seen a stronger U.S. force developed without increasing the numbers of U.S. troops deployed there and have observed our NATO allies actively assuming more of the responsibility for their own defense both by improving their own forces and by contributing more to support the financial burden of NATO. These and the many other improvements in the NATO alliance can be directly credited to the tireless efforts of our outgoing Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird.

Nevertheless, under this aura of the Nixon doctrine and the era of negotiation instead of confrontation, Mel Laird has stood fast in insisting on a realistic nuclear deterrence which is backed up by a realistic conventional deterrence. As the Secretary of Defense stated in his final report to the Congress:

> Detente without adequate defense is delusion.

I think we all realize that we owe this fine countryman of ours a hearty thanks for a job well done in giving us that "adequate defense" on which we all depend.

Mel Laird: Heartfelt thanks, sincere congratulations, and Godspeed.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a personal friend and longtime colleague of mine I am indeed sorry to see Secretary of Defense Mel Laird step down.

It is always a source of regret when an able and gifted public servant such as Mel Laird departs from such a vital and important position as the head of our Defense Establishment.

Mel and I served together for 16 years on the Appropriations Committee and he was the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for HEW-Labor over which I have the honor of serving as chairman. Therefore, I know at first hand of his great ability as a legislator and as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I also know at first hand the marvelous job he performed over the past 4 years as Secretary of Defense, a most difficult position for any man.

President Nixon made a wise selection when he chose Mel Laird as a member of his Cabinet as Defense Secretary. I knew at the time that the announcement was made at the beginning of the President's first term in office that our Department of Defense was in good hands. And, in view of the world situation, especially in Asia, it was most important that the President pick the right man for the top job in the Defense Department and he could not have selected a better man.

Whatever Mel Laird decides to do in the future I wish him well. Our countrymen owe him a debt of gratitude for the outstanding manner he has performed both in the legislative as well as the executive branches of our Federal Government.

We can ask no more of any man than to do his very best in the public interest and Mel Laird certainly has accomplished that. I wish he and his family good luck and good health in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 Melvin R. Laird will enter private life for the first time since early 1947. On that date he will complete more than 26 years of continuous public service, first, as a member of the Wisconsin State Senate; second, as a Member of this House for 16 years; and finally, for the past 4 years, as Secretary of Defense.

To these 26 years in public life, we should add 4 years of distinguished service in the U.S. Navy.

My assessment of these 30 years is very simple: Melvin Laird's magnificent record of service to his State and Nation is virtually without parallel. It is a record for public servants to examine with admiration and envy. It is a record that contemporary and future historians should contemplate with respect and appreciation.

In politics, there is no inherent correlation between success and ability. Mel Laird has been successful—very successful; but he has also been able. He has demonstrated his extraordinary ability in every position he has held. He has shown real qualities of leadership, brainpower, and imagination. He has shown himself equal to any task. There is nothing superficial about the man or his work. He is solid and his record will withstand the most careful scrutiny.

If we closed the books on Melvin Laird on Saturday—and never heard from him again—he would have to be ranked as one of the greatest men Wisconsin has produced. His record as Secretary of Defense compares very favorably with any Cabinet officer past or present.

But what is so intriguing today, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not going to close the books on Melvin Laird. We are going to keep the books open and wait with anticipation for a new chapter in his life.

Some have suggested that Melvin Laird is a natural for president of a major corporation. Certainly he has proved his exceptional executive ability. Others have said he would be an excellent university president. This, too, makes sense.

But there are some of us who hope that Melvin Laird will not stay in private life too long, even in the best of situations. The past 30 years suggest that his destiny is in the public service—and there is no question that his State and, indeed, his country, can use his ability, his energy, his dedication, and purpose.

Whatever he decides, he will have many friends and supporters. I am honored to count myself as one of them.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this week an historic era in the annals of American defense comes to an end with the departure of Mel Laird as Secretary of Defense.

Few men have been called upon to do more for our Nation and few men could have done more than Mel Laird. At times lashed with abuse from dissidents at home, constrained by budget limitations and growing inflationary pressures, and singled out by some unthinking foreign leaders and what they term "the epitome of barbaric behavior." Mel Laird nevertheless took aim on his goals and carried forward with them—goals which he himself told us a few days ago were "peace and people."

These are noble words and a noble objective.

In striving for peace, he undertook to strengthen our South Vietnamese allies and he has succeeded. Under the President's order he sought to remove as many Americans from the field of combat as was possible and we have brought home more than half a million of them. Yet, at a time when our presence in Southeast Asia was diminishing he was also called upon to support our remaining troops with airpower and to punctuate the peace negotiations by using military might as an extension of the diplomatic pouch. Most recent reports that a peace settlement is very close is substantive proof that, when he was asked by his President to lend his all to the cause of peace, Mel Laird was not found wanting.

As for people, his record is remarkable. Pay rates of our military forces have improved markedly. Living conditions, from family housing to troop barracks, have been given top priority. He says much remains to be done but he leaves behind him a legacy of accomplishment for which every man and woman in the service, and indeed the entire Nation, should be grateful.

As a man, there is no other like Mel Laird. To me he has been a longtime friend dating back to his earliest days in the Congress. It was my honor to serve with him when he was a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Then, as now, his first concerns were for peace and people. When he left Congress 4 years ago to assume his new duties as Secretary of Defense, he took with him the admiration of his colleagues and the trust of those who knew him.

The things he has done since taking over the Defense Department have increased, not diminished, my admiration for him. My trust in his integrity, judgment, patriotism, and dedication is stronger. In every way, Mel Laird has been candid with those of us in the Congress who were privileged to be able to continue to work with him. When our defenses were in trouble, he told us. When the trouble was caused by the Department of Defense, he accepted the blame, although most often the blame was not his. When policies needed alteration he came to us and told us why change was needed and what the change was to accomplish. In short, Mel Laird laid it on the line—good or bad—and he hid nothing from us we needed to know.

Now he is about to leave his post as Secretary of Defense. We know nothing of his future plans but, as he said in his January 8 statement, he will continue to work for peace and people.

Our Nation is indebted to him. The world is indebted to Mel Laird and, no matter where he goes or what he does in the service of his Nation over the years ahead, he will take with him the gratitude of the people for what he has done to further the cause of freedom, to keep our Nation strong, and for the credit he has brought to the high office entrusted to him.

Mel Laird kept that trust. He would do no less and could do no more.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in taking note of the retirement of the Secretary, and to congratulate him on his retirement.

Seven million tons of bombs and rockets in southeast Asia later; thousands of lost lives—of both Americans and Indochinese—later; many more prisoners later; I should like to commend and congratulate Mr. Laird for finally recognizing and admitting that there is no military purpose to be served by our being in the war in Vietnam.

I can think of no better way for Mel Laird to retire from the position of Secretary of Defense. During the time of his stewardship, the lives and the hopes and the aspirations of Vietnamese, and also the lives and the hopes and aspirations of Americans, were destroyed in a war which he as Secretary of Defense joined in perpetuating. Despite the fact that this war was opposed by the Members of the Congress and by the American people, he together with the President of the United States has continued and widened it. I think it is most timely and fitting that prior to his retirement from that post, he recognized and stated to the American people that he realized that all of those years, all of those lives, all of those billions of tons of bombs, all of those billions of dollars were improperly used in participating in an illegal and immoral war, and that there is no military purpose to be served in the war in Vietnam.

I would hope that on the occasion of his retirement that the President and the Congress would heed the words of an expert, the Secretary of Defense, who has run this war for the last 4 years and would act immediately to see to it that a peace is negotiated in Vietnam and, if that peace is not negotiated, to act to cut off all funds for the war so we can secure a return of our prisoners, a return to domestic tranquility, a return to the Constitution, and a return to the right of the people of this country to use our energies and resources to feed the hungry, to clothe those who are unclothed, to house those who are unhoused.

Indeed, I hope the words uttered by Melvin Laird on the occasion of his retirement will be words that will become acts and deeds early in 1973, so that his valedictory statement will not be in vain.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to Congress in 1962 it was my good fortune to be asked to join the SOS Club, a relatively small group of Republican members who meet twice weekly and share views. My good friend the Honorable Melvin R. Laird was one of the charter members of SOS so that over the years until Mel was chosen by President Nixon to be his Secretary of Defense, it was my privilege to meet regularly with him, to get to know him personally, and to learn from his vast experience and good judgment.

Then Congressman Laird was an excellent selection for the secretaryship. For more than a decade a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, he had been granted a perspective on military operations available to few individuals in this country. As a Member of Congress his relations with the military had been friendly but never subservient. As Secretary of Defense his understanding of the congressional process was invaluable in preserving and maintaining a working rapport with those Members of the House and Senate charged with the responsibility for oversight of the Pentagon.

Mel Laird has been an outstanding Secretary of Defense through a critical period in U.S. history. Under his direction the Vietnamization program of the President has become a reality—a program, by the way, that is a conclusive answer to those critics of our President whose unjustifiable lament has been to the effect that the President's plan to end our involvement in Vietnam was a hoax. The fact of the matter is that President Nixon has disengaged virtually all U.S. forces from combat in Southeast Asia, and done so without dishonor. Mel Laird has successfully carried out this enormously important mission for which the President himself is deeply appreciative and the American people profoundly grateful.

Secretary Laird has also implemented the Nixon doctrine successfully, articulating forcefully and effectively the requirement that those nations challenged by aggression must, in the first instance, respond to the maximum of their separate resources. He has also succeeded in maximizing the concept of realistic deterrence and kept the ball rolling for the long-range research and development for the next generation B–1 supersonic manned bomber and the long-range deep-diving Trident submarine successor to our Polaris boats.

Keenly perceptive of the strategic need to maintain comparative U.S. military strength as a deterrent to aggression upon us, Secretary Laird has encouraged and preserved necessary research and development of new weapons systems, all while shaping both the fly-before-you-buy and test-before-you-fly requirements in procurement, designed to avoid the disastrously wasteful cost increases resulting from hypertechnical and nonpragmatic procurement policies of his predecessors in office.

It has been an extraordinary privilege for me to be able to know Mel Laird and to count him as a personal friend as well. The United States has been strengthened by his presence in a position of executive leadership in which he has established his competency and effectiveness as a matter of public record.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that his return to private life will prove to be but a momentary gap between his outstanding secretaryship and additional commensurate responsibilities in leadership for our country. With men like Mel Laird to draw on, it is indeed an obligation of those in a position to select, to seek him for additional public service.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow colleagues today in paying tribute to a distinguished Secretary of Defense and an eminent American, Melvin Laird.

Melvin and I were elected to the House of Representatives the same year, November 4, 1952, and served our tenure as freshmen Members during the 83d Congress. We became good friends instantly and worked in concert for more than 15 years.

There was no other Member in the House of Representatives for whom I had greater respect for his personal integrity and perspicacity of political issues. I remember Melvin Laird as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. A very articulate and conscientious ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, Congressman Laird gained valuable information which was useful to him when he resigned from Congress to become Secretary of Defense in 1969.

Because he was a former Member, Secretary Laird understood the traditions of the House and knew personally most of the Members on both sides of the aisle. Those of us in this Chamber who knew him want to extend our grateful appreciation to Secretary Laird for his courtesy and candor and for his willingness to cooperate at all times with the House Armed Services Committee in matters of defense and national security.

Melvin Laird had to assume the difficult Cabinet position of Defense Secretary during one of the most trying periods of American involvement in the much criticized Vietnamization program. Whether or not we support this program for American disengagement from Vietnam, we can all agree that Melvin Laird has carried out the implementation of this program, and has fulfilled his duties as Secretary of Defense with dedication, resourcefulness, and marked efficiency.

So, I join in this tribute to Melvin Laird to wish him well and to wish him the very best in his new venture as he departs from the Defense Department.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. 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 the Honorable Melvin R. Laird.

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

There was no objection.

WHILE CONGRESS SLEPT: BURKE'S REFLECTIONS ON THE NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL REVIVAL RENAISSANCE AND RESURGENCE

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, now that the pace of the Democratic Committee on Committees on which I serve has slackened and the majority of that committee's recommendations to the caucus have been decided on, I hope I will be permitted a few minutes to reflect upon the major issues facing this Congress as we begin the work of a new Congress. These first few days would appear to be a particularly good time to be reflective before we get bogged down in the details of one piece of legislation or another and while the feelings and opinions of our constituents are still fresh on our minds as we return to Congress from the people we are elected to represent.

As a matter of fact, far from being the vacation or brief respite that these opportunities for extensive contact with the people back home are often depicted as being, I feel that any time a Congressman can spend back in his district moving among his constituents on a day-to-day basis is one of the best safeguards we have for insuring that Government keeps in touch with the people and Congressmen and Senators do not go floating off into the rarified atmosphere that is Washington and lose touch with reality.

In returning to Washington I leave a district which is sorely troubled by the events in Southeast Asia and the way in which things seem to have taken a turn for the worst in that trouble-ridden part of the world. Just when hopes were at an all-time high that peace was just around the corner and everyone felt that they could see the light at the end of the tunnel, we seem to have unexpectedly encountered yet another bend in that seemingly endless tunnel and the light seems gone once again.

Apparently our light at the end of the tunnel was only a mirage or reflection achieved by some cleverly arranged mirrors. It is as if we were sliding back instead of moving forward toward that cherished day when we would be free at last from the national millstone that is Vietnam, that festering sore on the body politic which turns to sickness all it touches and which seems destined to go on serving as the worldly stage on which is acted out the tragedy of a great nation reduced to unending agony and torment because of the very qualities of character which were considered marks of greatness a few short years ago.

Any visitor who left this planet a few years ago to return today must be forgiven if he gains the impression that in a very real sense, the world seems further away from real peace today than it did then. Perhaps if the impression deliberately encouraged a few short months ago had not dissolved into the ashes of renewed bombings and wholesale destruction in the space of a few days the disappointment, resentment, and even anger which is felt in so many homes

across the land would not be as keenly felt as it is.

Now the cry is moving across the land again for Congress to act and act now to reassert its authority and bring this war to a swift conclusion. Those who were formerly just tired of the war and wished it would disappear are now genuinely outraged over the moral insensitivity of the administration to the wanton destruction and senseless loss of lives resulting from a policy of bombing the enemy into submission and the political insensitivity of the administration to the genuine concerns and doubts about the wisdom of such a policy shared by so many of our citizens.

In the process, in turning their attention to the Congress for assistance in this matter as democratic men and women have for decades turned to their elected representatives in the Government, the people have begun to ask some very searching and profoundly unsettling questions about the inability of their representatives to influence the course of government in mid-20th century America. What is wrong, they say, with this Congress? Why can it not make its influence felt? It seems large enough; it seems more representative than ever of every shade of opinion in our society; it certainly seems well paid enough to do the job which it was sent to do; there certainly are enough resolutions floating around and bills being passed to accomplish anything under the sun—but still the war goes on. Why? they ask. What is the problem?

In other words, after years of focusing on the war in Vietnam, the American public is at last focusing on one of the principal underlying contributing factors, namely, the erosion of congressional authority as the separate and equal branch of the Government conceived by our Founding Fathers. This erosion did not just occur overnight. It was years, if not decades, in the works in a nation which had moved a considerable distance from the agrarian ideals of a Jeffersonian democracy to the era of a vastly more complicated, highly technical, industrialized urban America of today. It was hardly surprising that there would be an accompanying shift in power from a leisurely debate of the issues in Congress to the centralized speedy decisionmaking process of the executive department. If you remember, this great concentration of power in the White House was not something which too many constitutional historians or reformers and advocates of change lamented.

As a matter of fact, it was accomplished to the cheers and near-universal approval of this element in our society. Too often, Congress had been found to stand in the way of progress, preventing needed reforms from being implemented quickly and was found resisting the rush to progress. Senators and Congressmen seemed more interested in debating and discussing the issues, oblivious of the need for immediate action to solve the Nation's pressing problems.

In other words, when you examine the fabled power of Congress in days of old, very often the power which made Congress an institution to be feared and respected was the power to say "no," the power to delay, the power to underfund. The fabled power of the pursestrings itself is very much at the root of this negative power. As long as activist Presidents were pursuing domestic and international policies of a far-seeing nature, the battle cry seemed to be "all power to the President." In the end, it took the most unpopular war in recent memory to reverse this thinking and to underline for all to see the extent to which power had shifted away from Congress and to the White House. It took Vietnam to show the American public the dangers inherent in this trend and to remind the political pundits that what Lord Acton had to say so many years ago about the nature of power and its ability to corrupt is as true today as it was then—especially anything approaching absolute power.

Thus, as I see it, the real challenge facing this Congress is the challenge to make the Constitution a relevant blueprint for Government in the 1970's. Is it possible for 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 Members of the Senate to be galvanized into a body of power with sufficient flexibility and day-to-day agility to be an active partner in our Government? While a firm "no" to any further funding to the war in Vietnam would probably meet with widespread popular approval today, there is no doubt that these same people would be complaining in a very short time if all Congress was going to be to say in the future was "no", "no," and again "no."

For once the war is ended, there is the need for our Government to address itself to all the many problems that have been building up in our cities and towns across the land while valuable economic resources were being frittered away in a tiny stretch of land in Southeast Asia. Crying out for immediate attention are such contradictory forces for attention in our society as the ever-increasing demands on our Government for social services, decent housing, decent education, a cleaner environment, and a healthier life.

At the same time, the property tax payers and rent payers of this Nation reeling under the staggering increases which have come to characterize property taxes in the past decade, are literally taking to the streets in revolt in an attempt to get immediate relief. If those who have faith in Congress are going to be vindicated in their faith, then Congress will have to provide in the very near future that it is capable of playing a role in the solution of these problems, that it is indeed an equal partner in our Government.

I, for one, do have this faith that our Constitution which has served this Nation so well for so long has as much relevance to the problems of the people of America in 1973 as it did for America in 1815 or 1848 or 1865. It must work hard and in the end, this faith is probably based on the firm conviction that it must work because if it does not work, then one of history's great efforts to introduce representative democracy into the highest levels of Government will have been proved a failure. All we would have left to hope for would be that our ruler would be benevolent. Whatever the reasons for the erosion of the power of Congress, whatever the merits or demerits of Congress when it was exercising power in the past, Congress will have only itself to blame if it does not drag itself kicking and screaming into the 1970's.

There is not a Member here who has not lived to regret the abdication of power that was implicit in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of the 1960's.

As if to prove that what could happen in foreign affairs could happen here at home, last Congress we were almost treated to what I referred to in my dissenting views to the majority report of the Ways and Means Committee on the measure to give the President authority to impose a spending ceiling, as the domestic Gulf of Tonkin resolution of the 1970's. I am more convinced than ever as I stand here today that had this power been granted, we might as well have then and there forgotten about coming back January 3. Having abdicated power in foreign affairs Congress would have been bowing out of any significant role in domestic affairs.

Fortunately, commonsense prevailed in the end and that power was denied the President and Congress retained whatever shred of respectability it has for its claim to being an equal partner in the Government. Before any more time goes by, we must begin to reassert our interest and our influence, not only to bring the war in Vietnam to a speedy conclusion, but to protect the future of much needed domestic programs which were enacted only after considerable soul-searching here in Congress and then signed into law by the President.

The spectacle this Nation has been treated to of a President seemingly determined to ignore the very laws and programs he himself signed into law in whole fields such as housing, social services, pollution, urban renewal and water and sewer facilities has been a depressing one indeed for any Member of Congress who felt he was contributing to the solution of this Nation's problems and recognizing the needs of his constituents when these problems were voted on during the last and preceding Congress.

The device of impounding funds has been employed with such a frequency in recent months that it has become perhaps the single most powerful instrument of this administration in bypassing the will of Congress. My mail is a veritable availance of complaints as one after another of my constituents find themselves eliminated or terminated from one program or another which they had been led to expect they could count on just a few weeks or months before. They turn to me as their Congressman because they want action to restore the cuts and the sad part of it is that as things are now operating here in this city, the majority of Congressmen have little alternative but to honestly admit they they are virtually powerless to act.

To be sure, a Congressman can protest, to be sure he can contact one Federal agency or the other, to be sure he can express his disagreement with the

cutbacks. But from recent experience, such protests and pleadings seem to be falling on the deaf ears of an administration determined to ignore the wishes of the people as expressed through their Representatives in Congress.

Is it any wonder then that the people's faith in their elected Representatives has been reduced to an alltime low? While the war which has little public support continues to take its toll, programs with vast popular support are nipped in the bud or left withering on the vine for lack of adequate funding. Congress must reassert itself if the people of this country are to have any faith in their Government in the weeks and months ahead. Without any further delay Congress must find a way to bring this war to a conclusion and convince the President that it is the will of the people that he cooperate. At the same time Congress must find the machinery to insure the future of programs already on the books by once again actively involving itself in the total budget process.

If cutbacks are to be made and Federal spending kept in line, a Congress which allows the President to make the all important decisions in this area abdicates power by default. For too long, committees have been content to operate within increasingly narrow lines of authority and areas of concern and in the process, lose sight of the forests for the trees. The result is only the executive department is involved with the total budget picture, and the total economy and Congress has been increasingly left out in the cold on the major economic decisions affecting this Nation.

If Congress is to be involved intimately in formulating and shaping the policies of this Nation in every vital area of concern to the Nation from its foreign affairs, and its security, to its domestic welfare and its economy, then statements about the need for involvement in such policy formulation must be translated without further delay into needed overhauls of our congressional machinery. The goal is just too important to do otherwise in the end. The future of Congress and ultimately our democracy is what is at stake and given a choice between the future of Congress or the future of any given traditional approach to doing things, there can be no hesitating in choosing Congress over tradition. Congress lives. Congress must live.

ATLANTIC UNION

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today 74 Members of the House are joining Congressmen DON FRASER and JIM WRIGHT and me in reintroducing the Atlantic Union resolution.

This resolution, almost identical with the one eloquently endorsed 6 years ago by the man who is now President of the United States, would establish an 18-member U.S. delegation of eminent citizens.

This group would be authorized to meet in convention with similar groups from other NATO nations for these purposes: first, to seek agreement on federation as the goal of the alliance; second, to fix a target date for achievement of the goal; third, to establish interim institutions needed to keep the developments on schedule.

The resolution contemplates a massive advance in political institutions, one that indeed would be historic. At the same time it is no more massive than the advances in scientific technology we witness almost daily on our television screens.

The nations of the world have developed the capability to destroy one another completely, but we have yet to build a political system which can prevent a world holocaust. We have the ability to walk among the stars, but not the social institutions which can make it safe to walk the streets and roads of this planet.

Conceivably, the convention would explore the possibility of applying the genius of our own U.S. federal system to the broader Atlantic community. A federation of these major nations of Western civilization would be formidable indeed. It would result in a political institution large enough to deal successfully with the supranational problems that now confound us.

Is the United States ready for such a venture? That same question was asked by George Washington back in 1787 as the Constitutional Convention began its meetings in Philadelphia. Brushing it aside, General Washington pressed on, exhorting the Convention to raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair.

So, we too must press forward.

Scientific development and technology rush head on quite irrespective of national boundaries. So does world economic development. The multinational corporation is commonplace. Social phenomena, such as the youth culture, are no respectors of the nation-state. Poverty and disease have never known the confines of nationality. In recent years the environmental problems of air and water pollution have plagued the West.

The choice before the NATO countries as we face each of these social, political, and economic situations is whether each country will deal individually with every problem in a piecemeal fashion strictly limited by the requirements of the nation-state, or whether a common approach can be taken. If we choose the former method, we simply put off the day of national reckoning, for without government on a scale to match multinational, intercontinental problems, societies simply cannot continue to function smoothly, and perhaps may cease to function at all. The problems are already supranational. It is up to us to develop the supranational institutions to deal adequately with them.

Are Europeans ready to consider such a bold step? I believe they are. In 1970, at the annual meetings of the North Atlantic Assembly at The Hague, I introduced a similar proposal recommending that NATO heads of government call a convention to consider the possibility of federation or other means of greater cooperation in both military and nonmilitary areas. The measure was enthusiastically embraced by most of the delegate-parliamentarians from other countries attending the Assembly meetings. In the Political Committee where it was first debated, my proposal was approved by a vote of 18 to 5. Due to a parliamentary technicality, it was not considered on the floor of the Assembly, although there was no question that it had widespread support and would have passed by a substantial margin if a vote had been taken.

