The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. Eastland).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of history, may the taking of vows by the President and the Vice President be a renewal of vows for all. Make this a new beginning for the Nation when men rise above all petty rivalries, irrelevancies, and trivialities to a new unity of idealism and purpose. Make us a new people born in the spirit from above, given to regeneration of character and to moral renewal, fit for a new age of justice, peace, and righteousness. Work in us and all the people pure religion, an elevated and refined patriotism, and an eagerness to know and to do Thy will, which are the marks of one nation under God.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR
Hon. HIRAM L. FONG, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, attended the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS ALLEN AND ERVIN ON TUESDAY NEXT
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on Tuesday next, immediately following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. Nunnelee), the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. Allen) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Ervin) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INAUGURATION PROTESTS
Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, today Richard M. Nixon will be inaugurated to begin his second term as President of the United States.

Press reports indicate that a sizable protest has been organized to take place at the same time as the inauguration. Estimates of those who will participate range as high as 50,000 persons.

At the same time, two Members of the House of Representatives have stated publicly that a number of Congressmen plan to boycott the inaugural ceremonies. Apparently this action is being taken in protest against the President's Vietnam policies, or in support of the demonstration, or both.

Representative DON EDWARDS of California has been quoted as saying that as many as 100 to 150 Congressmen will refuse to attend the inauguration.

Representative JOHN F. SEIBELING, of Ohio, was quoted in the January 18 edition of the Washington Star-News as follows:

'There's a consensus not to come and bless this man who's got blood on his hands.'

That is very strong language, and, I feel, unjustified.

The statement by Congressman Seiberling, the expected action of those who are to take part in the demonstration, and the plans for a boycott on the part of some Members of Congress cause me considerable puzzlement.

Why, may I ask, are these actions being taken against the policies of a man who has successfully carried out the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam?

Why are these protests taking place at a time when bombing of North Vietnam has ceased and a peace agreement seems imminent?

It was not President Nixon who made the decision to commit American ground troops to the war in Vietnam. On the contrary, it was he who has withdrawn the troops.

When he took office, President Nixon was faced with a situation in which the United States was deeply committed in a ground war. There were 540,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam at that time.

Today 90 percent of those troops have been withdrawn. Nearly all combat troops are on the line in Vietnam.

Furthermore, President Nixon has pressed hard for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. It now appears that an agreement may be signed in the near future.

It is my feeling that the protests being carried out today are taking place at the wrong time, and are being directed against the wrong man.

If many Americans differ with the President as to the policies he has followed in Vietnam, that is understandable. It is the unquestionable right of such persons to give voice to their opposition.

However, I question the fairness and the judgment of those who would demonstrate against the inauguration today.

It is my profound hope that we shall have a cease-fire in Vietnam next week.

And it is my opinion that those who are carrying out demonstrations against the inaugural are doing nothing to bring peace 1 hour sooner.

QUORUM CALL
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENEROUS GIFT OF LAND BY UNION CAMP CORP. TO THE NATURE CONSERVANCY
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, on last Wednesday the Union Camp Corp. announced that it was donating to the Nature Conservancy over the next 3 years its Virginia landholdings in the Great Dismal Swamp of nearly 50,000 acres.

Accounts of this most generous gift appeared on the front page of last Thursday's edition of the Washington Post. I might add that Mr. James Free, the astute Washington reporter for Alabama's largest newspaper, the Birmingham News, must be psychic; for in the Tuesday, January 16, issue of the News, there appeared an article by Mr. Free about the Great Dismal Swamp and efforts being made to preserve and protect this natural and remarkable phenomenon.

I commend the Union Camp Corp. for this magnificent gift of land. The company has plants in my home State of Alabama and contributes to the economy and well-being of Alabama in so many ways.

This donation, I should point out, phil-
The heart of Great Dismal Swamp—77 square miles of America's last great wilderness—has been saved for a national wildlife refuge. The Nature Conservancy announced yesterday that it has acquired for $12.6 million the 50,000 acres along the U.S. 17 border. It now measures less than half of what it once was. It is “great” all right, and could remain so with a little help from the United States Government and the states of Virginia and North Carolina. Most of the several hundred thousand acres involved are in Virginia.

Much timber has been cut out of the swamp (since George Washington in 1765 organized the Great Dismal, he hoped to drain the swamp and use it for farmland). But back to the Great Dismal Swamp for a message of encouragement. We’ve driven through most of the dwindling swamp, and many more winter in it or use it as a way station during their migrations. There’s no way to prove the land where the lake level has fallen to six feet, half of what it once was. The deep peat beds through which the ground water filters into the lake give it a color which, in a glass, looks very like rainwater Madeira wine. It is sweet and supposed to be so resistant to going foul that sailing ships used to carry casks of it.

While the lake’s surface has shrunk along with the margins of the swamp, it still is home to the bear, deer, raccoon, snapping turtle, bobwhite, rabbit, cotton mouse and cotton minck, muskrat, flying squirrel, silver-haired bat, cottontail and nutria, which are all but unconfirmed. And it has its own unique species: the Dismal Swamp short-tailed shrew. The area, too, contains a reverberant clause that would void the transfer if the land is not to be preserved. The clause is important because, according to most of the people who have been fighting to save the swamp for many years, the government has been one of the chief villains in the destruction of Great Dismal Swamp.

The federal government, by way of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, has absolutely destroyed more than Lake Drummond, but for years and years they have done nothing to stop the ditching that is draining the water away from the lake, which feeds the lake,” said Alvah Duke, chairman of the Dismal Swamp committee of the Wilderness Society.

“We are expecting more careful control of lake drainage from now on,” a conservancy spokesman said yesterday. “We are told that the Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department are drawing up new ground rules that rise management in the swamp.”

One of the greatest strains on the 3,000-acre lake is the Dismal Swamp Canal, which is part of the Intercoastal Waterway and is operated by the engineers.

“Every time a boat—workboat, pleasure boat or commercial vessel—enters the canal, the opening of the locks drains away 3 million gallons of water from Lake Drummond. Three nations of migratory birds are most disturbed by this and most famous of fresh water in the world,” said William E. Ashley of Portsmouth.

The corps has long favored abandonment of the canal and its associated locks and instead of the deeper and shorter Chesapeake & Delaware Canal.

George Washington helped dig what is known as Washington’s ditch through which he hoped to drain the swamp and use it for farmland.

During most of its history Great Dismal has been regarded with much the same attitude as the Redskin fan (or juniper) that it isn’t very dismal any more. Early in this century many miles of narrow gauge railroad were built throughout the Great Dismal. And until a few years ago a substantial industry of lumber and cedar shingle production flourished on its borders.

While a reforestation program is well under way, it will be some years before a sizable new growth can cover much of the area. And, of course, the original scales and grandeur can never be recaptured.

HEART OF DISMAL SWAMP NOW REFUGE

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1973]

HEART OF DISMAL SWAMP NOW REFUGE

(HEART OF DISMAL SWAMP NOW REFUGE)

(From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 16, 1973)

S'WAMP?'

(From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1973)

S'WAMP?'

(From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1973)
INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McIntyre:
S. J. Res. 24. A joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McIntyre:
S. J. Res. 24. A joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

Mr. McIntyre. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce a resolution which will set aside the fourth Saturday of each September as the day the public recognizes the meritorious and deserving outdoor sportsmen of America for their remarkable contributions to environmental protection and enhancement, fish and wildlife preservation and propagation, and in gun and boat safety promotion and instruction.

