United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, November 6, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph R. Weber, pastor, First Baptist Church, Fountain Inn, S.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou that hearest prayer, to whom can we come, but unto Thee? Thou hast said, "Call upon Me and I will hear thee." Now, Lord, we come.

Grant that we all may put all our trust and confidence in Thee forever. Help us not to have fears or misgivings, but at all times help us to rest contented with Thy will. Keep us from faint-hearted and sinful doubting, and in all seasons of our lives may we have perfect peace because our minds are upon Thee.

May we not slight Thee with vague respect but rather consider Thee, and Thy will, day and night, so that the people and Nation might be the best and do the best for Christ's sake. 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 30, 1973:

H.R. 9590. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

On November 1, 1973:

H.R. 6691. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

On November 3, 1973:

H.R. 689. An act to amend section 712 of title 18 of the United States Code, to prohibit persons attempting to collect their own debts from misusing names in order to convey the false impression that any agency of the Federal Government is involved in such collection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 9286.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9286) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and the military training student loads, and for other purposes."

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

S. 1070. An act to implement the International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 1969;

S. 1432. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died while employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier after 20 or more years of such employment; and

S. 2651. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize reduced rate transportation for handicapped persons and for persons who are 65 years of age or older or 21 years of age or younger.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MANN) prior to the calling of the Private Calendar, and the Chair will ask that the Clerk then call the Private Calendar immediately thereafter.

There was no objection.

THE REVEREND JOSEPH R. WEBER

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we have just shared the experience of prayer with the Reverend Joseph R. Weber, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Fountain Inn, S.C. Fountain Inn is one of those delightful, perhaps idyllic, communities that combines the best qualities of urban and rural life. I am proud to represent it in the House of Representatives and pleased to be able to present to you today one of its religious leaders. As in many small towns and communities the church leaders are also the civic leaders, and Rev. Joseph Weber is no exception, participating actively in the affairs of the Fountain Inn area. He is a leader, in every sense of the word.

Reverend Weber was born in Charleston, S.C., on September 2, 1927. He is a graduate of the University of Louisville and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He was ordained at the Citadel Square Baptist Church in 1954, and since that time has served as pastor of the Forest Park Baptist Church in Anderson, S.C.; an instructor at the Baptist Extension Center, Walterboro, S.C.; trustee, Baptist College of Charleston; was recently elected vice-moderator of the Greenville Baptist Association; and, for the past 3 years, has served as pastor of the First Baptist Church at Fountain Inn.

Reverend Weber served his country during World War II and the Korean war. He and Mrs. Weber are celebrating their 25th wedding anniversary. One feature of that is this trip to Washington, and Mrs. Weber and Jolen Weber, the youngest of their three daughters, are in the House Gallery today.

I am pleased to have the privilege of welcoming them to Washington and the House of Representatives, and I know that I express on behalf of my colleagues here in the House appreciation for Reverend Weber's devotion to God's work and for the thoughts that he has brought us today.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2535) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. JOHN H. SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2633) for the relief of Col. John H. Sherman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF THE LATE RICHARD BURTON, SFC, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3533) for the relief of the estate of the late Richard Burton, SFC, U.S. Army, retired.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2508) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MURRAY SWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Murray Swartz.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ALVIN V. BURT, JR., EILEEN WALLACE KENNEDY POPE, AND DAVID DOUGLAS KENNEDY, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6624) for the relief of Alvin V. Burt, Jr., and the estate of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased.

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

H.R. 6624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $45,482 to Alvin V. Burt, Junior, and the sum of $73,500 to the estate of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased, in accordance with the opinion in Congressional Reference Case Numbered 2-68, Alvin V. Burt, Junior, and Eileen Wallace Kennedy, executrix of the estate of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased, against The United States, filed November 16, 1972, and in full and final settlement of the claims of the said Alvin V. Burt and of the estate for injuries and related disabilities and damages suffered by the said Alvin V. Burt and the late Douglas E. Kennedy on or about May 6, 1965, and thereafter as the result of wounds caused by gunfire from an United States checkpoint in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, manned by United States Marines.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike "$73,500 to the estate of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased, in accordance with" and insert "$36,750 to Eileen Wallace Kennedy Pope, widow of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased, and the sum of $36,750 to the legal guardian of David Douglas Kennedy, a minor, son of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased, for the use and benefit of the said David Douglas Kennedy, as provided in".

Page 1, line 11, after "1972," insert "as a gratuity".

Page 2, line 1, strike "estate" and insert "said Eileen Wallace Kennedy Pope and the said David Douglas Kennedy".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Alvin V. Burt, Junior, Eileen Wallace Kennedy Pope, and David Douglas Kennedy, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTELLE M. FASS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 362) to refer the bill (H.R. 7209) for the relief of Estelle M. Fass to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RITA SWANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1342) for the relief of Rita Swann.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LUIGI SANTANIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1466) for the relief of Luigi Santaniello.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LEONARD ALFRED BROWNRIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2629) for the relief of Leonard Alfred Brownrigg.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BOULOS STEPHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4438) for the relief of Boulos Stephan.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAUSTINO MURGIA-MELENDREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7535) for the relief of Faustino Murgia-Melendrez.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOSE RAMON SANTA MARIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2542) for the relief of Jose Ramon Santa Maria.

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

H.R. 2542

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Ramon Santa Maria shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLORIA GO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6116) for the relief of Gloria Go.

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

H.R. 6116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Go shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State

shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RITO E. JUDILLA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7363) for the relief of Rito E. Judilla.

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

H.R. 7363

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rito E. Judilla may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Adoracion J. Gonzaga and Robert S. Gonzaga, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of this Act: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRNA J. PASICARAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7364) for the relief of Virna J. Pasicaran.

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

H.R. 7364

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Virna J. Pasicaran may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Adoracion J. Gonzaga and Robert S. Gonzaga, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLA LOMUSCIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7684) for the relief of Nicola Lomuscio.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROMEO LANCIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4172) for the relief of Romeo Lancin.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DIANA L. ORTIZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4445) for the relief of Diana L. Ortiz.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MORENA STOLSMARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5759) for the relief of Morena Stolsmark.

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

H.R. 5759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Morena Stolsmark shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraph (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Morena Stolsmark may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Henry Stolsmark, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEVIN PATRICK SAUNDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2634) for the relief of Kevin Patrick Saunders.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LUCILLE DE SAINT ANDRE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6477) for the relief of Lucille de Saint Andre.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEDNESDAY

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the following announcement concerning the program for Wednesday.

Immediately upon the opening of the House, following the prayer and Journal, before the Speaker recognizes members for 1-minute speeches, we will have the matter of voting to override the veto on the war powers bill.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I was just coming up the aisle and I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. O'NEILL. There will be no 1-minute speeches tomorrow before we take up the matter of overriding the veto on the war powers bill. It will precede any 1-minute speeches.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will there be time for debate when the matter is brought to the floor?

The SPEAKER. It will be taken up under the 1-hour rule.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the time will be divided?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman very much.

THE ALASKA PIPELINE BILL

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, there are bonuses for the public interest contained in the Alaskan pipeline bill which can be safely locked in the bill when the House votes on the final bill which includes broadening authority for the Federal Trade Commission and limiting some of the Office of Management and Budget's heavy-handed authority over independent regulatory agencies.

The Senate-passed version of the bill contained both provisions which have caused OBM Director Roy Ash and some big business interests to lean heavily on the House conferees and House leadership to scuttle these public interest features of the bill. Belated is the word for their efforts; indeed, OMB Director Roy Ash showed up in my office to voice his objection only after the conference had completed its work. Somehow during the 6 weeks of conference committee meet-

ings he had not been moved to communicate his objections.

The bill with the features despite Mr. Ash's objection is stronger legislation than it was when it passed the House.

We have maintained the House's position on the provisions concerning general rights-of-way on public lands for oil and gas pipelines and have maintained the House position on the trans-Alaskan pipeline.

I believe that all the Members of the House can and should vote for the bill in good conscience as providing sound legislation to bring Alaskan crude oil down to the contiguous 48 States and also to provide needed authority for the Federal Trade Commission and a more workable arrangement for independent regulatory agencies on their questionnaires to carry out their functions as outlined by law.

If one or more of the provisions are objected to in a motion to recommit, it will mean a new conference procedure between the House and the Senate before final passage of the long-awaited bill can be accomplished. The delay would stretch into winter—too long, too long, and unnecessary.

A vote of approval by the House is warranted on the bill as it is, so that it can reach the President's desk this week.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

OCTOBER 31, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the following work plans for watershed projects:

PROJECT AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Lost Creek, Missouri, 1368, 93rd Congress.
Nutwood, Illinois, 1476, 93rd Congress.
Prickett Creek, West Virginia, 1368, 93rd Congress.
T or C Williamsburg Arroyos, New Mexico, 759, 93rd Congress.

Attached are Committee resolutions with respect to these projects.

With every good wish, I am,
Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 557]

Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Patman
Badillo	Gubser	Podell
Barrett	Hanley	Powell, Ohio
Bell	Hanna	Reid
Biester	Harsha	Rhodes
Blatnik	Hawkins	Rodino
Burke, Calif.	Hébert	Roncallo, N.Y.
Camp	Hudnut	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Jones, Tenn.	Sandman
Clark	Keating	Stanton,
Clay	Kemp	James V.
Conyers	Ketchum	Steiger, Wis.
Crane	Lent	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Stokes
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard	Stratton
Dellums	Maraziti	Symington
Dent	Mazzoli	Towell, Nev.
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Walsh
Dulski	Mitchell, N.Y.	Widnall
Eilberg	Mizell	Wilson,
Foley	Mollohan	Charles H.,
Fuqua	Morgan	Calif.
Gettys	Murphy, Ill.	Wydler
Giaimo	Nix	
Gray	Parris	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL WATERGATE PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing, with the cosponsorship of Mr. WRIGHT, the joint resolution for judicial appointment of a special Watergate prosecutor. I would like to note that Mr. WRIGHT should have been listed as a cosponsor last week, but his name was inadvertently omitted from the copy of the bill given to the Clerk of the House.

MR. WHITE COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was introduced, directing the Judiciary Committee to begin an investigation to determine if grounds exist for the impeachment of the President, the name of Mr. WHITE of Texas was inadvertently left off as a cosponsor. Therefore, I am today reintroducing this legislation to include Mr. WHITE among its list of supporters.

PERMITTING TWO IRANIAN CITIZENS TO ATTEND U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 735) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Empire of Iran.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 735

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit within eighteen months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Empire of Iran, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy, but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Navy, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of their graduation from the United States Naval Academy, or subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire as to whether the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) is opposed to the joint resolution?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Alabama opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the joint resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the joint resolution, and I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would do the same for Iran that we have done for any number of other friendly countries—that is, allow two Iranians to attend our Naval Academy. All their expenses are to be paid by the Government of Iran, and the admissions would not in any wise affect the usual nominations by Members of Congress.

Aside from precedents—of which there are many—we have every reason to extend a gesture of friendship to one of our most valued and dependable allies in the Middle East. Iran is the only one of the big oil and gas producers in that part of the world which refused to join the reduction and embargo of oil and gas imposed by Arab States.

As of today Iran is our chief source of oil and gas from the Middle East. As

we grapple with our severe fuel shortage we are increasingly aware of the fact that Iran is expected to increase its daily oil output to 8 or 9 million barrels a day, and we have good reason to believe our imports will share in that increase. Only 6 weeks ago a 22-year contract was signed which commits Iran to provide our east coast with 500 million cubic feet of liquefied gas a day.

In addition, Iran is one of our best cash customers in terms of trade—the volume of purchasers running into the billions of dollars—and increasing.

Surely this is no time to slight one of America's most valued and dependable allies and friends. This measure deserves to be approved unanimously.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) as one Member of the Congress who has at least two young women who desire to and have been trying to get into the Naval Academy, why we should be admitting males from Iran before we admit women from America to the Naval Academy?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman's answer to that is as good as mine. As the matter now stands, there are no facilities in the Academy to accommodate women. If the gentleman from Delaware would like to pursue that point, and if the gentleman would appear before our committee if and when the issue is before us, we would be pleased to hear the gentleman's views.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will say that I have a bill in to permit women to attend the service academies, and I would rather hope that the gentleman from Texas in his presentation would be willing to indicate support for that legislation.

Mr. FISHER. That would not be relevant to the legislation now pending before the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask my colleagues in the House today to oppose House Joint Resolution 735 on several bases. First of all, President Nixon has pledged withdrawal from involvement in military affairs of other nations, and I can think of no surer way to support this pledge than not to be training the armies and navies of any nation, friendly or obviously in opposition to us.

We are also, as has been ably pointed out this morning, continuing to discriminate in our military academies, particularly against women and to a great extent against blacks, browns, and other minorities. There is a form letter which the academies use in rejecting women applicants. It has nothing to do with the nonavailability of facilities to women. It says:

> The acceptance of a female nominee for appointment to the Military Academy would be contrary to the national interest.

I submit that as long as that is the state of the national interest, we might start to think about changing. Also it is important to understand that Iran is a military dictatorship where the Shah governs by fear, military forces, and currently holds some 25,000 political prisoners in Iranian jails. I ask if that is the kind of government we wish to support and whose friendship we wish to seek.

There are two bases on which the proponents of the bill would ask the Members to support it. One is by reason of the fact that they want us to receive oil from Iran. We could extend that logic to the same kind of logic that says, we will be blackmailed for some oil or for some natural gas, because it is that logic that led us to bomb Cambodia at the supposed request of Sihanouk. I wonder if we are going to capitulate to demands when we can with a little conservation in this country solve our own energy crisis.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly wish to associate myself with his remarks. I should like to propound one or two questions to the gentleman. Would the gentleman agree with me that there is a notable absence of black citizens in the officer corps of our various military services, including the Navy?

Mr. STARK. I would say that there is an outstandingly disproportionate low officer corps.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. If the gentleman would yield further, would the gentleman agree with me that there is a disproportionate concentration of black citizens at the lowest echelons of enlisted services in our various services?

Mr. STARK. I would agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Therefore, if the gentleman agrees with me, I certainly will reemphasize my association with his remarks. It is nonsensical to be talking about Iranian students when we should be attacking the problem of assuring mass participation of blacks in the officer corps of our country. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

It is further stated in support of our bill, and I submit erroneously, that the admission of citizens from friendly foreign nations will expose the citizens to good will and friendship, and create deep and abiding relationships, and that their exposure to American ideals and principles could prove to be of great advantage during these troubled times.

I should like to set forth some of these ideals and principles that we would expose our foreign friends to, the kinds of ideals and principles that created the coverup in Mylai, and the kinds of ideals and principles that created the lie about the Cambodian bombing, the kinds of principles that led General Van Fleet to call Korea a blessing, and that led General Custer to call the Army the Indians' best friend, and the current military academies official version of Vietnam that says:

> The war ended in August, 1968, when sorely battered Communist troops were unable to engage the allied war machine.

I submit with historians like that, we do not need generals or admirals any more.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote in opposition to this resolution. If they vote for it, first of all, they are voting against Mr. Nixon and his program. Secondly, if they vote for it, they are voting against equality for women, and they are voting for continued discrimination against minorities in our services. They are voting in support of a military dictatorship and, indeed, they are voting for approval of suppression of freedom and liberty, two of the basic tenets of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to join with me in opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 735.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit within 18 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Empire of Iran, to receive instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy, but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

Section 6957 of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the instruction at the Naval Academy of four persons from the Republic of the Philippines and not more than 20 persons at any one time from Canada and the American Republics—other than the United States. Except for these special provisions students from other friendly nations may attend the service academies only under special legislation. The act of November 9, 1966, Public Law 89–802 (80 Stat. 1518), authorized the admission of up to four students from foreign countries to each of the service academies, provided that the student's country was at the time of his admission assisting the United States in its efforts in Vietnam by the provision of manpower or bases. This act specified that no person might be admitted to an academy under the provisions of the act after October 1, 1970.

The Iranian Government has decided to expand the Imperial Iranian Navy and the commander in chief of the Imperial Iranian Navy, recognizing that the ultimate success of this expansion program is dependent upon a firm foundation of professional knowledge, has requested schooling for Imperial Iranian Navy officers and prospective officers in the United States. Specifically, the United States has been requested to permit two Iranian students to attend the U.S. Naval Academy for the class of 1978. For the past several years, the U.S. Government has authorized the training of Imperial Iranian Navy midshipmen at various NROTC colleges and universities and State maritime academies at Iranian expense.

The joint resolution provides that the United States shall not bear the expense of instructing the two Iranian citizens. The beneficiaries of this resolution must be mentally and physically qualified and agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resigna-

tion, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as midshipmen, appointed from the United States. They shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position or be required to serve in the U.S. Navy by reason of their graduation from the Academy.

The admission of citizens of friendly foreign nations to the service academies is a very sound measure to pursue in the national interests of the United States. The good will and the fellowship created is deep and abiding. The military expertise instilled in foreign midshipmen, coupled with their exposure to American ideals and principles, provides a much-needed asset.