The time for this initiative is now. Former President Eisenhower, who was a supporter of Atlantic Union, once told me at Gettysburg:

> We deal with the urgent questions, and leave the important ones for tomorrow.

In accepting the Republican nomination for President in 1964, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER spoke of the flowering of an Atlantic civilization:

> This is a goal more meaningful than a moon shot—a truly inspiring goal for all free men to set for themselves during the latter half of the twentieth century.
>
> I can see, and all free men must thrill to, the advance of this Atlantic civilization joined by its great ocean highway to the United States. What a destiny can be ours—to stand as a great central pillar linking Europe, the Americas, and the venerable and vital peoples and cultures of the Pacific.

Although this proposal is not new, the support for it is more impressive this year than ever before. This is the first time that the Senate majority leader and minority leader have joined on the first day in introducing the bill. In the House this is the largest number of Members who have ever cosponsored on the first day. Significantly, Majority Leader THOMAS P. O'NEILL is among them, and Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD has assured me that he will vote for it. House Conference Chairman JOHN B. ANDERSON is also a sponsor this year.

Last year the bill was passed unanimously by the Senate and reported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee by an overwhelming margin. Unfortunately, it was a victim of the rush to adjourn in the House. In the last days of the 92d Congress, it died on a tie vote in the House Rules Committee.

This is an historic moment for Atlantic Union. President Nixon is now shaping the direction and goals of his second and last term. He is the only man to endorse Atlantic Union who has subsequently become President of the United States and he has done so with great eloquence. In 1966, he told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

> To be sure the concept of an "Atlantic" is at present only a dream, but in the age of the rocket, dreams become reality with a speed which is difficult to imagine. The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption.

With the support of the leadership on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses, I am indeed optimistic that this

is the year for passage of the Atlantic Union Resolution.

If an Atlantic Union Resolution is passed, if a convention of Atlantic nations meets, if it recommends some form of Federal solution to the world problems of today, how will life for the average American be better than it is today. Abraham Lincoln said:

> The legitimate function of Government is to do for the people what they cannot do better for themselves.

How would a Federal Atlantic Union do things better for the American people than our present system?

Some who have faced the bureaucracy's red tape might say facetiously that nothing could be worse. Others might conclude that a bigger government, or more government, is the only thing that could be worse.

Both sentiments suggest that there is much to be improved in our present system. I need not burden you with tales of high taxes, inflation, poverty, unemployment, trade and monetary crises, and pollution to make my point. The question is, how could Atlantic Union deal with these problems more effectively than the efforts of individual nations. More important, how would Atlantic Union affect the life-style and life principles of the average American.

The first question is easily answered. Taxes are high because the Government spends a lot of money, perhaps too much. Inflation is a problem for the same reason. That is why this Congress has set up a Joint Committee on the Budget to find some way of controlling the appropriations and spending process.

The largest chunk of the tax dollar still goes for defense—over 30 percent. Although we bemoan the contributions of our European allies to their own defense, most of them also spend huge sums on defense. The duplication, waste, and inefficiency of such a system is tremendous.

President Eisenhower once suggested that as much as one half of the American tax dollar going for defense could be saved if the NATO allies had a truly integrated defense system under a Federal administration. This is the week that many Americans will receive their income tax forms from IRS and begin to worry over them until April 15. How much easier it would be if you knew that your taxes were going to be 15 percent lower because defense expenses were equitably shared among the citizens of NATO, and if the national security of the United States remained unimpaired—or, even, strengthened. Sounds almost like having your cake and eating it too.

The same holds true for the other shortcomings of our present system of government which I mentioned. Our trade problems with the expanded Common Market are only beginning. The monetary crisis of last year may recur again. Pollution of the Atlantic Ocean is caused by all nations which border it, European and American alike. Economic stagnation, unemployment, and poverty all are common problems of our systems.

Each of these problems must be tackled on an international scale.

Of the latter question, that is, how would the life-style and life-principles of the average American be changed by such an expanded Federal system, the answer has already in part been given. Life should be better if, as measured by its ability to effectively solve social problems, a federal system for NATO is capable of lessening the burdens upon each of its citizens.

Our American Government, however, is more than a problem-solving institution. First and foremost it is a bastion of individual liberty and freedom. The personal liberties enshrined in the Bill of Rights are perhaps the single most important contribution of American political thought to the history of mankind. The first 10 amendments are no less engraved on the cornerstone of American democracy than the Ten Commandments are engraved on the foundation of Western civilization. To alter either would surely cause the last noble experiment of mankind to crumble.

That, then, is given. Atlantic Union, a federation of the free states of the North Atlantic Alliance, would not lessen one iota the individual liberty and freedom guaranteed by our own Constitution.

It would require no more of its citizens than our own Government presently requires. Likely, it would require far less in the tax realm. It would preserve inviolate the rights which are assured us under our own Constitution.

At the same time, it would provide an institutional framework for dealing with the problems with which our own Government alone has singularly been unable to cope.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Atlantic Union Resolution and a list of both House and Senate sponsors:

ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

Whereas a more perfect union of the Charter of the United Nations gives promise of strengthening common defense, while cutting its cost, providing a stable currency for world trade, facilitating commerce of all kinds, enhancing the welfare of the people of the member nations, and increasing their capacity to aid the people of developing nations: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) The Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise, and other parliamentary democracies the convention may invite, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) a declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on federal principles;

(b) a timetable for the transition by stages to this goal; and

(c) a commission to facilities advancement toward such stages.

(2) The convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress.

(3) Not more than half of the delegation's members shall be from one political party.

(4) (a) Six of the delegates shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Leadership, six by the President of the Senate, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Leadership, and six by the President of the United States.

(b) Vacancies shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(c) The delegation shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) All members of the delegation shall be free from official instructions, and free to speak and vote individually in the convention.

(5) To promote the purposes set forth in section (1), the delegation is hereby authorized—

(a) to seek to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary;

(b) to employ and fix the compensation of such temporary professional and clerical staff as it deems necessary: Provided, That the number shall not exceed ten: And providing further, That compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress; and

(c) to pay not in excess of $100,000 toward such expenses as may be involved as a consequence of holding any meetings or conferences authorized by subparagraph (a) above.

(6) Members of the delegation, who shall serve without compensation, shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this joint resolution, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of said delegation.

(7) Not to exceed $200,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State to carry out the purposes of this resolution, payments to be made upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the delegation subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds. The delegation shall make semiannual reports to Congress accounting for all expendtiures and such other information as it deems appropriate.

(8) The delegation shall cease to exist at the expiration of the three-year period beginning on the date of the approval of this resolution.

LIST OF HOUSE CO-SPONSORS

John B. Anderson (R-Ill.), Joseph P. Addabbo (D-N.Y.), Glenn M. Anderson (D-Calif.), Thomas L. Ashley (D-Ohio), Herman Badillo (D-N.Y.), Bob Bergland (D-Minn.), Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.), John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.), Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.), Richard Bolling (D-Mo.).

Garry Brown (R-Mich.), Charles J. Carney (D-Ohio), Frank M. Clark (D-Pa.), Don H. Clausen (R-Calif.), Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.), James C. Corman (D-Calif.), Thaddeus J. Dulski (D-N.Y.), Bob Eckhardt (D-Tex.), Don Edwards (D-Calif.), Marvin L. Esch (R-Mich.).

Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.), *Paul Findley (R-Ill.), Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa.), Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.), William D. Ford (D-Mich.), Edwin B. Forsythe (R-N.J.), *Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.), Richard H. Fulton (D-Tenn), Sam Gibbons (D-Fla.), Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.).

Gilbert Gude (R-Md.), Michael Harrington (D-Mass.), James Harvey (R-Mich.), Henry Helstoski (D-N.J.), Chet Holifield (D-

Calif.), Frank Horton (R-N.Y.), Joseph E. Karth (D-Minn.), Edward I. Koch (D-N.Y.), Peter N. Kyros (D-Maine), Paul N. McCloskey (R-Calif.).

Torbert H. Macdonald (D-Mass.), John Melcher (D-Mont.), John Moakley (I-Mass.), William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.), John E. Moss (D-Calif.), Morgan F. Murphy (D-Ill.), Lucien N. Nedzi (D-Mich.), James G. O'Hara (D-Mich.), Claude Pepper (D-Fla.).

Bertram L. Podell (D-N.Y.), Richardson Preyer (D-N.C.), Melvin Price (D-Ill.), Albert H. Quie (R-Minn.), Tom Railsback (R-Ill.), Thomas M. Rees (D-Calif.), Donald W. Riegle (R-Mich.), Howard W. Robison (R-N.Y.), Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (D. N.J.).

Benjamin Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), Edward R. Roybal (D-Calif.), Philip E. Ruppe (R-Mich.), Herman Schneebeli (R-Pa.), John Seiberling (D-Ohio), Henry P. Smith, III (R-N.Y.), J. William Stanton (R-Ohio), Charles M. Teague (R-Calif.).

Frank Thompson, Jr. (D-N.J.), Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.), Jerome R. Waldie (D-Calif.), John Ware (R-Pa.), *Jim Wright (D-Tex.), Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.).

LIST OF SENATE CO-SPONSORS

Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), Henry Bellmon (R-Okla.), Wallace F. Bennett (R-Utah), Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.), Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.), Frank Church (D-Idaho), Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii), William D. Hathaway (D-Maine), Harold E. Hughes (D-Iowa).

Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.), Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.), *Gale W. McGee (D-Wyoming), George McGovern (D-S.D.), Lee Metcalf (D-Montana), Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), Hugh Scott (R-Pa.), Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), Robert Taft, Jr. (R-Ohio).

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) who has given outstanding leadership in many worthy causes, and especially to advance consideration of the Atlantic Union proposal. Without his leadership, the resolution could not possibly have received the favorable consideration it enjoyed in subcommittee and full committee of House Foreign Affairs last year. It is gratifying to see him resume this position of leadership in the 93d Congress. This quickens my hope that the resolution this year will be enacted.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of the joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation comes at a most opportune time. The need for members of parliamentary democracies to get together to explore ways of transforming their present relationships into something more durable and comprehensive increases steadily with the passage of time. Certainly we can look with deep satisfaction on the accomplishments of our present alliances and cooperative arrangements with like-minded countries of the world. Indeed, the stability of growth and continuing prosperity of the Western democracies in the postwar period is to a large extent the direct result of cooperative undertakings such as NATO, the Marshall plan, the International Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the European Common Market. But, recent developments and trends cast doubt on the adequacy of these institutions to deal effectively with the problems of international relations in the future. NATO encounters major problems, both from within and without; and as the cold war tensions of yesterday continue to ease in the era of détente, new security arrangements are being sought. International trade is becoming increasingly a bone of contention among otherwise friendly countries with talk of reprisals in the air. In it, the United States finds that many of its postwar policies have succeeded so well that our friends are no longer dependent upon us—a welcome development, but how do we insure constructive cooperation in the years ahead?

Cooperation among the industrialized democracies of the world now means an interdependence, and the alternative to interdependence is intense rivalry which can lead to the revival of old hostilities. As the material might of the industrialized democracies becomes even greater, will the national self-confidence thus gained cause a drawing back into isolation and protectionism, erecting walls between each other, undermining almost three decades of progress in collective security, political collaboration, economic cooperation, and peaceful exchange?

Clearly the need is urgent for a more comprehensive goal and institutions to strengthen the common defense of free peoples, provide for a stable currency for world trade, enhance the welfare of the peoples of member nations, and increase the capacity to aid the peoples of developing countries. A union of like-minded democratic countries, based on Federal principles would be such a goal and institution.

The resolution being introduced today does not claim to provide all the answers to these and other important quesions; it only proposes that we Americans once more take the initiative in seeking ways to insure future peace and prosperity of both our own people and the rest of the world.

This resolution enjoys the support of a very large number of our colleagues who represent both political parties and a wide range of political views. I note with special pride and pleasure that the distinguished majority leaders in the House and Senate have agreed to cosponsor the resolution.

The time is ripe for passage of this resolution and I urge all of my colleagues to join in this historic effort to lead the way toward building a new system of peaceful and prosperous international order.

* Chief sponsor

DR. WAYMAN RAMSEY FAGAN GRANT

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and to acquaint my colleagues in Congress with an outstanding resident of my District who plans soon to retire from the profession which he has served so well for the past 40 years.

He is Dr. Wayman Ramsey Fagan Grant who, for the past 18 years of his long and distinguished career, has served as principal of the Booker T. Washington Middle School in Mobile, Ala.

Dr. Grant has a lengthy list of accomplishments in education and in work for his fellow man from the date he was graduated from Tuskegee Institute in Alabama in 1932.

Dr. Grant has served both as teacher and principal throughout Alabama and in his native city of New Orleans, La. Among his many honors, Dr. Grant was the 40th president of the Alabama State Teachers Association. He also served as president of the Mobile County Teachers Association and was the first chairman of the United Negro College Fund. Dr. Grant worked extensively with the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee and the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association and was a great influence in the initiation of a long-range career guidance program in the public school system in which he most recently served.

In recognition of his tireless efforts and unselfish dedication, Dr. Grant was the recipient of an honorary doctor's degree from Daniel Payne College, Birmingham, Ala., May 20, 1960.

It is with a great deal of personal price that I extend best wishes to my friend, Dr. Grant, and wish him well. Millions of Americans have and will continue to benefit from his dedicated service.

FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Free Flow of Information Act," a bill to protect journalists from being forced to divulge sources and confidential information to government authorities. Joining me are 55 cosponsors. In addition, 20 other Members are sponsoring similar legislation.

Although I have urged the enactment of this legislation for a number of years, the need for congressional action has never been clearer than it is in 1973.

I. THE PROBLEM

The threat of Big Government dominating a once-independent media is a real one today, and one of the most alarming aspects of that threat is the problem of reporters being forced to reveal information or serve time in jail. When American reporters must choose between divulging confidential information and going to jail, American citizens—all of us—are the losers.

We suffer because the flow of information is curtailed. If potential sources cannot be assured that their identities will be protected, they will not communicate with the press.

For example, a Government employee knowing of corruption within his department will not inform a reporter about it unless he is certain that his

identity will be protected. The need for certainty is understandable: if the employee's identity is linked to the story about the corruption, he surely will lose his job. As the law stands now, however, the employee has no assurance that he can maintain a confidential relationship. Instead, it is likely that the reporter to whom he talked would have to reveal his identity or accept a potentially indefinite jail sentence. The consequence is as disturbing as it is obvious: Government employees knowing of corruption will choose to remain silent and keep their jobs, the corruption will continue, and the public will remain uninformed.

In addition, journalists who realize that they may be faced with a choice of betraying a confidence or going to jail may be deterred from pursuing contacts with sources. They may choose to avoid controversial stories and, instead, rely on "handouts." The public will read only favorable news about Government officials and agencies.

Thus, the Government power to subpena reporters creates a very real and dangerous "chilling effect" which discourages both potential sources and journalists from communicating. The free flow of information to the public is obstructed. The people know less about the realities of their Government and the society in which they live.

II. FAILURE OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE SOLUTIONS

Reporters sought protection from the judicial branch of government, but it was denied. The few cases in recent years which ruled that reporters had a right to shield confidential information from Government subpena were rendered moot by the Supreme Court decision in *Branzburg* v. *Hayes* (40 U.S.L.W. 5025) on June 29, 1972. The Court ruled, by a 5–4 margin, that the first amendment does not afford reporters the right to protect their sources and information.

The executive branch has not solved the problem either. The guidelines issued by the Attorney General in 1970 reduced tensions somewhat, but real protection was not provided. Subpenas may be issued under the guidelines, and when "emergencies and other unusual situations develop" the procedures outlined in the guidelines may be abandoned.

III. LEGISLATION: THE ONLY SOLUTION

Thus, if reporters are to be protected, and a free flow of information to the American people insured, the legislative branch must act.

Nineteen State legislatures have enacted some type of shield law for journalists, but reporters do not have statutory protection in 31 States.

At the Federal level, the first shield legislation was introduced by Senator Arthur Capper, Republican of Kansas, in 1929. Similar bills have been offered in 12 subsequent Congresses, but none has been acted upon.

The Supreme Court, acknowledging that the legislative branch was best-equipped to provide a solution, emphasized the authority of Congress to enact a Federal shield law:

At the Federal level, Congress has freedom to determine whether a statutory newsmen's privilege is necessary and desirable and to fashion standards and rules as narrow or broad as deemed necessary to address the evil discerned and, equally important, to refashion those rules as experience from time to time may dictate." (40 U.S.L.W. 5037)

IV. THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

The Free Flow of Information Act provides broad coverage. It protects reporters and those independently engaged in gathering news from being forced to reveal sources or information before any body of the Federal Government—the Congress, the courts, grand juries, and administrative agencies.

There is one specific, narrow exception to the privilege. If a reporter is a defendant in a libel suit and his defense is based on the reliability of his source, he cannot invoke the protection of the act and refuse to name his source, thereby precluding the court from examining the merits of his defense claim. In other words, this exception insures that the act will not emasculate existing libel laws.

The act also provides a means of divesting the privilege in unusual cases. A party seeking divestiture must apply for an order from the U.S. district court, and the application may be granted only if all of the following three conditions are satisfied: first, there is probable cause to believe that the person from whom the information is sought has information clearly relevant to a specific violation of the law; second, the information cannot be obtained by alternative means; and third, there is a compelling and overriding national interest in the information. This is the same standard the dissenting Justices on the Supreme Court would have established had they been in the majority in the Branzburg case.

Thus, the act provides broad protection, with a narrow libel exception and a procedure for divestiture in rare circumstances if stringent standards are satisfied.

V. CONCLUSION

I introduce the Free Flow of Information Act with the fervent hope that the Congress will enact it into law in the first session of the 93d Congress. A free and independent American press is now in jeopardy, and a nation based upon representative government cannot long survive without an unrestrained, robust press.

If the Free Flow of Information Act of 1973 or similar legislation is not enacted by the Congress, the ability of the news media to function will continue to erode to the ultimate detriment of American society. Make no mistake about the matter at hand. It is no abstract academic debate. Rather, we are confronting a matter that goes to the vitals of what the United States is.

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

Hon. Brock Adams.
Hon. Mark Andrews.
Hon. Thomas L. Ashley.
Hon. Herman Badillo.
Hon. Shirley Chisholm.
Hon. James C. Cleveland.
Hon. John C. Culver.
Hon. Mendel J. Davis.
Hon. John J. Duncan.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood.
Hon. Bill Frenzel.
Hon. Richard H. Fulton.
Hon. Gilbert Gude.
Hon. Tennyson Guyer.
Hon. Julia Butler Hansen.
Hon. Orval Hansen.
Hon. Michael Harrington.
Hon. James Harvey.
Hon. Ken Hechler.
Hon. Peter N. Kyros.
Hon. Robert L. Leggett.
Hon. William Lehman.
Hon. Norman F. Lent.
Hon. Paul N. McCloskey.
Hon. John Y. McCollister.
Hon. Mike McCormack.
Hon. Joseph M. McDade.
Hon. Robert H. Michel.
Hon. Parren J. Mitchell.
Hon. William S. Moorhead.
Hon. Charles A. Mosher.
Hon. Jerry L. Pettis.
Hon. Betram Podell.
Hon. Thomas M. Rees.
Hon. Donald W. Riegle, Jr.
Hon. Howard W. Robison.
Hon. Fred B. Rooney.
Hon. William R. Roy.
Hon. Edward R. Roybal.
Hon. Paul S. Sarbanes.
Hon. Garner E. Shriver.
Hon. J. William Stanton.
Hon. Robert H. Steele.
Hon. William A. Steiger.
Hon. Louis Stokes.
Hon. Gerry E. Studds.
Hon. Charles M. Teague.
Hon. Charles Thone.
Hon. Frank J. Thompson.
Hon. Morris K. Udall.
Hon. Guy Vander Jagt.
Hon. G. William Whitehurst.
Hon. Lester L. Wolff.
Hon. Gus Yatron.
Hon. John M. Zwach.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with several of my colleagues in introducing the Free Flow of Information Act. This bill seeks to provide a greater measure of protection to our newspeople as regards confidentiality of sources.

Over the past couple of years, this particular aspect of freedom of the press has been challenged. Last June, the Supreme Court held that first amendment guarantee of freedom of the press did not give a news reporter the right to refuse to testify before a grand jury about information given to him in confidence.

I think it is not insignificant that freedom of the press was included in the very first amendment to our Constitution. Since the time of Peter Zenger, Americans have held this right to be fundamental. It is truly one of the mainstays of our democratic form of government.

When our newspeople can no longer offer confidentiality to their sources of information, the sources of information themselves will dry up. Without a free press, we do not have the advantage of multiple sources of information and opinion. We would be dependent solely upon information provided by officialdom.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, how long must the American public endure the harassment and jailing of its citizen newsmen and reporters, whose only crimes have been attempts to protect the public's right to know. These newsmen have only acted as guardians of the free speech and free press rights as pro-

vided in the Bill of Rights to the Constitution.

When newsmen like William Farr and Peter Bridge can be jailed because they refuse to divulge their news sources, I say enough. Without the right to withhold news sources, a reporter's access to information would surely dry up and with it would also go one more news source necessary to an informed public.

If the right of the American people to know what their Government is doing is to be protected, and if government is to be conducted in an open manner, then the newsman must have the right to protect his sources of information.

That is why I am cosponsoring with Mr. Whalen a Free Flow of Information Act. This act would not only protect the reporter's privilege to withhold his sources of information before Congress, the Federal courts and grand juries, it would also protect the court system and investigatory bodies from unwarranted abuses of this privilege.

The act would establish machinery to allow any person seeking information or news sources to make application to a U.S. District Court. The person seeking the information or source would have to demonstrate that the newsman from whom the information was being sought had information relevant to a specific and probable violation of the law. In addition, it would have to be demonstrated that the information being sought could not be obtained by any other means other than a court order, and that there is a compelling and overriding national interest in the information.

This act would keep the channels for the free flow of information open to the American people. It would insure that every citizen of the United States would have accurate and complete information on which to base his actions and decisions. I believe this legislation can only lead to a more informed public. And a more informed public can only lead to better government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge speedy and careful consideration of this legislation.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation being introduced today by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) entitled the Free Flow of Information Act.

As I read the Constitution of the United States, there should be no need for the bill which we introduce today. Unfortunately of late, we have witnessed an unprecedented controversy concerning one of our most cherished rights, the freedom of the press. The integrity of our free press is the cornerstone of our democracy. Any encroachments on the sanctity of that freedom injure not only the individuals reporting the news, but do greater damage to the American public.

The citizens of our Nation must have an untrammeled right to know the facts, for it is only with broad knowledge that the people are able to continue to make the wise and responsible decisions that they have historically taken. Except in an extremely narrow class of cases, detailed in the bill, we must therefore protect the reporters of news from having to reveal the confidential sources of information, for if we do not, those sources will inevitably "dry up," and the news will become sterile repetitions of self-serving press releases. And that is not consistent with the first amendment.

The bill we introduce today will serve to reaffirm our commitment to the Bill of Rights, and will protect for the American people their right to get the full story—a right that we can not afford to have diminished. Half the truth is hardly better, and may be worse, than no truth at all.

Again, I would like to commend the able gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) for his leadership in this vital effort. I hope that many of our colleagues will join with us in this attemp to make secure the basic freedoms which are guaranteed in our Constitution.

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, the United States has no more important freedom than freedom of the press. Unless the news media have the ability to find information and to disseminate it widely, our form of Government cannot continue to exist. The shell and form of a republic might remain, but our Government will no longer be representative if the public does not have necessary information on which to form opinions.

Essential to gathering and dissemination of important information is the confidentiality of the news sources of reporters. A shield to protect reporters from being forced to reveal their sources of information is required.

Therefore, I am pleased to join the honorable gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) in cosponsoring the bill title the Free Flow of Information Act of 1973.

In February, 1971, I joined in cosponsoring a bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio that was much the same as the one introduced in this session. Hearings on this bill were not completed until October, 1972, so it was too late for action by the 92d Congress.