Any doubt that a so-designated National Hunting and Fishing Day is less than significant and justified was erased by the overwhelming public response to the first such day on September 23, 1972.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to introduce the first National Hunting and Fishing Day resolution a year ago, and my proud pleasure to see it adopted unanimously in this body, just as it was adopted without a dissenting vote when Representative Enzi introduced it in the House.

As originally introduced, the resolution called for the observance of National Hunting and Fishing Day on the third Saturday in each September, permanently establishing the occasion on such succeeding calendar.

Final congressional action, however, called for a single day, Saturday in 1972, and when President Nixon officially proclaimed National Hunting and Fishing Day it was so designated.

Now, as I reintroduce the resolution to
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make it an annual event. I would like to review for my colleagues the evidence of the tremendous response the first NHF Day produced, and to take this occasion to commend the National Shooting Sports Foundation for spearheading the event. I would also like to mention the main support given by the Sporting Goods Association, NHF Day 1972 enlisted the active support of no less than 40 national organizations, some of whom were represented on the NHF Day steering committee.

The National Shooting Sports Foundation alone distributed 325,000 NHF Day brochures, 4 million stickers, 3,010 65,200 public service radio messages, thousands of news releases about the event—NHF Day material appeared in 2,500 newspapers—and sent personal letters to every Governor, Fish and Game Commissioner, and cooperating organization.

The results of the ensuing promotional and educational effort were truly astonishing, Mr. President. In short order, all 50 State Governors proclaimed NHF Day or issued formal statements of support. Their lead was followed by more than 500 mayors or city managers from New York City to Sitka, Alaska.

Mr. President, the major purpose of National Hunting and Fishing Day was to give the Nation's 55 million outdoor sportsmen their greatest opportunity in modern times to present themselves to the public as practicing conservationists. They availed themselves of that opportunity, staging open houses, demonstrations, displays, and exhibits the length and breadth of the Nation.

It is estimated that more than 6,000 sportsmen's clubs participated in more than 2,000 such events.

Integrating public attendance ranged from 50,000 at a multicube 5-day observance on Long Island, to nearly 25,000 at the Wyandotte Fair Grounds near Kansas City. Some clubs took part down to a hundred or 200 people visiting sports club open houses in small towns.

Though all reports are not in, and may not be complete, because of the difficulty in judging attendance at those open houses conducted in such places as major stores, parking lots, and military bases, the NHF Day steering committee feels certain that no less than 4 million Americans turned out to view exhibits by sportsmen's clubs, national and local conservation organizations, State fish and game departments, Boy Scouts, and civic clubs involved in conservation projects.

At a shopping mall in Florida, an old faculty of Boston, a taxidermy shop in Washington State, and in a convention motel in my own State of New Hampshire, for example, people learned how sportsmen not only hunt and fish, but also how they contribute more than $250 million a year to the cause of conservation.

More than anything else, Mr. President, that first National Hunting and Fishing Day contributed immeasurably to broadening understanding between Nation's outdoor sportsmen and the general public, demonstrating that sportsmen and nonsportsmen do, indeed, have a mutual interest in preserving, enhancing, and enriching natural resources, natural beauty, wildlife and the total environment, and giving convincing evidence that the groups can—and must—work in harmony to achieve these goals.

Mr. President, because the first National Hunting and Fishing Day was so successful, because it was so encouraging, because future such occasions hold such promise, I am today reintroducing the resolution designating the fourth Saturday of September as National Hunting and Fishing Day and making this event an annual observance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

At the request of Mr. McIntyre, the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), the Senator from Texas (Mr. Bentsen), the Senator from Maine (Mr. Hays), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Burdick), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Robert C. Byrd), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Craig), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick), the Senator from Maine (Mr. Hathaway), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Symington), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Andrews), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Beall), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Hudson), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) were added as cosponsors of S. 200, a bill to require that new forms and reports, and revisions of existing forms, resulting from legislation be contained in reports of committees reporting the legislation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 23—REPORTING OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Referral to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. TALMAGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 194(a) and 194(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of Order of the Senate for Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1973, through February 28, 1974, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $231,000, of which amount not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1974.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingency fund of the Senate for Agriculture and Forestry, approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AMERICANS REMEMBER THE 148TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF STONEWALL JACKSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during this busy inaugural weekend for the 37th President of the United States, I remind my Senators and our citizens generally that tomorrow marks the commemoration of the 148th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious Americans.

On January 21, 1824, Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson was born in the western region of Virginia, in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va.

Jackson was described as a hard, young man in what is now Lewis County, in the Mountain State. Stonewall Jackson was 18 years old when he became a constable of Lewis County. Following the death of his parents, who died in poverty, Stonewall was reared by his uncle for 12 years before entering West Point in 1842.

Jackson was a born fighter. In his youth he fought poverty. He fought for an education at West Point. There he struggled against prejudice and disadvantage. Jackson set out to learn by sheer effort. What interested him he understood. He was a man with a soul of fire. Action was his life.

A Democrat and the owner of a few slaves, most of whom he bought at their own request, he deployed the prospect of war, which he described as the "sum of all evil," in the Federal War Between the States. Jackson achieved true greatness as one of the outstanding American military geniuses. History has recorded well the accomplishments of this soldier of the Civil War, a general on the battlefield. Much has been
written on Stonewall Jackson's numerous military feats, particularly on his unique conduct of the famous valley campaign, the successful military maneuvers, the leadership, his strong character, Jackson's 16,000 troops against the 62,000 Federal soldiers.

On June 17, 1861, at Harper's Ferry, in Jefferson County, W. Va., which is now a national battlefield park attracting over a million visitors annually, Jackson was made brigadier general and, having brought his command to high efficiency, he led the current of General J. Johnston's army, to the battlefield of Bull Run, where it sustained the Federal onslaught at a crucial hour. "There is Jackson standing like a stone wall," cried Brig. Gen. Barnard Bee, as his own troops retreated. This incident gave Jackson the name, "Stonewall," better known around the world than the Christian name given at birth.

General Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the early age of 39. His short but successful life ended sadly as a result of wounds inflicted on soldiers through unaccountable mistake during the Battle of Chancellorsville. We can only envision the role General Jackson might have provided in West Virginia's early formative years. West Virginia was admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 20, 1863, approximately 1 month after General Jackson's death.

It is testimony to the measure of the man, Stonewall Jackson, that both the sovereign States of Virginia and West Virginia claim him as a son. West Virginia, indeed, take justifiable pride in the landmarks that illustrate a part of his life. In Clarksburg a bronze plaque appears at the location of his birthplace, 324-336 West Main Street. The cemetery there in Jackson Park bears the physical remains of Stonewall Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father, and his sister, Elizabeth.

On the original 5 acres of Stonewall Jackson's boyhood home, which was destroyed by fire, is located the combination of the original model building which was listed February 23, 1972, on the national registrar of historic places by the National Park Service. His grandfather built his first mill on the West Fork River before 1800. In 1821, West Virginia acquired the historic mill and 5 acres for the beginning of the first State 4-H camp in the Nation. Now totaling 620 acres, the camp is operated as an off-campus educational facility. Jackson's Mill is known nationwide for its rustic beauty and excellent accommodations, located north of Charleston, West. Lewis County.

Mr. President, in the civic-minded city of Clarksburg, where an impressive equestrian statue of Jackson is located on the plaza of the Harrison County Courthouse, directly across the street from the Stonewall Jackson Hotel, the anniversary of the birth of Stonewall Jackson, February 11, 1824, the 150th anniversary, will be commemorated appropriately so, by historical and service organizations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Recess an article published by the Clarksburg Exponent January 18, 1970, on that year's ceremony.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Recess, as follows:

JACKSON WAS BORN HERE 148 YEARS AGO

Sunday, Jan. 21, will mark the 148th anniversary of the birth of General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson. He was born in Clarksburg, Va., on Jan. 21, 1824.