Mr. Speaker, this is not unique in the experience of this country. We have foreign students attending many of our universities and many of our military institutions, whether it be the Air War College or the Army War College, the academies, or whatever. It has been the experience of this Government that by doing this we create bonds of friendship that last for many years to come. It is a real plus and an asset for us to make friends worldwide. I think it is in the best interest of the United States to admit these two students on a one-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this joint resolution.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, let us consider the bill on its merits. Let us forget about the smoke screen and stop trying to defeat this bill with a lot of things that have nothing whatever to do with the bill.

I am amazed that this bill has drawn opposition. One of the best investments we can make is the training of promising young foreign students in our own country. Since military leaders figure prominently in the government of most countries, it is doubly important that we train promising young foreign military students in America. There are many examples of the way this results in good relations in subsequent years. For instance, there is Indonesia. This country was on the verge of a Communist takeover. The situation was reversed and a new government installed. The principal members of the new government were trained in the United States as young officers and the Government is now friendly toward us and strongly anti-Communist. Indonesia is one of the important nations in the Far East.

No one has to tell the House of the importance of the Middle East to the interests of the free world and particulary the United States. Surely the House realizes that our policy of supporting Israel has left us with but few friends in the Middle East. Iran is probably the staunchest of these friends. Iran is the only Middle East country that does not restrict its shipments of gas and oil to the United States. Iran is one of our best customers and the sad state of the balance of trade shows how much we need business. Iran is a responsible member of the community of nations and has agreed to accept the unpleasant task of serving on the peacekeeping team in Indochina. Iran is a leader in the Middle East. The progress made by this country in improving a lot of its own people within a few short years is probably unsurpassed anywhere in the world.

I strongly support the resolution which takes nothing away from American citizens and simply adds Iran to a list of about 20 countries who have had students admitted to the Academy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I think this particular bill presents some very serious diplomatic problems and if we vote it down it will undoubtedly be viewed by the people of Iran as a diplomatic slight set-back for Iran.

In view of the friendly diplomatic relations we have with Iran and the current crisis over oil, it would be a real mistake, in my opinion, to vote against this bill.

Nevertheless, I wish to record myself in opposition to the principle of continuing this kind of legislation in the future, which it seems to me amounts to a kind of intervention in the internal affairs of another country by creating an "old school tie" relationship between the career military in this country and those of other countries.

While I do not support the move of the gentleman from California to defeat this bill, I do believe he has raised a point that ought to be considered by the Committee on Armed Services in the future.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding to me, since I disagree with his position. As a matter of fact, when I looked at the schedule and saw this bill on the calendar, I assumed that it would pass unanimously. Then, yesterday I received a dear colleague letter from the gentleman from California which prompted me to send out one of my own in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to two points which the gentleman has raised. Let me say that I do not agree with the gentleman when he describes Iran as a military dictatorship. For example the Shah has, out of their oil income, expanded education in very effective fashion wiping out illiteracy in the country. Iran has a fine functioning parliament, and a viable economy with a good base of free enterprise.

In the 15 years I have served in this body, some of my proudest moments have come when I have witnessed the young men I have appointed to West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy, graduate and go on to serve their country. These are fine young men, outstanding young men. They are from the best of grassroots America. I think they can do a better job of selling America to foreign students than some people in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is a very practical diplomatic measure. I am surprised that it has generated any heat at all. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the Armed Services Committee for bringing it along expeditiously, and I urge an overwhelming vote from my colleagues here on the floor this afternoon.

Present law authorizes the instruction at the Naval Academy of four persons from the Republic of the Philippines and not more than 20 personnel at any one time from Canada and the other American Republics. Except for these special provisions, students from other friendly nations may attend the service academies only under special legislation. The Iranian Government has decided to expand the Imperial Iranian Navy and its commander in chief has requested schooling for two prospective Iranian Officers at the U.S. Naval Academy. House Joint Resolution 735 provides that the United States would not bear the expense of instructing the two Iranian students.

The admission of citizens of friendly foreign nations to the service academies is a very sound measure to pursue in the national interest of the United States. The good will and fellowship created is deep and abiding, and their exposure to American ideals and principles could prove to be of great advantage during these troubled times.

The admission of these two Iranian students at the Naval Academy would in no way reduce the number of openings for American boys, and, in my judgment, is a very practical development for both the United States and Iran.

Mr. Speaker, may I digress somewhat from the specific purpose of the bill before us to emphasize that, in my opinion, the various agreements under which young foreign nationals are trained at our service academies is a very practical and mutually beneficial undertaking for both the United States and any nation with which we work out such a program. It is really a high-level diplomatic program as well as a military program. I wish to reemphasize my strong belief that the understanding of our Nation which these outstanding young men receive is put to good use throughout their careers in which they serve their countries. International cooperation, understanding and a mutual desire to keep the peace is enhanced.

As a Member, I am very proud that I have been privileged to appoint some of our own outstanding young men to our service academics and I would, therefore, like to emphasize to the Members that this resolution that I urge them to adpot this afternoon would not reduce the number of openings for the young men who receive our congressional appointments. I reemphasize this point since our colleagues have circulated a letter stating that foreign nationals fill slots that would otherwise go to Americans, and this is totally inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this resolution certainly deserves our support.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I take this 1 minute to direct a question to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

This country is spending several billion dollars a year in the various colleges and universities in the United States. Would the gentleman inform me if it is a matter of national policy that we are not willing to accept any students from Iran or any of the other countries with whom we may agree or disagree? That we will not accept those students at any university such as the University of Oregon, the University of Texas, Yale, Princeton or Harvard, Radcliffe or the other schools and colleges of the country?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentlewoman's question, I would say, to be consistent, that if I were opposed to admitting them to one of the service academies, I would certainly be consistent and oppose allowing them in any of our colleges or universities in this country.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware of any national effort or practice to try to prevent such schools and universities from admitting them?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, until today, this is the first time I have ever heard anyone in the Congress oppose admitting students from friendly countries to the service academies when the entire cost of it is charged to the governments of those countries.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman and think it is as desirable to have foreign students from Iran and from other countries at the service academies as it is to have them at other universities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. HOLT).

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 735. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 of this year, your Committee on Armed Services brought to the floor House Joint Resolution 735 authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Empire of Iran. We had asked the Speaker to place this legislation on the Consent Calendar, because it was an extremely simple measure which would authorize two Iranian students to attend the Naval Academy with the class of 1978 with all costs to be borne by the Government of Iran.

Frankly, I was amazed when I heard Representative FORTNEY H. STARK object to the resolution. But, of course, he has every right to do so under the rules of the House, and he merely exercised his prerogative. He opposes this legislation; as he felt that "citizens of a military dictatorship, which arbitrarily oppresses and imprisons its people, should not be allowed to further their military prowess in a U.S. institution."

In my opinion, he is rendering a great disservice to the United States and its very important ally, the Empire of Iran. Let us look briefly at Iran and see what it has accomplished under the leadership of the present Shah.

In the short space of 10 years Iran, an old country with modern aspirations, has moved from a semifeudal state into the 20th century and is one of the most rapidly developing countries in Asia. What Iran has accomplished in this decade has an "epic quality," to use the words of George Ball, formerly Under Secretary of State. No nation except Japan has achieved such a sustained rate of growth, and there seems to be no reason why the Shah's ambition to transform his country into a strong and modern nation and to achieve what he calls "The Great Civilization" should not be realized in his lifetime.

A few statistics: Irans GNP at constant—1969—prices is now increasing about 13 percent annually. Per capita GNP in current prices is rising by almost 16 percent. Per capita income has risen from $176 in 1962, at the start of the Shah's White Revolution, to about $560 today, and $850 is the target by the end of the fifth plan period—March 1978. Iran's goal is to have by that date a standard of living second in Asia only to Japan's and equal to that of a number of European countries.

Iran's first four plans—1950–72—gave the country a solid modern industrial and commercial foundation for its economy and a communications infrastructure to bind together this vast country of rugged mountains, interior desert and long Persian Gulf coastline. Iran is the size of the United States east of the Mississippi. The fifth plan, launched this year, calls for a massive $36 billion investment and huge gains in GNP and per capita income. Its goals are: First, maintenance of a high—11.4 percent—rate of real economic growth; second, more equitable distribution of income; third, a balanced sectoral and regional development with greater emphasis on agriculture and rural services; and fourth, an enhanced Iranian presence in the world economic and political system.

These achievements are the results of prudent leadership and the sound use of the nation's resources. The Shah is a ruler in a hurry who 10 years ago inaugurated the White Revolution and launched Iran on its exciting success story which has brought it a political stability not enjoyed for centuries. There is no visible threat to the regime and the constitutional monarchy provides a framework for democratic institutions to grow. Of the country's considerable natural resources, the most important is of course oil. Today Iran exports nearly 5 million barrels per day of crude oil and is expected to increase to about 9 million barrels per day by 1976. Government revenues from this and other resources finance the Shah's guns and butter policy.

The Government is committed to spend 80 percent of its oil revenues on development and is now reaching this goal. Iran received more than $2.4 billion oil income in 1972. This income is expected to increase to nearly $13 billion by 1980. These abundant funds would, however, be useless or at best largely wasted in a society and economy unable to plan and change. The Shah early realized that changes in planning the economy required the same kind of central direction that he has assumed in the political and social development of Iran. Thus land reform, which was the basic element of his White Revolution, was intended not only to improve the agricultural sector, but to make way for progress in the health, education and community life of the majority of Iran's people who live by the soil. Land reform in Iran remains one of the largely unreported achievements of social and economic engineering on a national scale.

Iran has been a reliable source of oil for the West and Japan. It is as much interested in a secure, stable outlet for its oil to finance its development as the West and Japan are in a secure source of energy to fuel their industries. Iran wishes to play a stabilizing, constructive role in this relationship and to keep political blackmail out of the oil business. In 1967, Iran refused to join the Arabs in the oil embargo, and Iran has been a force for moderation and practicality in OPEC.

Iran is also excellent business for the United States. The high sustained rate of economic growth, combined with a strong foreign exchange position and a government committed to rapid industrialization and social welfare, make Iran the most attractive market in the Middle East for a wide range of American products. During 1972 Iran's imports totaled an estimated $3 billion, a 15-percent increase over the previous year. It is anticipated that the Iranian market for foreign goods will top $4 billion in the current Iranian year.

The U.S. share of this business is holding steady at about 21 percent even though the American firms are challenged in every sector by third country competition. In 1972 for the first time the United States moved in front of West Germany as Iran's largest trading partner with sales of over $550 million, and this is expected to increase substantially in the next several years.

The investment and business climate in Iran is basically good, and more than 1600 American firms are actively in the Iranian market. United States nonoil investment is presently about $130 million and this figure could easily be quadrupled in the coming year. Joint ventures with American concerns presently involve such well known U.S. companies as B. F. Goodrich, General Tire & Rubber Co., Amoco, Reynolds, General Motors, Cabot Corp., FMC, and Mack Truck; and important multimillion dollar projects with J. F. Pritchard of Kansas City, and Phelps Dodge are now being contemplated. American know-how makes a major contribution to both Iranian industry and agriculture and our commercial presence here is expected to contribute more than a billion dollars to our balance-of-payments position in 1973.

The Shah's butter policy is supplemented by efforts to modernize and expand Iran's armed forces. During the last Iranian fiscal year—March 1972–73—the defense budget was 22 percent of the total budget and 9 percent of the GNP.

Much of the equipment and advice needed for this program are being purchased from the United States.

Iran is a country which should gladden the heart of the American taxpayer and the Congress because, if there ever were a country that has received our aid and put it to good use, Iran is that country. Our military and economic assistance programs, which over the years totaled $1.4 billion, came to an end in 1968 and since that time Iran has stood on its own feet and paid its own way in all respects. The funds we invested in this country have come back to the United States many times over and in the process Iran has achieved a rare degree of political stability and economic prosperity. Further, it is a country that does not hesitate to thank us for aid in days gone by and for the cooperation characterizing our present relationship.

This relationship today is excellent. It is based on a solid mutuality of interests and of respect for one another, and is probably healthier and of longer standing than any other in all of Asia. The Shah, who is one of the most experienced chiefs of state, having assumed the throne in 1941, has greatly valued his close official and personal relationships with American Presidents over the years and most particularly with President Nixon, whom he has known for the last 20.

Finally, Iran is a country determined to stand on its own feet and to offer its friendship to one and all while maintaining a special relationship of cooperation with the United States. It is also a country that seeks to play a responsible role in this part of the world and especially in the Gulf to insure peace and stability in this strategic area and to shoulder some of the burdens and responsibilities assumed by others in the past.

Mr. Speaker, for us to reject this very simple measure would, in my opinion, be extremely detrimental to our national interest and would be a slap in the face to one of our staunchest allies. I urge the support of every Member of this body.

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

However, I would just like to summarize my opposition to the bill by saying that I believe some of the proponents have given us the best argument here this afternoon by saying that some of these nations, such as the military dictatorship of Greece and the military government of Chile, now have in their ranks those who are graduates of our academies. We should vote to stop this, since Congress voted to stop it in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote down this resolution.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAN DANIEL).

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I will say initially that I favor the admission of women to our Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, it is the judgment of this Member that if we are involved in another war, it will be fought over fuel, food, and fiber, rather than over any ideology. If we follow the suggestion of the gentleman from California and withdraw from the world and become isolationists, it is the further judgment of this Member that wars will surely follow us home.

For some time now the Government of Iran has shared our own concern about the security of the oil-rich Persian Gulf region, and their concern has intensified since the withdrawal of British forces east of Suez in late 1971. This has not been idle concern, however; Iran not only recognized the potential problem, but set about taking positive actions designed to avoid a worsening of the problem. That nation is expanding its naval forces from 11,000 to 24,000 men, and at the same time has begun a program to modernize and expand its other military services. As a result, there have been large equipment sales from U.S. sources over the past 3 years. But equipment alone will not suffice. They need trained personnel—their own people—to use the equipment.

And training alone is not enough. Even more important, indeed fundamental, in forming a solid naval establishment, is education. For many years their navy midshipmen have been educated at British, French, German, and Italian naval academies, and this has resulted in a confusing variety of naval standards. Iran has no coherent educational foundation on which to build an effective and cohesive naval officer corps.

One solution, of course, would be to build and develop their own naval academy. This is impractical, since at this time they require only 40 midshipmen a year. Aside from the cost, such an undertaking would require more time than is available to acquire and to train teachers, build facilities, and assure quality output.

The better solution—and House Joint Resolution 735 is its logical outgrowth—is to seek billets in a friendly nation with a common language and a unified naval tradition. For the past 8 years Iranians have attended the Universities of Utah and Idaho under those schools' NROTC programs. Today there are 90 Iranian midshipmen in attendance at such schools, and approximately 100 in our State maritime academies. They are doing quite well. This request to permit two midshipmen to attend the U.S. Naval Academy, at no cost to our Government and in addition to, not instead of, our own young men who wish to go there, is a logical and reasonable next step.

On a personal note, I have been to Iran, as I am sure many Members of this body have been. I have had an opportunity to meet with the Shah, the Foreign Minister, and many members of their legislative chamber. I have talked with them about matters concerning United States-Iranian friendship, and about development of their country. And I can frankly say that in my travels not only as a Member of Congress, but as a former national commander of the American Legion, I have never seen a country making such rapid strides in its economy—and a government so willing to share the benefits of growth with its people.

Set aside what Iran has done for its own people, though. Given the proper circumstances any nation can do that. And for the moment, set aside as well the advantage which will accrue to Iran from such an arrangement.

Consider briefly only one point: Iran, just now, is one of the few friends we have left in the world on which we can rely for oil, and to which we can look for stability in that part of the world. How much longer shall we continue our present course of opening our hands—and our pocketbooks—to hostile governments while pushing away our friends, and denying them even modest assistance?

Like Charlie Brown of the comic strips, "We need all the friends we can get."

I urge each of you to support this resolution, lest we find ourselves totally friendless in a dark, cold world.

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

I believe this would be the worst possible time for this House to vote down a resolution of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity for speaking, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 735 which would permit two Iranians to attend the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. Speaker, one's friends in this world fall into different categories, just as one's personal friends are divided into several classes.

Some of our friends in this world are fair weather friends. They are with us when the going is good but let there be the slightest adversity and we find that they are not on our side. A second class of friends that the United States has discovered in the past are those who remain friends as long as we give them something. To be plain and frank about it, as long as we give them economic aid or military assistance of some kind. But once that foreign aid stops they have forgotten all of the past favors. It is like the story of the late Alben Barkley who had extended repeated favors to a constituent. When Mr. Barkley asked for a small favor in return the reply was "What have you done for me lately?"

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a third class of friends. They are those true friends who are with us year in and year out. They never seem to let us down. Most of all they never ask for anything. Iran falls into this third category of friends.

Moreover, Iran is not only our good friend but our best cash customer in the Middle East. Just like friends there are three classes of customers. There are those who want favored treatment and expect long-term credit. Iran, on the

other hand, is a cash customer. As I mentioned once she is our very best cash customer in all of the Middle East. Oh, we have some new found friends who say they want to be our customers. What they mean is they will be our customers as long as we give them credits which may never be paid.