The need for action is greater now than when the similar bill was introduced in 1971. Those of us who supported the bill at that time thought that the rights of newsmen should be spelled out fully, even though we believed that those rights were generally guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. In July, 1972, however, the U.S. Supreme Court in a 5-to-4 decision decided that the Constitution did not guarantee such protection in all cases. Therefore, it is imperative that the 93d Congress enact legislation that will specifically protect the confidentiality of newsmen's sources.

Without such a shield much of the investigatory reporting in the Nation could wither away. If we lost that kind of reporting, it would not be the media's loss but the public's. A shield is necessary to encourage the kind of deep-digging journalism that over the years has revealed much of our Nation's wrongdoing. Through confidential sources, investigating reports have revealed serious scandals, cases of corruption and instances of rank injustice. The evils uncovered by such reporting have not been confined to Government but have also included industry, labor and nonprofit institutions.

To protect America we must protect the confidentiality of newsmen's files and sources through enactment of this legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Free Flow Information Act.

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

There was no objection.

THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support for swift legislative action on the bill which I have just introduced—the Consumer Protection Act of 1973. I have joined with my many colleagues who have sponsored this legislation because we share a common concern for providing a realistic and feasible solution to many of the problems which plague the American consumer.

The Consumer Protection Act of 1973 is in many ways landmark legislation. It provides citizens with an effective means of fighting the unfair and unconscionable acts perpetrated on the consumer by some businesses and some Government agencies. I believe it will be the strongest possible consumer protection legislation to emerge from the 93d Congress.

In April of 1971, the Committee on Government Operations held extensive hearings regarding the necessity of enacting such sweeping legislation. During those hearings several facts became abundantly clear:

First. Consumer interests were not adequately represented at Government levels where decision affecting consumer are made.

Second. There were too many instances where there is a disproportionate balance of legal remedies in favor of the seller which put the buyer at an unfair disadvantage.

Third. There were many consumer-oriented agencies and bureaus administering a myriad of statutes and regulations, but they lack the necessary coordination that would make them truly effective. There are in fact more than 200 consumer programs in 39 different Government agencies and departments.

While much of this information was now new, it dramatically underscored what I have personally observed and what my constituents have been writing to me about. Every week, I receive numerous letters from constituents, from all walks of life, asking for my assistance, because they have been unable to achieve any satisfaction regarding a complaint

they have registered against a firm or establishment that made or sold them a defective article. In effect, Mr. Speaker, their hands have been tied.

The consumer movement has undergone some very serious and practical changes in the last few years. Most of these changes have been born of necessity and self-protection. I remember that not too long ago, the "consumer movement" was just a catch-phrase that schoolchildren would hear in their economic class. Today, however, it is an active, viable, sophisticated, organized group which is anxious to have consumer problems resolved quickly and fairly and to enable buyers to receive top value for their dollars.

The various legislative proposals before local, State, and Federal governments are a result of genuine dissatisfaction on the part of the American people who have been deceived and disappointed by the business community's lack of ability and desire to regulate their merchandizing and sales practices. The bill which I am sponsoring today is by no means a panacea, but it does provide a basis on which consumers can legitimately have their interests served.

Passage of the Consumer Protection Act of 1973 would afford the people, through their Government, an opportunity to prevent defective or dangerous merchandise from being placed on the market and prevent deceptive advertising practices. Also built into this proposal is a permanent statutory body which will protect consumer interests before the various governmental agencies or departments that make decisions affecting consumers.

Clearly, the legal doctrine of caveat emptor is no longer a sufficient safeguard against sophisticated technology and deceptive advertising. The American public expects and deserves consumer protection laws that give them the strength to protect themselves.

To meet this compelling need, the Consumer Protection Act of 1973 attacks the problem on two distinct levels. Title I establishes an Office of Consumer Affairs within the Executive Office of the President. This new office is designed to coordinate the various consumer programs throughout the Federal bureaucracy.

This office will assure that consumer programs are moving in the same direction and that there will be no duplication of effort. Most importantly, title I centralizes in one office, with direct responsibility to the President, all consumer programs administered by the Federal Government.

Also, the Office of Consumer Affairs will be empowered to conduct substantive hearings and investigations into various problems facing the consumer today. Presently there is no single Federal agency with the statutory authority or manpower to hold hearings or initiate such extensive investigations.

In addition to serving as a coordinating agency, the Office of Consumer Affairs would be responsible for encouraging and developing consumer education programs throughout the local and State levels. It has always been my firm belief that the buyer should have the absolute and unqualified right to know about the quality of the product he is purchasing. Under this provision of the Consumer Protection Act of 1973 the Office of Consumer Affairs would have the necessary power to force manufacturers and dealers to make this type of basic information available.

Title II of the Consumer Protection Act establishes a much needed Consumer Protection Agency. This agency, which will be established as an independent arm in the executive branch will be empowered to represent the interests of consumers before Federal agencies and courts. By far, Mr. Speaker, this is a most important provision of the particular legislative proposal, because it is the first time a Government agency has been empowered to represent the interests of consumers at hearings and in rulemaking proceedings.

The agency also has statutory authority to intervene as a party for the purpose of representing the interests of consumers at any adjudicatory proceeding. This authority, along with the statutory authority to intervene as a party in a proceeding in a U.S. court which is reviewing action by a Federal agency will assure Americans that consumer interests are always being protected.

Title II also empowers the Consumer Protection Agency to evaluate, develop, and act on complaints to Federal or non-Federal establishments regarding consumer interests. It can if it deems necessary, propose legislation to any agency with the aim of making that agency more responsive to consumer complaints. Specific complaints regarding the testing and research of merchandise or products will also come under the direct jurisdiction of this agency.

Until now, consumers have had no formal or effective voice on consumer problems. Various agencies throughout the Federal Government protect the interests of many special interest groups. Farmers, laborers, and businessmen are all represented by various Federal agencies or departments. However, the single largest interest group in the country—the American consumer—is without direct and specific representation. I think this bill is long overdue, because it is our responsibility as lawmakers to provide a sound mechanism for the adequate representation of nonindustry public interests in the administrative process. The public confidence in consumer management and protection must be restored, and I believe the passage of the Consumer Protection Act of 1973 will be an effective first step in restoring this confidence.

A CRITIQUE OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE: A LAME HORSE IS FASTER THAN A RUPTURED EAGLE

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st Congress, I was one of the few—to be exact, one of the 29—who voted against one of the most damaging pieces of legislation ever to be approved by the "people's voice" in Government. I am referring to the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, an act which has served only one purpose—to revive the Pony Express.

After 3 futile years of diligent research and development, the U.S. Postal Service has evolved into a mass of complicated delivery routes that have set contemporary mail service back on a colonial delivery schedule. Alas, it now takes longer to deliver a letter than it did years ago, when the opposite should be the trend.

Surely you have not forgotten the recent episode of the gentleman from Philadelphia, who delivered his letter to the Washington area on horseback faster than did the postal service.

The heralded Government corporation has deliberately and methodically destroyed the age-old slogan of the postman, for today the natural disasters of rain, snow, sleet, and shine are the least of his worries. Now he must cope with the manmade disasters created by his bungling superiors: manpower cutbacks; low morale; alpine slopes of mail in sorting areas; wasted time and motion while toiling over inefficiently designed delivery routes; and last but far from least, the irate citizenry of this Nation.

When the new postal reform was conceived, it was envisioned as a means to eliminate all political influence over the appointments, procedures, and any other areas of persuasion that had previously existed in the Postal Department. Unfortunately, not only was political influence eliminated, but also absolute control was abolished. Even approval or a means of redress on behalf of the people was unequivocally denied.

A radio station owner in my district writes:

> I realize the Post Office is out of your control as you have told me previously, but something must be done and Congress will have to get it back to normal.

Or let us consider a local newspaper owner who resides in my district as he comments:

> I surely hope you'll continue your efforts to get an improvement in the postal service, the one service I feel the Government is obligated to give.

The same gentleman closed an additional letter in the following way:

> We simply cannot live with the non-service we are now receiving.

Keeping politics out of the Postal Service is one thing but denying citizens the representation they expect and deserve is another.

No one can deny that service has degenerated, and there appears little Congress can do under the present chuckleheaded regime. We literally stripped ourselves of control and now the people want to know, "why?"

For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 1152, which would abolish the present U.S. Postal Service and reestablish the old Postal Department—a critical step if we are to salvage the system, essential if we are to improve the system.

When the Postal Service was created, it shunned the old symbol of the Department, a Pony Express rider. Instead, the Service adopted the sleek, swift eagle, an honored symbol of this Nation, which their actions have disgraced. A more appropriate mascot for today's service would be a tortoise, because the eagle has been ruptured.

I demand that Postmaster General Klassen and the other high-ranking "experts" in his employ resign if they cannot bring about the promised reform. That lauded, efficient management structure was to solve the problems of the mails. Instead, it has achieved heights of failure never believed possible. I say, with tongue in cheek, that the time has come for former Postmaster General Blount to return to Washington and destroy the Frankenstein he was so influential in creating.

In its Christmas advertising, the U.S. Postal Service asked the public to "help the people who help bring you Christmas." In my opinion, the only way the public could have helped the Service would have been to personally deliver their own mail.

I am not basing this attack merely on constituent complaints received during the busy Christmas season. Rather, I am basing this statement on 3 years of constant and varied citizens' remarks. I did receive many criticisms prior to the hatching of the ruptured eagle, but nothing on the scale I have received in the last year or two. In taking the offensive early in the 93d Congress, I hope to alert the Members in time to correct the mistake of the 91st Congress.

Countless manpower cuts have left many rural areas in desperate need of service. At the same time, expansion of operational control on the local level has been discouraged. People no longer count with the postal management and this I deeply resent.

For example, I received a letter and petitions from an entire community in my district illustrating how the Postal Service disregards the people it serves. An excerpt states:

> We the patrons of R.D. #1, Hooversville, Pa. 15936, are opposed to the proposed changing of address being forced on us due to a realignment of Rural Routes.
>
> We are very satisfied with the present service and feel the inconvenience of changing our address is unnecessary. The enclosed petition represents 100 per cent of the patrons and their families involved in the change of address.
>
> We would appreciate if you will reconsider the proposed change of address and continue to serve the patrons according to the wishes of the people involved.

What now counts with the Postal Service is the perpetuation of the carefully planned regional sectional centers, the greatest pyramid of costly mismanagement ever assembled by modern man.

Allow me to further illustrate the gross inadequacies in the Postal Service by using a portion of a newspaper article from the Johnstown Tribune Democrat:

> Speaking of mail, it used to be a pastime to look at the postmarks on Christmas cards before opening the envelope and to try to guess who had sent the card.
>
> Now, however, the trend is to eliminate the city name from the postmark and substitute a ZIP code. The Johnstown post office postmarks mail from Bedford, Somerset and Cambria counties. So, rather than mark "Johnstown" on a letter from, say, Schellsburg, the post office—or regional sectional center, as it is called—instead uses "159" in the postmark.
>
> If somebody in Schellsburg wants to send a letter next door, chances are the letter will go to the Schellsburg Post Office, then to the Bedford Post Office, then to the Johnstown Post Office—where it is postmarked—then back to Bedford, then to Schellsburg, then to the folks next door.

Such mismanagement resulted in the following situation, as relayed in the same newspaper: A Johnstown rural district woman had a birthday anniversary on December 15 and her neighbors mailed her cards December 11 and 12 from a box adjacent to hers. They were delivered December 19. That certainly is efficient service, just as promised. It took the Postal Service 8 days to deliver a letter 3 feet.

Why has the United States been subjected to such horrendous mail service? I believe it is largely due to an irresponsible management structure housing a misguided idiocy that has shattered the system.

Let us examine a few of the mistakes the upper-echelons of the Postal Service have nurtured. First, they have not maintained or improved employee morale, because they are unable to sustain a productive level of output. Employees are forced to work extensive hours of overtime as a result of being understaffed and remain in a quandry as to their individual status. The labor-deficient post offices are a direct result of aimless regional management.

Many postal employees no longer care about their work, nor should they, when they are constantly transferred at the whim of their shallow-minded superiors. They have become pawns in the most inefficient chess game ever played. In my district, for example, one postmaster was transferred three times in 1 year. Can this man be blamed for lacking motivation. Other employees are quitting with disgust.

Mandatory transfers of employees are supposed to aid in offices where manpower shortages exist. No care is cast in the direction of the rural areas that are being stripped of their postmen. Services are cut in one area to fill gaps in other areas—gaps that should never have arisen in the first place. The Postal Service has been so preoccupied with profit that it has cut service and efficiency while throwing all public service to the wind.

My most recent personal defeat at the hands of the Ruptured Eagle Express occurred during the month of December. Each Yule season I give a Yule party for my appointees to the service schools. On December 1, 1972, I mailed invitations to all the young men, but by the time of the party on December 26, the invitations had not yet arrived at West Point. I realized something was wrong when I received no response from any of the men. I eventually telephoned them and learned no invitations had been received. For all I know, they may still be floating around the eastern seaboard.

However, this affair can be easily understood when you consider the following situation. One of the major post offices in my district has, at this moment, 10 trucks of mail in one office and there are seven in another, lying in its basement. This being the situation for 2 weeks, I can understand how it would take my mail 25 days to travel to New York.

Such gross inefficiency has fostered the following unfortunate saga. Many of my constituents, as do many of us, pay their monthly bills through the mails, by check. However, when mail remains untouched for 2 weeks, late delivery of payments can be expected. Accordingly the sender is forced to pay a late charge through no fault of his own. Such service can no longer be tolerated.

The dormant state of the Postal Service has caused many people serious problems: Late charges on public utility bills delivered after the due date have infuriated the public; rural newspapers have been delivered 1 week late; business men have had to wait for contracts, invoices, and other transactions that, in many cases, have resulted in lost business; individuals awaiting pay checks have been greatly inconvenienced; and scores of other too abundant to mention.

The Postal Service promised efficient and economical delivery. Instead, we can only look forward to higher rates and decreasing services. One of my constituents put it best by saying:

> If this problem (Postal Service) is national, we are in real trouble.

My reply: It is, and we are.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it has been heartening over the past 24 hours to witness the many Senators and Representatives of both parties who have made strong, positive statements about the chances for peace in Vietnam. I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to them for their bipartisan support of President Nixon's peace efforts at this time.

If this kind of support had been forthcoming over the past few years, the long-awaited prospect of a just and lasting peace might already have become a reality. But, at any rate, we are now witnessing in the Congress what we already witnessed at the polls this November—strong, bipartisan support for the President's peace policy. If it is overdue, it is also welcome, and I commend my colleagues on it.

Unfortunately, there remain some exceptions to the rule—a few of our number who have inveighed and attacked the President for so long that they almost seem to resent the success his policies have begun to achieve. These are the same men who wrongly and precipitously attacked the President at every turn on Cambodia, on Laos, on the blockade and on the bombing. At every turn, they predicted failure.

The south could not defend itself, they said. And yet the south did.

The blockade would not work, they said. And yet the blockade did, and it put pressure on the North Vietnamese that resulted in the first meaningful peace negotiations to occur in this long and painful struggle.

When the other side began to stall at the table and escalate the war on the ground, the President ordered the December bombing.

It would not work, they said. The bombing would undermine efforts for peace.

Once again they were wrong. Once again, the decision of the President, and of the people and politicians who backed him up at a difficult moment, has been vindicated by events.

So I urge those of my colleagues who have occasionally yielded to the temptation to engage in hasty, intemperate attacks on the President's Vietnam policy to stop for a moment and review the history of failed predictions and unfulfilled prophecies of doom. I urge them to stop these pointless attacks on a man and a policy that have brought us closer to peace in Vietnam than at any point since our combat involvement there began under President Kennedy so many long years ago.

No true friend of peace should lend himself to such attacks at this crucial juncture.

"RUNAWAY PAPPY" BILL REINTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced my "runaway pappy" bill, a piece of legislation aimed at fathers who have fled to other States to escape paying child support.

My bill would make child support orders enforceable in Federal courts. It would bring Federal authority to bear on the problem of nonsupport by husbands and fathers who shirk their parental responsibilities.

Passage of my bill would give legal sanction to the moral and social obligations every husband has to take care of his family.

The main purpose of the bill is to try to deter a man from leaving a State to avoid paying for child support under an order obtained against him.

My bill grants jurisdiction to Federal officials to act in those cases where a man flees from one State to another to evade his obligations under a divorce decree or child support order issued by a State court. The bill makes it a crime for a man to move out of the State to avoid obeying the State court order.

The States cannot get uniform State action on this matter, and the cost of extradition from one State to another is too great for a State or local government.

We need the help of the Federal Government to get at husbands and fathers who refuse to support their children and flee to another State to escape their responsibilities. I think we should throw the forces of the Federal Government into pursuit of fathers who run off and leave their families with no means of support. A man who abandons his children is just as much a felon as the man who steals an automobile.

Under the proposed Federal law, nonsupport cases would be heard by Federal courts in the State where the fugitive father is residing at the time. He would be given the option of supporting his children or going to jail. It would not be necessary to return the man to the State where the nonsupport or desertion charges had been brought.

THE UNITED STATES AND MOROCCO

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Morocco and its present ruler, King Hassan II, have been important friends of the United States and recipients of significant amounts of American military and economic aid for several years now. Today, unfortunately, the political and economic situation in Morocco is rapidly deteriorating and with it, perhaps, the future of United States-Moroccan relations.

Troubles for this North African country and its ruler are not new, but in the last 2 years, significant events have brought Morocco to an economic, political, and social standstill. Two attempts on King Hassan's life in the summers of 1971 and 1972, several arrests, trials, recent political executions, student demonstrations, worker strikes, and apparently inadequate attempts at constitutional, electoral and economic reforms have sharpened many antagonisms in Moroccan society and weakened the position of King Hassan.

The options for the United States in this situation are both difficult and few in number. Without any clear group in Morocco outside the government to which we can express our concerns, we have the choice of either supporting the present government or not doing so, each alternative involving certain risks. Our current policy dilemma could be simplified, and in my opinion significantly relieved, if a reevaluation of U.S. military presence in Morocco indicated that communication facilities for the U.S. 6th Fleet currently located at Kenitra could be situated elsewhere and that the utility of this and other bases had diminished. Without such a reappraisal, Morocco remains a country of some strategic importance to the United States, thereby reducing our options and even forcing a continuation of present policies.

Regardless of our interests in Morocco today, the disturbing trends in this country deserve attention. Reevaluation of United States-Moroccan relations should be a subject of interest within the U.S. Government and our deep concern over developments should be communicated to the Moroccan Government. Our concern is that the Moroccan Government take every step possible to stop the drift in the nation and act to promote political and economic development.

The United States has a long history of good relations with Morocco and its king, and many of us in Congress have been fortunate enough to have the opportunity to visit that beautiful country and to experience the good will that exists between the Moroccan and American peoples. It is precisely because this good will should not be allowed to dissipate that I make these observations.

"NO SOLICITORS" SIGNS ON PHONES

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation in the House of Representatives today which would allow an individual to place a "no solicitors" sign on his telephone.

This bill, called the Telephone Privacy Act, would give any individual a right to inform the telephone company that he does not wish to be solicited over the phone.

Commercial firms would be required to obtain a list from the telephone company of those subscribers who had placed the "no solicitors" sign on their phone, or the individuals who do not wish to be solicited could have their names marked by an asterisk in the phone book.

Advertising on radio, TV, and in magazines bombards the average American every day. At least in his own home, the individual should have the right to privacy and should be able to shut off advertising by persistent telephone solicitors. People advertise everything over the telephone—land sales in Florida, cemetery plots and newspaper subscriptions. Many citizens are tired of having their dinner interrupted or being disturbed while taking a nap to listen to some unsolicited sales pitch over the phone.

As many of my colleagues may remember, last year I introduced similar legislation which was cosponsored by 48 of my colleagues. In addition, I have received hundreds of letters of support for legislation from irate citizens who are constantly bombarded by the unwanted telephone solicitation.

One of the most important aspects of this bill is that it would cost the Government nothing and would not involve the setting up of a new bureaucracy. By passing this bill, Congress has a chance to eliminate one of those everyday annoyances that bothers millions of Americans.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS FOR GONZALEZ

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today a resolution which I sponsored in the last Congress regarding the impoundment of funds.

As you know, I sponsored a resolution last year which was supported by the Democratic Caucus denouncing the excessive impoundment of funds being made by the President and the Office of

Management and Budget. I am again taking issue with the practice which has become common of recent years, to impound more than $12 billion per fiscal year, thereby relegislating by executive fiat.

Having flexibility to administer the various programs we enact is one thing, but remolding and doing away with programs which the Congress has authorized and appropriated is quite another one. I was very glad when Senator SAM ERVIN'S subcommittee held hearings on the impoundment of funds in the last Congress, and I anxiously await the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee.

I trust that my colleagues will join me in sponsoring the legislation I have introduced which will seek to make clear that it is the Congress which is supposed to make the laws, according to the U.S. Constitution's mandate. My resolution would follow the same procedure which the reorganization of the executive branch follows now. The President would make the decisions to impound, inform the Congress, and if the Congress felt strongly enough, it would act to stop unwarranted impoundment. Two-thirds of either House would be able to disapprove the impoundment.

I urge your support.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING'S BIRTHDAY SHOULD BE DECLARED NATIONAL HOLIDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the subject of my special order this afternoon is the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Originally this special order had been requested by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). Mr. CONYERS called me a little while ago and explained he had been unavoidably detained in the State of Michigan and asked that on this occasion we carry out this special order for him.

In Congressman CONYERS' special order he calls attention to the fact that on January 15 the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. would have been 44 years of age. On this occasion the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has once again reintroduced into this Congress legislation signed by 68 cosponsors of this body requesting that this body enact legislation to declare January 15 a national legal public holiday in commemoration of the memory of this great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to cosponsor legislation with the Honorable JOHN CONYERS and my other distinguished colleagues legislation that would make the birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. a national holiday. To those of us who are members of the Congressional Black Caucus, Dr. King represents someone very special, but what is more important is that the memory of Dr. King means so much to the people of this country. Dr. King, while he was alive, represented the hopes of millions of people, both black and white; people felt that there was hope for all of us to live together in peace and harmony. Our challenge is to continue the work begun by this great conciliator.

Dr. King was a very rare man, and we, as Americans, have been prone toward remembering very rare men. If we do so honor him by making his birthday a national holiday, it would be a renewal of all of those things that our forefathers held dear. Dr. King tried, more than any other man of this century, to bring this country together and, had he lived, there was a good chance that he would have succeeded. It was his desire to replace the hate and bigotry in the country and the world with love and understanding; to replace the violence with kindness; and to replace the division with unity.

Now we should work toward the goals that Dr. King set for all of us. One of the ways to do this would be to establish his birthday as a national holiday. This would have the effect of saying that we are committed to what he advocated and that, while it may take some time, we will continue to both advocate and substantively work toward those desired ends.

Almost 10 years ago the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., came to this city with the hopes and dreams of millions of people who could not join him. The 200,000 people who heard Dr. King speak in front of the Lincoln Memorial that day knew in their hearts and minds that he was talking for all of the oppressed peoples in the world and talking to all of the oppressors. As we turn the words and voice of Dr. King over in our minds we are reminded that just a decade ago people were coming together with the hope of achieving a unified country. The march on Washington for jobs and freedom symbolized the hopes of many. Brother King spoke to the issues that were plaguing the black men of this country. All too often it is forgotten that we, with all of the other various peoples who make up this land, were given a "promissory note" and that in August of 1963 we, as black people, came to collect upon that note which had been returned to us marked "insufficient funds." Like Brother King, I cannot believe that the great "treasury of justice" is bankrupt, but it must surely be because still, to this day, we have not been able to collect on that note. I stand before you as a reminder that we all pledged on that day to continue the battle for equality and freedom. I stand before you to remind you that all of the minorities in this country are still reaffirming the pledge they took that day, whether it was in person or by surrogate.

To quote Dr. King further, "we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied" until something is done to remove the stigma of racism and hatred that seems to pervade the American way of life.

Ten years ago we called for an immediate end to segregated school districts. Has this been accomplished? No, it has not, and what is most disheartening is the fact that the segregation in the school districts in this country has gotten worse instead of better. The only place where any positive inroads have been made is in the South. Those true northern liberal "friends" that the blacks in this country are supposed to have, have turned out to be more biased than those in the South and less willing to admit it.