S. J. Birshein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, said two local organizations are honoring the historic occasion with appropriate wreaths.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy will place a wreath on the bronze plaque erected on the birthplace site in the 300 block of West Main Street in downtown Clarksburg. Mrs. E. B. Dakin, Jr. is president of the local U.D.C.

The Stonewall Jackson Civic Club will remember the renowned general by placing a wreath on the equestrian statue on the plaza of the Harrison County Court House. Mrs. Fray G. Queen, Jr. heads the civic organization.

The Clarksburg Chapter of the U.D.C. erected the bronze plaque in August, 1911, to commemorate the General's birthplace. On Sunday, January 20, the famous bronze equestrian statue was dedicated. This was made by the late Charles Keck, widely known sculptor of Chatanooga, Tenn. His Honeymoon widow attended the unveiling and impressive dedicatory ceremonies. The base of the statue was erected by William Grant, a Clarksburg architect.

The equestrian statue is a three-quarter life-size bronze original model casting for the Stonewall statue at Charlottesville, Va., dedicated Oct. 19, 1921.

Stonewall Jackson is enshrined in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. A striking statute by Moses Ezekiel of Richmond, Va., a graduate of Virginia Military Institute of Lexington, Va. and a personal friend of General and Mrs. Robert E. Lee, was dedicated at Charleston, W. Va., on Sept. 27, 1910. A similar statue was erected two years later on the grounds of V.M.I. and dedicated June 19, 1912.

Following the election of General Jackson in 1855 to the Halle of Fame, Bryant Baker, the sculptor, was commissioned to prepare the life-size, bronze which is in effect a model of the model from which Mr. Baker made the bust later placed in the Capitol Building in Charleston, W. Va. and dedicated Sept. 10, 1855.

At V.M.I. Stonewall Jackson was professor of Natural Science, Philosophy, and Instructor of Artillery Tactics for 10 years, from 1851 to 1861. Then he was called upon to enter that career of distinction which in two years made the name of Stonewall Jackson immortal.

Between April 29, 1861 and May 1, 1863, Stonewall Jackson distinguished himself as one of the greatest military strategists that ever lived. General Jackson was a master of the art of war. He used his two great elements, initiative and surprise, in unsurpassed applications. Swift and sure of attack, dogged and determined, invaded and defeated by odds, he was the ideal battlefield commander.

One of the finest tributes to Stonewall Jackson was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur, at the dedication of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" by Sculptor Bryant Baker in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University in January 1953.

In his telegram General MacArthur stated: "Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southeast Pacific area of World War II. 'The mantle you may yet wear, whatever you resolve to be' and 'Never the Counsel of Your Fears.'"

Stonewall Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father Jonathan and his sister, Elizabeth, are buried in the historic cemetery in Jackson Park, located on East Pike Street.

The General's mother is buried in Ansted, W. Va. His sister Laura lies at rest in Beckshannon, and his brother Warren is buried near that city.

Stonewall's wife, Mary Anna Morrison, died at Charleston, N.C., March 24, 1915.

Jackson died May 10, 1863 at the age of 39 near Guineas Station, Va. and is buried in Lexington, Va.

PHASE III

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on Sunday, January 14, 1973, the Washington Post published an article by Arnold Weber, formerly with the Pay Board, recommending a "free-form scenario" and literature on the controls program to date and the outlook for phase III.

We are about to take up the question of the proposed extension of the Economic Stabilization Act in the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and literature on the controls program needs to be circulated and discussed during the coming weeks if the Senate is to evaluate and act on this proposal in an informed manner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Recess, as follows:

WEBER ON PHASE III: "FREE-FORM SCENARIO" (By Arnold R. Weber)

If the Wage-Price Freeze of 1971 descended on the economy like an avalanche, Phase III of the initiative by its nature represents the expectation that it is more likely to enrich than to engulf the economy.

This program has been implemented without dampening the powerful shockwaves but has not had a chance to see this article can review it.

We are about to take up the question of the proposed extension of the Economic Stabilization Act in the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and literature on the controls program needs to be circulated and discussed during the coming weeks if the Senate is to evaluate and act on this proposal in an informed manner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Recess, as follows:

WEBER ON PHASE III: "FREE-FORM SCENARIO" (By Arnold R. Weber)
economist's aberration may become a union leader's standard of performance. If the Pay Board's most difficult task in 1972 was to get the "last cows" in the barn, the major task in 1973 will be to separate out the "golden goat" from the herd.

These difficulties will be augmented by the new Consumer Price Index formula, which will probably limit controls, food prices are a key element in the public's perception of the effectiveness of controls. And in this background, any adjustment of the wage and price targets posed a dilemma. To keep the numbers would provide fresh tinder for inflation. On the other hand, price behavior has not been sufficiently auspicious to lower the targets for wage increases. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Administration has essentially retained the same price goal for 1973 as for 1972.

The organizational structure of Phase II of the traditional pattern. Semi-independent agencies which provide a basic dosage of controls. But the organization for Phase III represents a complex effort to deal with these problems. Ignoring differences in trim and общность, the new model can be analyzed in terms of three broad issues: coverage, the nature of the program goals, and organizational structure.

The issue of coverage is the least dramatic but most crucial to the redefinition of the stabilization program. During Phase II the coverage issues are of minor importance. After all, the consumer who has gained control of the price of peanut butter and milk may be loath to let it go in exchange for a more meaningful barometer of economic stability than a rollback policy.

The organization for Phase III attempts to reap the benefits of administrative efficiency and effectiveness and the requirements of the program. The Price Commission and the Pay Board are consigned to the bureaucratic role of the program. The return on organized labor to the stabilization program is particularly important. In a democracy, the effectiveness of controls ultimately depends upon a consensus of those who must ultimately bear the program's costs and it has worked well in the past.

This consensus, the critical administrative problem will be to implement an effective composite price wage which, while facing the complexities of the coverage provisions.

Last, the blueprint for Phase III clearly incorporates a strategy for disengagement. The recent experience has revealed that controls are not self-sustaining. With almost biblical fulness, Phase III provides a basic dosage of controls to deal with the problems of inflation and employment. Not everyone would agree that 1978 should see the abandonment of controls. Some view inflation as the present target while others argue for a permanent form of incomes policy to deal with the problems of inflation and employment.

If we can divert ourselves from the monthly publicized Consumer Price Index, this a propitious time to move the debate from the seminar room to the public domain. At the least, the issue can be discussed on the basis of fresh experience, not nostalgia or dogma.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE A STRONGER PARTNER IN NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. MATTHIAS. Mr. President, every day, in newspapers, in radio and television commentaries, and in constituent correspondence, Members of Congress are becoming increasingly aware that a loss of public confidence in the country's ability to deal with inflation is damaging to the United States as an economic power and to American's sense of frustration and alienation from their Government. In fact, I was deeply saddened to learn from the President recently that less than 20 percent of the American people hold confidence in Congress as the determiner of our national priorities and policy.

I feel this is a shocking statistic to be associated with the one body in our Government which is in theory supposed to be directly responsive to the public and the public will. More than the other two branches of our Government, Congress belongs to the people because it functions as a democratic, deliberative, and representative body. When the people's questions are unanswered and their issues and priorities are to be openly and intelligently debated. Or at least this is the kind of body Congress is supposed to be and that it must become.

To take the first steps toward this goal, the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. Stennis) and I presented our Special Ad Hoc Committee on Congressional Reform to solicit opinions from experts within and without the Government on the most important reform measures. While the suggestions presented to our committee were diverse, the overall conclusion was that Congress needs to recast itself into a rightful position as the determiner of national priorities. When this happens, I have no doubt that the American public will gain confidence in Congress as an institution.