It is amazing why there should be any opposition to the admission of these two young Iranians to our Naval Academy. Surely those who oppose this resolution today have read of King Faisal turning off the valves of the oil pipelines that would give needed fuel not only to this country but to Western Europe this winter.

The admission of these young men to our Naval Academy is such a small thing. There are only two of them. We should remember there are now over 190 Iranian ROTC students in this country. Why should we risk even the slightest breach of friendship with our good and loyal ally as the Iranians?

Any arguments over quotas of minorities attending the Academy or admission of women to the Academy to satisfy the "women libbers" of this country are spurious arguments. They are pure surplusage to the issue before us today. Let us make room for more minority admissions. Let us make room some time in the future for young women to attend the Academy, if the Congress works its will on these issues, but these are not the issues before us today.

The true issue today is whether we should admit these two young men that come from a country that is our last remaining true friend in the Middle East. We should not refuse her this small request. Let us not slap her in the face.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 735 and urge its passage. I am somewhat surprised at the charges of some that Iran is a military dictatorship. The Shah does not remain in office because of the armed forces. He is the hereditary monarch of a constitutional monarchy and, according to the best information I have, is well accepted by the vast majority of his people.

During his reign, the present Shah has moved Iran from a semifeudal state into the 20th century. He has brought significant political, economic, and social reforms to his country.

His constitutional monarchy provides a framework in which democratic institutions may grow. Iran, for example, has a fully developed cabinet, responsive to a parliament elected by direct popular vote.

Iran has undertaken a successful and progressive land reform program, intended not only to improve the agricultural sector, but also to improve the quality of life for Iran's rural population. When I speak of quality of life I refer to health, education, and community life.

Iran has built a solid industrial and commercial foundation for its economy and is now in the midst of plans to build on the economic progress of the past and to achieve a fairer distribution of income and balanced sectoral and regional development.

This Persian Gulf country has committed itself to spending 80 percent of its oil revenues on development and is now reaching that goal.

Mr. Speaker, Iran provides a vivid example of a country which has used American aid to benefit its people. Furthermore, it is a country willing and able to assume a responsible role to insure peace and stability in the Persian Gulf area and to shoulder its fair share of the burdens and responsibilities toward this end.

I, therefore, urge the suspension of the rules and a favorable vote on House Joint Resolution 735.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to conclude this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out for your information that for a number of years the United States, being very much aware of our close ties with the country of Iran, has been providing training in our NROTC institutions and in our State maritime academies for a substantial number of their naval students. Right now there are 190 of those Iranian students receiving this training.

I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that when the Arab countries reduced or completely cut off the export of oil and other fuels to this country and to other countries Iran, one of the rich oil-producing countries in the Middle East, refused to go along with that. They stayed on our side, and today they are providing a vast amount of fuel to this country. We can expect them to continue in the future in an increasing amount.

Right now, of all times, who in this House would want to slap a valuable and dependable friend in the face by refusing to do for Iran what we are doing for 29 other countries? Any person who has any concern about our fuel shortage, the imminent prospects for an increase in gasoline and other fuel costs, and the liklihood we will soon face rationing, will surely not want to insult our trusted friend which is one of our chief mainstays for future supplies.

We have heard talk here about depriving minorities and girls of slots in the academy. That is utter nonsense. Every Member of Congress may appoint any qualified person to the academy. There are over 300 blacks in the Military Academy now, and at least 200 in the Naval Academy. If Members appoint them, they go. If Members do not appoint them, they do not go. The enactment of this bill can have no remote connection with appointment privileges of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves to be approved unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 735.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 343, nays 28, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

YEAS—343

Abdnor	Delaney	Jones, Okla.
Abzug	Dellenback	Jordan
Adams	Dennis	Karth
Alexander	Derwinski	Kazen
Anderson, Calif.	Devine	Kemp
	Dickinson	King
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Kluczynski
Andrews, N.C.	Donohue	Koch
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dorn	Kuykendall
	Downing	Kyros
Annunzio	Dulski	Landgrebe
Archer	Duncan	Landrum
Arends	Eckhardt	Latta
Armstrong	Edwards, Ala.	Leggett
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	Lehman
Ashley	Esch	Litton
Aspin	Eshleman	Long, La.
Bafalis	Evans, Colo.	Lott
Baker	Fascell	Lujan
Bauman	Findley	McClory
Beard	Fish	McCloskey
Bennett	Fisher	McCollister
Bergland	Flood	McCormack
Bevill	Flowers	McDade
Biaggi	Flynt	McFall
Biester	Foley	McKay
Bingham	Ford, Gerald R.	McKinney
Blackburn	Ford, William D.	McSpadden
Boggs		Macdonald
Boiling	Forsythe	Madden
Bowen	Fountain	Madigan
Brademas	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Brasco	Frenzel	Mallary
Bray	Frey	Mann
Breaux	Froehlich	Martin, Nebr.
Breckinridge	Fulton	Martin, N.C.
Brinkley	Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.
Brooks	Gibbons	Mathis, Ga.
Broomfield	Gilman	Matsunaga
Brotzman	Ginn	Mayne
Brown, Calif.	Goldwater	Meeds
Brown, Mich.	Gonzalez	Melcher
Brown, Ohio	Goodling	Metcalfe
Broyhill, N.C.	Grasso	Mezvinsky
Broyhill, Va.	Gray	Michel
Buchanan	Green, Oreg.	Milford
Burgener	Gross	Miller
Burke, Fla.	Grover	Minish
Burke, Mass.	Gude	Minshall, Ohio
Burleson, Tex.	Gunter	Moakley
Burlison, Mo.	Guyer	Montgomery
Butler	Haley	Moorhead, Calif.
Byron	Hamilton	
Carey, N.Y.	Hammer-schmidt	Moorhead, Pa.
Carney, Ohio		Mosher
Carter	Hanrahan	Moss
Casey, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Hansen, Wash.	Myers
Chappell	Harsha	Natcher
Clancy	Harvey	Nedzi
Clausen, Don H.	Hastings	Nelsen
	Hays	Nichols
Clawson, Del	Heckler, Mass.	O'Brien
Cleveland	Heinz	O'Hara
Cochran	Helstoski	O'Neill
Cohen	Henderson	Parris
Collier	Hicks	Passman
Collins, Ill.	Hillis	Patten
Collins, Tex.	Hinshaw	Pepper
Conable	Hogan	Perkins
Conlan	Holifield	Pettis
Conte	Holt	Peyser
Corman	Horton	Pickle
Cotter	Hosmer	Pike
Coughlin	Howard	Poage
Cronin	Huber	Podell
Culver	Hunt	Preyer
Daniel, Dan	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Ichord	Price, Tex.
	Jarman	Pritchard
Daniels, Dominick V.	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
	Johnson, Colo.	Quillen
Danielson	Johnson, Pa.	Railsback
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Ala.	Randall
de la Garza	Jones, N.C.	Rangel

Rarick	Skubitz	Waggonner
Rees	Slack	Waldie
Regula	Smith, Iowa	Wampler
Rinaldo	Smith, N.Y.	Ware
Roberts	Snyder	Whalen
Robinson, Va.	Spence	White
Robison, N.Y.	Staggers	Whitehurst
Rodino	Stanton,	Whitten
Roe	J. William	Wiggins
Rogers	Steed	Williams
Roncalio, Wyo.	Steele	Wilson, Bob
Rooney, N.Y.	Steelman	Wilson,
Rose	Steiger, Ariz.	Charles H.,
Rosenthal	Stubblefield	Calif.
Rostenkowski	Stuckey	Wilson,
Rousselot	Sullivan	Charles, Tex.
Roy	Symms	Winn
Runnels	Talcott	Wolff
Ruppe	Taylor, Mo.	Wright
Ruth	Taylor, N.C.	Wyatt
St Germain	Teague, Calif.	Wylie
Sarasin	Thompson, N.J.	Wyman
Sarbanes	Thomson, Wis.	Yates
Satterfield	Thone	Yatron
Scherle	Thornton	Young, Alaska
Schneebeli	Tiernan	Young, Fla.
Sebelius	Treen	Young, Ill.
Seiberling	Udall	Young, S.C.
Shipley	Ullman	Young, Tex.
Shoup	Van Deerlin	Zablocki
Shriver	Vander Jagt	Zion
Shuster	Vanik	Zwach
Sikes	Veysey	
Sisk	Vigorito	

NAYS—28

Burton	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
Clay	Holtzman	Roush
Denholm	Hungate	Roybal
Drinan	Kastenmeier	Ryan
du Pont	Long, Md.	Schroeder
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Stark
Evins, Tenn.	Mitchell, Md.	Studds
Fraser	Obey	Young, Ga.
Gaydos	Owens	
Harrington	Reuss	

NOT VOTING—62

Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.
Badillo	Griffiths	Nix
Barrett	Gubser	Patman
Bell	Hanley	Powell, Ohio
Blatnik	Hanna	Reid
Boland	Hawkins	Rhodes
Burke, Calif.	Hébert	Roncallo, N.Y.
Camp	Hudnut	Rooney, Pa.
Cederberg	Jones, Tenn.	Sandman
Chisholm	Keating	Stanton,
Clark	Ketchum	James V.
Conyers	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Crane	McEwen	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Stokes
Davis, Wis.	Maraziti	Stratton
Dellums	Mazzoli	Symington
Dent	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Mitchell, N.Y.	Towell, Nev.
Eilberg	Mizell	Walsh
Gettys	Mollohan	Widnall
Giaimo	Morgan	Wydler

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Badillo against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Crane.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Ketchum.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Dent with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Handley with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Mitchell of New York.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stokes.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Conyers.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT BY SECRETARY OF INTERIOR RECOMMENDING DISCONTINUANCE OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR A FEDERAL-INTERSTATE COMPACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-176)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 3 of Public Law 89-605, as amended by Public Law 91-242, I am transmitting a report by the Secretary of the Interior. This report recommends discontinuance of negotiations for a Federal-Interstate Compact and suggests repeal by Congress of Public Law 89-605 as amended by Public Law 91-242, the Hudson River Basin Compact Act.

The report includes a letter of agreement signed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Governors of New Jersey and New York. This letter documents the agreement reached and explains the facts leading to the agreement.

I concur in the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior. A draft bill repealing Public Law 89-605 as amended by Public Law 91-242 is enclosed for your consideration.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSITION OF OFFICE EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHINGS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9075) to authorize the disposition of office equipment and furnishings, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9075

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member may purchase, upon leaving office or otherwise ceasing to be a Member (except by expulsion), any item or items of office equipment or office furnishings provided by the General Services Administration and then currently located and in use in the office space of such Member in the district then represented by such Member.

(b) Each purchase of equipment or furnishings under subsection (a) of this section shall be—

(1) in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, after consultation with the General Services Administration; and

(2) at a price equal to the acquisition cost to the Federal Government of the equipment or furnishings so purchased, less allowance for depreciation determined under such regulations.

(c) Amounts received by the Federal Government from the sale of items of office equipment or office furnishings under this section shall be remitted to the General Services Administration and credited to the appropriate account or accounts.

(d) For the purposes of this section—

(1) "Member" means a Member of, Delegate to, or Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives; and

(2) "district" means a congressional district, the District of Columbia (with respect to any office of the Delegate from the District of Columbia situated at any place in the District other than at the United States Capitol), the Virgin Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, and, in the case of a Representative at Large, a State.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a United States Senator may purchase, upon leaving office or otherwise ceasing to be a Senator (except by expulsion), any item or items of office equipment or office furnishings provided by the General Services Administration and then currently located and in use in the office space of such Senator in the State then represented by such Senator.

(b) At the request of any United States Senator, the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate shall arrange for and make the purchase of equipment and furnishings under subsection (a) of this section on behalf of such Senator. Each such purchase shall be—

(1) in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, after consultation with the General Services Administration; and

(2) at a price equal to the acquisition cost to the Federal Government of the equipment or furnishings so purchased, less allowance for depreciation determined under such regulations.

(c) Amounts received by the Federal Government from the sale of items of office equipment or office furnishings under this section shall be remitted to the General Services Administration and credited to the appropriate account or accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) supported unanimously in the Subcommittee on Accounts and by the Committee on House Administration.

The purpose of this bill is simple. It allows Members who leave Congress, except for expulsion, to purchase the furnishings provided by the GSA for their offices at their depreciated value. In the usual course of events when one leaves and has GSA provided furniture, that furniture is sent for by GSA, tossed into the nearest GSA warehouse and made available to the public on a bid basis in the same manner in which the Members

would be able to purchase the furnishings under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is this bill limited strictly and entirely to the equipment in the Member's district office or offices?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, it is, I will say to my colleague from Iowa. It does not relate at all to the furnishings in the three House buildings, in our Washington offices. It is limited entirely to furnishings in one's district office or offices.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a very real need for this legislation. I was surprised to learn that upon retirement a Member of Congress is not allowed to buy at the actual value the furnishings in the district office.

I do not intend to use this privilege at any time, but some Members do.

This simply permits a Member if he elects to do so to purchase from GSA the furnishings and equipment in his district office back home at its depreciated value.

It is better than putting it back in the GSA warehouse. I do not know where it goes from there.

I think it is reasonable. I think it is a service to the Members and I urge its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9075, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the disposition of certain office equipment and furnishings, and for other purposes.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF POLICE FORCE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10840) to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for members of the police force of the Library of Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10840

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411; 2 U.S.C. 167), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) The Librarian of Congress may designate employees of the Library of Congress as special policemen for duty in connection with policing of the Library of Congress buildings and grounds and adjacent streets and shall fix their rates of basic pay as follows:

"(1) Private GS–7—step one through five;

"(2) Sergeant GS–8—step one through five;

"(3) Lieutenant GS–9—step one through five;

"(4) Senior Lieutenant GS–10—step one through five; and

"(5) Captain GS–11—step one through seven.

"(b) The Librarian of Congress may apply the provisions of subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, to members of the special police force of the Library of Congress."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10840 is to increase the pay scale of Library of Congress Police officers to a level competitive with those of other Federal police forces in this area.

Prior to 1968, Library Police were covered by the Classification Act of 1949, which kept their salaries constant with that of police at the General Services Administration. However, pursuant to Public Law 90–610, approved in that year, the Library force was removed from the Classification Act and were assigned pay grades with step 5 ceilings in each. There are normally 10 steps in each grade.

Given the pay scales of other forces in the metropolitan area, the Library is left in a poor competitive position to recruit and retain first-rate individuals. As a result, the Library for the past 3 years has found it necessary to pay new privates, sergeants, and junior lieutenants at the maximum levels. Under present law, these individuals would be denied further pay increases unless promoted.

The committee has conducted a study of Library Police statutory responsibilities and actual functioning. They have concluded that while valuable Library collections, staff, and public visitors require an experienced and reliable police force, the force's actual duties are more custodial than law enforcement in nature. There is virtually no crime problem at Library facilities; instead, Library officers deal with building safety, public complaints, and the prevention of unauthorized removal of Library materials. In short, the duties of Library Police are not comparable to those of the Capitol Police. However, the work of the Library force is similar to that of other Federal police in the area.

The bill would raise the grade levels of Library privates, sergeants, junior lieutenants, senior lieutenants, and captain from the equivalents of, respectively, grades 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the civil service classification schedule to the equivalents of, respectively, grades 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. The step 5 ceiling within each grade would be retained, except that the captain of the Library force would be permitted a step 7 ceiling. These increases would place the Library scale in a somewhat superior position to that of the General Services Administration, and would virtually equate Library compensation with that of the National Zoological Park force. Library Police salaries would continue to trail substantially those of the Capitol Police.

Last summer, the Senate approved a bill containing the same grade increases as in H.R. 10840, but which also removed all Step ceilings within grades. In your committee's view, the Senate bill's removal of the step ceilings is unwarranted. Accordingly, the Committee on House Administration unanimously endorsed this alternate measure.

It is my belief that the pay adjustments in H.R. 10840 are appropriate in view of the duties of the Library force; at the same time, the bill provides an equitable increase to insure that the Library of Congress can continue to attract and retain qualified officers. I urge approval of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, but I still am not clear as to why, in the matter of pay, this bill should give to the police of the Library of Congress superior pay status to those in the General Services Administration and the National Zoological Park Service.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it was felt by the people in the Library of Congress that they will not be able to attract people at the GSA pay schedule. It does provide for compensation which is equal to that of the zoological park system. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that people working for the Library of Congress have somewhat different duties than most GSA guards who do not handle crowds and this type of thing.