Ten years ago we called for an end to Federal funding of any and all projects where discrimination existed. Again, nothing has been done to fully remove discrimination from Federal projects. Ten years ago we asked for effective civil rights legislation, employment possibilities, public accommodations, housing, and enforcement of the 14th amendment. What has been done to bring some of these things about—token legislation, and, in some cases, token enforcement of the laws. Why, you ask, has this happened? The present administration has worked very hard to try and throw us back to the days of the late 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. They think that we will be oblivious to their actions, but we will not. We will continue the struggle that Dr. King and Rosa Parks started in the 1950's. We will continue to struggle to collect on our promissory note; we will overcome; we shall be free.

We pledged 10 years ago to take the struggle home with us and to take it up on all of the fronts. I am reminding you all that we are still struggling and that we will continue to struggle until such time as you either remove us totally in body and spirit from this world and from your minds or until you recognize us as the human beings that we are and accord us those rights that are accorded to all of the peoples of the world. We pledged to devote ourselves to the rights of people, to nonviolent protest, to peaceful assembly, and to use all of the inalienable rights of this democracy. We are still very much committed to that pledge. Our efforts will not stop until the day that the pledge has been fulfilled. We want to live in dignity and personal security, and we will live in dignity and personal security regardless of the wishes and intent of the administration of this country or the various groups of people who would still like to see us in our former role; docile individuals bound in slavery.

As a reminder to all of you here and all of those in this country, we still have the spirit of Brother King living within us. As a reminder to those brothers and sisters out there, it is never too late to be black: I think that I may qualify as an example of that.

We have come to that time when we must proceed from the past, look to the future, and use the present as the vehicle to the future. I stand before you to put

this challenge where it belongs. The administration has done very little and seems quite content to continue in that position; past Congresses have done little more to help alleviate the situation. It is, therefore, the responsibility of this Congress, the 93d, which must be the central force behind the changes in this society. We must be the leaders of this change, we must adhere to the principles laid down and articulated by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence and the 13th and 14th amendments. For if we again fail to act in a positive constructive manner, the people may feel the necessity to make the changes themselves. We have sworn to uphold all of the laws of this land. This we must do, and do fairly. Injustice to one is injustice to all. Actions, as always, speak louder than words. All too long the Government has made promises to the people and, yet, done nothing to fulfill those promises. The time for action is now. We can no longer say that we will do something, we must act or we shall be stained with the sins of our inaction. We will be held accountable, in the final analyses, not the people. As their agents we have to act or we lose the right to represent them as free people, and we lose the credibility of being concerned human beings. Again, I say, take up the struggle now or submit yourselves to disgrace and indignation in the face of our heritage, our beliefs, and our reason for existence.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his comments.

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Miss JORDAN).

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King was one of the greatest men in our history, and he left a gaping hole in the life of all of our countrymen when he died.

It is fitting that we pay tribute to this man on the occasion of his birthday.

For over a decade his voice and his actions kindled a fire in the conscience of our Nation that roared into a nationwide drive for human rights. From lunch counters to the lobbies of Congress, from State houses to the Supreme Court, his influence was felt as he persistently and courageously demanded that this Nation right the wrongs of centuries of neglect and discrimination.

His hopes, his compassion, and his dreams gave courage and determination to millions of people both black and white who joined in a determined effort across the land to eliminate racism.

He once said:

> We will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

If he were with us today he clearly would not be satisfied. The crusade he began has markedly changed its thrust from one of mass movements and demonstrations to one of quieter building of community groups. Open resistance to integration and civil rights has in many cases shifted to more subtle but equally intransigent opposition.

This would not have discouraged this great man. He recognized that "all progress is precarious, and the solution of one problem brings us face to face with another problem."

We can pay no greater tribute to this singular leader than to continue to pursue his dream—the creation of a society where people of all races have equal rights and equal opportunities, where the distinctions of race or color have no bearing on the ability of people to lead fulfilling lives, where both black and white are beautiful.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her comments and remarks at this time.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for taking this special order. Like the man we honor today, he has been an active participant and leader in our efforts to bring about social justice and peace.

We are here to salute the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whose assassination 4 years ago left a void never to be filled.

We need him now that violence shakes this Nation and rocks the world. He knew all the quirks of what we call human nature. He knew how beastly human beings can be, but he also knew and deeply loved the other side of human nature, the godlike side.

Time after time he was able to call upon this inner divinity; time after time he was able to inspire men and women to acts of courage and compassion far beyond their known capacity; time after time he persuaded the lion and the lamb to lie down in harmony.

When he failed, he did not despair, but renewed his own vision and thereby that of others.

He and his equally courageous wife, Coretta, were among the first to actively oppose the war in Indochina. His words when he received the Nobel Peace Prize are words we need to hear again today. He said:

> Nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our time . . . the need for men to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to violence and oppression.
>
> Sooner or later, all the people of the world will have to discover a way to live together in peace and thereby transform the pending cosmic elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. If this is to be achieved, men must evolve through all human conflict a method which rejects revenge, aggression, and retaliation. The foundation of such a method is love.

I hope these words will be heeded as we move into the inauguration. I hope that the President will heed these words, and resolve the conflict in Vietnam. If he does not, I hope that the Members of Congress will search out, very soon, a way to "transform the pending cosmic elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood" and end this terrible war.

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Ohio in paying tribute to the memory of the late Dr. Martin Luther King on this occasion just a few days after his birthday anniversary.

It so happened that on Sunday last in my congressional district, I had an invitation to address a memorial service dedicated to Dr. King, sponsored by the Council of Churches of the city of Albany. It was a moving occasion. I had the opportunity at that time to mention to those who were present at that service that I had been in Washington in 1963 when Dr. King led that famous march from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial.

To me it was one of the most stirring and moving occasions I have ever taken part in. The surge of human beings down there was something I had never seen in my life before.

That of course was also the occasion of his very eloquent speech, "I have a dream," which I think perhaps more than anything else characterized the vision which he himself provided to the country and to the fight for civil rights.

I was also here in Washington in 1968 when the word came that Dr. King had been shot down by an assassin. That is one of those occasions, of course, where everyone can remember exactly where he was—when Pearl Harbor occurred, when President Kennedy was assassinated, and when Martin Luther King was assassinated.

And I was here in Washington, too, when Dr. Abernathy, carrying on in Dr. King's footsteps, brought Resurrection City here to Washington. We in the Congress responded in various ways to that appeal, particularly with greatly expanded aid under the food stamp surplus foods programs.

Since people sometimes tend to forget the achievements made in this long struggle, I believe it is rather significant that two of the people who had been coparticipants with Dr. King in his work and who were there at Resurrection City after his death are today sitting here in the House of Representatives, the Delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG). This I believe demonstrates some of the achievements that Dr. King brought about, and demonstrates also that his spirit and ideals do indeed continue to live on. Those could never be cut down even by an assassin's bullet.

Mr. Speaker, I was one who 2 years ago joined in sponsoring the legislation to create a national holiday to commemorate Dr. King's birthday. I have joined again in introducing that legislation this year.

I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) the leader of the Black Caucus, that the people in my district are now circulating petitions and expect to get thousands of signatures in support of that holiday legislation. I want to assure the gentleman I will work with him and other

Members of the House to see that we get that bill enacted.

I believe the previous chairman of the Judiciary Committee, although he certainly had a distinguished record in the fight for civil rights, was not in favor of creating any new holidays. But we have a new chairman this year, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), and so we have an opportunity, particularly when the people from New Jersey are heard from, to get some more serious consideration of this King legislation

As the original author of legislation a few years ago that put some of our national holidays on Monday, I might add that it is conceivable we might have to make a compromise and get Dr. King's birthday observed on a Monday rather than on the exact January 15 date. But after all the important thing is not which particular day of the week the holiday comes on, but whether we as a Nation are prepared to take action that clearly recognizes Dr. King as one of our great Americans, by memorializing his birthday as a national holiday.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman from New York for his very timely remarks.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I am pleased and proud to take part in these proceedings today, and to pay my respect to the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King; to relay the respect of the people of the State of Wyoming, my district, for this great leader of men.

We, in Wyoming, pride ourselves on equality. Our motto is "The Equality State." And we are concerned about the substance of equality, and of the never-ending need to engage in mutual improvement so that the full force of equal rights stays alive.

Our contributions speak to this need over the past abrasive and shocking decade. They include the assassination of one of our young ministers, the late Rev. James Reeb, of Casper, Wyo., who gave his life in Selma, Ala., during Dr. King's historic march in that community.

Incidentally, his mother, Mrs. Reeb, died this past year and is buried at Casper, Wyo. His wife and three children continue to reside in Casper, as does his father, a retired businessman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of us and the people we represent throughout this Nation continue the good fight for fairness to assure that the quality of justice is improved in our land. And above all that these corrections can take place in peace and dignity. I hope that the seventies will bring to an end the violence which Martin King himself preached against and abhorred.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion once again to commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for having reintroduced this legislation in this Congress and for his leadership in this area.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., would have been 44 years old. In honor of the life and work of this great man, I am today introducing legislation on behalf of myself, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and 53 other cosponsors to make his birthday a legal public holiday. Let me tell you why I am introducing this legislation.

I loved and admired Dr. King. He showed us the strength of his resolve to make justice and equality a reality for all in his continual struggle to end bigotry and violence. He showed us the power of wisdom and the beauty of love for mankind. He spent his life teaching peace through social justice.

In his lifetime, Martin Luther King, Jr., also became the symbol of the struggle to realize the American ideals of equality and equal opportunity. In 1964, in recognition of his great program of creative, constructive, nonviolent action, he received the Nobel Prize for Peace.

Dr. King's tireless activities in both the North and the South were largely responsible for the landmark civil rights legislation of the sixties. For example, his campaign for the guarantees of voting rights in Selma, Ala., contributed signally to the adoption of corrective legislation in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Enactment of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 were also partially the result of Dr. King's dedicated and selfless efforts. Even his final great effort—the Poor People's Campaign—helped bring the neglected plight of millions of Americans into sharp public focus.

When his life was interrupted, we said we would see that the peace he pursued would be won. We said that the work and the suffering he endured would not be in vain. We said that the people he led would not be abandoned, and the love he lived would be returned. But, as we turn now to take an honest look at those promises—when we make a full review of what has been done—it is shamefully clear that those promises have yet to be fulfilled.

Poor Americans still suffer from hunger. Little children are still denied adequate schooling amid cries of defiance and emotionalism. Sons and fathers are still dying in a distant, bitter war. Crime and despair still haunt our streets and neighborhoods. Distrust and fear among neighbors still pervade our daily business councils. Fortunately, there are men and women who are answering our distressing cry for a continuation of the kind of leadership stirred by the powerful dignity of Martin Luther King, Jr.

But, we sadly realize that without a national devotion to the aims inspired by that leadership we cannot bring an end to the problems of our society. What we need—and we need it now—is a reaffirmation of our intent to continue the struggles of Martin Luther King, Jr. This bill would set aside Dr. King's birthday as a day for all Americans to pause in honor of his life and work, and the selfless contributions he made to America, and to all mankind. It would set aside 1 day each year where we could reaffirm our commitment to make his work bear fruit. We cannot let his memory pass into history without the full affirmation of our intent to continue his struggles.

We should pause, not only in respect, but also to evaluate our success in striving for the goals he set for us. To establish his birthday as a day of national recognition is an excellent way to make those assessments. But, we must not allow the designation of a national day of reverence to become the only way we continue with Dr. King's plans.

We must resolve to eliminate bitterness and hate from our struggles. We must strive to resolve the conflicts against which Dr. King worked. We must enact the programs he wanted. And we must seek the peace he dreamed of.

The meaning that Dr. King's life has for each of us is that we should use our power not to create conditions of oppression that lead to violence, but conditions of hope that lead to peace. We cannot ignore the significance of that one magnificent life. We cannot avoid trying to finish the many vital tasks he began.

We must—all of us—continue the struggles he endured. We must continue the battle to end oppression and deprivation and racism. Perhaps when we have done these things, the day will come when together we can sing, "Free at last, free at last, I thank God I'm free at last."

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. STOKES. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CONYERS, and the entire caucus for reintroducing this legislation.

We shall overcome;
We shall overcome;
We shall overcome, one day,
Deep in my heart, I do believe we shall overcome some day.

Mr. Speaker, I use these words not merely to invoke the nostalgia of an era, but to try to focus in on how this black man, a man of such tremendous, dynamic vitality, affected the course of a nation.

Those words became associated with the total civil rights movements. Those words impacted strongly on the lives of black Americans and also had an impact on the lives of white Americans as well.

In 1963 we sang, "We are not afraid, we are not afraid, we are not afraid today, deep in our hearts, we do believe, we are not afraid today." I do believe we were not afraid of police dogs, or fire hoses, or jails, or beatings; we derived our strength from the tower of strength that was Martin Luther King, Jr. I think it is time that we started to sing those words again, because, despite his Herculean efforts, there appears to be a resurgence of racism in this country. Not the open and naked kind of racism but a velvet kind of racism. I think we will have to start singing again. We are not

afraid of those who would subvert the gains in education for blacks, and those who would turn back the clock, stopping the advance of black Americans.

In 1964 we sang, did we not, "We'll walk hand in hand, we'll walk hand in hand, we'll walk hand in hand some day." That is what we sang. We added "Deep in our hearts, we do believe we will walk hand in hand some day."

King suggested those words meant that blacks and whites could walk hand in hand. Indeed in that dramatic and turbulent period, there was a demonstration on the part of a number of whites of a willingness to walk hand in hand toward the common goal of making this Nation recognize its potential.

We need to sing those words again, because in 1973, as a result of a sustained and prolonged effort in which such words as "busing," "welfare," "crime," and other words are used as cue words, we find a nation that is dangerously polarized. I think we need to start singing those words again.

1963, 1964, and 1965. We come to 1965, when we sang "We shall overcome, we shall overcome, we shall overcome some day." My own strong feeling is that there are forces loose in this country which would vitiate and undo all of the tremendous gains that Martin Luther King spearheaded. Only a fool or a knave would say that we have not made progress in this country. As my distinguished colleague, Mr. STOKES, has indicated, we see black mayors, black Members serving in the Congress, and in the State and city legislative bodies. We see a tremendous forward movement on the part of blacks. That forward movement has been on occasion aided and supported by whites who understand the necessity for making this a whole nation.

However, it is very, very clear to me that, in terms of the busing issue, in terms of the retrenchments in the area of minority enterprise, the housing moratorium, and a whole host of other developments, those gains are in jeopardy.

I think this Congress of the United States has a responsibility to commemorate the birthday of Martin Luther King. I believe we have a responsibility to pass the legislation that has been introduced. That responsibility, it seems to me, does not only relate to black Americans. This Congress has a responsibility to white Americans to pass this legislation, so that once again in clear and unequivocal terms we will state the destiny of this Nation is one in which all persons are tied together. Through its passage, the Congress can state that the man you keep in the gutter will eventually drag you into the gutter and the man whose progress you deny—because he is black—is the man who becomes one who does not believe in the system.

It seems to me that we have a responsibility to say to the Nation as a whole that indeed we cannot become one, we can never recognize, nor realize, nor begin to approach our potential for greatness until once and for all we have done away with every manifestation of racism whether it be overt or covert, blatant or "velvet racism," as I call it. I believe this is the time for the Congress and the Nation at large to rededicate itself to the principle that America can be great and good and just, America can stand as the citadel for all of the humanistic ideals that should dominate civilization if we solve the No. 1 problem in this Nation, and that is the problem of race.

Again I want to congratulate my colleagues for introducing this piece of legislation. I want to urge my colleagues who make up the House of Representatives portion of the 93d Congress that this is the time to show guts, this is the time to take a positive stand. This is the time, it seems to me, when we reiterate our commitment to decency, honor, and justice; that is the least we can do in the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL), for his remarks, and I certainly would also like to thank all of those who have participated in this special order this afternoon. Let us all hope that it will be the 93d Congress that pays tribute to these kinds of things which have been spoken of by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL), by their enactment into legislation in the memory of one of America's greatest and most renowned leaders.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whose assassination 4 years ago left a void never to be filled. We need him now; now, when violence shakes this Nation and rocks the world.

He knew all too well what we call human nature—he knew how beastly human beings can be. But he also knew, and deeply loved, the other side of human nature, the godlike side. Time after time he was able to call upon this inner divinity, too often hidden in all of us. Time after time he was able to inspire men and women to acts of courage and compassion, far beyond their known capacity. Time after time he persuaded the lion and the lamb to lie down in harmony. And when he failed, he did not despair, but renewed his own vision and thereby, that of others.

He and his equally courageous wife Coretta were among the first to actively oppose the war in Indochina. His words, when he received the Nobel Peace Prize, are words we need to hear again today. He said:

> Non-violence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our time. . . the need for men to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to violence and oppression. . . . Sooner or later, all the people of the world will have to discover a way to live together in peace, and thereby transform the pending cosmic elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. If this is to be achieved, men must evolve for all human conflict a method which rejects revenge, aggression and retaliation. The foundation of such a method is love.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I personally feel very strongly about this bill and have coauthored it for a number of years. My office, together with many other offices and schools throughout the country, was closed this January 15. It is because Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was not only an outstanding black leader, but also a great American that I believe we should honor him by making his birthday a national holiday. The Reverend King's work as a civil rights leader has made his name, his face, and his ideals a familiar and beloved part of the heritage of this country. His dedication to the principle of freedom—the freedom of black people from racism and its corollary the freedom of all people from every form of prejudice—was selfless and unceasing. He willingly risked, and finally sacrificed, his life for that goal.

Martin Luther King, Jr. is dead, but the impact of his life will affect our lives and our country for generations to come. Through his efforts, what were only hopes began to turn into reality. His voice began the irreversible movement toward equal opportunity, and still gives impetus and energy to the strivings of black people for equality. In honoring Dr. King by the observance of his birthday as a national holiday we can continue to keep alive the ideals for which he strove and our own commitment to the continued advancement of civil rights for all citizens of our Nation.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his fine statement and for providing us this opportunity to remember Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. King taught us that a person must seek first his commitments from within himself and second, in order not to have lived in vain, must follow through with these commitments with all the God-given resources at his command.

Dr. King was articulate, and politically aware. He was firm in his commitment to God and mankind. He pointed out the road to be taken and continued on that road as long as he could. In his struggle for civil rights, Dr. King found in each lost battle and in each victory, renewed courage not to stop there and reflect on losses or on gains but to keep on down the road until peace, brotherhood, and economic and political equality reigned in this Nation.

At this point in the history of this country we see that the end of the road is not near. This administration presents only obstacles along our way. And if ever we needed a day on which the citizenry of this country can reflect on the commitments of Dr. King, God knows we need it now. It should be a day on which each and every one of us, black, white, yellow, or brown, asks himself, "Has Dr. King's dream become a reality, and if not, why not?"

It would provide us with a national occasion to review once again our adherence to his dream and to refresh ourselves anew.

Dr. King, a recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, certainly ranks with Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Veterans Day, and Labor Day—a day set aside to honor the workingman.

Miss HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the life of Martin Luther King, Jr., serves as a testimonial to all Americans that

peaceful and constructive nonviolent action can play a significant role in the reformation of governmental and social institutions. Dr. King's tireless and well organized campaigns toward obtaining equal rights for black Americans and the elimination of poverty and social injustice in general won widespread endorsement and approval. By coalescing a concerned constituency of Americans, he was able to lead this country to new plateaus of social reform which included the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968.

I enthusiastically support the resolution to commemorate his birthday as a national holiday and hope that this event will serve as a constant reminder that determined and orderly efforts on behalf of the dream we all have for a better America can produce positive and meaningful results.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as we look in retrospect on the life and death of Dr. Martin Luther King, I am sure even his most bitter enemies will readily admit the impact his activities had on the course of change in America. For good or bad, depending on one's point of view, that impact was more profound than any other during the turbulent years of the fifties and sixties.

Dr. King, the moral giant, in his travels from Montgomery to Memphis carved out a chapter in history that rivals those of other freedom fighters such as Jefferson, Franklin, and Payne. His accomplishments were of revolutionary dimension embodying all the frontier fervor in his lust for freedom.

The man who lived his life, and gave his life, to unify mankind in the brotherhood of love can appropriately be described and praised for his great ability to divide. Perhaps, his greatest asset was that ability to divide men on the question of morality. Dr. King did what few before him or few since have been able to do. He divided America into two groups—those who loved and those who hated. He sought out, encouraged, and organized those who loved freedom, justice, and their country. And, he identified, challenged, and confronted those who hated equality of the races and justice for all.

Martin's great crusade, launched in Montgomery and terminated in Memphis, was to cleanse the soul of a nation. The 20th century "Prince of Peace" sacrificed his life so that his fellow man might live in a country void of hatred and prejudice. Until Martin Luther King arrived on the scene, there was little hope that blacks and other minorities would achieve racial equality or enjoy economic and political justice.

Dr. King made Americans feel a sense of guilt for the racial atrocities and injustices heaped upon 20 million citizens. Before his campaign for justice, whites generally refused to become personally involved or personally responsible for the murderous, inhumane acts of their fellow citizens. Martin pricked the conscience of this Nation. He shocked white America from its smug, lethargic, aristocratic, Christian hypocrisy. And many men of good will came forward to side with right.

To divide was Dr. King's greatest asset. He transformed the comfortable into the concerned. He brought the masses off the proverbial fence and forced them to take sides in the struggle for black manhood. Many who had pretended that all was well and blacks were happy, were suddenly and dramatically confronted with reality. Martin initiated massive sit-ins and disruptions to arouse the conscience of a people. Major traffic arteries which had casually taken suburbanites past the misery and suffering of the ghetto, overnight became symbols for protest with the blocking of traffic. Prestigious restaurants and theaters suddenly became the battlegrounds for civil rights armies. Voting booths and lily-white neighborhoods quickly became the targets of unrelenting attack by those committed to make the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights blueprints for perfection.

Martin Luther King redefined the word racist. No longer could sanctimonious pious religious leaders, business executives or Government officials describe the culprits as stringy-haired, backwooded, ignorant southerners who were determined to maintain the ante bellum status quo. Martin moved the Mason-Dixon line to the southern border of Canada and expanded the membership of the Ku Klux Klan to include organized labor, the chamber of commerce, the Christian community, and the Federal Government.

Martin the great divider solidified his people in the process. He defined the common goal and advanced the common mechanism for achieving that goal—nonviolent, passive resistance. Although Martin Luther King lived but a few years and left a Nation battle scarred and torn with strife, his deeds will live for generations to come. Martin is dead—long live the king.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in urging the early consideration by this body of legislation recognizing Dr. Martin Luther King day as a national holiday. Few men have had the insight into the problems and challenges facing our Nation as Dr. King. It is appropriate that we remember his devotion to the improvement of our society as well as the tragic circumstances of his death.

The recognition of Dr. King should be a national holiday, for only through this action can we provide the highest honor to his memory. The lesson which Dr. King taught his followers and admirers during his lifetime is as relevant in today's world as it was then. Progress and change through peaceful means can become a reality if society will listen and maintain freedom of speech as our highest principle of democracy.

Recent threats and obstacles to freedom of speech have caused great concern to many in public and private life. The society which tolerates the imprisonment or intimidation of newsmen will soon become a weak society unable to face the natural changes necessary to promote progress in a democracy. The future growth and freedom of our Nation depends in large part on the leadership of men like Dr. Martin Luther King. His message is clear and applicable to all people of whatever race, religion, or national origin.

For these reasons, I support this effort to remember his outstanding career as a national holiday through the passage of Federal legislation.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation making January 15, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, a national holiday. My bill never came before the House for consideration. This past Tuesday, I added my name as a cosponsor to an identical bill. I sincerely hope that it will not meet with the same fate.

Dr. King was more than a great American. His was a revolutionary spirit of worldwide magnitude, sounding an impassioned plea for an all-embracing and unconditional love among men. While it is possible to kill men like Dr. King, their ideals are not mortal or destructible. And though remembrance of the senseless tragedy of his death churns our emotions, well-meant tears and eloquent words are no real tribute to his memory.