As evidence that congressional reform is not a mere internal "housekeeping" matter, Time Inc., has chosen the role of Congress as its special theme to explore in conjunction with its 50th anniversary. I was privileged to participate in one of its public seminars on this subject not long after the report was published by the thoughtful exchange of ideas on the need for congressional reform.

In close association with this seminar, Max Ways has written in "Fortune" magazine an article entitled "The Congress Should Be a Stronger Partner in National Policy." The article contains a general discussion of many of the problems we have already discussed among ourselves, and it broadens our understanding of the issue by bringing new perspectives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Way's article be printed in the Record. I hope that Senators will have an opportunity to look it over.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Fortune magazine, January 1973]

CONGRESS SHOULD BE A STRONGER PARTNER IN NATIONAL POLICY

(By Max Ways)

American reform movements have a tendency to deal with the institution they wish to change as much as the disease they treat. The Congress has already discussed many issues and priorities, and it broadens our understanding of the issue by bringing new perspectives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Way's article be printed in the Record. I hope that Senators will have an opportunity to look it over.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Fortune magazine, January 1973]
ably cerebral hemorrhage) or of fluidity in their prescriptions.

Anxiety over the condition of Congress is, indeed, one of the more logical things to worry about, in their zeal to recruit other citizens to their viewpoint, adopt diagnoses and propagandize themselves. Yet the characteristically unisian reformist overkill. Congress is said to be the government's weakest link—its procedures sclerotic, its leaders senile, and its very nature unsuited to modern life.

Such alarmist premises for the reform of Congress have the immediate effect of attracting the wrong kind of attention—in this instance, already, a lack of trust in Congress contributes to frustration, alienation, and discord among the citizenry. And it concentrates upon the White House an unrealisitic burden of hope and responsibility.

A soldier base from which to move toward better congressional performance is suggested by a look at the persuasive changes that have occurred in government generally in the last hundred years—especially the rise of a huge and expert bureaucracy. This new element is the governmental reflection of more profound changes in U.S. society. A bureaucracy, though indispensable to a wide range of responsibilities, has very many limitations—or blind spots—when the country and the world around it are caught up in momentous historical change. People do circumstances change, but people's goals, desires, and values are changing too. Because this change is at the heart of U.S. society, it is more important and harder to read, the quality of Congress—the people's branch—takes on more significance with every decade.

In that perspective, much talk about congressional weakness is irrelevant to the key question of policy implementation. For people, when the Nixon after the 1972 election moved to improve coordination within the executive branches, the dynamic hands-on approach over whether his moves would further undermine the position of Congress. The assumption that any strengthening of the executive branch must inevitably weaken Congress is a superficial reading of the situation. Congress is not strengthened by confusion and inefficiency elsewhere in government. The challenges to policy making that confront this nation require an improved quality in all branches.

A BUTT OF CARTOONISTS

To be sure, congressional reform is overdue. A box on page 191 proposes some remedies, less of the kind that address specific defects in specific congressional procedures. But it is important to keep in mind that intact, or at least more acceptable, is the Congress's decline in public reputation. This decline has been caused less by the shortcomings of Congress itself than by defects in the processes through which public reputation is made.

After all, generations of cartoonists and satirists have had fun with Congress. Hundreds of editorialists and political scientists have deplored it as an obstacle to the vigor of American democracy. And yet one will find no popular stereotype that so many impatient citizens, ill informed about how Congress works, have not made their way to the fourth branch of government. Reform in Congress won't do much good unless other elements of the executive branch and the political system become more competent and efficient. —But the way they look at Congress.

The pardon grows faster than the frog

Despite all these signs of health and strength, there is a "trouble with Congress." The problem lies elsewhere in the government and perhaps more directly in the lack of public and legislative hearings. Reform in Congress won't do much good unless other elements of the executive branch and the political system become more competent and efficient.

For that misleading phrase, "the trouble with Congress," is applied to its individual members. The average quality of Congressmen has almost certainly improved through the course of the last century. Congressmen now are better educated, alert to a wider range of complex issues. They have far more health-care dollars. Thanks to air travel and modern communications, they keep in much more direct touch with their constituencies. Many members are well informed, to a degree that would surprise observers outside the nation, on national and international topics to which they have given particular attention. The ethical rules of Congress need tightening, and individual cases of graft appear to be rare these days. Congress is防腐 the temptations to magnificient congressional malaise that now abound, it has indeed been the one place where it can be argued that a collective body of public servants has sat in that place for a hundred and fifty years. Absent from that place with Nixon was Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Thaddeus Stevens, or Robert Taft, but the men and women who get elected these days are no moral or intellectual pygmies. The nation is not told enough about Congress to appreciate such examples of conscience, patriotism, and quiet ability as Senators Mike Mansfield and George Allen. The national mainstream spots some Senators primarily as presidential possibilities. But Hubert Humphrey and Edward Kennedy, to take two examples, have contributed more to the Senate than most of their partisans appreciate.

Outside their own states, members of the House and Senate are relatively unknown to newspaper editors and television and movie stars. Who hears about members of the Ways and Means Committee? Illinois' John Anderson, Minnesota's Albert Michelson, Arizona's Morris Udall, Oregon's Edith Green, Massachusetts' Silvio Conte, New Jersey's Frank Thompson, and fifty others would be a credit to any U.S. Congress that ever convened. Collectively, the U.S. Congress has held its own higher than any other national legislature amid the tide of executive power that has risen to the top. Britain's House of Commons, though its debates still glitter, is overregimented by party discipline. The lack of really influential standing committee member to define specific subjects areas leaves the Commons helpless to resist cabinet that control (or, in some cases, are controlled by) knowledgeable civil servants. While many parliaments on the Continent and elsewhere own an enviable number of brilliant members, no foreign parliament has, as the U.S. Congress, its own state, members of the House of Representatives.

The succinct picture of what happened in government, true as far as it goes, omits the huge change that occurred outside of government. The political process of power toward the attainment of conscious goals—was exploding in all parts of the political structure. Business corporations, nonprofit organizations, and individuals have all increased their goal-pursuing capabilities.

Mass prosperity is the most obvious and generalized evidence of this multiplied power. But many sources of the risen standard of living lie outside the strictly material realm. They include the much higher educational level, the huge reserve of specialized knowledge and skills, and the ability to mobilize these toward particular targets of action.

The framers of the Constitution had only rudimentary intuitions of the kind of wealth and power that are today being used to characterize all facets of twentieth-century society. If John Quincy Adams ran the government today, some reformers might argue that the executive branch be given the power to direct the welfare state.

But even Adams would argue that the executive branch be given the power to direct the welfare state. But even Adams would argue that the executive branch be given the power to direct the welfare state.

In many fields an understanding of the new sources of social power is not shared even among the professions who deal with the power of the executive branch. Expertise comes to be recognized as a force apart from the traditional political structure, which is, after all, a corporate enterprise. The muscle for stronger government comes in the form of living lie outside the strictly material realm. They include the much higher educational level, the huge reserve of specialized knowledge and skills, and the ability to mobilize these toward particular targets of action.

The President or the Congress to initiate action. But, in the twentieth century, governmental regulation and control, welfare programs, foreign affairs, military policy, and taxation are all required for these purposes have produced a veritable 'policy explosion.'

The muscle for stronger government comes in the form of living lie outside the strictly material realm. They include the much higher educational level, the huge reserve of specialized knowledge and skills, and the ability to mobilize these toward particular targets of action.
find a unity to bring order. The spotlight savings toward the "people-man in the White House," who happens, moreover, to be (at least nominally) in charge of those horses of Congress.