The GSA pay scale covers custodial employees who do not have quite the contact with the public that these others have.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10840.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REMOVE THE RESTRICTION ON CHANGE OF SALARY OF FULL-TIME REFEREES

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3490) to amend section 40b of the Bankruptcy Act—11 U.S.C. 68(b)—to remove the restriction on change of salary of full-time referees.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3490

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

division b of section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"b. The conference, in the light of the recommendations of the councils, made after advising with the district judges or decrease any salary, within the limits prescribed in subdivision a of this section, if there has been a material increase or decrease in the volume of business or other change in the factors which may be considered material in fixing salaries: *Provided, however,* That during the tenure of any full-time referee his salary shall not be reduced below that at which he was originally appointed under this amendatory Act, and during any term of any such referee his salary shall not be reduced below the salary fixed for him at the beginning of that term."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3490, to amend section 40b of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(b)) to remove the restriction on change of salary of full-time referees.

The purpose of this bill is to eliminate the 2-year restriction on changes of salary for full-time referees in bankruptcy.

Full-time referees in bankruptcy alone among all legislative, executive and judicial offices subject to the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act may be barred from receiving salary increases as and when they are recommended by the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries and approved by Congress.

In 1946, section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act was enacted in substantially its present form by the Referee's Salary Act. This section, along with section 37 of the act, is the heart of the legislation which removed referees from the fee-collecting system of compensation and placed them on a salary basis.

Within the past 4-year period, the Judicial Conference of the United States has taken certain actions which have had the practical effect of changing this system. Upon recommendation of its Bankruptcy Committee, the Judicial Conference adopted a statement of policy that all full-time referees should be paid at the same rate within the limit upon such salaries established by the Presidential Salary Commission.

The Conference later, in 1971, adopted a policy that referees' salaries should be set at from 75 to 80 percent of the salaries of U.S. district judges. The last increase received by referees was effective November 1, 1972, when the Judicial Conference approved a recommendation by the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Court of 5.5 percent, which was the equivalent of the increase given to graded Government employees under the economic stabilization amendments—in other words, a cost of living increase.

Under section 40(b), as it is presently stated, the next increase that can be considered for referees would be in November of 1974. The "2-year rule" is obsolete. It singles out referees in bankruptcy to suffer a lag in cost of living increases and other compensation adjustments. The circumstances which prevailed when the "2-year rule" was enacted are far different today. This restriction should be removed so that referees' salaries will simply be adjusted or not adjusted along with salaries of other personnel in the court system.

The repeal of this 2-year proviso has been urged by the Judicial Conference of the United States and was proposed and is supported by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

We are unaware of any opposition to the repeal proposed in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration on this resolution.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3490, a bill to delete that portion of Section 40(b) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68[b]) which limits the authority of the Judicial Conference of the United States to adjust the salaries of Federal referees in bankruptcy more often than once in any 2-year period and in an amount of less than $250.

The salaries of referees are fixed by the Judicial Conference pursuant to section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act. That statute provides that a referee can receive a maximum of $36,000 per year. Section 40 further provides that the conference, in fixing a salary, shall consider a referee's workload, the asset size of his cases, and certain other factors. (11 U.S.C. 68[a]). However, currently all of the 190 full time referees are paid the maximum salary authorized by the Judicial Conference, $31,625, because of their uniformly heavy caseloads.

The notion that the application of statutory criteria would cause referees salaries to frequently gyrate up and down has been obselete for many years. The Judicial Conference testified that a salary adjustment of less than $250 is not a realistic possibility.

The restriction in section 40(b) of the act which this bill will eliminate now works an unfair hardship on all full time referees that Congress never intended. The Judicial Conference approved a "cost of living" adjustment in the rate of pay of referees effective November 1, 1972. Their salaries were raised from $30,000 per year to $31,625 per year. However, the referees are now in a unique position among all other government employees of being ineligible for a pay increase until November 1, 1974.

If H.R. 3490 is passed, it will not change the salaries of referees in bankruptcy. However, if the Judicial Conference decides to raise their salaries, within the existing maximum rate, whether to pass along a "cost of living" increase, or for any other reason, it should not be encumbered by this outdated restriction.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill does not put referees in bankruptcy with other Federal employees on the pay escalator which operates in accordance with cost-of-living increases?

Mr. WIGGINS. No, sir, it does not. Pay increases amounting to a cost-of-living increase are not automatic as to referees. They must be approved by the Judicial conference.

Mr. GROSS. They must be approved by the Judicial Council?

Mr. WIGGINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And henceforth they can be approved every 6 or 12 months and not necessarily every 2 or 3 years?

Mr. WIGGINS. That is correct. It is contemplated they will be just like other employees and when other employees are given a cost-of-living increase, then it is contemplated that referees may be treated accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I have no further questions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3490.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report on S. 1081, the Alaska pipeline bill, was signed last week. It is the intention of myself and the chairman of the conference committee, Chairman HALEY of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to call that conference report up for consideration of the House tomorrow.

FEDERAL FINANCING BANK ACT OF 1973

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5874) to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5874

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 Financing Bank Act of 1973".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that demands for funds through Federal and federally assisted borrowing programs are increasing faster than the total supply of credit and

that such borrowings are not adequately coordinated with overall Federal fiscal and debt management policies. The purpose of this Act is to assure coordination of these programs with the overall economic and fiscal policies of the Government, to reduce the costs of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and to assure that such borrowings are financed in a manner least disruptive of private financial markets and institutions.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Federal agency" means an executive department, an independent Federal establishment, or a corporation or other entity established by the Congress which is owned in whole or in part by the United States.

(2) The term "obligation" means any note, bond, debenture, or other evidence of indebtedness, but does not include Federal Reserve notes or stock evidencing an ownership interest in the issuing Federal agency.

(3) The term "guarantee" means any guarantee, insurance, or other pledge with respect to the payment of all or part of the principal or interest on any obligation, but does not include the insurance of deposits, shares, or other withdrawable accounts in financial institutions, or any guarantee or pledge arising out of a statutory obligation to insure such deposits, shares, or other withdrawable accounts.

(4) The term "Bank" means the Federal Financing Bank established by section 4 of this Act.

CREATION OF BANK

SEC. 4. There is hereby created a body corporation to be known as the Federal Financing Bank, which shall have succession until dissolved by an Act of Congress. The Bank shall be subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Bank shall be an instrumentality of the United States Government and shall maintain such offices as may be necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 5. (a) The Bank shall have a Board of Directors consisting of five persons, one of whom shall be the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman of the Board, and four of whom shall be appointed by the President from among the officers or employees of the Bank or of any Federal agency. The Chairman and each other member of the Board may designate some other officer or employee of the Government to serve in his place.

(b) The Board of Directors shall meet at the call of its Chairman. The Board shall determine the general policies which shall govern the operations of the Bank. The Chairman of the Board shall select and effect the appointment of qualified persons to fill such offices as may be provided for in the bylaws, and such persons shall be the executive officers of the Bank and shall discharge such executive functions, powers, and duties as may be provided for in the bylaws or by the Board of Directors. The members of the Board and their designees shall not receive compensation for their services on the Board.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Bank is authorized to make commitments to purchase and sell, and to purchase and sell on terms and conditions determined by the Bank, any obligation which is issued, sold, or guaranteed by a Federal agency. Any Federal agency which is authorized to issue, sell, or guarantee any obligation is authorized to issue or sell such obligations directly to the Bank.

(b) Any purchase by the Bank shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration (1) the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity, or (2) whenever the Bank's own obligations outstanding are sufficient, the current average yield on outstanding obligations of the Bank of comparable maturity.

(c) The Bank is authorized to charge fees for its commitments and other services adequate to cover all expenses and to provide for the accumulation of reasonable contingency reserves.

TREASURY APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) To insure the orderly and coordinated marketing of Treasury and Federal agency obligations and appropriate financing planning with respect thereto, and to facilitate the effective financing of programs authorized by law subject to the applicable provisions of such law, the prior approval of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be required with respect to—

(1) the method of financing,

(2) the source of financing,

(3) the timing of financing in relation to market conditions and financing by other Federal agencies, and

(4) the financing terms and conditions, including rates of interest and maturities, of obligations issued or sold by any Federal agency; except that the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury shall not be required with respect to obligations issued or sold pursuant to an Act of Congress which expressly prohibits any guarantee of such obligations by the United States.

(b) Upon receipt of a request from a Federal agency for his approval under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall act promptly either to grant his approval or to advise the agency of the reasons for withholding his approval. In no case shall the Secretary of the Treasury withhold such approval for a period longer than one hundred and twenty days unless, prior to the end of such period, he submits to the Congress a detailed explanation of his reasons for so doing. Expedited treatment shall be accorded in any case in which the Federal agency advises the Secretary of the Treasury that unusual circumstances require such treatment.

(c) Federal agencies subject to this section shall submit financing plans to the Secretary of the Treasury at such times and in such forms as he shall prescribe.

INITIAL CAPITAL

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to advance the funds necessary to provide initial capital to the Bank. Each such advance shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity. Interest payments on such advances may be deferred, at the discretion of the Secretary, but any such deferred payments shall themselves bear interest at the rate specified in this section. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000,000, which shall be available for the purposes of this section without fiscal year limitation.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE BANK

SEC. 9. (a) The Bank is authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue publicly and have outstanding at any one time not in excess of $15,000,000,000 or such additional amounts as may be authorized in appropriations Acts, of obligations having such maturities and bearing such rate or rates of interest as may be determined by the Bank. Such obligations may be redeemable at the option of the Bank before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated therein. So far as is feasible, the debt structure of the Bank shall be commensurate with its asset structure.

(b) The Bank is also authorized to issue its obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion purchase or agree to purchase any such obligations, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act are extended to include such purchases. Each purchase of obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into condition the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity. The Secretary of the Treasury may sell, upon such terms and conditions and at such price or prices as he shall determine, any of the obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All purchases and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such obligations under this subsection shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(c) The Bank may require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank issued pursuant to subsection (b) in such amounts as will not cause the holding by the Secretary of the Treasury resulting from such required purchases to exceed $5,000,000,000 at any one time. This subsection shall not be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary to purchase obligations of the Bank in excess of such amount.

(b) Obligations of the Bank issued pursuant to this section shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, or any officer or offices thereof.

GENERAL POWERS

SEC. 10. The Bank shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain and defend, in its corporate name;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations as may be necessary for the conduct of its business;

(4) to conduct its business, carry on its operations, and have offices and exercise the powers granted by this Act in any State without regard to any qualification or similar statute in any State;

(5) to lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire, own, hold, improve, use, or otherwise deal in and with any property, real, personal, or mixed or any interest therein wherever situated;

(6) to accept gifts or donations of services, or of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes of the Bank;

(7) to sell, convey, mortgage, pledge, lease, exchange, and otherwise dispose of its property and assets;

(8) to appoint such officers, attorneys, employees, and agents as may be required, to define their duties, to fix and to pay such compensation for their services as may be determined, subject to the civil service and classification laws, to require bonds for them and pay the premium therof;

(9) to enter into contracts, to execute instruments to incur liabilities, and to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business;

(10) to act through any corporate or other agency or instrumentality of the United

States, and to utilize the service thereof on a reimbursable basis, and any such agency or instrumentality is authorized to provide services as requested by the Bank; and

(11) to determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 11. (a) The Bank, its property, its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, security holdings, and other funds, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State or local taxing authority; except that (1) any real property and any tangible personal property of the Bank shall be subject to Federal, State, and local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other such property is taxed, and (2) any obligation issued by the Bank shall be subject to Federal taxation to the same extent as obligations of private corporations are taxed.

(b) All obligations issued by the Bank pursuant to this Act shall be deemed to be exempted securities within the meaning of section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(a)(2)), of section 3(a)(12) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(12)), and of section 304(a)(4) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 77ddd(a)(4)).

(c) Nothing herein shall affect the budget status of the Federal agencies selling obligations to the Bank under section 6(a) of this Act, or the method of budget accounting for their transactions. The receipts and disbursements of the Bank in the discharge of its functions shall not be included in the totals of the budget of the United States Government and shall be exempt from any general limitation imposed by statute on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the United States.

PREPARATION OF OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 12. In order to furnish obligations for delivery by the Bank, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prepare such obligations in such form as the Bank may approve, such obligations when prepared to be held in the Treasury subject to delivery upon order by the Bank. The engraved plates, dies, bed pieces, and other material, executed in connection therewith shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Bank shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenditures made in preparation, custody, and delivery of such obligations.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 13. The Bank shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, transmit to the President and the Congress an annual report of its operations and activities.

OBLIGATIONS ELIGIBLE FOR PURCHASE BY NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 14. The sixth sentence of the seventh paragraph of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by inserting "or obligations of the Federal Financing Bank" immediately after "or obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Government National Mortgage Association,".

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 15. The budget and audit provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841 et seq.) shall be applicable to the Federal Financing Bank in the same manner as they are applied to the wholly owned Government corporations named in section 101 of such Act (31 U.S.C. 846).

PAYMENTS ON BEHALF OF PUBLIC BODIES

SEC. 16. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, purchase by the Bank of the obligations of any local public body or agency within the United States shall be made upon such terms and conditions as may be necessary to avoid an increase in borrowing costs to such local public body or agency as a result of the purchase by the Bank of its obligations. The head of the Federal agency guaranteeing such obligations, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall estimate the borrowing costs that would be incurred by the local public body or agency if its obligations were not sold to the Bank.

(b) The Federal agency guaranteeing obligations purchased by the Bank may contract to make periodic payments to the Bank which shall be sufficient to offset the costs to the Bank of purchasing obligations of local public bodies or agencies upon terms and conditions as prescribed in this section rather than as prescribed by section 6. Such contracts may be made in advance of appropriations therefor, and appropriations for making payments under such contracts are hereby authorized.

NO IMPAIRMENT

SEC. 17. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as impairing any authority or responsibility of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury under any other provision of law, nor shall anything in this Act affect in any manner any provision of law concerning the right of any Federal agency to sell obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury or the authority or responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase such obligations.

PROGRAM LIMITATION

SEC. 18. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing an increase in the amounts of obligations issued, sold, or guaranteed by any Federal agency which issues, sells, or guarantees obligations purchased by the Bank.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 19. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 20. This Act becomes effective upon the date of its enactment, except that section 7 becomes effective upon the expiration of thirty days after such date.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5874, establishes a Federal Financing Bank for centralizing the marketing of Federal and federally assisted borrowing activities. Additionally, the bill requires most Federal agencies to submit to the Secretary of the Treasury for his advance approval their financing plans for securities they will sell or issue.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary because of the substantial increase in Federal credit programs in recent years. With this increase in Federal borrowings, many Federal agencies have had to finance their own programs through the securities markets. This has required these agencies to deal with debt management problems, which has taken away in some respects from their program functions. The increase of Federal agency issues also has raised borrowing costs to the Federal Government because of the competition among Federal security issues, the specialized nature of many Federal securities, and the consequent limited markets in which they are sold. Many of these issues are not coordinated with Treasury financial management advisers, and this lack of coordination has made these financing problems worse.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Financing Bank created by this bill would work to correct these problems. The bank would be able to purchase securities issued, sold, or guaranteed by all Federal agencies, and in turn could sell its own obligations on the securities market. In this way, the bank could centralize the financing of Federal agency obligations. It could decrease the cost of Federal borrowings, by providing expertise and flexibility in the securities market and by issuing a single widely accepted security backed by the Federal Government. The Federal Financing Bank would be an instrumentality of the U.S. Government, subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary of the Treasury.

In addition to establishing the Federal Financing Bank, this bill would require most Federal agencies to submit their financing plans to the Secretary of the Treasury for his advance approval. In this way, the Secretary would be able to coordinate the securities issued and sold by the Federal agencies. However, the bill does not include the TVA in this advance approval requirement, to maintain the independence of the TVA.

The bill does not give the Secretary of the Treasury any new authority to review obligations guaranteed by the Federal Government, such as guaranteed local public housing bonds or guaranteed merchant marine bonds. However, the bill does provide that guaranteed obligations may be sold to the Federal Financing Bank on a voluntary basis. Advance approval by the Secretary of the Treasury was not extended to guaranteed issues at this time because of questions raised about the possible impact of this review on some securities issues. This decision can be reconsidered at a later time when we have more experience with the Federal Financing Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that obligations of the Federal Financing Bank are subject only to Federal taxation, and not taxation by State and local governments. This conforms to the existing tax treatment of Federal obligations.

Finally, the bill makes it clear that no additional authority is provided for the Federal Government to borrow or guarantee borrowings.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury Department recommends its enactment. I urge that the bill be adopted.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5874, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee. This measure would establish a Federal Financing Bank to provide for coordinated and more effi-

cient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public. It would do so by shifting the debt management problems from program agencies to a Federal Financing Bank, by insuring the coordination of the financial management of agency programs which place or guarantee debt issues in the market and by providing that Federal and federally assisted borrowings are financed in a way least disruptive to private financial markets and institutions.

During the last Congress, the Senate passed legislation similar to the bill presently before us. The Ways and Means Committee considered and reported with certain amendments the Senate-passed bill but due to the lateness of the session, it was not brought to the House for consideration. H.R. 5874 with one clarifying technical amendment is identical to the bill approved by our committee last year. In June, the Senate passed similar legislation.