Tears and words are but passing symbols of sympathy and dedication to principle and purpose. Only deeds and personal sacrifice now have meaning, if we are truly the Nation we represent ourselves to be. What Dr. King hoped to achieve was to give substance to the many great aspirations and high promises inherent in our democracy. In 1958, he made the following statement:

> History has thrust upon our generation an indescribably important destiny—to complete a process of democratization which our nation has too long developed too slowly. How we deal with this crucial situation will determine our moral health as individuals, our cultural health as a region, our political health as a nation, and our prestige as a leader of the free world.

I believe that the national observance of his birthday will serve as an expression of our determination to carry forward his great work. He had a dream—a dream for all of us. We must make his dream a reality.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., would have been 44 years old. In honor of the life and work of this great man, I am today introducing legislation on behalf of myself, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and numerous other cosponsors to make his birthday a national public holiday.

The 68 cosponsors and I urge you, our colleagues, to join in sponsoring the bill as national support for its enactment steadily grows. Since the death of Dr. King in 1968, members of the caucus have received thousands of petitions containing several million signatures in support of the bill from groups and individuals in all parts of the Nation.

In his own lifetime, Martin Luther King became a symbol of the struggle to realize the American ideals of equality and equal opportunity. He led a program of creative, constructive, nonviolent action to combat the problems of discrimination and poverty, and to secure equal justice for all Americans. His inspirational leadership of the civil rights movement effected lasting changes in America and gave new life to the philosophy which guides our Nation.

Dr. King's tireless activities in both the North and the South were largely

responsible for the landmark civil rights legislation of the sixties. For example, his campaign for the guarantees of voting rights in Selma, Ala., contributed signally to the adoption of corrective legislation in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Enactment of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 were also partially the result of Dr. King's dedicated and selfless efforts. Even his final great effort—the 1968 Poor People's Campaign—helped bring the neglected plight of millions of Americans into sharp public focus.

In recognition of his great work, he received the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964, an honor reserved for the great humanitarian activists of our age. For the Congress of the United States to commemorate the birthday of Martin Luther King by declaring it a legal public holiday would be a gesture commensurate with the esteem in which he is held by people the world over.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, many of America's most intelligent, idealistic and dedicated citizens are very disillusioned with our system of government and our political processes. There are more reasons for this erosion of faith than I could list, but some principal causes include the apparent abandonment by the Federal Government of the fight for equal rights, the assassinations of some of our most highly respected national figures, the character and results of our last two presidential elections, and, of course, the policies of this Nation with regard to Southeast Asia over the last 18 years.

It is easy to understand their disillusionment.

But I ask my fellow citizens to remember these words from Dr. Martin Luther King's famous speech at the Lincoln Memorial in 1963:

> Let us not wallow in the valley of despair. I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream.

This was a common theme in the speeches and conversations of Dr. King. No matter how bad the situation became, Martin Luther King never gave up hope.

If Martin Luther King were with us today, he would be reminding us not to be discouraged. The progress is slow, and there are times when we slip backward a bit, but we are moving closer, an inch at a time, to that dream which he described for us 10 years ago. I implore those who share that vision of a just society to rededicate themselves to the fight, for we shall overcome someday.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 15, the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., would have been 44 years old. In honor of the life and work of this great man, the Congressional Black Caucus is today introducing legislation to make January 15 a national holiday.

Dr. Martin Luther King's pacifist philosophy and adherence to nonviolent action were taken from the Hindu freedom leader Mohandas K. Gandhi. Dr. King's skillful use of nonviolent civil disobedience tactics in the civil rights movement won him the Nobel Peace Prize, worldwide respect, and admiration.

Dr. King could vividly articulate the dreams and desires of black people. At the same time his talks of brotherly love, soothed and reassured white contemplating both feelings of guilt and conceptions of change.

Martin Luther King thought the American political and economic system could be reformed to make the American dream of equality and equal opportunity a reality. But before his dream of a new America was fulfilled, Dr. King was slain by the violence against which he preached and worked. Yet, the cause for which he died has not fallen.

An assassin's bullet stilled his voice of justice and brotherhood, but his quest for freedom, which gave hope to millions continues.

We call upon all men to join together and redevote themselves to fulfilling this vision of brotherhood that gave purpose to his life and works. We ask the Congress to pay respect to this great American leader who represented the philosophy of "equal justice for all," which is the true philosophy of this great Nation. We ask Congress to commemorate this world beloved leader by declaring his birth date a legal public holiday.

For all Americans January 15 can be a day of rededication; a day to remember the causes for which Dr. King so nobly lived and died; a day to recommit ourselves to the eradication of injustice and inequality in America; a day to begin anew to realize the American dream of which Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., so often spoke.

FEDERAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Frank McKinney Hubbard, who was one of our best newspaper humorists around the turn of the century, had a special concern for good government and liked to tell the story about the constable who had three sons: two self-sustaining and one employed by the city. Mr. Hubbard's rather low esteem for civil servants must be shared by substantial numbers of Americans because in recent years we have witnessed an incredible decline in the level of confidence people feel in their government. A current Harris poll found that only 27 percent of the American people express "a great deal of confidence" in those running the Federal executive branch. This disappointing, but hardly surprising, percentage is lower than that for most professional and business groups included in the poll.

It is my opinion that a major reason for this crisis of confidence is the disturbing number of proven or suspected conflicts of interest that exist among employees in Federal, State, and local government. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the American people feel estranged from and even suspicious of their Federal Government when they are treated to events like—

The firing or disciplining of loyal Government employees who testify before Congress to the wasteful expenditure of public tax dollars;

The use of large campaign contributions, like the ITT, dairy lobby, carpet industry and McDonald's contributions to the Nixon campaign, to influence governmental decisionmaking;

The leak of inside information about the Russian wheat deal to large grain companies;

The use of cabinet offices for private and political gain; and, perhaps most importantly,

The debilitating game of musical chairs that goes on between high Government officials and special interest business groups regulated by the Government.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the appointment of businessmen to high Government positions with supervisory power over their former industry associates is the principal reason for the lack of confidence people have in the executive branch.

The appointment of individuals to top Government jobs with responsibility over their former business clients is practiced by all administrations but is a particularly acute problem in the Nixon administration. Consider, for example, Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz, formerly a board member of Ralston Purina Co.; ex-Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard, formerly board chairman of Hewlett-Packard, a defense contractor; Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Charls Walker, formerly executive vice president of American Bankers Association; ex-Federal Railroad Administrator, Reginald N. Whitman, formerly general manager of Gerat Northern Railway and presently an officer of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad; Clarence L. Palmby, appointed Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, formerly executive vice president of the U.S. Feed Grains Council; and Roy Ash, appointed Director of the Office of Management and Budget, formerly chief executive of Litton Industries.

The "incestuous flip-flop" of Clarence Palmby from industry to Government and then back to industry—Palmby was a vice president of the U.S. Feed Grains Council who negotiated the United States-Soviet grain deal for the Department of Agriculture and is now a vice president of Continental Grain Co.—and the appointment of Roy Ash as Director of the Office of Management and Budget while Litton Industries—of which he was president—has contract disputes outstanding with the Government, stand as classic examples of the tawdry game of musical chairs played by this administration which undermines the executive branch and causes the American people to doubt their Government.

Existing conflict-of-interest laws prevent individuals who have left Government service for industry jobs from representing their industry before the Government. But, present laws do not prohibit individuals who have left industry for top Government service—like Ash and Palmby—from making decisions

which involve their former business interests. Moreover, existing conflict laws are inadequately enforced because the Justice Department is reluctant to investigate and prosecute its administration's appointees.

Mr. Speaker, the new conflict-of-interest legislation I am introducing will discourage the appointment to high Federal office of persons from Government-regulated industries, such as Roy Ash and Clarence Palmby.

The need to fill top Government jobs with experienced personnel does not justify permitting those appointees to decide issues involving their former business interests—interests to which they will probably return. If an individual has exceptional managerial talents then those talents can be used in areas totally unrelated to the interests of his former industry group. Moreover, there are large numbers of career Government employees and academicians who are perfectly capable of filling high Government positions.

The new bill, entitled the "Federal Conflict of Interest Act of 1973," would—

Prohibit executive branch Federal employees from participating in any Federal regulatory action or policy decision: First, which involves any special interest in which such employee had a substantial economic interest, including employment, any time during a period of 2 years prior to the commencement of Government service; or two, involving any subject matter concerning which such employee has been involved or participated personally for a special interest at any time;

Require executive branch Federal employees to publically disclose all prior employment or financial interest in Government regulated special interest groups, within 30 days after Federal employment has begun;

Require the dismissal of any executive branch Federal employee who takes or holds office in violation of the act;

Provide a private right of action to any citizen in U.S. district court to enforce, by mandamus, the provisions of the act; and

Require the Comptroller General of the United States, pursuant to his official responsibility to monitor the expenditure of public funds, to investigate and report to Congress on all instances of suspected payment of public funds to executive branch employees in violation of this act or other conflict-of-interest laws—and to seek restitution of such illegal payments.

The final two provisions of the new act would serve as an independent check on the enforcement of the conflict laws by the Attorney General. The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 2410

A bill to restrict the activities of certain Federal employees and officers, to provide private remedies to implement these restrictions, and to facilitate the enforcement of existing conflict of interest statutes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Conflict of Interest Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the administration and enforcement of Federal statutes and the public's confidence in governmental processes are seriously undermined by the absence of effective restrictions on the activities of employees in policymaking positions whose economic interests have been closely allied with corporations, industries, or other groups regulated by agencies and entities in the executive branch; and that existing conflict of interest laws deal inadequately or not at all with the types of activities to be performed by Federal officials whose immediately previous associations and economic interests are tied to special interest groups regulated by the Federal Government. The Congress also finds that there is a reluctance on the part of any administration in office to investigate and prosecute violations of the conflict of interest laws by existing or former officials of that administration.

It is the purpose of this Act, therefore, to circumscribe the Government activities of persons whose prior employment was with a regulated group, to permit judicial enforcement by private persons of the provisions of this Act, and to establish an independent mechanism for the purpose of monitoring the enforcement of existing conflict of interest statutes.

SEC. 3. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, whose rate of pay is equal to or greater than the rate established for level GS–16 in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code or who occupies a professional or technical position with duties of a nature that the employee could cause an economic advantage for or handicap against a special interest in the discharge of his official duties and responsibilities or who occupies a management, administrative, or investigative position, in either regulatory or management echelons, where his actions are likely to have a significant impact on special interest enterprises, shall—

(1) participate in any Federal regulatory action or policy decision which involves any special interest in which such officer or employee had a substantial economic involvement any time during a period of two years prior to the commencement of the term of office or employment of such officer or employee; or

(2) participate in any Federal regulatory action or policy decision involving any subject matter concerning which such officer or employee has been involved or participated personally for or represented a special interest.

SEC. 4. Each officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, whose rate of pay is equal to or greater than the rate established for level GS–16 in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code or who occupies a professional or technical position with duties of a nature that the employee could cause an economic advantage for or handicap against a special interest in the discharge for or handicap against a special interest in the discharge of his official duties and responsibilities or who occupies a management, administrative, or investigative position, in either regulatory or management echelons, where his actions are likely to have a significant impact on special interest enterprises, shall within thirty days of the commencement of any Federal office or employment submit to the head of the agency or entity in connection with which such office or employment is held a detailed statement of such officer's or employee's former substantial economic involvement with any special interests. Such statement shall include the dates and a comprehensive description of such substantial economic involvement, including all work done for such special interest in connection with the Federal Government. All such statements shall be made available for public inspection on request, under rules made by the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 5. The head of each agency or entity may make a specific individual exception, in the case of a particular and specific regulatory action or policy decision, to the provisions of section 3 of this Act whenever such head determines in writing that to make that specific individual exception is essential to the public interest, except that with respect to the head of each agency or entity, such exception and written determination shall be made by the President. Such written determination shall be available for public inspection on request, under rules made by the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 6. (a) It shall be the duty of every officer and employee of the United States having the authority to do so to dismiss any other officer or employee who takes or holds office or employment in violation of Section 3 of this Act, and any person may by action in the nature of mandamus compel any officer or employee of the United States to execute the duty imposed by this subsection.

(b) Any person may be action in the nature of mandamus or prohibition prevent any officer or employee from participating in any Federal regulatory action or policy decision in violation of section 3 and require compliance with Section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 7. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) with respect to any officer or employee, the term "special interest" means any corporation, industry, trade, labor union, or other similar group, if such corporation, industry, trade, labor union, or other similar group is regulated or directly affected by the policies and decisions of such officer or employee in his official Federal capacity; and

(2) the term "substantial economic involvement means any involvement through investment, or as an employee, or otherwise which directly or indirectly either (A) produces, or (B) equals one-quarter or more of the annual income of an individual, or of such individual's spouse, if any, or of both combined.

SEC. 8. (a) This Act shall not apply to the President and Vice President or to anyone occupying a position in the White House Office or on the staff of the Vice President. Except That, this act shall apply to any such person if he is also an officer or employee in the executive branch within the meaning of section 3.

(b) This Act shall not apply to any special Government employee, as that term is defined in section 202(a) of title 18 of the United States Code, except that each such employee and each other person serving on any Government advisory body shall file a written report within thirty days of the commencement of such Government employment or service with the head of the agency or entity with which such employment or service commences, and such report shall set forth such employee's or person's past and present employment and duties for any special interest. All such reports shall be made available for public inspection on request, under rules made by the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 9. (a) The payment of any salary or emolument with respect to office or employment held during violation of this Act or violation of any prohibition imposed in section 205, 207, or 208 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be deemed an expenditure made in violation of the law, and it shall be the duty of the Comptroller General to section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53(a)), the legality of payment of public funds to Federal officers and employees, and to report any such expenditure made in violation of the law to

the Congress under section 312(c) of such Act (31 U.S.C. 53(c)).

(b) The total salary or emolument received in violation of the law under subsection (a) shall constitute—

(1) an indebtedness due to the United States for the purposes of withholding pay of an employee removed for cause under section 5511 of title 5 of the United States Code; and

(2) arrears to the United States for the purposes of withholding pay until arrears are settled under section 5512 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(c) When the General Accounting Office disallows credit or raises a charge because of a payment to an individual made in violation of the law under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, section 5513 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to withholding of pay) shall apply.

(d) Section 5514 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to installment deductions from pay for indebtedness because of erroneous payment) shall apply to an indebtedness incurred under this section.

(e) Section 5584 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to waiver of claims for overpayment of pay where such claims are against equity and good conscience) shall apply to any claim of the United States arising under this section.

(f) The Comptroller General shall have available for the purposes of this Act the applicable authorities, remedies, and procedures established under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and under title 5 of the United States Code.

(g) All departments and establishments shall furnish the Comptroller General with such information relevant to his duties under this Act as the Comptroller General may require of them under section 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 54).

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth calendar day following the date of its enactment, or on such earlier date on or after its enactment as the President shall determine and publish in the Federal Register.

CRITICAL NEED FOR SHORE EROSION PROTECTION LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman J. WILLIAM STANTON and myself are introducing legislation, cosponsored by 17 other Members of the House, which would permit the Army Corps of Engineers to assist cities and local citizens groups in meeting the cost of constructing shore erosion protection devices. This legislation is the same bill which a number of Members from coastal and Great Lakes States sponsored last year.

The need for this legislation has grown even more urgent since the adjournment of the 92d Congress. In particular, the erosion and flooding crisis on the Great Lakes has reached unprecedented proportions, with recent water levels higher than any recorded since 1861. Because of these high water levels, erosion has accelerated, wearing away the soft material which composes the bluffs along most of the Great Lakes shorelines. High water levels on Lake Erie and fierce storms, such as Hurricane Agnes and more recent fall and winter storms, have in many places totally obliterated the beach at the base of the bluffs. The lake now comes right up to the bottom of the bluffs, undercuts them, and collapses huge sections of earth. In some spots, 30 feet of shoreline disappear every year into the lake. A single storm can wash away 20 or 30 feet of land and destroy dozens of homes along the urbanized shoreline of Lake Erie. The effect of these storms and their terrible erosive effect is nearly impossible to describe. During the last several years, I have received countless letters from constituents who live in cities on or near the lakefront. These letters describe, in vivid and terrifying detail, the effects of this erosion—and the reason why the expertise and help of the Federal Government is so desperately needed. I would like to print portions of these sample letters at this point in the RECORD:

EASTLAKE, OHIO,
June 27, 1972.

DEAR SIR: My family and I are residence of the city of Eastlake, living on Lake Shore Blvd., with lake frontage.

In past thirteen years we have seen many things on the lake front that many people that live away from this area would never believe, the ever changing weather patterns and the effect they have on the south shore of Lake Erie.

When we first moved here we had a small small beach, we graded our bank, planted grass and trees to hold our bank from erosion, and a retaining wall below to catch any slippage of land from the elements.

Over the years we gained some beach and lost some. Our trees grew and so did the grass. It did hold our bank. We spent money to maintain all this. We did not mind the expense because we felt we were holding our own.

This past week in just three days of high winds and the fact that the lake level is extremely high, we lost every thing along the bank we put into it in all the years.

Today we can't walk down our steps to the beach we had. In its place we are staring at a blank clay cliff with the few remaining trees sliding slowly down to whats left of the beach and waiting for the next wind storm to come up and carry the soil into the Lake, never to be replaced again.

We are not asking for a hand out. Protecting our property is really protecting other investments—our taxes pay for schools and all other tax necessities. If our property is lost there will be no taxable land or property.

I am sure you are aware of the situation we have and other people in area have.

The only thing I can say is who can we turn to for an answer? We are no longer in a position to continue to fight a battle with nature.

Sincerely,

GEORGE CHINCHAR.

EASTLAKE, OHIO,
June 26, 1972.

DEAR MR. VANIK: I live in Eastlake, Ohio (Chagrin Harbor). My home sets on high ground right at the foot of Forest Drive right by the Lake. This last big storm put sand, silt and logs up to 20 feet long, and stumps 5 feet in diameter in my front yard. My home came out O.K., but I lost 4 feet of land, which puts me within 12 feet of the Lake. The people right below me were not as lucky. Their home busted up in just 2½ hours. The next morning the cottage next to it was gone also. All that remains is the concrete foundations.

In 9 months, we have seen 17 feet of land go to Lake Erie, 5 beautiful trees, six homes. Five of these just 3 days ago.

Mr. Vanik, some of the people lived here for 25 years. Raised their children; now that they are old, they lost their homes.

Would you please try to help us in some way in getting some type of protection.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. WEISERT.

EASTLAKE, OHIO,
January 11, 1973.

CHARLES VANIK,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I purchased our home in August. We have saved for our home for four years. As a young couple we had to scrimp and save over the years as our economy always sky-rockets and never declines.

The home we purchased is on a lovely street which borders Lake Erie at the end. We are situated approximately 600 feet from the lake.

Over the excitement of finally finding a home, we never really realize the potential or fury of Lake Erie.

We had talked frequently with the neighbors who own lakefront property and we are encouraged that they will still continue to fight against the lake overcoming and causing their homes to fall in.

These people are hardworking, middle-wage working people. They practically sink everything they can save into rocks, rubble and anything else that they can buy to try and stop the lake from progressing into their front doors.

My husband and I are petrified of losing our home because of the lake. After four long years of saving we can't afford to lose this.

Sincerely,

LAURA LINTALA.

Needless to say, many of us in the Great Lakes Basin States have tried to call the Federal Government's attention to the impending disaster which will strike these Great Lakes communities during the traditional fierce spring storms. As the following article from the January 17, 1973, Cleveland Plain Dealer indicates, the Federal Government has failed—miserably—to take action to prevent a disaster along the lake.

SPRING HIGH LEVELS FEARED: OHIO GETS FLOOD WARNING

(By Jason Thomas)

Residents along Ohio's already storm-battered Lake Erie shoreline face prospects of the worst pounding in history this spring because of the high lake level, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers warned yesterday.

The rising water level is expected to reach a record five feet above normal in late spring, just in time to be tossed by the annual storms that sweep in off the lake.

Army engineers described the situation as potentially disastrous. Flooding could be widespread, they said.

U.S. Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D–22, of Cleveland, said damage could run into millions of dollars and could involve thousands of acres in the urbanized Great Lakes basin.

Eastlake Mayor William H. Lucas, whose city has felt the brunt of the lake many times, called the outlook "frustrating beyond belief."

Last month the lake level was 2.3 feet above normal, according to a survey released by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The same report said the lake by late spring would exceed its all-time high of slightly more than four feet above normal set in 1952.

"There is nothing we can do," said Sam Maiore, chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydraulic's section at Buffalo. "We have no controls on Lake Erie."

The Corps of Engineers has warned 42 vulnerable areas along the Ohio shoreline to expect extensive damage from spring flooding.

Through a project called "Operation Foresight," the engineers have offered plans for the construction of elaborate sandbag dikes around low areas, including frequently flooded areas in Vermilion, Eastlake and near Toledo.

"All those guys are doing is offering a pile of bags," Vanik said. "They aren't even filling them. They are just standing around and waiting for this thing to happen."

Army Engineers predicted the worst flooding would occur in the Vermilion Lagoons area, where expensive homes sit along manmade waterways. Owners will be advised on methods to safeguard their houses. These methods include blocking basement windows and building small dams around each house.

"That area is hopeless," an Army spokesman added.

Maiore said the sandbagging would have to begin in February so that adequate dikes could be built in time to block the rising, storm-tossed waters.

Vanik has requested that Casper W. Weinberger, director of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, set aside "hundreds of millions of dollars to provide for the disaster relief that will be needed" if extensive flooding occurs.

In a letter to Weinberger, Vanik said:

"It is incredible to me that the federal government can stand by in callous disregard in the face of obvious and impending disaster which is likely to occur during the spring thaw.

"To my knowledge, this is the first time in American history that we have received such a stern and clear warning of impending disaster."

Record rainfall during the last year has raised the water levels in all the Great Lakes. This water eventually flows into Lakes Erie and Ontario before emptying into the St. Lawrence River.

The water level in Lake Ontario last month was 1.1 feet above normal, which was only 0.03 foot below the all-time record. Army engineers said the level in Lake Ontario could be almost two feet higher if they were not able to regulate the water flow through the huge dams of the Robert Moses-Saunders power plant at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River.

"We have no such regulation safeguards on Lake Erie," an engineer said. "We could let more water through the dam, but that would endanger Montreal, and we have a responsibility to Canada."

But even extensive lowering of Lake Ontario, which would result in flooding of parts of Canada, would have little effect on the Lake Erie problem because there is no way of speeding up the flow of Lake Erie waters over Niagara Falls into Lake Ontario, an Army spokesman said.

Corps of Engineers studies show that a dam at the source of the Niagara River with an estimated construction cost of about $200 million could help ease Lake Erie flooding by controlling water flow year-round.

Vanik said there are other more immediate solutions.

He has asked President Nixon to request that the Canadian government reopen the Welland Canal that connects Lake Erie with Lake Ontario. The canal had been closed for repairs during the winter months, shutting off the flow of 7,500 cubic feet of water per second out of Lake Erie.

Vanik said another help would be a cutback in the 5,390 cubic feet of water per second diverted from the Hudson Bay basin into Lake Superior through the Ogoki-Long Lake Project. This water eventually empties into Lake Erie.

He also suggested lowering the level of Lake Michigan by emptying water into the Chicago drainage canal and opening the Black Rock Lock, used primarily for barge traffic, so that an additional 5,000 cubic feet of water per second could flow from Lake Erie into the Niagara River.

"We are talking about only lowering the level four to five inches on the outside, but that would help reduce the damage," Vanik said.

The International Lake Superior Board of Control yesterday closed two additional gates in the St. Mary's River controlling the water flow from Lake Superior to Lake Huron.

Closing of the gates in Sault Ste. Marie in Michigan and Ontario is expected to reduce the amount of water flowing out of Lake Superior by about 9,000 cubic feet per second. During the first week of December, 12 of 16 gates were closed, which reduced the outflow by about 35,000 cubic feet per second. At the same time, the Ontario hydroutility plant cut the outflow of Lake Nipigon into Lake Superior by 5,000 cubic feet per second.

Every drop of water that is kept from flowing into the Great Lakes will help to lessen the expected flooding this spring along the Lake Erie shore.

"All water in the upper Great Lakes will eventually flow downstream," an Army engineer said, "and downstream is Lake Erie."