It isn't surprising, then, that for three generations many scholars, journalists, and federal officials have been leading men—have seen the development of presidential primary as "modern" and right. To the extent that Congress, now, is tending toward irrelevance. It can act as a check and watchdog over executive action. It can mod­ify or prevent policy. But Congress cannot initiate top policy, or play a constructive and responsible part in shaping it.

The case of presidential monopoly in foreign policy had been immensely strengthened in the post-War II, and strengthened further by the haunting postwar fear of atomic attack. The administration's "decide" and "hypever every mind, seemed to eliminate Congress from any key part in the process. After all, the great decision, the crucial decision, on Korea, it seemed to be settled that the great decisions of international affairs were the exclusive preserve of the White House.

Then Vietnam, that least sad of all American wars, recalled us to recognition that even in a nuclear age more major intern­ational policies can—and should be—determined through the serious deliberation and reflection of our elected representatives. If this view was to be steadily reinforced, it would be that Vietnam, the most internally divisive foreign war the U.S. ever fought, has been from first to last a very important, and, in its way, congressional, of our wars? The steps deter­mining the long, gradual escalation of the U.S. commitment, the strategies of the hasty or reckless or ill informed. For deci­sion after decision, tremendous thrusts of expertise were made available to the White House.

But somehow it was all too much of an inside job. Moral issues were not dis­cussed as early and as publicly as they should have been. No truly representative forum handled questions of priority be­tween Vietnam and competing claims on fed­eral money. To many citizens the war came to seem not only a blunder, but an illegiti­mate political act, a usurpation.

HOW THE BUDGET GOT OUT OF CONTROL

Internally, the most glaring governmental flaw here, some undeniable muta­tion in the evolution of the nation's policy­making system.

Through English history, "the power of the purse" had been the core around which other functions of the legislature gradually ac­cumulated. But during the 1930's, it was under­stood in U.S. politics that Congress had almost exclusive control over fiscal policy. Federal taxing and spending authority, government federal activities became wider and more com­plex, officials and observers recognized a need for an independent fiscal control in line with the theories of expanded presidential leader­ship that were popular even then, Congress itself, in 1921, created the Budget and Accounts Act, founding the Budget Board and giving it the President a large share of responsibil­ity for coordinating the fiscal policies of the government.

A unified federal budget, enabling officials of departments and agencies to interact about policy, and to receive feedback.The new system was also a step in the process of shifting fiscal responsibility off the shoulders of Congress. For some years it has been difficult to tell whether the President or Congress would have the President the aggregate spending level that neither defends.

Since the great depression and the New Deal, Presidents have taken—or had thrust upon them—responsibility for maintaining the stability and growth of the economy by using the leverage of the federal surplus or deficit. How the taxing and appropriating functions of Congress has earned new Presidents has been a matter of constitutional claims, supported by cogent arguments arising from the executive's su­preme and responsible position—knowledge.
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focus the party image on its conservative wings; “disclosure” means the same thing in striving for a sharply liberal party image. What many would-be simplifiers fail to see is the flaw in the partisanship argument: the breadth of both parties, especially the electorate that forms the strongest argument for an elevation of congressional influence, is not ideological but occupational; they favor stories that can be readily communicated to the public. The President—any President—is easier to write about than any congressional situation. Journalists minimize the importance of Congress because they are reluctant to explain that “can’t of worms.” This neglect, in turn, leads to an actual reduction of the power of Congress, because of the distinct clusters of the more readily communicable person of the President. In this society, which is perhaps more democratic than is usually supposed, the power tends to go where the people think it is.

When President Kennedy asked Lawrence O’Brien to serve as his liaison with Congress, O’Brien was chagrined to discover how few congressional leaders he knew, despite his interest in law and politics. To this, he began giving a series of Sunday brunches at his home to which he invited congressional leaders, some fellow Kennedy aides, and some Washington journalists. Again and again at these brunches, correspondents would ask O’Brien how Congress was getting along for decades asked, “Who’s he?” indicating a chairman or a ranking member of some important congressional committee. The fact that only half of Americans can name their Congressman is not entirely to be blamed on voter “apathy.” Journalists who will risk life and limb to find out what the President had for breakfast wouldn’t walk around Congress and ask a Congressmen deliver a reasoned explanation of his vote.

In an occupational—not a political—sense, journalism has a strong conservative bias, a semantic bias, a sense of irrelevance and of news judgment that prevailed yesterday. Every active U.S. journalist knew up close and personally in an era when counted in policy was the White House. Both he and his readers are conditioned by a pattern established in the first half of this century. Switching the spotlight to Congress would run the risk of boring or puzzling readers—a risk that professional communicators, who desire above all to communicate, are loath to run.

A NEED FOR BETTER BRIDGES

Nevertheless, the movement for a resistant Congress will gain momentum in the years to come, despite Journalistic and other forms of inertia. What goes on in Washington is not always top-of-the-head news and can be happy to see Congress have a larger share of responsibility for policy.

Congress Comes to Town

Most is best bridges to the executive branch, where the experts reside, where policy is now prepared, carried out, and evaluated. For that, Congress needs much more. Much stronger influence and informative support will be required if Congress is to improve its ability to form judgments about such highly complex matters as weapons systems, manpower retraining, international trade, and the economic effects of taxation.

The support available to Congress has been strengthened in recent years. The Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress has been expanded; it should be further upgraded. More important, Congress has been systematically proving that little-known arm of Congress, the General Accounting Office. The G.A.O. has been making it more difficult intended to ensure that congressional purposes are actually carried out. Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut has led the fight that would further broaden the G.A.O.’s activity along this line.

However, forbid that Congress should develop a massive parallel bureaucracy, with its own specialists dealing with their opposite numbers in the departments. It could use a staff of its own, somewhat analogous to the White House staff, a few hundred people looking for government careers broader and more exciting than those available on the civil-service scale.

BEYOND EXPERTISE

Improved staffing would help Congress to restore its sadly reduced role in policy-making. With specialized knowledge, the executive branch is not a trustworthy creator of national policy, as temporary changes in the unbridled expertise. As President Kennedy lamented after the Bay of Pigs: “All my life, I’ve known better than to depend on the experts. How could I have been so stupid, to let them go?”

A society immersed in internal and external change needs a policy-making body that can foresee the gestation of problems and issues in the lives of the people. A bureaucracy cannot represent or integrate or express the popular will. But, indeed, are notoriously insensitive to changes occurring in the peripheral of their assigned tasks. And Presidents must delegate much of their energies to administrating the vast and busy apparatus of government. The original division of function was that the executive branch should carry out the popular will as formed and expressed by the Congress. In the decades ahead, that division will seem wiser than at any time in the past.

AN AGENDA FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

To support congressional reformation, one need not be especially concerned about corruption, or unresponsive to the people, or hopelessly inefficient, or under the thumb of a special interest group. Congress for the most part is not corrupted by public money; the House limits contributions to a candidate’s campaign, the public will probably vote against him in return. Since the donor can’t prove his campaign, he is pure as the driven snow, which they just possibly may be, the only practical alternative is to forbid these big gifts. The conflict of interest are quite strictly enforced upon appointees of the executive branch—but not upon members of Congress.
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Seniority, Yesterday’s reform can petrify in the ossified by année doll it the seniority system, many distinguished congressmen do not rise to a point of effectiveness on the seniority system. The chairmen of the powerful committees, which tend to be an average of thirty-one years in the House. At present and most chairmen come from districts that are safely Republican. At present and most chairmen come from districts that are safely Republican.