The establishment of a Federal Financing Bank is a priority item for the administration and H.R. 5874 has the support of the Treasury Department. Basically, it provides for a Federal Financing Bank which would be a focal point for the marketing of Federal and federally assisted borrowing activities. In addition, the bill calls for advance submission of financing plans to the Secretary of the Treasury and for Treasury approval of the method and source of financing, timing, rates of interest, maturities, and all other financing terms and conditions of financing of Federal obligations. It is anticipated that as a result of the coordination in Federal borrowing programs, which this bill should insure, significant economies will be effected.

Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, Paul A. Volcker, in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in support of H.R. 5874, highlighted the need for this legislation by noting the growing tendency to finance credit programs directly in the securities markets rather than through lending institutions. In addition, he pointed out that the borrowing costs of the various Federal agency financing methods normally exceed Treasury borrowing costs, because of the proliferation of competing issues, the cumbersome nature of many of the securities, problems of timing and size of issues, limited markets in which they are sold and underwriting costs.

Under the bill, these debt management problems could be shifted from the program agencies to the Federal Financing Bank. The Bank would be able to buy the obligations of the Federal agencies and those guaranteed by Federal agencies and, in turn, issue its own securities. Financing of these programs through the Bank would relieve the various Federal agencies of the debt management problems, minimize the cost of such management and assure greater flexibility and a broader market for the securities.

The committee, however, did not believe that the advance approval should be required for obligations issued under an act of Congress which expressly prohibits any U.S. guarantee of these obligations. As a result, the bill excludes obligations of this type from the provisions in the bill requiring advance Treasury approval. The Tennessee Valley Authority's obligations would be excluded by this amendment.

In summary, this measure should provide for more effective management of the Federal borrowing programs which presently operate independent of one another. The coordination which will be effected by the Federal Financing Bank should produce savings to the Government overall and make it easier for the various agencies involved in the borrowing programs to finance their programs. As a result, this bill should be approved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have not heard thus far a good reason for the establishment of this Federal Financing Bank. I note that on page 6 of the report it states:

> Federal agencies issuing or selling obligations would be required to submit financing plans to the Secretary.

And so on; but on page 5 I note this language:

> Thus, the bill does not cover the Federal Reserve System or the five federally sponsored but wholly privately owned agencies, including the Federal land banks . . .

And so on.

If Congress is now going to create a Federal Financing Bank, why these exceptions and exemptions from its purview? And why have a Federal Financing Bank to cost in its inception $100 million?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that the Government is already, as the gentleman knows, in the credit business in a very widespread way. Many, many agencies of Government do issue their own paper, as the gentleman knows. This does not in any way expand that authority or infringe upon any other jurisdiction. All this does is provide a Federal bank that would coordinate these sales of securities by the Federal agencies.

When we have private agencies in an uncoordinated way issuing their securities willy-nilly, it results in not only inefficiencies, but extra cost to the Government. The Department of the Treasury keeps a good eye on the market, and by coordinating these sales that would go into the market anyway, by coordinating them in an orderly way, we think that we can save the Government money by getting lower interest rates, and we can also bring the market impact of these offerings to a minimum basis.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman why, if the Department of the Treasury is interested in this kind of legislation, there is no statement in the report to indicate that is the case? There are no departmental reports, no Bureau of the Budget report, no departmental report of any kind accompanying this bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would say to the gentleman that this bill is the result of an urgent recommendation by the Department of the Treasury, fully endorsed by this administration. We bring it to the Members at this time because of a special pleading on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and the administration that we should move forward in this area so that they can begin coordinating the activities of the sales of securities. The Committee on Ways and Means had a public hearing on the proposal in March of this year.

Mr. GROSS. What is the urgency? We have gotten along pretty well without the creation of still another bank and another bureaucracy in the Federal Government, and this apparently will be an expensive one. Consider the fact that the bill asks for $100 million apparently for administrative costs, in other words, to get it off the ground.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, if he will yield further, that it is our feeling that this bank will save the Government far more money through the coordinating of the issuance of securities than it woud cost for administrative purposes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman is as concerned as I am about the increasing proliferation of the issuance of credit and other types of securities on the part of Government agencies.

All of this proliferation of paper which does not come under the national debt and is issued by these agencies is a matter of concern. I think it is high time that we started to coordinate this whole area of financing activity on the part of the Government agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Turning to page 8 of the bill, beginning on line 6, it says:

> (c) The Bank may require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank issued pursuant to subsection (b) in such amounts as will not cause the holding by the Secretary of the Treasury resulting from such required purchases to exceed $5,000,000,000 at any one time.

Is this the $5 billion provision that we have been extending periodically to provide a so-called cushion for the Treasury in financing the Government, and which the late Senator Taft called "the printing press money provision"?

Mr. ULLMAN. Will the gentleman give me the reference again to the point in the bill?

Mr. GROSS. It is on page 8, beginning on line 6. Is that the $5 billion provision that has been periodically extended?

Mr. ULLMAN. It says:

> The Bank may require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank issued pursuant to subsection (b)—

That is the basic authority—

> in such amounts as will not cause the holding by the Secretary of the Treasury resulting from such required purchases to exceed $5,000,000,000 at any one time.

That is a limitation on the amount of these securities that the Bank can acquire and can hold at any one time.

Mr. GROSS. Evidently that provision is being taken from existing law and put into this bill and is the same as that about which I raised the question.

Mr. ULLMAN. It is merely a limiting factor on the activities of the Bank, I would say.

Mr. GROSS. What does the $15 billion refer to?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONABLE. I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 minute.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the $15 billion is another limitation on the extent to which the Bank can issue and have outstanding at any one time its obligations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that this bill is brought to the House floor under suspension of the rules. This is a bill involving the handling of a tremendous amount of money. It provides for the creation of a brand-new setup in the Federal Government, in the form of a Federal Financing Bank. It deserves much more attention from the House of Representatives than can be obtained under this seriously limited debate and procedure by which amendments are precluded. I regret very much that this bill has not been brought up under a rule, and I must vote against it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct some questions to the gentleman from Oregon.

Is it not true that most of the functions described in this bill are presently performed by the Treasury Department?

Mr. ULLMAN. With respect to the handing of obligations?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The handling of obligations and so forth.

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes, as to Treasury obligations.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Have they been doing such a bad job up until now? Is another agency handling it?

Mr. ULLMAN. But they cannot do it with respect to other agency obligations. For example on page 49 of the hearings, you will see a list of a number of different agencies, involved in the securities market including the Export-Import Bank, HEW-guaranteed medical facility loans, public housing bonds, Rural Telephone Bank, Small Business Investment Corporation, and the Student Loan Marketing Association, and so on.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am aware that the Federal Government is in the money market too much. We certainly agree with that. My point is that is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury presently has supervisory authority and control of much that is accomplished? Why do we need the addtional bureaucracy? Do we not have adequate machinery now to take care of it?

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. The only reason we have this bill is because the Treasury does not now have that coordinating authority under the law. All this would do would be to give the Treasury the coordinating authority which the gentleman refers to over these obligations that are issued by the various agencies outside the Treasury that are covered under the bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Would not the gentleman agree that one of the best things that Congress could do to come to grips with this basic problem and what caused it is to stop going so far into debt, constantly creating more debt, to support the bill, offered by the gentleman and others, that came out of the Joint Committee on Budget Control, to begin to control the expenditure situation here, so we do not go so far into debt and require the Treasury Department to be constantly in the money market?

Mr. ULLMAN. I could not agree with the gentleman more, but under the existing circumstances this is at least a step in the right direction where we reach out and try to coordinate some of these proliferating issues on the part of the agencies.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is the gentleman convinced that this legislation will put some kind of control on this, rather than encouraging the Federal Government to go into debt?

Mr. ULLMAN. Although we are not in any way attempting to impinge on the jurisdiction of any other committee or any other Department, we feel that by coordinating these various issues it is a step in the right direction for putting them all together on a meaningful basis.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. This is not an increase in the authority to borrow. It does, however, give the Treasury the power to coordinate the circumstances of an issue in order to save the Government money. It does not enlarge the borrowing capacity of the Government in any way. The borrowing authority is dependent on the individual programs that will be seeking financing.

I would like to add also that the $100 million seed money is simply an authorization provided here and is still subject to appropriation. The intention that is simply to provide an opportunity to get the program moving and enable the Federal Financing Bank to buy the proffered bonds by these agencies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

What are these underwriting costs now? Will this new bank save costs in underwriting? If so, how much?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman let me give an example of the higher costs of agency borrowing?

On November 5, 1973, HUD issued some new community debentures, $18 million in amount, with a 20-year maturity. The effective rate was 7.97. Now, the comparable Treasury rate at the same time during this period was 7.35. There was 0.62 percent difference, or $111,600 in interest per year for 20 years.

Let me give the gentleman a second example of the Export-Import Bank issuance of August 14, 1973. This amounted to $300 million. It was a 5-year maturity and the effective rate there was 8.39. The comparable Treasury rate during this period was 7.80. The difference was 0.59 per cent, or $1,770,000 per year for 5 years.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is trying to make the point that there is a need to better coordinate the kind of interest rates that are allowed. I appreciate that.

The point that I was making was with regard to the statement made in the report that underwriting costs are often significant initial costs. Will this bill assure that the underwriting costs will be reduced or eliminated, and if so, how?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think I can give the gentleman every assurance that the underwriting costs will be greatly reduced, because the Treasury does its own underwriting and *therefore to* the extent that the Treasury issues the securities, there will be no underwriting costs.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In other words, they will not go to private institutions?

Mr. ULLMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And those underwriting costs will be eliminated?

Mr. ULLMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. What kind of underwriting costs totally do we have? Do we have any estimate in the hearings concerning any figures as to what the savings might be?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, at present one problem is that we do not know and have no evidence of just exactly what the underwriting costs are within the various agencies now. Certainly, we should be able to balance it up, but we have not been able to. This would eliminate them.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will do tremendous surveillance on this issue to make sure that we do find that there actually is a reduction in cost and that they do not turn around and find that this bank is going out again and turning it over to underwriters and we actually have an increase in cost.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that the Ways and Means Committee will exercise a very stringent oversight over this operation. This is a trial operation, I would say. I think it is a good experiment in the right direction. If there are any problems developing, then I want to assure the

gentleman that we will come back to the Congress in the future.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Oregon and New York for yielding to me. I still share the concern of my colleague from Iowa that I am sorry this bill was not brought up under the normal procedure. I realize the gentleman may be anxious to move it, but I really believe it should have been more extensively discussed and open for the Members.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today's legislation to establish a Federal Financing Bank is a timid but welcome step in the direction of fiscal responsibility. The Bank establishes a framework to coordinate all Federal and federally assisted borrowing from the public. The present patchwork of public debt management practices is confusing, costly, and often irrationally inflationary. The Bank, in having the authority to purchase obligations of the various Federal agencies and to issue its own obligations in turn, will undoubtedly become the focal point for future Federal financing activities.

The major shortcoming of this legislation is that it lacks teeth. Although the Bank is given the authority to pool Federal borrowing, nowhere is there language in this bill to force the agencies to funnel their debt management activities through the Bank. Under section 7(a) of the bill every Federal agency issuing obligations must submit a financing plan to the Secretary of the Treasury. However, there is no requirement that these obligations be issued through the Bank. I can foresee the situation in which an agency, impatient with the progress of the Bank, would continue to seek financing directly in the private market. In short, there is no guarantee that all debt management problems will be shifted from the program agencies to the Bank.

A more glaring weakness of this legislation is the failure to define more clearly the nature of the Federal budget and the true dimensions of the national debt. Presently, an enormous amount of the Government's financing activities occurs outside the purview of the budget and the debt ceiling.

For example, in 1971 Congress passed legislation to remove the receipts and disbursements of the Export-Import Bank from the total of the budget of the United States. At present, the Eximbank has $20 billion borrowing authority. They are requesting an additional $10 billion. The Eximbank is given complete autonomy over this borrowing authority. Elmer Staats, Comptroller General, opposed this legislation stating at that time:

> In our view, excluding the Export-Import Bank's disbursements and receipts from the budget totals would establish a highly undesirable precedent since the exclusion could with equal logic and justification be applied to other loan programs—In my opinion it is impossible to differentiate between this program and other loan programs in the budget. It would open the door to excluding other programs, a weakening of the budgetary process, and reduce the ability of Congress to establish budgetary priorities.

From data provided to me by the Treasury, it appears that the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government now approach $1 trillion. It, obviously, would be a mistake to include this total contingent liability as part of the public debt. But is it reasonable to assume that 5 percent of this liability—is likely to become debt through the failure of Federal programs. Yet the Congress has little control or say over the growth of this contingent liability/potential debt.

In view of the enormous impact of the Government's financing activities on the economy, it is vital that Congress exercise some control over the extent and condition of Federal borrowing, loans, guarantees, and insurance. The primary tool for the control of the Government's impact on the economy has historically been the budget. However, H.R. 5874 timidly sidesteps the matter of including Government borrowing activities in the budget: If a program is now financed outside the budget, that treatment would continue; if a program is now financed in the budget, that treatment would continue.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that in the fight against inflation, a ceiling on Federal expenditures will be largely meaningless unless we harness Federal borrowing and restrain Federal guarantee of debt. As an example of this burgeoning liability of the Federal Government, I include the following table which details the alarming growth in recent years of Federal direct and guaranteed loans.

FEDERAL DIRECT AND GUARANTEED LOANS

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Amounts outstanding at end of fiscal year: Direct loans	Guaranteed loans
1968	[1] 45.2	108.1
1969	46.9	117.7
1970	51.1	124.1
1971	53.2	140.1
1972	50.1	158.9
1973 (estimated)	50.1	179.0
1974 (estimated)	51.0	196.6

[1] For consistency with current budget treatment, excludes loans of the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks and the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Source: Special analysis E of the budget of the U.S. Government.

We will not be able to control effectively our Government's borrowing until we can understand more clearly the exact nature of our financing activities.

For this reason, if the parliamentary situation would permit, I would offer an amendment to clarify the extent to which Federal borrowing occurs outside the budget and which would provide regular information on the size of the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government. Specifically, I would request that the Bank, in filing its annual report, accomplish three important tasks:

First, list all obligations issued, sold, or guaranteed by all Federal agencies from whom a financing program is required under section 7(a);

Second, a statement of the receipts and disbursements of these agencies and a breakdown as to whether these receipts and disbursements are included in the computation of the budget; and

Third, recommendations for drawing more clearly the lines of the budget with regard to the borrowing activities of the Government and recommendations relating to supervising the lending, guaranteeing and insuring activities of the Government to prevent an excessive contingent liability and to insure maximum coordination in Federal fiscal policies.

The first step in reasserting congressional control over the autonomous financing activities of many Federal agencies is accurate information. We need to know exactly what borrowing occurs and where it is being listed. This is exactly what I am requesting in the first two requirements I have suggested be included in each annual report. As a next step, we need to establish the exact boundaries of the budget. If the budget is to be a meaningful fiscal tool, and if the concept of the public debt is to have any integrity whatsoever, we must make clear what Federal borrowing is included in the debt and what is not. To assist Congress in this task, I would request the Bank Directors to recommend a realinement of the budget with regard to Federal borrowing and to Federal guarantees and insurances.

The framework of the Federal Financing Bank could provide an instrument to exercise congressional control over virtually all Federal and federally assisted borrowing from and lending and guaranteeing to the public. By forcing the program agencies to finance borrowing through the Bank and by placing an effective ceiling on the obligations the Bank can issue, Congress can begin to regulate the full impact of all Federal borrowing on the Nation's economy. Today's legislation stops disappointingly short of accomplishing this important task.

Following is a draft copy of the type of amendment I would seek to offer if the parliamentary situation permitted:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK TO H.R. 5874, THE FEDERAL FINANCING BANK ACT

On page 12, line 4, change "Section 13" to "Section 13(a)";

On page 12, after line 6, add the following new subsection:

"(b) The annual report shall include the following information:

"(1) a listing of all obligations issued, sold, or guaranteed by any Federal agency subject to the provisions of Section 7(a) of this Act;

"(2) a statement of the receipts and disbursements for each such Federal agency and a determination of which of these receipts and disbursements are included in the Budget of the United States; and

"(3) recommendations from the Board of Directors of the Bank as to whether the receipts and disbursements of each such Federal agency shall be included in the Budget of the United States or otherwise regulated;

"(4) recommendations from the Board of Directors of the Bank as to ways and means to regulate the level of direct and indirect loans issued and guaranteed by Federal agencies, and ways and means to regulate and control the level of Federal guaran-

tees, insurances and other actions which constitute the contingent liability of the United States."

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) for his long interest in this problem. It is an extracurricular problem concerning financial matters, not coming under the debt ceiling, and it is something we ought to bring under control.

In the budget control bill that the Joint Committee has offered we have made provision for this by taking an overall look at all of these Government obligations which have proliferated through the years.