In light of the failure for the Federal Government to provide more positive leadership in controlling the water levels of the Middle Great Lakes, and in light of their failure to provide adequate flood protection and assistance against erosion, I sent the following letter to the Honorable Caspar Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget on January 10, 1973. As I stated in the letter:

It is incredible to me that the Federal Government can stand by in callous disregard, in the face of obvious and impending disaster. . . .

And that therefore the administration should budget now for hundreds of millions of dollars which will be needed for disaster relief—for relief of a disaster which could have been lessened or even prevented. The letter follows:

JANUARY 10, 1973.

Hon. CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEINBERGER: For some time, I have been endeavoring to alert the Administration to the impending crisis that will occur on large sections of the Lake Erie shoreline—resulting from extraordinarily high water levels which have already flooded large portions of the coastline and which are predicted to cause further extensive flooding during the coming spring storms.

In this period, Lake Erie water levels, already eighteen inches above normal, may well rise in excess of an additional twelve inches over present and unprecedented levels. The flood areas under storm conditions may involve hundreds of thousands of urbanized acres in the Great Lakes Basin.

It is incredible to me that the Federal government can stand by in callous disregard, in the face of obvious and impending disaster which is likely to occur during this spring's thaw. It seems to me that there are many steps that could be taken to reduce the level of the Lake and protect the shoreline with even this short period of lead time over the impending disaster.

If the Federal government is unable to come up with an immediate program of help in this crisis, I must advise your office to set aside adequate financial allocations in the hundreds of millions of dollars to provide for the disaster relief which will be needed.

To my knowledge, this is the first time in American history that we have received such a stern and clear warning of impending disaster.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the only firm protection which can be provided for these highly urbanized shore communities is the construction of shore protection devices in those cases where the cost-benefit ratio justifies construction. Temporary sandbags will not work in the face of Great Lakes storms.

Passage and implementation of the legislation we are introducing today is urgent. In reality, it is emergency legislation to help these communities—and I hope that the Congress and the relevant communities will accept this legislation on an emergency basis and provide for its rapid enactment.

THE URBAN RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, since 1968, the recreation support program—RSP—a temporary summer youth recreation program, has been the only national recreation effort for urban youth in this country. Recreation support is geared to inner-city neighborhood groups and the utilization of existing parks, schools, and recreation areas. Despite minimal and perennially late funding and a lack of local program coordination, the RSP has laid the foundation for all national urban recreation programs to come.

Unfortunately, there is not, nor has there ever been, a strong core organization from which our urban recreation programs could evolve. Our cities have reached the point where they can no longer afford to match Government grants. There is an urgent demand for urban youth recreation programs. About 90 percent of our population resides in metropolitan areas. Sixty-three percent of these people are children under 15 years of age. Yet, there is no money, no open space, and no permanent program to satisfy their recreation needs.

More than anyone else it is our low income and poverty area youth who really suffer from this recreation gap. These children are literally prisoners in their own neighborhoods. Rarely can they find local recreation areas or programs within their reach.

Mr. Speaker, today, along with my distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman GUS HAWKINS of California, I am introducing the Urban Recreational Opportunities Act of 1973. This bill would provide our inner-city youth with permanent, year-round recreational activities. It would also encourage cooperation with other youth programs in order to develop a comprehensive youth recreation system in urban areas throughout the United States.

The new, year-round urban recreational opportunities program would in

effect replace the present summer recreation support program and would be administered by the Department of Labor. It would create a federally subsidized urban recreation system from which park districts, civic centers, neighborhood groups, as well as private organizations or individuals could contract for grants through the chief executive officer of their local government.

The act stresses the necessity of coordinating other youth-oriented programs, such as, the "free lunch" program and youth transportation programs, in order to enable the development of strong local recreation systems with mimimal duplication and maximum effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the youth of this Nation—to the 100 million young people who live in our cities—to provide adequate urban recreation opportunities.

At this point I insert the text of this legislation in the RECORD:

H.R. 2334

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide for the development and implementation of programs of units of local government to provide comprehensive year-round recreational opportunities for the Nation's underprivileged youth, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Recreation Support Program be cited as the "Urban Recreational Opportunities Act of 1973."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that many young Americans are unable to have healthful, developmental recreational opportunities because of lack of personal financial resources and the absence of appropriate facilities to provide such opportunities; that the denial of these opportunities is more evident and critical with respect to the underprivileged youth who reside in the crowded neighborhoods of the Nation's major cities; and that the problem of providing such recreational opportunities is compounded by such factors as the financial inability of local governmental agencies to plan and operate comprehensive year-round recreation programs, the changing patterns of public school operations which are presenting greater challenges to local governmental recreation agencies, and the operation of State and Federal recreation programs in locations far removed from the Nation's major cities.

(b) The Congress further finds that the solution to the problem of providing recreational opportunities for the Nation's underprivileged youth lies in:

(1) the establishment of a permanent year-round urban recreational opportunities program within the Department of Labor; and

(2) the providing of the necessary linkage on the local level with already existing Federal, State, or locally funded programs in such a way as to utilize existing resources.

PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 3 (a) For the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Labor (herein after referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Interior, to develop and to implement programs which are used or usable for recreation, including but not limited to—

(1) transfer of funds to any other federal department or agency involved in supporting recreation programs;

(2) technical assistance, to be made available by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's regional representatives working with manpower planning staffs provided for under the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS); and

(3) coordination of all such programs by the Secretary with units of local government.

PROGRAM PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to units of local government, to assess, and to plan for meeting, the total recreation need, consistent with the purposes of this Act.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to units of local government for urban recreational services for underprivileged youth that will meet the high priority needs identified in the programs developed in accordance with provisions of section 4 of this Act.

(b) Programs shall be carried out through grants made directly to units of local government, including but not limited to the largest cities in the United States as determined by the 1970 census, and to the rural areas where the need for recreational opportunities is the greatest.

(c) Particular attention shall be given to the needs of Appalachia and Indian tribes.

(d) To the maximum extent feasible, recreation sites selected for programs must be located directly in low-income communities or areas to insure that disadvantaged youth will benefit from the program.

(e) Programs assisted under this Act shall, to the extent feasible, be designed to include the following:

(1) Informational tours
(2) Cultural field trips
(3) Instruction in arts and crafts
(4) Athletic activities
(5) Admission to special events
(6) Transportation for youth
(7) Transportation for staff
(8) Lunches provided as part of the recreational activity
(9) Special recreation clothing where needed.

(f) Funds made available to units of local government may be made available by the chief executive officer of such unit or his designated body, to any political subdivision within that unit of local government.

(g) Agencies designated under part (b) of this section may contract with any private non-profit agency or organization to implement such program projects.

(h) The amounts available for annual grants under this section shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the following factors:

(1) The number of underprivileged youth residing within the area;

(2) The ability of the local government's program to serve the high priority recreational needs of youth, especially the underprivileged youth residing in crowded neighborhoods of major cities;

(3) The effectiveness of the local government's overall recreation programs including acquisition and development of recreation lands and facilities to serve high priority needs; and

(4) Such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant.

(i) A public agency may receive funds under this section for costs of the direct recreational opportunities program services for underprivileged youth, including supervisory and leadership services, transportation, program supplies, lodging, meals, clothing, insurance, and such other services as the Secretary deems necessary for such youth to participate in recreational activities.

(j) Grants shall be used to supplement rather than supplant financial efforts of units of local government.

(k) The Secretary may establish such additional terms and conditions to the grants authorized by the section as he determines to be desirable.

(l) The District of Columbia and Puerto Rico shall be considered as units of local government for the purposes of this section.

CRITICAL SERVICES AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 6(a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any public or private bodies or agencies in coordination with chief elected officials of local units of government subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, for the purposes of (1) providing recreational opportunities concentrations of underprivileged youth if he determines the needs of such youth are not adequately met through the other federal, State, or local programs established pursuant to this Act; or (2) demonstrating and evaluating new methods and techniques of providing recreation support services for concentrations of underprivileged youth.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 7(a) The Secretary shall take appropriate action to insure that any program for which financial assistance is received under this Act utilizes, to the maximum extent practicable, lands and facilities in public ownership that may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall to the extent possible, insure that Federal assistance in public housing, housing loan guarantees and school construction programs take into account and provide for needs for recreation space and program operation.

(c) Funds made available to other federal agencies for programs supporting this Act shall not affect grants for funds made available under this Act.

(d) In order to assure consistency in policies and actions under this Act with other related Federal programs and activities, the Secretary may issue such regulations with respect thereto as he deems desirable.

EVALUATION

SEC. 8. (a) From funds appropriated to carry out the grants, the Secretary may reserve such amount, not to exceed one per centum, as he deems necessary to provide for a continuing evaluation of programs assisted under this Act and their impact on related programs.

(b) The Secretary may disseminate the results of the evaluations conducted under this section as well as other information concerning Recreational Opportunities, to interested agencies, organizations and individuals.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 9. (a) Each unit of local government or private non-profit agency receiving financial assistance under this Act shall keep such records and make such reports as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the disposition of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the undertakings in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the progress made toward implementing the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Secretary of Labor may reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for expenses incurred in assisting in the implementation of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, $100 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $150 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $200 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Any amounts appropriated under this Act shall remain available until expended.

THE URBAN RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my colleague Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the introduction of the Urban Recreational Opportunities Act of 1973. It is important that I explain this legislation, because of the attention it gives to creating and developing meaningful uses of time for our youth.

The Urban Recreational Opportunities Act, a critically needed program, establishes with permanency the recreation support program. RSP was initially created out of demonstration and pilot project funds by the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor. This legislation also provides a method of stabilized funding through authorized appropriations.

Since the summer of 1970, the recreation support program—RSP—has been administered by the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior.

Initially, RSP was designed to expand existing recreational efforts conducted by public and private agencies for children 6 to 13 years of age, drew its major source of manpower from the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Funds flowed through mayors and their youth coordinators and were then subcontracted to public agencies or nonprofit organizations which desired to conduct recreation programs.

The use of the NYC aides established lines of communication between innercity residents and summer recreation staff members, gave credibility to the program and succeeded in combining youth employment and recreation program needs.

Agencies which prior to 1970 had given incidental assistance for recreation, have since that time cut or severely limited such grants. To fill this gap, "crash funding" was requested and the Congress appropriated $15 million in 1970; $12.8 million in 1971; and $15 million in 1972 for a 2½-month summer program.

In both 1971 and 1972, the recreation support programs was funded under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act. There was no other authority. This continued uncertainty of funding and the levels has resulted in several studies of the operation of the program and have revealed that:

First. "Crash funding" severely limits effectiveness by curtailing planning.

Second. Age restrictions have been unfair and have hindered the provision of services to those youth who needed them.

Third. The "summer only" operation of the program on such limited basis has prevented maximum effectiveness.

Fourth. Disadvantaged youth require better equipment, better facilities, and more recreational services.

Fifth. Inadequate recreation opportunity is one of the major grievances of the poor urban residents.

One suggestion has been the establishment of a permanent recreation program that takes maximum advantage of existing investments in land and facilities.

Clearly the need for recreation facilities and organized programs has grown since it ranked fourth among the 12 most intense grievances in the cities where there were riots in 1967. Local governments desperately need Federal finance assistance, and there presently exists no permanently established recreation program to provide such help.

The Urban Recreational Opportunities Act provides a major step in the direction of eliminating many of the past problems. This bill would establish a permanent year-round recreational program within the Department of Labor with funding authorized for a 3-year period.

This bill would also provide much-needed linkages on the local level with already existing Federal, State, or locally funded programs in such a way as to utilize existing resources. Excellent examples of the coordination involved are the usage of special feeding programs for youth in the summer months under the Department of Agriculture, youth transportation under the Department of Transportation, and the use of programs under the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

The bill would assist the mayors of our large urban areas by allowing:

First. The Secretary to make grants to units of local government to assess the total urban recreational needs.

Second. Utilization of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's regional representative working with manpower planning staffs under the cooperative area manpower planning system—CAMPS.

Third. High priority to meet the urban recreational needs of underprivileged youth.

Fourth. Particular attention to be given to the needs of Appalachia and Indian tribes.

The year-round nature of this legislation is designed to provide the needed planning in order to flexibly serve the greater needs of the younger and nonemployable youth during the summer months, and the type of constructive activities desired by the age group employable during the summer months, but in need of recreation in addition to more limited employment during the in-school months.

Mr. Speaker, as we witness a growth in youthful unemployment accompanied by greater demands for meaningful jobs, as we witness a national growth in youthful unrest and resulting acts of violence in our urban cities from New York to California, we must prepare to meet the crisis.

Let us not ignore the warning signals. Let us move quickly in enactment of this legislation and thereby strike another blow for our Nation's youth.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JIM SMITH

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my other colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding man, Mr. Jim Smith, who is ending his tenure as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

Even though I was not privileged to serve with Mr. Smith when he was a distinguished Member of the House, I have known and admired him as he has served rural America in his latest capacity.

I feel that Mr. Smith's knowledge and keen awareness of the problems that have faced rural America were extremely unique for leadership of governmental agencies and the Farmers Home Administration programs certainly reflected his wisdom.

Under his leadership, the Farmers Home Administration in 1972 alone financed the construction and repair of 115,985 individual houses and 3,500 rental units, providing housing for more than 570,000 rural people.

FHA loans to farmers included $816 million loaned to 71,583 families to purchase or operate farms or to restore disrupted farm operations, benefiting over 323,000 rural people. Private lenders participated with over $300 million, helping to make 8,900 additional loans and bringing total money available to over $1 billion.

In developing rural water and waste disposal systems, FHA provided some $300 million in loans and $40 million in grants for the construction or improvement of more than 1,200 systems serving more than 2.2 million rural citizens.

Needless to say, I am extremely saddened that such an able administrator is departing, but I want to wish Jim every success in the future in what endeavors he decides to pursue.

THE THREAT TO RURAL AMERICA TODAY

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

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—I would like to go on record today in regards to one of the recent

austerity moves by the administration. Frankly, I must admit my confusion over the matter. I am speaking about the action taken by the administration toward the Rural Environmental Assistance program.

I recall around election time the campaign promise to the small farmer and citizen in rural America was "Don't worry, we'll take care of you." Well, all my friends and constituents who live in rural America are saying that is certainly true, and if they get taken care of any more they will not be able to stand it. As it is now, they only face destitution. If the Department of Agriculture leadership has its way, they will take good enough care of the small farmer to bring about his starvation.

Mr. Speaker, somebody is talking out of both sides of their mouth, with one hand patting the farmer on the back, and with the other picking his pocket. That somebody is not the Congress.

Today, rural America is faced with the greatest threat in its history—every day more and more people say "enough" and leave the farm. They leave because they cannot afford to be "taken care of" in the manner to which the powers that be would like them to become accustomed. They are tired of being the have-nots in an affluent society. Well, I do not blame them. I suspect I would lose my enthusiasm too in light of the most recent developments—the abolishment of REAP. This is not a budget cut—but a death sentence. This will be the "final straw" for many in rural America. The deciding factor between staying and leaving. To maintain the American farmer can continue to subsist without assistance is pure folly. He cannot. Moreover he should not.

The rural citizen deserves the same consideration as his urban counterpart, but the administration wants to take away this program that has done so much. What has it done? Well, just to put this program in perspective I would like to quote the distinguished chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, our colleague, Mr. POAGE of Texas. Speaking of the results of REAP he said:

> It has done more to clean up our streams than all of our pollution programs.

It has done this by widespread effort. This program has invited increased yearly participation by never allowing more than $2,500 per individual. This program has stopped the movement of silt and erosion of the land with terraces, contour farming, establishment of cover crops, and restoration of grasslands. Another plus for the program is the major portion it has accounted for in the reforestation of much of our private lands.

Let us not forget, this has been a participation program in which the small farmer has put his own funds on a matching basis. Now the "experts" want to stop this program. I am not sure if they do not know—or do not care that stopping such a program will have disastrous, long-range effects on all Americans.

Last year, 3 million acre-feet of silt poured into our streams—practically all of it from the rural area. In comparison, 104,000 acre-feet of sewage—practically all from the city was added to the streams. The very man who is responsible for helping to keep the rural figure from assuming astronomical proportions, the farmer, is being cut out of the assistance picture.

I must protest the lack of foresight that is being shown at this time. If we dismantle this program, I can see a return to the dustbowl days of 40 years ago. I am sure there are some who can remember those trying times, when much of America's heartland was lost. While I agree with the President that expenditures have gone too far, I do not feel that one segment of our society, the farmer, should bear the full weight of budget cuts. At this time, the administration is approving, yes, even increasing, the Federal percentage of assistance to the urban areas. I must object to the "stepson" role that is being thrust upon rural America.

Furthermore, I am concerned with the attempt to determine the priority of Federal spending. We, in the Congress, passed this law to spend $225 million on this program. First plans were to spend $140 million in initial funds. By my calculations, this was a cut of $85 million. Now we are told that none of the money will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I must wonder aloud if anyone but Congress has the authority to abolish a program. As I understand the Constitution, it gives Congress the authority to determine the priority of Federal expenditures. Secondly, I must object to the timing of the announcement of cuts. Farmers in my district had been led to believe that at least $140 million was going to be available—money some of them were looking forward to. Following the election this changed, but not until the Christmas holidays. Could it be that there was hope such an announcement would be lost in the shuffle—buried in the hustle-bustle of the season. Frankly, gentlemen, this whole affair is beginning to take on a faint odor that seems to be growing stronger every minute. I, for one, am reluctant to allow still further erosion of the legislative branch's powers. I answer to the people who take the time to elect me every 2 years. I do not hide behind a wall of advisers, Cabinet members, and various assorted aides. I stand face to face with voters who are displeased with the direction of aid in rural America. I talk to the people and listen to their problems—not a pack of advisers who would not know a bull from a bass fiddle.

I cannot explain to an irate farmer that while I voted for a bill and it passed and the President signed it, no money will be spent. All the farmer sees is that helping hand being withdrawn at a time when he needs it more than ever. So when he cannot get an answer from the farm agent, then he turns to me for help. Since the Constitution says that I can give him that help, by God, I intend to. Congress has marched to another tune long enough. Now is the time to start making our own music and set our own pace. If that means others must fall into step, then so be it.

LEGISLATICN TO AMEND THE DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives in the 92d Congress, but which failed to become enacted into law as the other body moved toward adjournment. That bill was H.R. 16598 and was then, and is now, an urgently needed amendment to the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 which provides that community disaster grants be based upon loss of budgeted revenue.

The catalog of sins visited by Hurricane Agnes upon the people of Pennsylvania is indeed a rouges' gallery—however, one of the most persistent and profound problems has been the destruction of the tax base at the local governmental level. As the direct result of every major natural disaster suffered in this Nation, fiscal damage to local governments is impacted twofold: First, in response to the sharp increase in needed services due to the disaster, expenditures rise dramatically. Second, revenues fall off sharply as a reflection of lost property and other tax sources which have been destroyed by the disaster. Local governments, find themselves with a drastically eroded tax base, and the prospect of not being able to deliver badly needed services both while in the middle of the disaster and in subsequent years.

The Congress recognized these terrible side effects of disaster when it passed the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 which contained a provision allowing for community disaster grants, section 241 of Public Law 91-606. It was a great idea with all the good intentions in the world—it was a fine plan of action to aid the communities in their struggle against ruin—but there was one major fault, it just did not work. And believe me, I know. I can recite for the next 10 minutes a list in my congressional district of small towns and some cities on both sides of the Susquehanna River stretching for some 60 miles which were wiped out by the flooding from Hurricane Agnes; and which would receive either nothing under current law or merely a few hundred dollars.

As evidence of the above-mentioned situation, I present the following charts, prepared by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, which will graphically illustrate the fiscal impact upon the city of Wilkes-Barre and the county of Luzerne—the hardest hit areas in the Agnes disaster:

CHART A

WILKES-BARRE CITY IN 1972—REDUCED LOCAL REVENUES IN 1972, PROJECTED 1972 REVENUE SHORTFALLS FOR SEVERAL CITY INCOME SOURCES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Budgeted	Expected	Revenue shortfall	Revenue shortfall as a percentage of 1972 budgeted amount
Real estate tax collections	$3,052	$2,792	$260	9
City-based nontax revenues (e.g., permits, parking)	781	601	180	23
Collections of prior years' taxes	160	130	30	19
Per capita and residence taxes [1]	230	199	31	13
Occupational privilege tax	165	150	15	9
Earned income tax	635	620	15	2
Mercantile tax	120	116	4	3
Subtotal	5,143	4,608	535	10
All other	321			
Total 1972 budget	5,464			

[1] Both taxes have been combined in this table.

Source: Wilkes-Barre City financial records and McKinsey estimates.

CHART B WILKES BARRE CITY 1972

Section 241 of the Disaster Relief Act provides no relief on the biggest shortfall—the property tax.

Qualification for recovery assistance requires a 15 percent flood year loss versus base year.

Wilkes-Barre 1972 collections exceeded 1971 since most collections preceded the flood.

(NOTE: Charts accompanying text not reproduced in the RECORD.)

CHART C

Section 241 not likely to provide relief in 1973 either.

[In thousands of dollars]

3-year average	2,374
1969 actual	2,054
1970 actual	2,514
1971 actual	2,554
1972 estimated year to date	2,792
1973 estimated	2,496

Source: Calculation procedure reviewed with OEP.

CHART D—LUZERNE COUNTY

The county will not qualify for Section 241 funds.

[Receipts in thousands of dollars]

1971	5,302
1972	5,394
Qualification line (85 percent)	4,508

CHART E—LUZERNE COUNTY 1973

Luzerne County does not qualify for Section 241 funds.

[In thousands of dollars]

3-year average	$4,834
1969 actual	4,131
1970 actual	5,070
1971 actual	5,303
1972 actual year to date	5,520
1973 estimated	5,273
Qualification line	4,508

Source: McKinsey estimates/county budget.

In explanation of the above situation, under current law grants under section 241 are based upon an average of tax collections over the past 3 years. In growing communities—and almost all are growing—the average of 3 years tax collections is significantly lower than the current disaster years tax collections. If you use the average figure as a base for making a community disaster grant, the result is zero grant money. What I have done in this bill to rectify this deplorable situation is to base the grants upon the loss of budgeted revenue. A community will then get a grant to make up for the difference between what their expected revenue was in the disaster year and what they actually did collect. The aim will be to fill this fiscal gap. This assures that the effects of a seriously eroded tax base will not be immediately felt at such a critical moment as the time when efforts are being strenuously made toward recovery—with all the consequences that can mean.

In addition, grants are to be made to make up for all locally generated revenues which have been cut due to the disaster. This excludes extraordinary revenues such bond issues for obvious reasons, but does include property and other taxes, permits, fines, departmental earnings, refunds and reimbursements, et cetera, all of which suffer reduction in amounts collected when disaster strikes.

Mr. Speaker, safeguards have been written into this bill—tax rates and tax assessment valuation factors in effect at the time of the disaster shall be used for purposes of computing the grant, without reduction. Furthermore, any State grants—made strictly for the purposes outlined in this act—will reduce the amount of the Federal grant. In addition, the bill provides for the opportunity of local governments to grow and thus provide for the demanded services which are so desperately needed at the local level. The bill allows a 10-percent growth in the budget in the year following the disaster, and an additional 10 percent in the second year, for the purposes of making these grants.

This bill assures that the congressional intent to "shore-up" municipal tax bases which had been eroded due to natural disaster becomes a reality. The machinery exists presently which was intended to help communities recover from a disaster; however, that machinery must be replaced with a new engine designed to close the fiscal gaps which prevent the rapid and complete recovery of destroyed American towns and cities. When an American city such as Wilkes-Barre, Pa. has suffered a revenue shortfall in 1972 of $665,000; when that same city will face an initial revenue gap of over $1.5 million in 1973; when that city must be forced to spend over one-half of its revenue sharing funds of 1972 and all of its revenue sharing funds of 1973 merely to balance the budget; when the only other option available is to raise the taxes of a citizenry who have virtually lost all of their possessions, or curtail crucially needed local services—when such a situation exists now and can exist at any moment in the future in any, I repeat any, American city, then the time has come for a rapid change in the law. I can assure you that the benefits will rebound to all of us many fold what little we shall expend.