Ten most important committees have served overhauls to as tight as a band. But in recent decades sen, it has been impractical, and perhaps unfair, to forbid a member of Congress to keep an inside-a law firm which is more used for before federal agencies. But now that members of Congress have full-time jobs, pay-"NEED for BEST BRIDGES"
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burdened by campaigning. Since nearly all Reapportionment bills have been accompanied by "compensatory" terms that would require a constitutional amendment, which Washington observers say could never pass, it looks as though Janzen is right. We give Rep­resentatives a chance to run for the Senate without resigning from the House. But with enough public pressure that Senate resis­ tance would give way.

EL PASO BUSINESS COMMUNITY OFFERS FARAH SOLID SUPPORT

Mr. TOWER, Mr. President, the presi­dent of the El Paso Chamber of Com­merce, George Janzen, issued a statement for the chamber this fall which deals with the company's strike for rights and labor law question affecting many of my con­stituents in the El Paso area. This ques­tion involves the extent of the rights of organized labor in El Paso and how far the courts and the National Labor Rel­ations Board are able to regulate this labor force to be free from coercive actions by powerful industry unions.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the state­ment to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EL PASO BUSINESS COMMUNITY OFFERS FARAH SOLID SUPPORT

George Janzen, president of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce and president of the Southwest National Bank in this city, posi­tioned the business community solidly behind El Paso Manufacturers Company in a "President's Message" to the Chamber mem­bership at the annual banquet Tuesday night, September 26, 1972.

Following are portions of Mr. Jan­zen's text that relate to Farah's current labor dispute and its effect on the El Paso business community.

The courts, however, have issued restraining orders against the union for unrestricted picketing which resulted in arrests for viola­tion of the Texas State Mos Picketing Statute. We as community leaders must recognize that a minority is attempting to force a majority to act against its will and desires.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the outgoing Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, on one of the most important statements of his administra­tion to Congress in the year 1972. His statement was made on August 21, 1972, the day before I was specifically cal­lled to give the farewell address to this body of Representatives, the last time the Members of Con­gress will have the opportunity to hear from the floor of this chamber the voice of its leadership has not been heard. We call on all citizens of El Paso and American consumers to stand with us, resist this boycott and turn the decision away from a system of "trial in the market place."
Asia, and as a result of this involvement, a significantly expanded force structure. Secretary Laird had the perplexing problem of reducing this force structure by more than 1.2 million men and women and at the same time easing this transition from war to peace both on the individuals involved and on the economy. Despite the turbulence, we managed this transition probably better than in any major war.

Of course, there was the Vietnam war. Of all his problems, none was more complex for Mel Laird than providing the President with the military milieu in which to find a just and lasting peace. The seeming incongruity of applying military pressure in order to achieve peace required the most delicate judgment. Providing President Nixon with an alternative to the all-too-long deadlocked Paris peace talks meant training the South Vietnamese to fight for themselves—something for which they had demonstrated a dislimning lack of desire. Nevertheless, Mel made the right decisions, and his Vietnamization program has been more successful than could possibly be expected. Today, we stand on the threshold of peace. There can be no greater tribute to Melvin Laird.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS MCCLELLAN AND JACKSON ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, immediately following the recognition of the two leaders or their designees under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McClellan) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will make the call.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

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

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock meridian. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Mr. Muskie, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Nunn, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Allen, Mr. Robert C. Byrd. There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business 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 William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to be a Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Mr. Schlagenhaft, to be Director of Central Intelligence. I anticipate that there will be some discussion, and possibly a rollcall vote or rollcall votes on one or more of the nominations. I cannot say with absolute assurance that there will be such rollcall votes, but I think it would be well to anticipate them so that Senators may schedule their day accordingly.

Mr. President, it is now anticipated that the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Elliot Richardson to the Office of Secretary of Defense will occur on Thursday next.

Senators should be alerted to the possibility of a yeas-and-nays vote on the confirmation of Mr. Richardson's nomination on Thursday next.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn to the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 10:46 a.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 23, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL PROCEEDINGS

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1973

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted to the President's platform by Mr. Greer, administrative assistant to Senator Cook.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, preceded by the Court's Marshal and its clerk, were escorted to the President's platform by Mr. Sobsey, administrative assistant to Senator Cannon.

Mrs. Agnew was escorted to the President's platform by Mrs. Cannon.

Mrs. Nixon was escorted to the President's platform by Mrs. Cook.

The Sergeant at Arms of the House (Mr. Kenneth R. Harding) escorted Vice President Agnew to the President's platform.

The Vice President was accompanied by Speaker Albert, Senator Cannon, Senator Cook, Senator Scott of Pennsylvania, Senator Mansfield, and Representative O'Neill. They were seated by Mr. Thomas N. Gny of the Congressional Inaugural Committee.

The U.S. Marine Corps Band played ruffles and flourishes and "Hail to the Chief."

The Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and the House and Executive Director William McWhorter Cochrane escorted President Nixon to the inaugural platform. The President was accompanied by Senator Cannon, Senator Cook, Representative Gerald R. Ford, Speaker Albert, Senator Scott of Pennsylvania, Senator Mansfield, and Representative O'Neill. They were seated by Mrs. Thomas N. Gny of the Congressional Inaugural Committee.

The U.S. Marine Corps Band played ruffles and flourishes and "Hail to the Chief."

THE INAUGURATION CEREMONIES

Senator Cook. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, my fellow citizens, I present for our invocation today Dr. E. V. Hill, Dr. Hill.

Prayer

Dr. Hill. Let us pray. Our Father and our God, we thank Thee for the privilege of prayer. With this privilege we offer to You thanks for life and for abundant material and spiritual blessings. We thank Thee for the indications
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On this historic occasion we praise You in ancient words of blessing:

Blessed are You, O Lord our God, King of the Universe.

Who shares a portion of His glory with mortal man. Amen.

Senator COOK. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans: I present now the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Warren Burger, who will administer the oath of office to the Vice President.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Earl Burger, administered to the Vice President the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, Richard Nixon, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. So help me God.

Four ruffles and a chime, "Hail to the Chief," and 21-gun salute.

The central question before us is: How shall we use that peace?

Let us resolve that this era we are about to enter will not be what other post-war periods have so often been: a time of retreat and isolation that leads to stagnation at home and invites new dangers abroad.

Let us resolve that this will be what it can become: a time of great responsibilities greatly borne, in which we renew the faith and the determination of America as we enter our third century as a nation.

This past year saw far-reaching results from our new policies for peace. By continuing to revitalize our traditional friendships, and by our missions to Peking and to Moscow, we were able to establish the base for a new and more stable pattern of relationships among the nations of the world. Because of America's bold initiatives, 1972 will be long remembered as the year of the America's role in maintaining that peace.

Until we in America work to preserve the peace, there will be no peace.
January 30, 1973

UNLESS WE IN AMERICA WORK TO PRESERVE FREEDOM, THERE WILL BE NO FREEDOM. BUT LET US CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE NEW NATURE OF AMERICA'S ROLE AS A RESULT OF THE NEW POLICIES WE HAVE ADOPTED OVER THESE PAST FOUR YEARS.

WE SHALL RESPECT OUR TREATY COMMITMENTS. WE SHALL SUPPORT VIGOROUSLY THE PRINCIPLE THAT NO COUNTRY HAS THE RIGHT TO IMPOSE ITS WILL OR RULE ON ANOTHER BY FORCE.

WE SHALL CONTINUE IN THIS ERA OF NEGOTIATION, TO WORK FOR THE LIMITATION OF NUCLEAR ARMS, AND TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE GREAT POWERS.