Certainly I fully agree with the gentleman that we must bring all of these matters within the immediate purview of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5874, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 25, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

YEAS—349

Abdnor	Clausen,	Fisher
Abzug	Don H.	Flood
Adams	Clawson, Del	Flowers
Alexander	Clay	Flynt
Anderson,	Cleveland	Foley
Calif.	Cochran	Ford, Gerald R.
Anderson, Ill.	Cohen	Ford,
Andrews, N.C.	Collier	William D.
Andrews,	Collins, Ill.	Forsythe
N. Dak.	Conable	Fountain
Annunzio	Conte	Fraser
Archer	Corman	Frelinghuysen
Ashley	Cotter	Frenzel
Aspin	Coughlin	Frey
Bafalis	Cronin	Froehlich
Baker	Culver	Fulton
Beard	Daniel, Dan	Fuqua
Bennett	Daniel, Robert	Gettys
Bergland	W., Jr.	Gibbons
Bevill	Daniels,	Gilman
Biester	Dominick V.	Ginn
Bingham	Danielson	Goldwater
Blackburn	Davis, S.C.	Gonzalez
Boggs	de la Garza	Goodling
Boland	Delaney	Grasso
Bolling	Dellenback	Gray
Bowen	Dellums	Green, Oreg.
Brademas	Denholm	Griffiths
Brasco	Dennis	Grover
Breckinridge	Derwinski	Gubser
Brinkley	Devine	Gude
Brooks	Dickinson	Gunter
Broomfield	Dingell	Guyer
Brown, Calif.	Donohue	Haley
Brown, Mich.	Dorn	Hamilton
Brown, Ohio	Downing	Hanrahan
Broyhill, N.C.	Drinan	Hansen, Idaho
Broyhill, Va.	Dulski	Hansen, Wash.
Buchanan	Duncan	Harrington
Burke, Mass.	du Pont	Harsha
Burleson, Tex.	Eckhardt	Harvey
Burlison, Mo.	Edwards, Ala.	Hastings
Burton	Edwards, Calif.	Hays
Butler	Erlenborn	Hechler, W. Va.
Byron	Esch	Heckler, Mass.
Carey, N.Y.	Eshleman	Heinz
Carney, Ohio	Evans, Colo.	Helstoski
Casey, Tex.	Evins, Tenn.	Henderson
Cederberg	Fascell	Hicks
Chamberlain	Findley	Hillis
Clancy	Fish	Hinshaw
Hogan	Moorhead,	Shriver
Holifield	Calif.	Shuster
Holtzman	Moorhead, Pa.	Sikes
Horton	Mosher	Sisk
Hosmer	Moss	Slack
Howard	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
Huber	Myers	Smith, N.Y.
Hungate	Natcher	Spence
Hunt	Nedzi	Staggers
Hutchinson	Nelsen	Stanton,
Ichord	Nichols	J. William
Jarman	Obey	Steed
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien	Steele
Johnson, Colo.	O'Hara	Steelman
Johnson, Pa.	O'Neill	Steiger, Wis.
Jones, Ala.	Owens	Stephens
Jones, N.C.	Parris	Stratton
Jones, Okla.	Passman	Stubblefield
Jordan	Patten	Stuckey
Karth	Pepper	Studds
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Sullivan
Kazen	Pettis	Symington
Kemp	Peyser	Talcott
King	Pickle	Taylor, N.C.
Kluczynski	Pike	Teague, Calif.
Koch	Poage	Thompson, N.J.
Kuykendall	Podell	Thomson, Wis.
Kyros	Preyer	Thone
Landrum	Price, Ill.	Thornton
Latta	Price, Tex.	Tiernan
Leggett	Pritchard	Treen
Lehman	Quie	Udall
Litton	Quillen	Ullman
Long, La.	Railsback	Van Deerlin
Long, Md.	Randall	Vander Jagt
Lott	Rangel	Vanik
Lujan	Rees	Veysey
McClory	Regula	Vigorito
McCollister	Reuss	Waggonner
McCormack	Riegle	Waldie
McDade	Rinaldo	Ware
McFall	Roberts	Whalen
McKay	Robinson, Va.	White
McSpadden	Robison, N.Y.	Whitehurst
Macdonald	Rodino	Whitten
Madden	Roe	Widnall
Madigan	Rogers	Wiggins
Mahon	Roncalio, Wyo.	Williams
Mallary	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Mann	Rose	Wilson,
Martin, Nebr.	Rosenthal	Charles H.,
Martin, N.C.	Rostenkowski	Calif.
Mathias, Calif.	Roush	Wilson,
Mathis, Ga.	Roy	Charles, Tex.
Matsunaga	Roybal	Winn
Mayne	Runnels	Wolff
Meeds	Ruppe	Wright
Melcher	Ruth	Wyatt
Metcalfe	Ryan	Wylie
Mezvinsky	St Germain	Wyman
Michel	Sarasin	Yates
Milford	Sarbanes	Yatron
Miller	Scherle	Young, Ga.
Minish	Schneebeli	Young, Ill.
Mink	Schroeder	Young, S.C.
Minshall, Ohio	Sebelius	Young, Tex.
Mitchell, Md.	Seiberling	Zablocki
Moakley	Shipley	Zion
Montgomery	Shoup	Zwach

NAYS—25

Ashbrook	Gross	Satterfield
Bauman	Hammer-	Snyder
Biaggi	schmidt	Steiger, Ariz.
Bray	Holt	Symms
Burgener	Landgrebe	Taylor, Mo.
Burke, Fla.	McCloskey	Wampler
Collins, Tex.	McKinney	Young, Alaska
Crane	Rarick	Young, Fla.
Gaydos	Rousselot	

NOT VOTING—59

Addabbo	Diggs	Mollohan
Arends	Eilberg	Morgan
Armstrong	Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.
Badillo	Green, Pa.	Nix
Barrett	Hanley	Patman
Bell	Hanna	Powell, Ohio
Blatnik	Hawkins	Reid
Breaux	Hébert	Rhodes
Brotzman	Hudnut	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Camp	Keating	Sandman
Carter	Ketchum	Skubitz
Chappell	Lent	Stanton,
Chisholm	McEwen	James V.
Clark	Mailliard	Stark
Conlan	Maraziti	Stokes
Conyers	Mazzoli	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Mills, Ark.	Towell, Nev.
Davis, Wis.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Walsh
Dent	Mizell	Wydler

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Conlan.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Ketchum.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Stark with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Mitchell of New York.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Reid.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8219) to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act to authorize the President to extend certain privileges and immunities to the Organization of African Unity.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288–288f) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 12. The provisions of this title may be extended to the Organization of African Unity in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same conditions, as they may be extended to a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any Act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide the President with authority to extend to the Organization of

African Unity and its office, officials, and employees in the United States those privileges and immunities specified in the International Organizations Immunities Act.

Under the bill, at the discretion of the President the Organization of African Unity—OAU—may be designated by the President as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act. Upon such a designation the organization, to the extent so provided by the President, will be exempt from customs duties on property imported for the activities in which it engages, from income taxes, from withholding taxes on wages, and from excise taxes on services and facilities. In addition, the employees of the international organization, to the extent not nationals of the United States, may not be subject to U.S. income tax on the income they receive from OAU. OAU is an organization composed of 41 member states, representing all the independent African nations—except the Republic of South Africa—and acts to further the goals of political and economic development of Africa. It presently has a mission in New York.

For purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act, under which international organizations may enjoy the exterritorial privileges generally granted to foreign governments, an international organization is one in which the United States participates and which has been designated by the President, through an appropriate Executive order, as being entitled to the privileges and immunities in question. The United States is not a member of the OAU, and therefore the organization presently cannot qualify under the act. H.R. 8219 which would provide the President with authority to extend to the OAU privileges and immunities under the act.

In transmitting this legislation to the Congress, the State Department stated that its enactment "would be consistent with important foreign policy interests of the U.S. Government." The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, and I urge its favorable consideration by the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8219, which amends the International Organizations Immunities Act to authorize the President to extend certain privileges and immunities to the Organization of African Unity.

As the Members will recall, on October 2, 1973, the acting chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asked unanimous consent that this legislation be considered by the House. At that time, an objection was lodged against that request and now the bill is being considered under suspension of the rules.

As I said on October 2, this measure, which was requested by the administration, would allow the President to grant to the Organization of African Unity Mission in New York, its officers, and employees, the same privileges, exemptions, and immunities extended to most other international organizations and their officers and employees located in the United States.

Among the privileges and immunities included are the capacity to contract, acquire, and dispose of real and personal property; the immunity from suit and other judicial process for themselves, their property and assets equivalent to that enjoyed by foreign governments and the duty-free importation of baggage and effects for alien officers and employees upon their arrival. In addition, the International Organization Immunities Act extends an exemption from Federal income tax to income of international organizations such as the Organization of African Unity as well as the salaries of their alien employees and the employees of foreign governments represented in the organization. It should be noted that all of the employees of the Organization of African Unity are nationals of African countries.

The Committee on Ways and Means was informed by the Department of State that this legislation is a result of the administration's desire to develop a closer working relationship with the Organization of African Unity and to be responsive to the Organization of African Unity's request for some form of official acknowledgment of the status of its New York mission. This mission serves as the secretariat to the African group at the United Nations and acts as a liaison with the U.N. on issues relating to Africa.

Although the United States is not a member of the Organization of African Unity, the administration feels that the enactment of the proposed bill is consistent with important foreign policy interests of the United States.

The committee is convinced that this legislation will be helpful to the President in the exercise of his foreign policy responsibilities and unanimously voted to report it to the House. I urge its approval.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this involves only a handful of people in the mission in New York. The costs are listed as negligible.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

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

I take this time to ask several questions of the gentleman. As I understand this legislation it would create a special exemption only in this one instance to the existing law under the International Organizations Immunities Act.

Mr. ULLMAN. This would merely add one organization to the list of those organizations that get these special privileges under the International Organizations Immunities Act. This would add the OAU to that list. It would only be eligible to receive the same privileges that the other international organizations get under the act.

Mr. RARICK. But this is an exception to the existing law. Since the OAU is not qualified, because the United States is not a member of the Organization of African Unity.

Mr. ULLMAN. As I have indicated, normally under the definition of international organizations as specified in the International Organizations Immunities Act, the United States must be a member of that organization in order for the organization to receive the benefits. In this instance, of course, the United States, not being a member of this organization, to that extent it is an exception.

Mr. RARICK. Do not all of the 41-member nations in the Organization of African Unity, presently have delegations to the United Nations Organization?

Mr. ULLMAN. That is true. The OAU does have a mission in New York that is active in the affairs of the organization there, but it is not officially, of course, a member of the United Nations.

Mr. RARICK. I am referring to the 41 individual member nations has having a delegation to the United Nations Organization.

Mr. ULLMAN. Each individual country is a member of the United Nations, that is correct.

Mr. RARICK. And as far as we know, except perhaps for Egypt and Libya, all the OAU member nations also have an embassy in or diplomatic status with our Government.

Mr. ULLMAN. Very probably they do, yes.

Mr. RARICK. Since we are talking about an exception to the existing law, can the gentleman tell me what benefit the American people would realize by enacting this legislation?

Mr. ULLMAN. Well, the objectives are set out quite clearly in the report. I think the report is worthy of the attention of all the members.

The pertinent report language is as follows. This quote is from the Department of State's transmittal letter to the Congress of March 28, 1973:

> This bill results from the Administration's desire to develop a closer working relationship with the OAU and to be responsive to repeated resolutions at annual OAU conferences requesting some form of official acknowledgement of the status of its Mission in New York, as well as to specific discussions with OAU representatives in New York concerning their desires for certain privileges and immunities. The bill would serve three principal United States objectives: it would improve the ability of the U.S. to obtain the cooperation and support of the OAU and its 41 members at the U.N., enhance our bilateral relations with OAU members, and demonstrate concretely the Administration's expressed concern about the problems of African countries

Mr. RARICK. I notice also in the report it says that the OAU exists "to further the goals of political and economic development of Africa."

It is true, is it not, that the African countries of South Africa, Rhodesia, Spanish Sahara, the Portuguese States of Mozambique, Guinea, and Angola are not members of the OAU.

Mr. ULLMAN. The only independent African nation of which I am aware that is not a member is the Republic of South Africa.

Mr. RARICK. Is it not correct that Egypt, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, Somalia, Sudan, and other Arab States are members of this OAU?

Mr. ULLMAN. I believe that is true.

Mr. RARICK. Can the gentleman tell me what the OAU's political and economic goals for Africa consist of?

Do these goals include political activity in the United States, to repeal the Byrd amendment in an effort to prohibit purchases of chrome ore from Rhodesia and substituting the U.S. importation of Soviet chrome ore.

Mr. ULLMAN. I have no knowledge of such activities. Perhaps the gentleman knows something that I do not.

Mr. RARICK. Well, will the gentleman tell me the purpose of this legislation. Is not its effect, by giving tax exempt status, that of encouraging our tax exempt organizations in the United States to contribute financial support to terrorists and guerrillas of the so-called liberation movements against non-Communist governments in Africa who are not members of the OAU.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would just say to the gentleman that I think it is very important that the United States do develop a good working relationship with these 41 principal nations of Africa. All this would do at a negligible cost would be to extend certain very minimal benefits to the OAU mission in New York, which today comprises only six people.

Mr. RARICK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8219.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 340, nays 39, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—340

Abdnor	Brooks	Conable
Abzug	Broomfield	Conte
Adams	Brotzman	Corman
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Calif.	Cotter
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Mich.	Coughlin
Andrews, N.C.	Broyhill, N.C.	Cronin
Andrews, N. Dak.	Broyhill, Va.	Culver
Annunzio	Buchanan	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Arends	Burgener	Daniels, Dominick V.
Armstrong	Burke, Fla.	Danielson
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Ga.
Aspin	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, S.C.
Bafalis	Burlison, Mo.	de la Garza
Baker	Burton	Delaney
Bergland	Butler	Dellenback
Bevill	Byron	Dellums
Biaggi	Carey, N.Y.	Denholm
Biester	Carney, Ohio	Dennis
Bingham	Carter	Dent
Blackburn	Casey, Tex.	Derwinski
Boggs	Cederberg	Devine
Boland	Chamberlain	Dickinson
Bolling	Clancy	Dingell
Bowen	Clausen, Don H.	Donohue
Brademas	Clawson, Del	Dorn
Brasco	Clay	Downing
Bray	Cleveland	Drinan
Breaux	Cohen	Dulski
Breckinridge	Collier	du Pont
Brinkley	Collins, Ill.	Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.	Leggett	Roush
Edwards, Calif.	Lehman	Roy
Erlenborn	Litton	Roybal
Esch	Long, La.	Runnels
Eshleman	Long, Md.	Ruppe
Evans, Colo.	Lujan	Ruth
Evins, Tenn.	McClory	Ryan
Fascell	McCloskey	Sarasin
Findley	McCollister	Sarbanes
Fish	McCormack	Schneebeli
Fisher	McDade	Schroeder
Flood	McFall	Sebelius
Flowers	McKay	Seiberling
Foley	McKinney	Shipley
Ford, William D.	Macdonald	Shoup
Forsythe	Madden	Shriver
Fountain	Madigan	Shuster
Fraser	Mahon	Sikes
Frelinghuysen	Mallary	Sisk
Frenzel	Mann	Skubitz
Frey	Martin, Nebr.	Slack
Froehlich	Martin, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Fulton	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Fuqua	Matsunaga	Spence
Gaydos	Mayne	Staggers
Gettys	Meeds	Stanton, J. William
Gibbons	Melcher	Steed
Gonzalez	Metcalfe	Steele
Goodling	Mezvinsky	Steelman
Grasso	Michel	Steiger, Ariz.
Gray	Milford	Steiger, Wis.
Green, Oreg.	Miller	Stephens
Griffiths	Minish	Stratton
Grover	Mink	Stubblefield
Gubser	Minshall, Ohio	Stuckey
Gude	Mitchell, Md.	Studds
Gunter	Moakley	Symington
Guyer	Moorhead, Calif.	Talcott
Haley	Moorhead, Pa.	Taylor, N.C.
Hamilton	Morgan	Teague, Calif.
Hammer-schmidt	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
Hanrahan	Moss	Thomson, Wis.
Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.	Thone
Hansen, Wash.	Myers	Thornton
Harrington	Natcher	Tiernan
Harsha	Nedzi	Treen
Harvey	Nelsen	Udall
Hastings	Nichols	Ullman
Hays	Obey	Van Deerlin
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara	Vanik
Heinz	O'Neill	Veysey
Helstoski	Owens	Vigorito
Henderson	Parris	Waggonner
Hicks	Passman	Waldie
Hillis	Patten	Wampler
Hinshaw	Pepper	Ware
Hogan	Perkins	Whalen
Holtzman	Pettis	White
Horton	Peyser	Whitehurst
Hosmer	Pickle	Widnall
Howard	Pike	Wiggins
Hungate	Podell	Williams
Hunt	Preyer	Wilson, Bob
Hutchinson	Price, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Jarman	Pritchard	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	Quie	Winn
Johnson, Colo.	Railsback	Wright
Johnson, Pa.	Randall	Wyatt
Jones, Ala.	Rangel	Wylie
Jones, N.C.	Rees	Wyman
Jones, Okla.	Regula	Yates
Jordan	Reuss	Yatron
Karth	Riegle	Young, Ga.
Kastenmeier	Rinaldo	Young, Ill.
Kazen	Roberts	Young, S.C.
Kemp	Robinson, Va.	Young, Tex.
King	Robison, N.Y.	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Rodino	Zion
Koch	Roe	Zwach
Kuykendall	Rogers	
Kyros	Roncalio, Wyo.	
Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.	
Latta	Rosenthal	
	Rostenkowski	

NAYS—39

Alexander	Gilman	Price, Tex.
Archer	Ginn	Quillen
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Rarick
Bauman	Gross	Rousselot
Beard	Holt	Satterfield
Bennett	Huber	Scherle
Cochran	Ichord	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Symms
Conlan	Lott	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	McSpadden	Whitten
Daniel, Dan	Mathis, Ga.	Wolff
Duncan	Montgomery	Young, Alaska
Flynt	Poage	Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—54

Addabbo	Barrett	Blatnik
Badillo	Bell	Burke, Calif.
Camp	Jones, Tenn.	Rhodes
Chappell	Keating	Roncallo, N.Y.
Chisholm	Ketchum	Rooney, Pa.
Clark	Lent	Rose
Conyers	McEwen	St Germain
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard	Sandman
Diggs	Maraziti	Stanton, James V.
Eilberg	Mazzoli	Stark
Ford, Gerald R.	Mills, Ark.	Stokes
Giaimo	Mitchell, N.Y.	Sullivan
Green, Pa.	Mizell	Teague, Tex.
Hanley	Mollohan	Towell, Nev.
Hanna	Murphy, Ill.	Walsh
Hawkins	Nix	Wydler
Hébert	Patman	
Holifield	Powell, Ohio	
Hudnut	Reid	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ketchum.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Mitchell of New York.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Badillo with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Stokes
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Stark.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF WATERGATE GRAND JURY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10937) to extend the life of the June 5, 1972, grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10937

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding rule 6(g) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or any other law, rule, or regulation, the term of the grand jury of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which was impaneled on June 5, 1972, is extended to June 4, 1974. If the United States District Court for the District of Columbia determines that the business of the grand jury will not be completed by that date, that court is authorized to extend its term for an additional six months.