H.R. 2306

A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to provide that community disaster grants be based upon loss of budgeted revenue

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 241 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4460) is amended to read as follows:

"COMMUNITY DISASTER GRANTS

"SEC. 241. (a) The President is authorized to make grants to any local government which, as the result of a major disaster, has suffered a substantial loss of revenue. Grants made under this section may be made for the tax year in which the disaster occurred and for each of the following two tax years. A grant under this section for the tax year in which the major disaster occurred, plus a grant from the State in which such local government is located made for the purposes of this section for such tax year, shall not exceed the difference between the total revenue received by the local government for such year and the total revenue provided for in the base budget of the local government which was in effect for such year. For each of the two tax years following the major disaster, a grant under this section, plus such a State grant for such tax years, shall not exceed the difference between the total revenue received by the local government for the tax year for which the grant is made and the total revenue provided for in the base budget of the local government which was in effect for such year. In no case shall a grant for the tax year following a major disaster, plus such a State grant for such tax year, exceed the difference between the total revenue received by the local government for the tax year for which the grant is made and an amount equal to 110 per centum of the total revenue provided for in the base budget of the local government which was in effect for the tax year in which the major disaster occurred. In no case shall a grant for the second tax year following a major disaster, plus such a State grant for such tax year, exceed the difference between the total revenue received by the local governments for the tax year for which the grant is made and an amount equal to 120 per centum of the total revenue provided for in the base budget of the local government which was in effect for the tax year in which the major disaster occurred.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'revenue' includes revenue generated by the local government derived from property taxes (both real and personal) and other taxes, permits, licenses, fines and costs, departmental earnings, refunds, and reimbursements, but does not include extraordinary receipts of a nonrecurring nature.

"(2) The term 'base budget' means the budget of the local government which was in effect on that date prior to the date of the major disaster for which a grant is made under this section.

"(c) For the purposes of computing the revenue received by a local government in any tax year during which a grant is made under this section, the President shall use the tax rates and tax assessment valuation factors of the local government in effect

at the time of the major disaster without reduction."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect with respect to grants to local governments for losses resulting from major disasters which occur after June 1, 1972.

NIER TOOLS FOR SCHOOLS: COCK ROBIN OR PHOENIX?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 30 mniutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker—

"Who killed Cock Robin?
Who saw him die?
Who'll dig his grave?" (from *Mother Goose*)

". . . when the bird of wonder dies,
The maiden phoenix, her ashes new-create another heir as great in admiration as herself." (from Shakespeare)

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, machine tools worth over $46 million are literally rusting away in two storage depots of the National Industrial Equipment Reserve—NIER—and some 400 U.S. schools face the possible loss of over $40 million in NIER machinery on free loan for vocational training purposes.

What precipitated this sad state of affairs was a minor disagreement between the Congress and the administration last year over whether to retain NIER funds in the budget of the General Services Administration or shift them to the Department of Defense budget. While GSA has responsibility for the protection and maintenance of NIER machinery in storage and for the tools for schools loan program, the Department of Defense has overall responsibility for NIER. The upshot of this budgetary disagreement was that NIER ended up nowhere, and at midnight, December 31, 1972, GSA was forced, due to lack of funds, to turn off the dehumidifiers and lock up its two main storage facilities, cease its inspections of machinery on loan to schools, and shove pending loan applications into the deepfreeze. All this was allowed to happen despite the fact that Deputy Defense Secretary Rush has termed the situation, "detrimental to our national security interests" and has praised the "tools for schools" program as beneficial both because some 35,000 youths and disadvantaged persons "are taught skills which are critical to defense emergency production" on this machinery, and because "the Government has obtained free storage and maintenance of NIER equipment" on loan.

The correspondence I have had both within the Congress and with the executive branch reinforces my impression about the value of the NIER program and the need to continue it. It also reflects some difference of opinion as to who is responsible for the death of Cock Robin—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 11, 1973, page 875. I am not interested at this point in affixing blame. The administration had some valid reasons for including NIER funding under DOD, and the House Appropriations Committee had equally persuasive arguments for keeping DOD out of the school loan business. And by the time the matter had been resolved with respect to the DOD appropriation bill, the GSA appropriation bill had already been signed into law.

So, I come today not to bury the NIER Cock Robin, but to praise it and to suggest and urge that it be recreated, phoenix-like, from the ashes. To accomplish this I am today introducing with Mr. QUIE, Mr. BRADEMAS, and 61 cosponsors, a $1.8 million supplemental appropriation bill for GSA to continue the NIER program.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should be fully aware of the possible consequences if we do not move to restore funds for NIER. If NIER is terminated and it becomes necessary to withdraw the 8,149 pieces of machinery now on loan to schools and place them in Government storage, it could cost the Government up to an additional $3.8 million per year to store and maintain this machinery, according to estimates provided to me by the General Accounting Office.

And if the schools in turn attempt to replace this machinery at their own expense, it could cost them up to $103 million, again according to estimates supplied by GAO in consultation with GSA and DOD officials.

Now I admit this is all based on the worst possible contingency, that is, the forced withdrawal of all machinery on loan, but it is still a very real possibility since GSA can no longer make its periodic inspections of the schools to insure that the machinery on loan is still in adequate condition to be retained as part of the machine tool reserve. So, while no decision has yet been made as to what to do with the machinery on loan, we must seriously consider total withdrawal as a possibility and assess its projected impact on the Government and the schools involved, both in terms of money and manpower training requirements. And we can only conclude, on the basis of estimates supplied to me by GAO, that the additional expense to the Government could be up to twice as much as we are now spending on the entire NIER program, that is, that the cost to the Government would triple. But even more significant would be the impossible financial burden placed upon the schools if they attempted to replace this machinery at their own expense, amounting to as much as $103 million.

And I must point out that I am not including in these estimates what it will cost the Government to replace the machinery now rusting away in storage unless something is soon done.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that while the bill we are introducing today involves a very miniscule supplemental appropriation of $1.8 million, our failure to act on it expeditiously could come back to haunt us a hundredfold. This bill supports the position of our Appropriations Committee last year to retain NIER under GSA, and the subsequent communication to me by the chairman that, "the Committee has no objection to the funding of such programs in the appropriate departments or agencies, such as the General Services Administration." By our introduction of this bill today we are simply underlining our strong support for the position taken by the committee and its chairman and calling the attention of the committee to the importance and urgency which we attach to this issue. It is our hope that the committee will be encouraged and impressed by this support and will give priority attention to this matter at the earlier practicable date.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a list of cosponsors of this supplemental appropriation bill, a table showing the number of schools in each State having NIER equipment on loan, an exchange of correspondence between myself and a White House official on this matter, and the report I have cited from the Comptroller General of GAO, the Honorable Elmer Staats.

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF NIER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. Anderson (R-Ill.), Mr. Quie (R-Minn.), Mr. Brademas (D-Ind.), Mr. Adams (D-Wash.), Mr. Alexander (D-Ark.), Mr. Badillo (D-N.Y.), Mr. Bergland (D-Minn.), Mr. Bevill (D-Ala.), Mr. Boland (D-Mass.), Mr. Buchanan (R-Ala.), Mrs. Chisholm (D-N.Y.), Mr. Cohen (R-Maine), Mr. Danielson (D-Calif.), Mr. Davis (D-Ga.), Mr. Dellenback (R-Oreg.), Mr. de Lugo (V.I.), Mr. Derwinski (R-Ill.), Mr. Forsythe (R-N.J.), Mr. Fraser (D-Minn.), Mr. Guyer (R-Ohio), Mr. Harrington (D-Mass.), Mr. Harsha (R-Ohio), Mr. Ichord (D-Mo.), Mr. Kemp (R-N.Y.), Mr. Johnson (D-Calif.).

Mr. Latta (R-Ohio), Mr. McClory (R-Ill.), Mr. McCollister (R-Nebr.), Mr. Mailliard (R-Calif.), Mr. Mayne (R-Iowa), Mr. Meeds (D-Wash.), Mr. Moakley (D-Mass.), Mr. Mollohan (D-W. Va.), Mr. Mosher (R-Ohio), Mr. Moss (D-Calif.), Mr. Myers (R-Ind.), Mr. Nelsen (R-Minn.), Mr. Pepper (D-Fla.), Mr. Peyser (R-N.Y.), Mr. Podell (D-N.Y.), Mr. Price (D-Ill.), Mr. Riegle (R-Mich.), Mr. Roe (D-N.J.), Mr. Roybal (D-Calif.), Mr. Sarbanes (D-Md.), Mr. Scherle (R-Iowa), Mr. Selberling (D-Ohio);

Mr. James V. Stanton (D-Ohio), Mr. Stuckey (D-Ga.), Mr. Symington (D-Mo.), Mr. Thompson (D-N.J.), Mr. Thone (R-Nebr.), Mr. Thornton (D-Ark.), Mr. Williams (R-Pa.), Mr. Charles Wilson (D-Tex.), Mr. Wolff (D-N.Y.), Mr. Wyman (R-N.H.), Mr. Zwach (R-Minn.), Mr. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.), Mr. Frenzel (R-Minn.), Mr. Culver (D-Iowa), Mr. Landgrebe (R-Ind.), Mr. Veysey (R-Calif.), Mr. Mendel Davis (D-S.C.).

TOOLS FOR SCHOOLS LOAN AGREEMENTS AS OF SEPT. 30, 1972

State	Number of loans	Number of items	Acquisition cost
Alabama	8	157	$633,981
Arkansas	27	507	2,126,019
California	28	499	2,552,628
Colorado	1	35	143,133
Connecticut	10	123	450,279
Delaware	2	22	111,112
Florida	1	43	97,020
Georgia	12	251	1,062,123
Idaho	3	33	110,098
Illinois	15	229	999,404
Indiana	18	321	2,229,527
Iowa	11	249	1,333,824
Kansas	10	233	897,585
Louisiana	1	14	42,461
Maine	3	41	172,942
Maryland	1	18	65,494
Massachusetts	27	665	2,573,796
Michigan	32	784	4,060,852
Minnesota	12	496	2,512,708
Mississippi	1	24	77,309
Missouri	9	259	1,564,196
Montana	1	5	10,668
Nebraska	4	131	704,464
New Hampshire	7	177	800,001
New Jersey	12	113	500,090
New Mexico	3	48	176,656
New York	7	49	170,998

TOOLS FOR SCHOOLS LOAN AGREEMENTS AS OF SEPT. 30, 1972—Continued

State	Number of loans	Number of items	Acquisition cost
North Carolina	5	152	$654,548
North Dakota	1	37	183,219
Ohio	31	484	2,653,809
Oklahoma	5	61	401,878
Oregon	13	181	1,304,911
Pennsylvania	19	378	1,929,475
South Carolina	10	301	2,265,046
South Dakota	3	77	320,360
Tennessee	7	86	328,532
Texas	4	45	243,330
Utah	3	76	525,959
Vermont	1	40	137,479
Virginia	13	172	1,198,264
Washington	7	146	732,610
West Virginia	3	81	236,243
Wisconsin	7	284	1,708,968
Wyoming	1	22	156,662
Total, 44 States	399	8,149	41,160,661

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 9, 1973.

Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This refers to your letter to Mr. Weinberger of December 13, 1972, concerning the National Industrial Equipment Reserve program which involves loans of machine tools to vocational education programs.

The President's 1973 Budget proposed that funding for the administrative expenses of the NIER program be shifted from the General Services Administration to the Department of Defense. In reviewing the 1973 budget proposals we concluded that this was not a high priority program and should be subject to examination by the Congress as part of their action on the 1973 Defense program. The budget proposed that 16 programs be absorbed within existing Defense Department funds.

As you know, the Congress decided not to provide funds for continuation of the Industrial Reserve program. While this action was, I am sure, the result of many considerations, I would point out that Mr. Mahon expressed concern that this program appeared to be based more on vocational training objectives than on defense requirements.

In view of the congressional action leading to termination of the NIER program I understand that the Department of Defense is considering a number of alternatives relating to the future of NIER and other Defense equipment reserves. To the extent that any of the stockpiled equipment is declared excess, it could then be donated to educational institutions for vocational training programs.

I appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. GIFFORD,
Special Assistant to the President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1973.

Mr. WILLIAM L. GIFFORD,
Special Assistant to the President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for your letter of January 9 in response to my letter of December 13 concerning funding for the National Industrial Equipment Reserve (NIER) and its "tools for schools" loan program.

In your final paragraph you indicate that the Department of Defense "is considering a number of alternatives relating to the future of NIER and other Defense equipment reserves." I assume you may be referring to the December 13 letter from Deputy Defense Secretary Kenneth Rush to Chairman Mahon requesting authority and funds to "transfer the 4,100 tools from the NIER to the General Industrial Equipment Reserve of the DoD." As you may know, Chairman Mahon denied that request in his response of December 21, saying such a transfer "may not be in consonance with the intent of Congress." At the same time, Chairman Mahon indicated that, "The Congress, of course, did not object to the continuation of the program in the General Services Administration."

If, as Deputy Defense Secretary Rush maintains, the present limbo status of NIER "has an immediate detrimental effect on national security interests," and if, as he further maintains, the Government has benefited from "the free storage and maintenance of NIER equipment" on loan to schools, "and at the same time some 35,000 youths and disadvantaged people are taught skills which are critical to defense emergency production" on this machinery, then it would seem to me that the Government has a very large stake in continuing the NIER program and that every effort should be made to resolve the small bookkeeping differences which exist between the Congress and the Executive. I would simply propose again that this can be achieved by restoring NIER funds to GSA now through a supplemental appropriation, and by retaining it under GSA in the fiscal 1974 budget.

I don't think it really makes all that much difference whether NIER appears in the Defense budget or that of GSA because, as Deputy Defense Secretary Rush points out in his letter, "emergency plans call for transfer of the functions which the Secretary of Defense exercises with respect to NIER to the agency established for control of national production in time of emergency."

I think it would be doubly disastrous if, by our inaction at this time, we were to allow the unattended NIER machinery in storage to rust into a state of disrepair (and that is a real danger), and if we were to terminate the valuable "tools for schools" loan program and perhaps be forced to withdraw the machinery now on loan. Both components of NIER are vital to our national security interests and both are popular in the Congress, in the Executive Branch and with the schools.

I would therefore strongly urge the President and the Office of Management and the Budget to lend their immediate support to a supplemental appropriation to salvage the NIER program and to retain this function in the GSA budget in fiscal 1974.

With all best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1973.

B–125187.

The Honorable JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In your letter dated December 18, 1972, you asked the General Accounting Office to provide two cost estimates relating to the potential impact of discontinuing the school loan program of the National Industrial Equipment Reserve (NIER). Specifically, you asked us to estimate (1) the additional cost to the Government if machine tools on loan to vocational schools from the NIER were recalled, stored, and maintained in Government supply depots and (2) the cost to vocational schools to replace these tools.

The National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (Public Law 80–883) established the NIER as a reserve of machine tools for use in time of national emergency. The NIER consists of 12,249 machine tools having an acquisition cost of $89,221,000 as of September 30, 1972. Tools on loan to schools totaled 8,149 with an acquisition cost of $41,161,000; the remainder—4,100 with an acquisition cost of $48,060,000—are stored at Department of Defense (DOD) depots and General Services Administration (GSA) facilities.

DOD has overall responsibility for the NIER. GSA, under the direction of DOD, is responsible for storing, maintaining, leasing, and disposing of the reserve and for operating the school loan program.

We asked Department of Defense officials to estimate the additional cost to store approximately 8,200 tools. DOD provided us with estimated costs to store the tools in both controlled dehumidified storage and in general purpose storage on a 1- and 5-year basis. General purpose storage sites would be used until dehumidified control storage becomes available. The estimated amounts included costs for receiving and storing, preservation, storage space, surveillance, and represervation.

The estimated cost to store approximately 8,200 tools in controlled dehumidified storage on a 1-year basis is about $1 million. On a 5-year basis the cost is estimated to be $2 million. The costs differ because of increased inspections and additional storage cost required during the 5-year period.

The estimated cost of storing the tools in general purpose storage on a 1-year basis is about $1.2 million and $3.8 million on a 5-year basis. The cost of general purpose storage increases on a 5-year basis because of additional storage costs, surveillance costs, and tool represervation costs. The general purpose storage estimate presupposes that all 8,200 tools would need to be represerved once or twice during a 5-year period.

While DOD has estimated the costs to store the tools, DOD and GSA officials told us that, at the present time, adequate storage space is not available.

Concerning the cost to replace the tools, GSA and DOD officials estimated that the cost of replacing such equipment with new equipment would be from 2 to 2½ times the acquisition cost. On the basis of the acquisition cost of approximately $41,000,000, we estimated that the schools would have to pay between $82 and $103 million to replace the NIER equipment in their custody.

We trust that this information is responsive to your request. We will not distribute this report further unless we obtain your agreement or you publicly announce its contents.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WOMEN AGAINST THE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning a number of women who have been active in opposing our involvement in Vietnam held a news conference to indicate our support for peace activities during the inaugural weekend and to demonstrate our belief that citizen efforts to bring about peace should continue unabated until peace is not merely "at hand," but actually here, with a signed peace agreement to prove it.

We call upon women and men all over this Nation to keep up the struggle for peace, to write to their Senators, Representatives, and even to their President to demand an immediate and permanent halt to all U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

I insert a list of those participating in the news conference and the text of my statement there in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

PARTICIPANTS

Bella S. Abzug, Congresswoman, 20th C.D., New York.

Elizabeth Holtzman, Congresswoman, 16th C.D., New York.

Patricia Schroeder, Congresswoman, 1st C.D., Colorado.

Jane Hart.

Arvonne Fraser, Women's Equity Action League.

Betty Fridan, former chairperson, National Organization for Women (NOW).

Bonnie Garvin, National Peace Action Coalition.

Gwen Patton, D.C. Committee on Peace and Government.

Susan Miller, People's Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Flo Crater, Northern Virginia NOW.

Joyce Hamlin, United Methodist Women's Division.

Tara Reddy, Bombay, India, Women's International Democratic Federation.

STATEMENT OF BELLA ABZUG

Many of us in this room have spent the last decade calling for an end of this senseless, cruel war. As the bearers and nourishers of life, we feel kinship with all other women, with their children, and with their suffering. We cannot stand by and watch while this cruelty is continued in our name. We cannot accept yet another deception.

We conceive the participation of women in anti-war inaugural activities in Washington and across the country to be a clear restatement of our commitment to life, not death.

We are here today because everything else we have done has failed. President Nixon has promised repeatedly to bring us peace, but there is no peace. This time—when the promise is so alluring—we want him to know, and we want the world to know, that we will not stop protesting and start celebrating until we see the actual black and white of a peace agreement.

I'm glad to be able to report that the Congress seems to be in the same mood. There is unprecedented rumbling on Capitol Hill, where for too long Senators and Representatives have been as completely ignored by the President as has every other segment of the public.

Now more than ever, your efforts count—every letter is read and tabulated, every "for" and "against" opinion recorded, by Congressmen looking for your support in their new readiness to end this war. It has been estimated that about one hundred and fifty Representatives may boycott the inauguration. Some will join our demonstration. Ironically, the administration warns us to be "peaceful"—they who have dropped millions of tons of bombs on civilians. They need not fear: we are peaceful people 365 days a year—to be otherwise would violate everything we stand for. Let us remind *them* that we expect an end to their mouthing peace, a beginning of making it.

One way to begin is to pass cut off fund legislation which I and other Representatives have introduced.

It is very important that we gather here this weekend, that men and women from every walk of life are gathering elsewhere, to remind us that in the end it is people, exercising every constitutional right of petition and protest, who will see that either the President or the Congress ends this war.

ATTENDANCE AT INAUGURATION

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I will not take 5 minutes.

The Washington Post and possibly some other media today reported on a press conference attended yesterday by Congressman EDWARDS and I, among other Members, to the effect that certain Members intended to boycott the inauguration of the President on Saturday.

I simply wish to correct the record. Neither Mr. EDWARDS nor I or any other Member present at that press conference stated that there was any boycott of the inauguration. What we did say was that he and I, as individuals, for reasons which we arrived at independently, did not intend to be present at the inauguration. My reason was that I did not by my presence desire to appear to lend support to policies of the administration which produced the bombing of North Vietnamese civilian areas and have failed thus far to extricate us from the war. I further stated, in response to questions, that I did not know of any organized movement for Members to stay away from the inauguration, but that each Member would undoubtedly do individually what he considered to be right and proper in his own conscience

Mr. EDWARDS was then asked, "How many did he think would be absent from the inauguration." He volunteered a figure which he stated at that time was purely a guess and that he had no way of knowing because there was no organized effort to bring about such an absence on the part of Members.

I feel that it is important to say this so that, as to any Members not present at the inauguration, there is not necessarily an inference that their absence is due to any particular reason, except as the individual Member may have expressed a reason.

EXPANSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS TO INCLUDE SCHOOL BOARD OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) and I are reintroducing legislation to give locally elected school board officials a voice on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This bill was first introduced in the 92d Congress and hearings were conducted on this matter by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Governmental Operations Committee in August 1972. Among other things the ACIR advises the President on the intergovernmental relationship aspect of the complex financial problems which presently beset our Nation's elementary and secondary school systems.

The President, in his 1972 state of the Union message, referred to two complex and interrelated sets of problems with which school systems are now confronted. He spoke of their financial problems and he mentioned the possible affects that any type of tax reform might have on the basic relationships of Federal, State, and local governments.

In addressing the intergovernmental relations aspects of these problems, the President announced last year that he had enlisted the aid of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and quite accurately he pointed out that the Commission is composed of Members of Congress, representatives of the executive branch, Governors, State legislators, local officials, and private citizens.

However, there is one group whose voice in this body is conspicuously absent—the voice of locally elected school board officials. They have no representation whatsoever.

As presently constituted, the Advisory Commission consists of 26 members—three of which are appointed from the Senate and three from the House of Representatives. The remaining 20 are appointed by the President as follows: three must be officers of the executive branch and three must be private citizens; four are appointed from a panel of at least eight Governors submitted by the Governors Conference; three are appointed from a panel of at least six members of State legislative bodies submitted by the Council of State Governments; four are appointed from a panel of at least eight mayors submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors; and three are appointed from a panel of at least six elected county officers submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

The legislation we are introducing today would simply expand the number of members of the Advisory Commission from 26 to 28 and provide that two members shall be appointed by the President from a panel of at least four elected school board officials submitted by the National School Boards Association.

We think that this is a reasonable and equitable proposal. The President himself expressed his commitment to the principle that local school boards must have control over local schools. We agree wholeheartedly.

However, we would like to extend this principle by giving locally elected school officials a voice in formulating the national policies which will ultimately affect their local school districts. The legislation which we are introducing today would accomplish this—by giving locally elected school officials a voice in the Advisory Commision on Intergovernmental Relations.

We urge our collegues to give this legislation the favorable and prompt consideration which it merits. By adopting this bill we will merely be extending the same privilges to elected school officials that are now enjoyed by elected officials from virtually every other level of government and we will be making the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations a more effective advisory body as well.