WE SHALL DO OUR SHARE IN DEFENDING PEACE AND FREEDOM IN THE WORLD. BUT WE SHALL EXPECT OTHERS TO DO THEIR SHARE.

APPLAUSE.

THE TIME HAS PASSED WHEN AMERICA WILL MAKE EVERY OTHER NATION'S CONFlict OUR OWN, OR MAKE EVERY OTHER NATION'S FUTURE OUR RESPONSIBILITY, OR PRESENTLY TELL THE PEOPLE OF OTHER NATIONS HOW TO MANAGE THEIR OWN AFFAIRS. [APPLAUSE.]

JUST AS WE RESPECT THE RIGHT OF EACH NATION TO DETERMINE ITS OWN FUTURE, WE ALSO RECOGNIZE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH NATION TO SECURE ITS OWN FUTURE.

JUST AS AMERICA'S ROLE IS INDISPENSABLE IN PRESERVING THE WORLD'S PEACE, SO EACH NATION IS INDISPENSABLE IN PRESERVING ITS OWN PEACE.

TOGETHER WITH THE REST OF THE WORLD, LET US RESOLVE TO MOVE FORWARD FROM THE BEGINNINGS WE HAVE MADE. LET US CONTINUE TO BRING DOWN THE WALLS OF HOSTILITY WHICH HAVE DIVIDED THE WORLD FOR TOO LONG, AND TO BUILD IN THEIR PLACE BRIDGES OF UNDERSTANDING—SO THAT DESPITE PROFOUND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SYSTEMS OF GOVERNMENT, THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD CAN BE FRIENDS.

APPLAUSE.

LET US BUILD A STRUCTURE OF PEACE IN THE WORLD IN WHICH THE WEAK ARE AS SAFE AS THE STRONG—IN WHICH EACH RESPECTS THE RIGHT OF THE OTHER TO LIVE BY A DIFFERENT SYSTEM, AND THOSE WHO STRIVE TO INFLUENCE OTHERS WILL DO SO BY THE STRENGTH OF THEIR IDEAS, AND NOT BY THE FORCE OF THEIR ARMS.

WE ACCEPT THAT HIGH RESPONSIBILITY NOT AS A BURDEN, BUT GLADLY—GLADLY BECAUSE THE CAUSE TO BUILD SUCH A PEACE IS THE NOBLEST ENDEAVOR IN WHICH A NATION CAN ENGAGE; GLADLY, ALSO BECAUSE ONLY IF WE ACT GREATLY IN MEETING OUR RESPONSIBILITIES ABROAD WILL WE REMAIN A GREAT NATION, AND ONLY IF WE REMAIN A GREAT NATION WILL WE ACT GREATLY IN MEETING OUR CHALLENGES AT HOME.

WE HAVE THE CHANCE TODAY TO DO MORE THAN EVER BEFORE IN OUR HISTORY TO MAKE LIFE BETTER IN AMERICA—TO ENSURE BETTER EDUCATION, BETTER HEALTH, BETTER HOUSING, BETTER TRANSPORTATION, A CLEANER ENVIRONMENT—TO RESTORE RESPECT FOR LAW, TO MAKE OUR COMMUNITIES MORE LIVABLE—and to ensure that every American has the God-given right of every American to full and equal opportunity.

APPLAUSE.

BECAUSE THE RANGE OF OUR NEEDS IS SO WIDE, OUR CHALLENGES SO GREAT, AND OUR RESOURCES SO GREAT—LET US BE BOLD. IN OUR DETERMINATION TO MEET THOSE NEEDS IN NEW WAYS.

JUST AS BUILDING A STRUCTURE OF PEACE ABROAD HAS REQUIRED TURNING AWAY FROM OLD POLICIES THAT FAILED, SO BUILDING A NEW ERA OF PROGRESS AT HOME REQUIRES TURNING AWAY FROM OLD POLICIES THAT HAVE FAILED.

ABROAD, THE SHIFT FROM OLD POLICIES TO NEW, HAS NOT BEEN A RETREAT FROM OUR RESPONSIBILITIES, BUT A BETTER WAY TO PEACE.

AND AT HOME, THE LESSON FROM OLD POLICIES TO NEW WILL NOT BE A RETREAT FROM OUR RESPONSIBILITIES, BUT A BETTER WAY TO PROGRESS.

ABROAD AND AT HOME, THE KEY TO THESE NEW RESPONSIBILITIES LIES NOT IN THE PLACING AND THE DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY. WE HAVE LIVED TOO LONG WITH THE CONSEQUENCES OF ATTEMPTING TO GATHER ALL POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY IN WASHINGTON.

ABROAD AND AT HOME, THE TIME HAS COME TO TURN AWAY FROM THE CONCEDENDING POLICIES OF PATRONAGE—OF "WASHINGTON KNOWS BEST." [APPLAUSE.]

A PERSON CAN BE EXPECTED TO ACT RESPONSIBLY ONLY IF HE HAS RESPONSIBILITY. THIS IS HUMAN NATURE. SO LET US ENCOURAGE EACH AGE INDIVIDUAL TO BE PRUDENT AND TO ABROAD TO DO MORE FOR THEMSELVES, TO DECIDE MORE FOR THEMSELVES. LET US LOCATE RESPONSIBILITY IN MORE PLACES. LET US MANAGE WHAT WE WILL DO FOR OTHERS WITH WHAT THEY WILL DO FOR THEMSELVES. [APPLAUSE.]

THAT IS WHY TODAY I OFFER NO PROMISE OF A PURELY GOVERNMENTAL SOLUTION FOR EVERY PROBLEM. WE HAVE LIVED TOO LONG WITH THAT FALSE PROMISE. IN TRUSTING TOO MUCH IN GOVERNMENT, WE HAVE ASKED OF IT MORE THAN IT CAN DELIVER.

This leads us to only too well recognize the individual's responsibility, and to a disappointment and frustration that erode confidence both in what government can do and in what we in Washington...

GOVERNMENT MUST LEARN TO TAKE LESS FROM PEOPLE SO THAT PEOPLE CAN DO MORE FOR THEMSELVES. [APPLAUSE.]

LET US REMEMBER THAT AMERICA WAS BUILT NOT BY GOVERNMENT, BUT BY PEOPLE—NOT BY WELFARE, BUT BY WORK—NOT BY SHRINKING RESPONSIBILITY, BUT BY SEEKING RESPONSIBILITY. [APPLAUSE.]

IN OUR CONSCIENCE EACH OF US ASK NOT WHAT WILL GOVERNMENT DO FOR ME, BUT WHAT CAN I DO FOR MYSELF?

IN THE CHALLENGES WE FACE TOGETHER, LET EACH OF US BE BEFORE ALL ELSE A GOOD COMMUNITY SERVICE MEMBER, AND NOT A NEGATIVE GOVERNMENT HATER, BUT HOW CAN I HELP?

YOUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT HAS A GREAT AND VITAL ROLE TO PLAY. AND I PLEDGE TO YOU THAT WHERE THIS GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT, WE WILL ACT BOLDLY AND WE WILL LEAD BOLDLY. BUT JUST AS IMPORTANT IS THE ROLE THAT EACH AND EVERY ONE OF US MUST PLAY, AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND AS A MEMBER OF HIS OWN COMMUNITY.

FROM THIS DAY FORWARD, LET EACH OF US MAKE A SOLEMN COMMITMENT IN HIS OWN HEART TO HELP HIS NEIGHBOR, TO DO HIS PART, TO LIVE HIS IDEALS—SO THAT TOGETHER, WE CAN SEE THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE OF PROGRESS FOR AMERICA, AND TOGETHER, AS WE CELEBRATE OUR 200TH ANNIVERSARY AS A NATION, WE CAN BE PROUD IN THE FULL FULFILLMENT OF OUR PROMISE TO OURSELVES AND TO THE WORLD.