(b) If the United States District Court for the District of Columbia fails to extend the term of the grand jury beyond the statutory extension period ending June 4, 1974, the

Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit may extend its term for an additional six months on application by the grand jury upon the affirmative vote of a majority of its members that it has not completed its business. Upon the making of such an application by the grand jury, its term shall continue until the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit enters an appropriate order. In no event shall the term of the grand jury extend beyond December 4, 1974.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH) will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 10937, as amended, a bill to extend the life of the June 5, 1972, grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

As you may know, that grand jury is hearing testimony and receiving evidence relating to the Watergate break-in and coverup and is commonly known as the "Watergate grand jury." Pursuant to the provisions of rule 6(g) of the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the U.S. district courts, the grand jury's term will end on December 4, 1973, unless this legislation is enacted.

H.R. 10937, as amended, legislatively extends the term of the grand jury to June 4, 1974. At the conclusion of that extension, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia is empowered to extend the term of the grand jury for 6 additional months. The bill further provides that if the district court fails to extend the term, the grand jury may apply for the extension to the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The grand jury is empowered to make this application upon the affirmative vote of a majority of its members that it has not completed its business. Finally, H.R. 10937, as amended, provides that in no event shall the term of the grand jury extend beyond December 4, 1974.

The arguments supporting this bill are very compelling. The representatives of the Department of Justice, who testified in support of this legislation, indicated that the Watergate grand jury will not complete its work by December 4, 1973, the end of its term. If we do not extend the term of this grand jury, it will then be necessary to impanel a new grand jury. That new grand jury will then have to receive all of the evidence and testimony presented to the June 5, 1972, grand jury. This would require the recalling of the witnesses before the new grand jury or the reading or extensive summarizing of their previous testimony. Either procedure will unnecessarily duplicate work already done and result in needless additional expense.

As you may know, the Watergate grand jury has been sitting for over 16 months and has heard numerous witnesses whose testimony fills many volumes of transcript. The grand jury has seen the witnesses, observed their demeanor, and been able to assess their credibility. It has, in short, developed a considerable expertise that will be invaluable when the time comes to decide whether to return indictments.

If the grand jury's term is permitted to expire, all of this expertise will be lost. This would, indeed, be regrettable, for it would result in prejudice to the prosecutors, to potential defendants, and to the general public. If we extend the term of the grand jury, we insure that all new evidence will be presented to a grand jury with the expertise to assess it and put it in the proper context.

My colleagues, this legislation is necessary to help bring the Watergate matter to a just and speedy conclusion and to promote the efficient administration of justice. I call upon you to act favorably on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I merely would like to advise the House that this legislation was introduced by me at the request of the former Attorney General Elliot Richardson. The need for this legislation has been amply demonstrated. The subcommittee reported this legislation unanimously, and the full committee, without objection. I believe that under the circumstances in which we find ourselves today there is ample justification for the need to extend the life of this grand jury. I hope that the Members will so agree.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, as the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, will extend the life of the so-called Watergate grand jury for 6 months and thereafter provide the means by which the grand jury may be extended for an additional 6 months if necessary either by the district court, or if the district court should refuse, then by the chief judge of the Federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on the grand jury's own motion. The bill provides that in no event shall the grand jury be extended beyond December 4, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be passed and the life of this grand jury be extended.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON).

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10937, to extend the life of the June 5, 1972, grand jury, which has come to be known as the Watergate grand jury.

It is clear that, due to the complexity of the matters which this grand jury has been investigating, as well as the long refusal of the administration to provide the grand jury with necessary and relevant materials, the work of the grand jury will be far from completion when its life expires on December 4, 1973. Although the grand jury has made great progress in its investigation, much remains to be done.

The American public demands that this investigation be continued until all the facts in this case are brought out, so that those accused of wrongdoings can be charged and tried in a court of law. Equally important, the cloud of suspicion and doubt should be removed from those who, in fact, have not been involved in any of the illegal acts associated with the break-in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters on June 17, 1972 and related matters. It is in the public interest that this investigation be completed thoroughly and as soon as possible.

I urge the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY).

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give my support to H.R. 10937—a bill to extend the life of the Watergate grand jury for a period of 6 months, with the possibility of a similar extension by the district judge providing the grand jury's investigation has not been completed by next June 4, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that any and all violations of the law which have been perpetrated in connection with the Watergate break-in or related activities should be fully and fairly investigated and the perpetrators brought to justice.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, I supported and helped secure enactment of legislation which permits special grand juries in cases of organized crime to serve for as long as 36 months. This extended period of time seemed requisite when we considered the ramifications and complexities of some organized crime activities. In connection with the Watergate affair, the ramifications and complexities are also present—and it would be a reflection on this Congress—indeed, on all in public life—if the opportunities for a full investigation were to be hampered by the dismissal of the grand jury when its current term expires in just a few weeks—December 4, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will not be used by the district judge as a basis for any undue delays—or that any persons for political or other reasons would be persuaded to drag out the Watergate affair for a single day beyond that which is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, no course of misconduct by persons in positions of political and governmental influence has ever received the attention or extensive involvement as in the case of the Watergate affair. In order to restore public confidence, it is of course necessary to avoid any appearance of a whitewash or cover-up. Indeed, with the thorough and intensive attention which the Watergate affair has received, any such suggestions are unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, let us today extend the

authority for the Watergate grand jury to continue and to complete its work. Let us hope thereafter that all of those charged with wrongdong will be brought to prompt justice and that the entire disaster which bears the label of "Watergate" may be relegated to the past, that we may profit from the stupidity and the misdeeds which created this dreadful national problem—and that this Nation may go forward in the hands of honorable men and women whose courses of conduct will reflect the highest in human honesty and integrity, and with a deep and abiding respect for both the laws of this land and for the underlying principle of the rule of law upon which our great Republic is founded.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an overwhelming favorable vote in support of the Watergate grand jury extension bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which simply extends the Watergate grand jury for a 6-month period, provides that the district court may extend it for another 6-month period, and provides further that if the district court does not make that second extension, that if the grand jury feels that the second extension should be made, they may petition the chief judge of the circuit court of appeals for that second extension.

I think it is a good bill and needed under the circumstances. I urge its support.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I supported this extension of the term of the Watergate grand jury in the Criminal Justice Subcommittee and in the full Committee on the Judiciary and I am happy to do so again today.

The U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia appoints a new grand jury approximately every 2 months to hear evidence and draw up necessary indictments in local criminal cases. On June 5, 1972, the court summoned a new grand jury to sit during the months of June and July. On June 17, 1972, five men were apprehended with electronic "bugging" equipment inside the Democratic National Committee headquarters at the Watergate complex in Washington. The June 5 grand jury investigated the break-in and handed down an indictment against seven Watergate defendants on September 15, 1973.

Since those initial proceedings, the June 5 grand jury has continued to investigate several other matters directly related to the Watergate break-in, although a second grand jury was also impaneled on August 13, 1973, at the request of the Watergate special prosecution force specifically to review Watergate-related matters.

Under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, a grand jury serves for a maximum period of 18 months. Although the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 provides that special grand juries may serve as long as 36 months or even longer under certain circumstances, the June 5 grand jury was not named as a special grand jury and its term will therefore expire when the 18 months run out, on December 4, 1973.

The Department of Justice has requested that the term of the June 5 grand jury be extended, because of its special nature and because it has not yet completed its investigations. If this panel were allowed to expire on December 4, all the evidence heard in the last 16 months would have to be presented again to a new grand jury. As the Justice Department witnesses testified in our subcommittee hearings on this matter, such a procedure might result in delay and possible prejudice to the Government, to witnesses, and to the public interest in obtaining an early resolution of the Watergate affair and related matters. Enactment of the proposed extension, similar to the procedures employed for continuing special grand juries, may result in considerable savings by avoiding the repetition of testimony to a new grand jury.

The bill extends the term of the June 5, 1972, grand jury to June 4, 1974. The district court may further extend the grand jury's term for an additional 6 months if the court determines that the panel will not complete its business by that date. If the court fails to extend the term beyond the June 4, 1974, deadline, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals may extend the term for 6 months upon application by a majority of the members of the panel. Under no circumstances is the term of the grand jury to extend beyond December 4, 1974.

It would be a tremendous waste of the experience of this particular grand jury and its familiarity with the facts regarding the Watergate matter were this grand jury to be allowed to go out of existence on December 4 without first having completed its important task. It is essential for the restoration of confidence in our institutions and system of justice that the work of this grand jury go forward unimpeded in order to investigate fully the entire Watergate matter and hand down whatever further indictments as it finds the facts justify. This is an absolutely indispensable first step toward bringing to trial, to conviction and to punishment all those guilty of the commission of crimes in connection with the sordid Watergate affair.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of this bill.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the shocking events that have unfolded in connection with Watergate have shaken all of us. Due to the distress and concern of the American people, it is vitally important that this investigation go forward unfettered so that we can restore confidence in our Government.

We have before us today, the bill H.R. 10937, which would extend the life of the June 5, 1972, grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. This grand jury, the so-called Watergate grand jury, is hearing evidence concerning the break-in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters on June 17, 1972, and related matters. On September 15, 1973, the grand jury handed down an indictment against seven Watergate defendants.

The present law does not permit judicial extension of the life of a general grand jury and statutory extensions have been discouraged in the past. This, however, is a unique case because of the character of the crimes, the potential defendants, and the questions of public confidence that may arise. Under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, a grand jury serves for a maximum period of 18 months. The June 5, 1972, grand jury's term will expire on December 4, 1973. The Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 provides that special grand juries may, under certain circumstances, serve as long as 36 months and in some cases even longer. Although the June 5 grand jury is not a "special grand jury," the Department of Justice has requested that the panel be extended because of the special nature of the Watergate affair.

The bill would extend this grand jury for 6 months and create the possibility of another 6 months' extension although we have been assured that the grand jury is expected to complete its work during the next 6 months.

At no time in the history of this country has a grand jury of this type served more than 18 months. However, due to nature of this particular grand jury and the need to restore the public's confidence in the Government, I strongly recommend that the Members of this body pass the bill and allow the grand jury to continue its investigation of the Watergate affair.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee that expeditiously considered and favorably reported it, I earnestly urge and hope the House will speedily approve H.R. 10937 that is designed, as amended, to extend the term of the June 5, 1972, grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

The substantive purpose of the bill is to provide for two 6-month extensions of the term of the grand jury, with the first extension being mandatory rather than discretionary. I would emphasize that none of the normal powers and duties of the grand jury are affected by this bill. The bill's provisions are confined to simply extending the length of the grand jury term.

I would like to point out that such an extension will tend to result in a Federal savings instead of any increased cost because if the present jury is not extended a new grand jury would have to be empaneled by the court and any new jury would have to be given the time to receive testimony that already has been presented to the present grand jury.

It should be further emphasized that there was unchallenged testimony presented to our Judiciary Committee by the Department of Justice prosecutors, associated with the Watergate investigations and other related matters, that the business of the grand jury will not be completed by December 4, 1973, and that the then Attorney General, Elliot Richardson, urged prompt enactment of this legislation because of the character of the crimes, potential defendants and the questions of public confidence that were obviously raised by the matters under consideration by the grand jury.

Mr. Speaker, under any and all standards of judgment that might be applied to this historic legislative pro-

The estimate is well under the 161,000 peak school attendance of a couple of years ago. In one of the fastest-growing counties in the Nation, private and church schools are gaining, public schools are losing students, and families are moving out of Prince Georges County to avoid busing.

Fifth. Disciplinary problems are manifold as evidenced by the request of the Prince Georges County schools for "alternative educational programs for disruptive students." The increased cost is indicated as $296,000 annually. The security staff of the schools has required an addition of 13 positions.

Sixth. A 4-year-old youngster being bused for racial balance from Palmer Park to New Carrollton has been killed in a bus accident. It was a tragic commentary on Judge Kaufman's order that the child was a member of a minority group, so young, and that the accident was so unnecessary.

Seventh. The outlook is for substantial readjustments of schoolbusing for racial balance this next semester because any kind of a plan drawn will be outbalanced when families move or put their children in private schools to avoid busing. As predicted, minority growth in various schools has resulted in the need to reschedule busing plans and pupil assignment under Judge Kaufman's formula twice a year.

The refusal of the Supreme Court to review the Prince Georges County case ends the judicial phase. What about the congressional or legislative prospects?

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 85, a constitutional amendment which would preclude the Court from ordering busing for racial balance, which states:

SECTION 1. No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

In the Congress approximately 50 antibusing bills have been introduced in seven different categories. Because of the proliferation of legislation and the differing provisions, the Busing Strategy Committee was formed, which I mentioned earlier.

I am hopeful that a single legislative proposed can be agreed upon which will receive favorable action by the Congress. Too long the courts have experimented with our schools with artificial color quotas and extravagant busing. I think it is time to return our schools to our communities. I think it is time the neighborhood schools again become the acceptable concept.

WAR POWERS LEGISLATION OVERDUE

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to override the President's veto of the war powers resolution (H.J. Res. 542).

This legislation requires that the President report to the Congress within 48 hours after a commitment of U.S. troops to combat abroad. It also would require that such troops be withdrawn within 60 days, unless the Congress specifically approved the action. It encourages, rather than discourages, consultation between the two branches on vital matters of war and peace.

Some opponents charge that, through this bill, the Congress is giving up some of its power by statute to the President. It is said the President has a 60-day mandate to commit troops to hostilities. I find this reasoning difficult to fathom. The fact is that under the provisions of House Joint Resolution 542, the Congress can halt military action anytime prior to the 60-day period by the passage of a concurrent resolution. The bill provides a definite procedure for preventing future "Vietnams." I can only interpret this as a reassertion of congressional prerogative, rather than a relinquishment.

Ironically, other critics argue that the bill goes too far. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill which inhibits quick fulfillment of the constitutional obligations of the Commander in Chief. There is nothing in the bill that would prevent the President from taking prompt action in response to a crisis anywhere in the world as recently he has done brilliantly in the Mideast. There is nothing that would impair our treaty obligations with other nations. To say otherwise assumes an irresponsible Congress. There is nothing that would reflect, either favorably or unfavorably, on our deterrent posture.

What this legislation signifies is a long overdue attempt by the Congress to share responsibility for warmaking—its clear constitutional role. What is implicit is a confidence in the collective judgment of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are legislating pursuant to a power and a responsibility granted to the Congress in article I of the Constitution. The people expect no less of us.

THE IRS IS NOT A POLITICAL TOOL

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, almost 5 months ago I rose in this Chamber to voice my concern that the present administration had entered into activities designed to use the Internal Revenue Service as a political tool. Such an accomplishment would be a flagrant invasion of the right of privacy of millions of Americans. It would constitute an inexcusable breach of faith with the millions of law-abiding citizens who have honestly filed their income tax reports in the belief that the confidential information contained therein would be used only for the purpose of computing their tax liability.