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. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.
Ms. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COCHRAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WHALEN, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. RINALDO, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
Mr. METCALFE, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HAMILTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STOKES, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HAWKINS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SEIBERLING, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BENITEZ, for 60 minutes, on January 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:
Mr. HOLIFIELD in two instances, and to include extraneous material.
Mr. BINGHAM, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the estimated cost of $1,317.50.
Mr. KASTENMEIER, to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the estimated cost of $425 by the Public Printer.
Mr. MAHON, and to include extraneous matter with his remarks with respect to Mr. Helms, Director of CIA.
Mr. HUBER in two instances.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COCHRAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. HANRAHAN.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. QUIE in two instances.
Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.
Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.
Mr. DEVINE.
Mr. SHRIVER in four instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. CONABLE.
Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. RAILSBACK in four instances.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. CARTER in three instances.
Mr. SHOUP in three instances.
Mr. KEATING.
Mr. HARSHA in two instances.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. TREEN in two instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in four instances.
Mr. FORSYTHE in two instances.
Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. SAYLOR.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
Mr. METCALFE in five instances.
Mr. RARICK in five instances.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. MORGAN.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. REES in 10 instances.
Mr. WOLFF in seven instances.
Mr. DULSKI in five instances.
Mr. CLARK.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. HICKS.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.
Mr. ADDABBO in three instances.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.
Mr. BERGLAND.
Mr. ASHLEY.
Mr. SISK in two instances.
Mr. DRINAN.
Mr. FUQUA in two instances.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS in two instances
Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.
Mr. BURTON.
Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.
Mr. DENHOLM.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. BARRETT.
Mr. BLATNIK.
Mr. COTTER in five instances.
Mr. HANNA.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that commitee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution extending the time within which the President may transmit the budget Message and the Economic Report to the Congress and extending the time within which the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m., under its previous order, the House adjourned until Saturday, January 20, 1973 at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

229. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.
230. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July to October 1972, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
231. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 1972 Financial and Statistical Report of the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
232. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of States, transmitting copies of various international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92–403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
233. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1972, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2363; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
234. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report of sums drawn by him, the application and disbursement of the sums, and the balances remaining, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 84; to the Committee on House Administration.
235. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of a study of the feasibility and desirability of a national lakeshore at Lake Tahoe, pursuant to Public Law 91–425; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
236. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 1973 Report on the Health Consequences of Smoking, pursuant to section 8(a) of the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
237. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on identical bidding in advertised public procurement, covering calendar year 1971, pursuant to section 7 of Executive Order 10936 issued April 24, 1961; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
238. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the opinion and findings of fact of the Court in Congress Reference case No. 2–68, *Alvin V. Burt, Jr., and Eileen Wallace Kennedy, Executrix of the Estate of Douglas E. Kennedy, Deceased* v. *The United States*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1492 and 2509, and House Resolution 1110, 90th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
239. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
240. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the organization for the year ended June 30, 1972, pursuant to Public Laws 81–740 and 88–504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
241. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report on scientific and professional positions established in the Library of Congress during calendar year 1972, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3104(c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

242. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to determine the cost and im-

prove reporting of the development of a nationwide criminal data exchange system, Department of Justice; to the Committee on Government Operations.

243. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities to improve the Model Cities program in Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo., and New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 2219. A bill to remove certain limitations on the amount of grant assistance which may be available in any one State under the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2220. A bill to grant child care centers status as educational institutions, and to assist such center in raising capital by permitting donation of surplus Federal property for their use; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2221. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. HALEY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BYRON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 2222. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio, Mr. FREY, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. RHODES, Mr. KYROS, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. FISHER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. GROSS):

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HUNT, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BEARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BRAY, Mr. HANRAHAN, and Mr. SHOUP):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. ESCH, Mr. ZION, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. DOWNING, and Mr. RANDALL):

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax cerdits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 2227. A bill making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the national industrial reserve under the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHERLE, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 2228. A bill making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the National Industrial Reserve under the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CULVER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 2229. A bill making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the National Industrial Reserve under the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 2230. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 2231. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. GUYER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 2232. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 2233. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 2234. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 2235. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 2236. A bill to amend sections 235 and 236 of the National Housing Act to require local governmental approval of certain projects as a condition of interest reduction payments (or mortgage insurance) with respect to such projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to require Senate confirmation of the appointment of Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2238. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ban sports from closed-circuit television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2240. A bill to amend section 1505 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2241. A bill concerning the allocation of water pollution funds among the States in fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide a substantial increase in the total amount authorized for assistance thereunder, to increase the portion of project cost which may be covered by a Federal grant, to authorize assistance for operating expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERGLAND (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 2244. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2245. A bill to authorize a survey of the East Two Rivers between Tower, Minn., and Vermilion Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. GROVER, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ZION, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DORN, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. GINN, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. MCFALL, and Mr. MILLER):

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorization for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.R. 2248. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUIE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROUSH, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2249. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUIE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. STEELE, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. KOCH, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 2250. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. OWENS, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. PIKE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 2251. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ROE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 2252. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BREAUX:

H.R. 2253. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2254. 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. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2255. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize grants for the modification of surplus military equipment for law enforcement purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for depreciation on capital expenditures incurred in connecting residential sewer lines to municipal sewage systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 2257. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain organizations from private foundation status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 2259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 2260. A bill to authorize voluntary withholding of Maryland, Virginia, and District income taxes in the case of certain legislative officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2261. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2262. A bill to provide for amortization of railroad grading and tunnel bores, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 2263. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Miss JORDAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NIX, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 2265. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.R. 2266. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 2267. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 2268. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself and Mr. BURLESON of Texas):

H.R. 2269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status of certain oil well service equipment under subchapter D of chapter 36 of such Code (relating to tax on the use of certain vehicles); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 2270. A bill to establish the Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H.R. 2271. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ROUSH, and Mr. COTTER):

H.R. 2272. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 in order to establish a framework of national science policy and to focus the Nation's scientific talent and resources on its priority problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina:

H.R. 2273. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of cooperative community programs for patients with kidney disease and for training related to such programs, and to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the costs of necessary treatment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2275. A bill to require that certain textile products bear a label containing cleaning instructions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FULTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 2276. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 2277. A bill to further the achievement of equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 2278. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that future increases in retirement or disability benefits under Federal programs shall not be taken into consideration in determining a person's need for aid or assistance under any of the Federal State public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2279. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2280. A bill for the relief of the city of Riverview, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2281. A bill to abolish the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2282. A bill to require the furnishing of documentation of claims concerning safety, performance, efficacy, characteristics, and comparative price of advertised products and services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 2283. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States," approved October 14, 1966, to require that the method of straight baselines shall be employed for the purposes of determining the boundaries of such fishery zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 2284. A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to require the return of certain vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2285. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for more effective protection of fish and wildlife resources from the effects of projects licensed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2286. A bill to amend the act of June 15, 1935, to provide for the disposition of moneys in the migratory bird fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. KARTH, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2287. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2288. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to require certain permits for exploring or mining oil and gas underlying the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2289. A bill to require a Federal permit for the taking of any migratory game birds other than migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2290. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize restrictions and prohibitions on the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides which pollute the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2291. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to prohibit the issuance of Federal permits authorizing water resource development by non-Federal public and private agencies until such agencies reimburse the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for related investigations required by such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2292. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2293. A bill to provide for comprehensive surveys with respect to the adequacy of game and other animals and game birds and other birds and fish, and their habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. KARTH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2294. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require a longer period of notice before a Federal agency commences any action significantly affecting the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 2295. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Alaska as units of the national wildlife refuge system; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KARTH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2296. A bill to increase the maximum amount of aggregate payments which may be made in calendar years after 1973 to carry out conservation agreements under the Water Bank Act; to the Committee in Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2297. A bill to amend the Act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 2298. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make loans to associations of fishing vessel owners and operators organized to provide insurance against the damage or loss of fishing vessels or the injury or death of fishing crews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2299. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2300. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program in the Veterans' Administration for servicemen, veterans, and ex-servicemen suffering from drug abuse or drug dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2301. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MAYNE, and Mr. MOORHEAD of California):

H.R. 2302. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 2303. A bill to continue mandatory price support for tung nuts only through the 1976 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. KARTH, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 2304. A bill to promote the foreign policy and trade interests of the United States by providing authority to negotiate a commercial agreement with Rumania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2305. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 2306. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to provide that community disaster grants be based upon loss of budgeted revenue; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 2307. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a certain river in the State of Alabama for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2308. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 2309. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 2310. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 2311. A bill relative to the oil import program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. ROY and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 2312. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GROVER, Mr. MANN, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2313. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 2314. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit the States concurrently with the Atomic Energy Commission to regulate the emission of radioactive effluents; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIEBERLING, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 2315. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit the States concurrently with the Atomic Energy Commission to regulate the emission of radioactive effluents; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2316. A bill to strengthen interstate reporting and interstate services for parents of runaway children, to provide for the development of a comprehensive program for the transient youth population for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of temporary housing and psychiatric, medical, and other counseling services for transient youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2317. A bill to affirm the President's power to impound appropriated funds, subject to the right of either House of Congress to disapprove any such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 2318. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 44, United States Code, to provide that certain proceedings of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2319. A bill to amend chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition of representatives of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2320. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2321. A bill relative to the oil import program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself and Mr. GUBSER):

H.R. 2322. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. High Court of Settlement which shall have jurisdiction over certain labor disputes in industries and other enterprises affecting interstate commerce and the public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 2323. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1974, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2324. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1975, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BELL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BROWN of California, Miss HOLTZMAN, and Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.R. 2325. A bill to provide for a study and investigation to assess the extent of the damage done to the environment of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia as the result of the operations of the Armed Forces of the United States in such countries, and to consider plans for effectively rectifying such damage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 2326. A bill to provide that Members of the House of Representatives defeated for reelection may not travel at public expense; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2327. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, "Patents", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. NIX, Mr. REID, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 2328. A bill to terminate U.S. military combat operations in or over Indochina, subject to certain conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 2329. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 2330. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Commission on Rules.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 2331. A bill to remove tolls from interstate bridges; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. GROVER, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ZION, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MILLER, Mr. DORN, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. THONE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ROE, and Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming):

H.R. 2332. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. GINN, and Mr. MILFORD):

H.R. 2333. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 2334. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide for the development and implementation of programs of units of local government to provide cmprehensive year-round recreational opportunities for the Nation's underprivileged youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 2335. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 2336. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BELL, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. HOLIFIELD):

H.R. 2337. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 2338. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. LITTON, and Mr. RANDALL):

H.R. 2339. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional U.S. district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 2340. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. ROE, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 2341. A bill to limit the authority of States and their subdivisions to impose taxes with respect to income on residents of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2342. A bill to amend section 1681(b) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of the educational assistance allowance in certain cases where a veteran transfers from one approved educational institution to another educational institution; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 2343. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 2344. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee of Agriculture.

By Mr. KARTH (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 2345. A bill to provide additional funds to the States for carrying out wildlife restoration projects and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2346. A bill to protect the political rights and privacy of individuals and organizations and to prohibit the Armed Forces from collecting, distributing, and storing information about civilian political activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. KYROS and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 2347. A bill to prohibit the use of funds authorized or appropriated for military actions in Indochina except for purposes of withdrawing all U.S. Forces from Indochina with a 30-day period if within that period all American prisoners of war are released and American servicemen missing in action are accounted for, and to halt immediately all air bombing in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 2348. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit the attendance, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, of certain U.S. Postal Service employees at funerals of honorably discharged members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 2349. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that broadcast licenses shall be granted for an unlimited term; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCLORY (for himself, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 2350. A bill to establish a program for the United States to convert to the metric system; to the Committee on Sciences and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCLORY (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 2351. A bill to establish a program for the United States to convert to the metric system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCFALL (for himself and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 2352. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act with respect to definition of wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 2353. A bill to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the 100th anniversary of the invention of the cable car; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 2354. A bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 2355. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station shall be issued for a term of 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2356. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2357. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 2358. A bill to encourage and support the dissemination of news, opinion, scientific, cultural, and educational matter through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2359. A bill to repeal section 411 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972, thereby restoring the right of aged, blind, and disabled individuals who receive assistance under title XVI of the Social Security Act after 1973 to participate in the food stamp and surplus commodities program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, and Mr. DENNIS):

H.R. 2360. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr.

ESHLEMAN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. FULTON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HINSHAW, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 2361. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KING, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. NICHOLS):

H.R. 2362. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RARICK, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 2363. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. ROY, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. ROUSSELOT, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 2364. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 2365. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2366. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2367. A bill to provide for adjustments in monthly monetary benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, according to changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2368. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time period within which veterans may be entitled to educational assistance under such chapter after their discharge or release from active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. RARICK, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2369. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2370. A bill to create a comprehensive Federal system for determining the ownership of and amount of compensation to be paid for inventions made by employed persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 2371. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to clarify the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission to regulate the safety of mobile homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 2372. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the assaulting, injuring, or killing of police officers and firemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 2373. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant, and economical electric power supply by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 2375. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 2376. A bill to authorize a White House Conference on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2377. A bill to provide a comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2378. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the various ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2379. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2380. A bill to provide for the regulation of strip coal mining for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of strip coal mining areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2381. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources that the United States requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by adding a new section to prohibit sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition eliminating a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, to establish an emergency Federal economic assistance program, to authorize the President to declare areas of the Nation which meet certain economic and employment criteria to be economic disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2387. A bill. The Adequate Income Act of 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to permit Federal Sharing of the cost of unemployment benefits which extend for 52 weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2389. A bill to establish a Transportation Trust Fund, to encourage urban mass transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase personal exemptions after 1974 by an amount based on annual variations in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to workers' readjustment allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2394. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROY, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 2395. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 2396. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968,

as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2398. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an agreement between the States of Illinois and Iowa relating to the establishment by certain of their political subdivisions of a regional air pollution control board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2399. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for the Federal funding of land and easement acquisitions and the construction and improvement of necessary roads and scenic viewing facilities in order to develop a national scenic and recreational highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension of $125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2401. A bill to provide an incentive for the production of motion pictures in the United States by excluding from gross income, for Federal income tax purposes, a part of the gross income derived from the distribution or exploitation of motion pictures produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FREY, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 2403. A bill to implement the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 2404. A bill the Antihijacking Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 2405. A bill to provide that the President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, an item for not less than $2 billion to be applied toward reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HUBER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. TREEN, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 2406. A bill to improve and implement procedures of fiscal controls in the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 2407. A bill to improve and implement procedures for fiscal controls in the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 2408. A bill to authorize additional judgeships for the U.S. courts of appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2409. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 2410. A bill to restrict the activities of certain Federal employees and officers, to provide private remedies to implement these restrictions, and to facilitate the enforcement of existing conflict of interest statutes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CULVER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 2411. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the advice and consent of the Senate for appointment to Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California; Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, and Mr. DRINAN):

H.R. 2412. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs, in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FISH, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 2413. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NIX, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 2414. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. GRASSO, Miss JORDAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H.R. 2415. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for income averaging in the event of downward fluctuations in income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2417. A bill to ban aerosol cans in commerce unless they conform to safety standards set by the Consumer Product Safety Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 2418. A bill to suspend for a 2-year period the duty on crude barium sulphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, to make any Federal savings and loan association or State chartered mutual savings and loan association which converts to a stock savings and loan institution ineligible for insurance under this title; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2420. A bill to provide for the study of certain lands to determine their suitability for designation as wilderness in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension compensation will have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 2422. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2424. A bill to designate certain segments of the Interstate System as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Highway"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 2425. A bill to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface areas affected by coal mining activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2426. A bill to provide increased penalties for distribution of heroin by certain persons, and to provide for pretrial detention of such persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain persons eligible

for retired pay for nonregular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2430. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 20 percent, and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 2432. A bill to strengthen and improve the protection and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 2433. A bill to protect confidential sources of the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2434. A bill to provide for compensation to victims of violent crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2435. A bill to provide death benefits to survivors of certain public safety and law enforcement personnel, and public officials concerned with the administration of criminal justice and corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 2436. A bill to provide for greater and more efficient Federal financial assistance to certain large cities with a high incidence of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings which (subject to further increases under the automatic adjustment provisions) is permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2439. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercal establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 2440. 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. STRATTON:

H.R. 2441. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2442. A bill to prohibit the imposition by the States of discriminatory burdens upon interstate commerce in wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2443. A bill to provide for effective congressional controls over the budget by requiring the establishment and enforcement of a ceiling on appropriations for each fiscal year, the notification to Members of Congress of that ceiling and of the current amounts appropriated, the modification of the fiscal year so that it coincides with the calendar year, and the continuation of the joint committee which was created by the act of October 27, 1972, as a permanent committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 2444. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

H.R. 2445. A bill to provide that meetings of Government agencies and of congressional committees shall be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. BRADEMAS):

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 to further cultural activities by making unused railroad passenger depots available to communities for such activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 2447. A bill to provide for the equalization of the retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THONE (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. HANLEY, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 2448. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide that where violations are corrected within the prescribed abatement period, no penalty shall be assessed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THONE (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 2449. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 2450. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2451. A bill to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2453. A bill to withhold compensation from Members of the House of Representatives and Senate under certain circumstances with respect to attendance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2454. 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. THORNTON:

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Emergency Loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mrs. GRIFFITHS):

H.R. 2457. A bill to repeal the meat quota provisions of Public Law 88-482; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 2458. A bill to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968 to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, to make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2459. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO (for himself, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LENT, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. BELL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KOCH, Mr. PETTIS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 2461. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 2462. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2463. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize refund of tax on distilled spirits, wines, rectified products, and beer lost or rendered unmarketable due to fire, flood, casualty, or other disaster, or breakage, destruction or other damage (excluding theft) resulting from vandalism or malicious mischief while held for sale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER (for himself, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 2464. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a research center at Blacksburg, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may become entitled to widow's or widower's insurance benefits, subject to the existing actuarial reductions, at age 50,

whether or not disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 2466. A bill for peace in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2467. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of a fence near the international boundary between the United States and Mexico in the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 2468. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2469. A bill to provide retroactive pay to certain members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2470. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide for equality of treatment for military personnel in the application of dependency criteria; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2471. 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. 2472. A bill authorizing the President to proclaim the week including the Fourth of July as "God Bless America Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2473. A bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2474. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2475. A bill to repeal section 5532 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reductions in the retired or retirement pay of retired officers of regular components of the uniformed services who are employed in civilian offices or positions in the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2476. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend section 410(a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide a statutory presumption of service-connected death of any veteran who has been rated totally disabled by reason of service-connected disability for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman may simultaneously receive (without any reduction or offset) both an old-age or disability insurance benefit and a widow's insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 each year of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for correction of inequities respecting losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the armed forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee Ways and Means.

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income any payments made under the retired serviceman's family protection plan by an individual who has waived his military retirement pay in order to receive a civil service retirement annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend title 45, United States Code, in order to provide that a State may act in the case of labor disputes involving a railroad industry primarily engaged in intrastate operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 2486. A bill to protect the political rights and privacy of individuals and organizations and to define the authority of the armed forces to collect, distribute, and store information about civilian political activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2487. A bill to provide for the discharge of members of the armed forces from active military service by reason of physical disability when suffering from drug dependency, to authorize the civil commitment of such members concurrent with their discharge, to provide for retroactive honorable discharges in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2488. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2489. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend the Bilingual Education Act with respect to the qualification of schools in which programs under such act may be carried out; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2491. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft into or over the United States until certain findings are made by the Environmental Protection Agency and by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2492. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2493. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the ocean, coastal, and other waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2494. A bill to prohibit the discharge into any of the navigable waters of the United States or into international waters of any military material or other refuse without a certification by the Environmental Protection Agency approving such discharge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2495. A bill to require States to pass along to individuals who are recipients of aid or assistance under the Federal-State public assistance programs or under certain other Federal programs, and who are entitled to social security benefits, the full amount of the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2496. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a Formulary Committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2497. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as Cape Canaveral; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the tenure in office of Supreme Court judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to authorize the emergency importation of oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. GIAIMO, and Mr. COTTER):

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to authorize the emergency importation of oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. REES, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. CORMAN, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. BURTON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. BELL, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. HINSHAW, and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union Delegation; to the Committee Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PODELL):

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union Delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. FASCELL, Mr FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEGGET, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SISK, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS (for himself and Mr. MATHIS of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting expenditures by the Federal Government to revenues except in national emergencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September as "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in June of each year as "National Pet Memorial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr. PREYER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WARE, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois):

H.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union Delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GIAIMO, and Mr. GRAY):

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIPLEY, and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution accepting the gift of the centennial safe and expressing the thanks of the Congress to the late donor, Mrs. Charles F. Deihm, and authorizing its display in the Capitol to create interest in the forthcoming bicentennial; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Union should be condemned for its policy of demanding a ransom from educated Jews who want to emigrate to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Res. 139. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for the efficient operation of congressional committees and to insure the rights of all committee members to have equal voice in committee business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THONE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCCOLLISTER):

H. Res. 140. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ICHORD, and Mr. JARMAN):

H. Res. 141. Resolution to establish a House-authorized budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ROY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TREEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. ZWACH):

H. Res. 142. Resolution to establish a House-authorized budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. METCALFE):

H. Res. 143. Resolution, an inquiry into the extent of the bombing of North Vietnam, December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Res. 144. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Res. 145. Resolution to create a select committee to regulate parking on the House side of the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

13. The SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Hon. Antonio B. Won Pat; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 146. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 10478) entitled "A bill to clear and settle title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, Calif." to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Shiela Joy Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Calogero, Maria, and minor child, Fabio Lauria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Kang Soong Sook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 2502. A bill to allow International Risks, Inc., to use within the District of Columbia the name Special Risk Covers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 2503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land in Missouri to Grace F. Sisler, the record owner of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Giana Antonietta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Paulina Bustamante Bognot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Lee Shie-Chien Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Marino Del Frate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2508. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Iwamoto Goetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Leona B. Labartinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Franco Magnani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Candida Menes Malolot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Jose Carlos Recalde Martorella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gavina A. Palacay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Maria Isaura Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 2516. A bill for the relief of Gianfranco Sandri and his wife, Fiorella Borgatti Sandri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2517. A bill for the relief of Emerita Sarmiente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Severa Salonga Virag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2519. A bill for the relief of Stefan Wiedersperg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2520. A bill for the relief of Fausto Pitetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 2521. A bill for the relief of Frank J. McCabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2522. A bill to permit the vessel *Pious Puffin* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2523. A bill for the relief of the Villa Rosa Annex of the Santa Rosa Medical Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 2524. A bill to permit the Capital Yacht Club of the District of Columbia to borrow money without regard to the usury laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2525. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios K. Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2526. A bill for the relief of the estate of Albert W. Small; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Antonio Guarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Mastrangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Sister Innocenza (Natalina Zerlotin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Day's Sportswear, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Day's Sportswear, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Rosa Barbero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Raphael Gidharry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2534. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Kahn and Barbara Heyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sheila L. C. Tompkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 2537. A bill for the relief of Lidia Myslinska Bokosky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 2538. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 2539. A bill for the relief of tenants of Scully lands in Marion County, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 2540. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ardito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2541. A bill for the relief of Mikolaj Kormanicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMMS:

H.R. 2542. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Santa Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 2543. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the State of California by the United States to John C. Brinton; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 2544. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land located in the State of California to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 2545. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, to convey a parcel of land at the Fort Bliss Military Reservation in exchange for another parcel of land; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Antonino Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Timothy J. Mayer; 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:

21. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank M. Meyer, Blandford, Mass., relative to a letter of marque and reprisal against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

22. Also, petition of the city council, Rochester, N.Y., relative to the war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

23. Also, petition of Edward C. Rose, Chicago, Ill., relative to the impeachment of certain officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

24. Also, petition of Joseph P. Gerardi, Arlington, Va., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

25. Also, petition of John Korczak, Denver, Colo., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. Also, petition of S. J. Oppong, Accra, Ghana, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

27. Also, petition of the Hyde Park Peace Council, Hyde Park-Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues, and Hyde Park Town Meeting for Peace, Chicago, Ill., relative to the war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Saturday, January 20, 1973*

The House met at 10:30 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PATMAN.

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

If my people shall humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then, will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sins, and will heal their land.—Chronicles 7: 14.

Almighty God, our Father, we bow humbly in Thy presence as we pray heartily for these United States of America. We thank Thee for our fathers who founded this Republic and for the faith of those who through the years have kept her the land of the free and the home of the brave. Help us O God, to keep this faith alive in our land this day and every day.

May Thy spirit rest upon and move within the hearts of our President and Vice President as they take the oath of office and pledge their allegiance to our beloved America. Grant unto them creative minds and courageous hearts as they endeavor to meet the challenge of these crucial days.

Give to these representatives of our Nation patience of mind, peace of heart, and a persistence in doing good as they lead our people in these trying times.

Bless Thou our country, those who live on these shores and those who serve our Nation abroad. Help us all to work to be good citizens of this free land, to obey Thy Commandments, to love our fellow men and to keep our faith in Thee. Thus may justice come to our land, peace to our world, and freedom to all men everywhere.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that Members must display their official tickets in order to have a seat on the platform. There are no extra seats available, so former Members cannot join the procession.

The same holds true for children. They can neither go with the procession nor be seated on the platform.

The area where Members of the House are to be seated is not covered. Members should keep this fact in mind in deciding whether to wear overcoats and hats.

The procession will be headed by the Sergeant at Arms bearing the mace. He will be followed by the Speaker pro tem-