AMERICA’S LARGEST AND MOST DIFFICULT WAR COMES TO AN END, LET US AGAIN LEARN TO DEBATE OUR DIFFERENCES WITH CIVILITY AND DECENCY. [APPLAUSE.] AND LET EACH OF US REACH OUT FOR THAT ONE PRECIOUS QUALITY GOVERNMENT CANNOT PROVIDE—a new level of respect for the rights and feelings of one another, a new level of respect for the individual human dignity which is the cherished birthright of every American. [APPLAUSE.]

ABOVE ALL ELSE, THE TIME HAS COME FOR US TO RENEW OUR FAITH IN OURSELVES AND IN AMERICA.

IN RECENT YEARS, THAT FAITH HAS BEEN CHALLENGED.

OUR CHILDREN HAVE BEEN TAUGHT TO BE ASHAMED OF THEIR COUNTRY, ASHAMED OF THEIR PARENTS, ASHAMED OF AMERICA'S RECORD AT HOME AND OF ITS ROLE IN THE WORLD.

AT EVERY TURN, WE HAVE BEEN BENT BY THOSE WHO FIND EVERYTHING WRONG WITH AMERICA AND LITTLE THAT IS RIGHT. BUT I AM CONFIDENT THAT THIS WILL NOT BE THE JUDGMENT OF HISTORY ON THESE REMARKABLE TIMES IN WHICH WE ARE PRIVILEGED TO LIVE.

APPLAUSE.

AMERICA’S RECORD IN THIS CENTURY HAS BEEN UNPARALLELED IN THE WORLD’S HISTORY FOR ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS GENEROSITY, FOR ITS CREATIVITY AND FOR ITS PROGRESS.

WHAT WE HAVE PRODUCED AND PROVIDED MORE FREEDOM AND MORE ABUNDANCE, MORE WIDELY SHARED, THAN ANY OTHER SYSTEM IN THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD.

LET US BE PROUD THAT IN EACH OF THE FOUR WARS IN WHICH WE HAVE BEEN ENGAGED IN THIS CENTURY, INCLUDING THE ONE JUST ENDING, OUR COUNTRY AND ITS PEOPLE HAVE SHOWN THE WORLD WHAT THE WORLD HAS NOT KNOWN BEFORE—A STRUCTURE OF PEACE THAT CAN LAST, NOT MERELY FOR OUR OWN TIME, BUT FOR GENERATIONS TO COME.

WE ARE EMBARKING HERE TODAY ON AN ERA THAT PRESENTS CHALLENGES AS GREAT AS THOSE ANY NATION, OR ANY GENERATION, HAS EVER FACED.

WE SHALL ANSWER TO GOD, TO HISTORY, AND TO OUR CONSCIENCE FOR THE WAY IN WHICH WE USE THESE YEARS.

AS I STAND IN THIS PLACE, SO HALLLOWED BY HISTORY, I THINK OF THOSE WHO HAVE SUSTAINED US BEFORE, AND I THINK OF THE DREAMS THEY HAD FOR AMERICA, AND I THINK OF HOW EACH RECOGNIZED THAT HE NEEDED HELP FAR BEYOND HIMSELF IN ORDER TO MAKE THOSE DREAMS COME TRUE.

TODAY, I ASK YOUR PRAYERS THAT IN THE YEARS AHEAD I MAY HAVE GOD’S HELP IN MAKING DECISIONS THAT ARE RIGHT FOR AMERICA, AND I PRAY FOR YOUR HELP SO THAT TOGETHER WE MAY BE WORTHY OF OUR CHALLENGE.

LET US PLEDGE TOGETHER TO MAKE THESE NEXT FOUR YEARS THE BEST FOUR YEARS IN AMERICA’S HISTORY, SO THAT OUR BIRTHDAY AMERICA WILL BE AS YOUNG AND AS VITAL AS WHEN IT BEGAN, AND AS BRIGHT A BEACON OF HOPE FOR ALL THE WORLD.

LET US GO FORWARD FROM HERE CONFIDENT IN THE SPIRIT OF PROUD FAITH IN EACH OTHER, SUSTAINED BY OUR FAITH IN GOD WHO CREATED US, AND STRIVING ALWAYS TO SERVE HIS PURPOSE. [APPLAUSE, ALL RISING.]

Benediction

Senator COOK. Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, our benediction will be
still to be fulfilled. Help us to succeed in
this day by Cardinal Terence J.

Cardinal COOKE. Heavenly Father,
loving God of our Fathers, on this In-
auguration Day we thank You for all
the blessings You have bestowed upon
our Nation and our people. We thank
You for the vast resources of our land,
the lofty hopes and ideals of our citizens,
the devotion and dedication of those
who bear the responsibility of public
service.

Heavenly Father, as we approach the
second centenary of our freedom and in-
dependence, our gratitude for the past
carries with it an earnest prayer for the
future. We have yet so much to accom-
plish! There are even now so many of
Your blessings not yet adequately shared,
the great and continuing task of assur-
ing a fuller life, true liberty, real peace,
and personal dignity for all.

Heavenly Father, our Nation’s motto
proclaims that we trust in You. Help us
to realize the full meaning of this trust.
Deepen our awareness that without You,
our best efforts are as nothing; with-
out Your help, we simply cannot achieve
our hopes and our ideals.

Heavenly Father, bless our President
and our Vice President who today dedi-
cate themselves in the service of God to
all the people of this Nation. Give them
standing, patience and courage.

Heavenly Father, our Nation yearns for
peace. Help us to achieve true peace at
home and abroad and to be an example of
so many of our hopes and aspirations
a peace-loving, peace-making people to
the nations of the world. We are pledged
to be “one Nation under God. Bless ev-
every effort of our leaders to make us one
and keep all of us, Heavenly Father, un-
der the protection of Your abiding and
never-failing love, Amen.

Senator COOK. Fellow Americans,
the inauguration of our President is more
than a traditional ceremony. It is an op-
portunity to recommit our Nation to the
ideals of liberty and peace upon which
it was founded.

With this thought in mind, we will
now be favored by Miss Ethel Ennis, who
will sing “The Star-Spangled Banner”.
(Miss Ennis sang the national anthem,
Audience standing.)

(The inaugural ceremonies were con-
cluded at 12:26 p.m.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS
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HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. Presi-
dent, a recent edition of the Greensburg
Pa., Tribune-Review included an inter-
esting editorial concerning the revenue-
sharing program.

The editorial points out that according
to figures compiled by the U.S. Depart-
ment of Commerce, the cities and States of
this Nation had a tax surplus-sur-
plus of $14.8 billion during the second
quarter of 1972. By contrast, the Federal
Government reports that cities and states ran up a $14.8
billion tax surplus during the second quarter of
1973-

So long as the Federal Government
runs huge deficits, there really is no rea-

Certain large cities are in bad financial
condition, as the editorial notes, but the
overall condition of our States and mu-
icipalities are nowhere near as bad as is
the financial condition of the Federal
Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the ed-
torial, entitled “Poverty Suit,” be printed in
the Extensions of Remarks, and that
this editorial be followed by a table I
have prepared showing deficits in Fed-
eral funds and interest on the national
debt.

There being no objection, the items
were ordered to be printed in the Record,
as follows:

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review,
Dec. 14, 1972]

Poverty Suit

During the congressional debate over
revenue-sharing earlier this year, proponents
claimed that the cities and states were des-
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