My suspicions have been heightened by the revelations last week of a memorandum dated October 17, 1969, from Jeb Magruder to H. R. Haldeman, both former members of the highest echelons of this administration. The memorandum was titled "The Shotgun Versus the Rifle" and discussed methods which might be employed by the administration to put a dangerous damper on the freedom of the press.

I would like to quote two portions of this memo. The first describes the task, as Magruder saw it:

The real problem that faces the Administration is to get to this unfair coverage in such a way that we make major impact on a basis which the networks-newspapers and Congress will react to and begin to look at things somewhat differently. It is my opinion that we should begin concentrated efforts in a number of major areas that will have more impact on the media and other anti-Administration spokesmen and will do more good in the long run . . .

There followed this comment some suggested ways of accomplishing the goal as Magruder saw it. Among these was the following:

Utilizing the Internal Revenue Service as a method to look into the various organizations that we are more concerned about. Just a threat of an IRS investigation will probably turn their approach. . . .

A more blatant proposal for subverting our laws I have never seen nor heard proposed by an official in a position to influence policy decisions. It is evident from the date on this memorandum that seeds of things to come had already been planted in the minds of some members of the administration even before its first year in office ended.

It was this spring that I first suspected that a link might exist between the attempts by the White House to politicize the IRS and a couple of Executive orders issued early this year by President Nixon. My feeling developed as the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, of which I am a member, held hearings, at my request, on Executive Orders Nos. 11697 and 11709. These orders are designed to give the Agriculture Department authority to study income tax returns of our Nation's three million farmers.

The stated purpose for these orders was to allow the USDA to improve its statistical surveys.

On October 18, 1973, the subcommittee issued its report on its study of those Executive orders. The report is titled "Information from Farmer's Income Tax Returns and Invasion of Privacy." It contains three recommendations. They are:

1. For the purpose of statistical mail surveys, that the Internal Revenue Service provide to the Department of Agriculture only names, addresses, and taxpayer identification numbers. No personal financial data from farmers income tax returns should be provided unless an individual citizen gives his voluntary informed consent in writing. Ideally, the farmer could provide this information directly to the Department of Agriculture.

2. That the Department of Agriculture, utilizing lists of persons having farm operations provided by the Internal Revenue Service, seek the voluntary informed consent of farmers in obtaining private financial information needed to design statistical mail surveys.

3. That the appropriate Congressional Committees consider legislation amending

section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code to make tax returns explicitly confidential, except as otherwise limited for tax administration, enforcement and other purposes approved by Congress.

My suspicions about a link between an Administration attempt to use IRS as a political tool and the Executive orders favoring USDA were triggered by the admission by the Department of Justice to the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information that those orders had been designed to serve as a prototype for future tax return inspection orders. This feeling was strengthened by testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities—the "Watergate Committee"—that certain White House aides had sought to use the IRS as a political weapon against the administration's "enemies."

There were a number of other factors which influenced my thinking:

The testimony of John Wesley Dean III before the Senate Select Committee showed clearly there was a determined and active effort to politicize the Internal Revenue Service and much consternation over the resistance of top officials in the IRS to be a party to any such effort;

The revelation that J. Gordon Liddy and John Caulfield were employed by the Department of the Treasury at the time the Executive orders were formulated;

Dean's production of documents showing that Caulfield had advised him on matters pertaining to political enemies and the IRS; and

The Dean documents which included a reference to a way in which the IRS could "target" individuals by requesting an IRS audit "of a group of individuals having the same occupation."

To me this struck a resounding chord. Executive Orders 11697 and 11709 are aimed at "a group of individuals having the same occupation"—namely, farmers.

The appearance of the Magruder memorandum last week is additional evidence that the state of mind of the administration during the time the tax return release order was being formulated was to compromise the IRS and other agencies for political purposes.

Another portion of the Magruder memorandum's suggestions for putting the screws on the news media seems relevant here. Its final suggestion was—

Utilize Republican National Committee for major letter writing efforts of both a class nature and a quantity nature. We have set up a situation at the National Committee that will allow us to do this, and I think by effective letter writing and telegrams we will accomplish our objective rather than again just the shot-gun approach to one specific Senator or one specific news broadcaster because of various comments. . . .

Could it be that they wanted the names and addresses of the Nation's 3 million farmers so they could pick out those who earned a high income and recruit them for political letterwriting campaigns "of a class nature"?

In "Past and Present," Thomas Carlyle wrote:

In the long run every Government is the exact symbol of its people, with their wisdom and unwisdom. . . .

In the nearly 2 centuries since our Nation was founded the wisdom and courage of our people have given us the strength and determination to protect our precious rights and freedoms. Among the most important of these are freedom from illegal coercion and the right of privacy. Failure to protect these rights for even one citizen could well be the key to tyranny for us all.

These coincidents which I have cited are too obvious to ignore. It may be that the Congress will want to act along the lines suggested by Donald C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue during his testimony before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information.

Commissioner Alexander said in part:

. . . As I see it, today we should consider the basic problem of balancing two competing interests: The right of the taxpayer to privacy against the need of the requesting person or agency to information necessary to the fulfillment of its function. In striking this balance, the Congress might wish to impose a heavy burden upon the entity seeking tax information. . . . * * * Congress might consider modifications in the rules permitting access to tax information of those having a direct or beneficial interest in the particular tax return. . . .

I agree with the Commissioner. I am convinced that present tax law, which has the effect of treating an individual's tax return as a public document, within too loose limits, may well need to be changed. I believe that Congress should carefully consider modifying the law to make income tax returns private documents except under certain carefully prescribed circumstances.

In the future I expect to urge the appropriate congressional committees to give full consideration to this need.

IT WAS THE BEST OF TIMES, IT WAS THE WORST OF TIMES

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Charles Dickens opened his classic "A Tale of Two Cities" with the following words—

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times. . . .

Today it, indeed, is "the best of times" for the oil industry, and for the American consumer, on the other hand, it is "the worst of times." While the public is warned about energy shortages and rationing and is forced to pay higher prices for fuel, the oil oligopoly, despite the energy crisis and the greater demands by the oil-rich Middle East governments, is doing better than ever.

The third quarter profits are now being reported and they show some of the biggest profit increases in the history of the oil industry. Exxon Corp., the Nation's largest oil company, earned $638 million in the July–September quarter, an 80-percent hike over the $353 million reported in the third quarter of 1972. Profits for the first 9 months of this for Exxon were $1.66 billion, some 59.4 percent higher than profits in the same period of 1972. The Gulf Oil Corp. raked in record 9-month earnings of $570 million, a 60-percent gain over the first 9 months of 1972. Gulf's 1973 third quarter advanced 91 percent to $210 million. Standard Oil of Indiana's third quarter net surged by 37 percent to $147.3 million. Continental Oil Co. said its third quarter earnings rose 38 percent to $54.2 million. Cities Service Co. reported its third quarter earnings climbed nearly 61 percent to $28.6 million.

Ashland Oil had a 17-percent earnings gain to $24.4 million for the July–September period. Standard Oil Co. of Ohio announced its third quarter net rose 14 percent to $18 million. Getty Oil's third quarter net income of $33.7 million was a 71-percent jump over last year's third quarter figures. Phillips Petroleum earnings for the third quarter rose to $53.8 million, a 43-percent gain over a year ago. Atlantic Richfield's profits rose 16 percent in the third quarter and 37 percent in the 9-month period. Texaco's net income followed the trend of sharp gains as it advanced 48 percent above the 1972 third quarter. Union Oil saw its third quarter earnings rise 61 percent to $50.7 million, and Mobil Oil came in with a 64.1-percent boost in its third quarter profits, reaching $231.2 million. Standard Oil Co. of California turned in record profits for the third quarter with a 51-percent gain over the similar 3 months last year.

Mr. Speaker, the oil oligopoly has found a way to use the energy crunch to its advantage and to make more money than ever before. Furthermore, as we all know, the oil industry is the beneficiary of many Government policies, and we, in the Congress, find ourselves even unable to pass any reform of the minimum income tax provisions because we are told that the oil giants, who object to paying their fair share of taxes, have gotten to our brethren. So, as we enter "the winter of despair," the oil companies will have everything before them, and the American consumers, who are forced to pay more for fuel products in order to provide the greater profits for the oil barons, will have nothing before them.

CPA AT THE FED, CONTINUED

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, on October 18, as part of my continuing effort to determine the scope of Consumer Protection Agency authority under the pending CPA bills, I entered into the RECORD responses to my questionnaire from four banking agencies.

One of the critical questions asked of each agency in my survey of the most affected Federal agencies concerned how many of their 1972 final decisions were appealable to the courts by anyone. Under two of the three CPA bills now before a subcommittee on which I serve, the CPA would be able to appeal the final decisions of another agency if anyone else could appeal them. This grant of power is the major difference among the three bills. Only H.R. 564, the bipartisan bill introduced by Congressman BROWN of Ohio and myself, would not grant such

posal, there can be no doubt whatsoever that it is in entire accord with the public interest and concern of the people of this country and I therefore urge its prompt and resounding adoption by the House.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 10937, which would extend the life of the Watergate grand jury beyond its present expiration date of December 4, 1973, for a minimum of 6 months, but not more than 1 year. It seems to me that the extension of the Watergate grand jury is essential to the prosecution of those responsible for the Watergate break-in and related crimes. If the grand jury expires, it will mean that, no matter what the various special prosecutors discover in the course of their investigations, those suspected of crimes will not be brought to justice.

The question before us is whether we will be a government of laws, with equal protection for all Americans, or a government which excuses the rich and powerful from prosecution and punishment. I opt for the former, and am sure that my colleagues will do the same. For this reason, I support extending the life of the Sirica grand jury, and urge each of my colleagues to vote for the legislation under consideration.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 10937, extension of the Watergate grand jury.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10937, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

YEAS—378

Abdnor	Bafalis	Bray
Abzug	Baker	Breaux
Adams	Bauman	Breckinridge
Alexander	Beard	Brinkley
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett	Brooks
	Bergland	Broomfield
Anderson, Ill.	Bevill	Brotzman
Andrews, N.C.	Biaggi	Brown, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Biester	Brown, Mich.
	Bingham	Brown, Ohio
Annunzio	Blackburn	Broyhill, N.C.
Archer	Boggs	Broyhill, Va.
Arends	Boland	Buchanan
Armstrong	Bolling	Burgener
Ashbrook	Bowen	Burke, Fla.
Ashley	Brademas	Burke, Mass.
Aspin	Brasco	Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Burton	Harrington	Patten
Butler	Harsha	Pepper
Byron	Harvey	Perkins
Carey, N.Y.	Hastings	Pettis
Carter	Hays	Peyser
Casey, Tex.	Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle
Cederberg	Heckler, Mass.	Pike
Chamberlain	Heinz	Poage
Clancy	Helstoski	Podell
Clawson, Del	Henderson	Preyer
Clay	Hicks	Price, Ill.
Cleveland	Hillis	Price, Tex.
Cochran	Hinshaw	Pritchard
Cohen	Hogan	Quie
Collier	Holifield	Quillen
Collins, Ill.	Holt	Railsback
Collins, Tex.	Holtzman	Randall
Conable	Horton	Rangel
Conlan	Hosmer	Rarick
Conte	Howard	Rees
Corman	Huber	Regula
Cotter	Hungate	Reuss
Coughlin	Hunt	Riegle
Crane	Hutchinson	Rinaldo
Cronin	Ichord	Roberts
Culver	Jarman	Robinson, Va.
Daniel, Dan	Johnson, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Johnson, Colo.	Rodino
	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Daniels, Dominick V.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers
	Jones, N.C.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Danielson	Jones, Okla.	Rooney, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Jordan	Rosenthal
Davis, S.C.	Karth	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Roush
Delaney	Kazen	Rousselot
Dellenback	Kemp	Roy
Dellums	King	Roybal
Denholm	Kluczynski	Runnels
Dennis	Koch	Ruppe
Dent	Kuykendall	Ruth
Derwinski	Kyros	Ryan
Devine	Landrum	St Germain
Dickinson	Latta	Sarasin
Dingell	Leggett	Sarbanes
Donohue	Lehman	Satterfield
Dorn	Litton	Scherle
Downing	Long, La.	Schneebeli
Drinan	Long, Md.	Schroeder
Dulski	Lott	Sebelius
Duncan	Lujan	Seiberling
du Pont	McClory	Shipley
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Shoup
Edwards, Ala.	McCollister	Shriver
Edwards, Calif.	McCormack	Shuster
Erlenborn	McDade	Sikes
Esch	McFall	Sisk
Eshleman	McKay	Skubitz
Evans, Colo.	McKinney	Slack
Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden	Smith, Iowa
Fascell	Macdonald	Smith, N.Y.
Findley	Madden	Snyder
Fish	Madigan	Spence
Fisher	Mahon	Staggers
Flood	Mallary	Stanton, J. William
Flowers	Mann	
Flynt	Martin, Nebr.	Steed
Foley	Martin, N.C.	Steele
Ford, William D.	Mathias, Calif.	Steelman
	Mathis, Ga.	Steiger, Ariz.
Forsythe	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Fountain	Mayne	Stephens
Fraser	Meeds	Stratton
Frelinghuysen	Melcher	Stubblefield
Frenzel	Metcalfe	Stuckey
Frey	Mezvinsky	Studds
Froehlich	Michel	Sullivan
Fulton	Milford	Symington
Fuqua	Miller	Symms
Gaydos	Minish	Talcott
Gettys	Mink	Taylor, Mo.
Gibbons	Minshall, Ohio	Taylor, N.C.
Gilman	Mitchell, Md.	Teague, Calif.
Ginn	Moakley	Thompson, N.J.
Goldwater	Montgomery	Thomson, Wis.
Gonzalez	Moorhead, Calif.	Thone
Goodling		Thornton
Grasso	Moorhead, Pa.	Tiernan
Gray	Morgan	Treen
Green, Oreg.	Mosher	Udall
Griffiths	Moss	Ullman
Gross	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Grover	Myers	Vander Jagt
Gubser	Natcher	Vanik
Gude	Nedzi	Veysey
Gunter	Nelsen	Vigorito
Guyer	Nichols	Waggonner
Haley	Obey	Waldie
Hamilton	O'Brien	Wampler
Hammer-schmidt	O'Hara	Ware
	O'Neill	Whalen
Hanrahan	Owens	White
Hansen, Idaho	Parris	Whitehurst
Whitten	Winn	Young, Fla.
Wiggins	Wolff	Young, Ga.
Williams	Wright	Young, Ill.
Wilson, Bob	Wyatt	Young, S.C.
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.	Wylie	Young, Tex.
	Wyman	Zablocki
	Yates	Zion
Wilson, Charles, Tex.	Yatron	Zwach
	Young, Alaska	

NAYS—1

Landgrebe

NOT VOTING—54

Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Nix
Badillo	Hanley	Patman
Barrett	Hanna	Powell, Ohio
Bell	Hawkins	Reid
Blatnik	Hébert	Rhodes
Burke, Calif.	Hudnut	Roncallo, N.Y.
Camp	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Carney, Ohio	Keating	Rose
Chappell	Ketchum	Sandman
Chisholm	Lent	Stanton, James V.
Clark	McEwen	
Clausen, Don H.	Mailliard	Stark
	Maraziti	Stokes
Conyers	Mazzoli	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Wis.	Mills, Ark.	Towell, Nev.
Diggs	Mitchell, N.Y.	Walsh
Eilberg	Mizell	Widnall
Ford, Gerald R.	Mollohan	Wydler
Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Ketchum.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Carney of Ohio with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Mitchell of New York.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Stark with Mr. Hawkins.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Nix.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a further change in the legislative program for tomorrow.

We are adding the debt limit bill to the schedule. So the program for tomorrow will be as follows:

The consideration of House Joint Resolution 542, the war powers resolution, a vote to override the President's veto, which will be the first item of business tomorrow; a vote on the conference report on S. 1081, the trans-Alaska pipe-

line bill; and a vote on H.R. 11104, the increase in the public debt limit, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

UNITED NATIONS AND HYPOCRISY

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is located in my congressional district and so I take special interest in its activities. But regretfully, I must admit that over the years I have viewed its actions—or better said its lack of action—with sadness and oftentimes contempt when its initiatives have been hypocritical. What distresses me today, Mr. Speaker, is that that august body, including both the General Assembly and the Security Council, has been silent in the face of the extraordinary savagery committed by Syrians on Israeli prisoners. We read reports that Israeli soldiers captured by the Syrians at the outbreak of the recent hostilities have been chained, blindfolded and shot—all in gross violation of the Geneva Convention and the most basic tenets of human decency. Yet, the United Nations remains silent, it does nothing to condemn or stop this barbarism.

We witness this callous disregard for human life with outrage and sadness. Yet in the context of the United Nations' short history, it no longer comes as a surprise to us to see this body turn its back on the most moral of issues. Let us consider for a moment just a few other instances in which it has ignored human suffering and failed to undertake its moral responsibility.

The tragedy that befell the Indian subcontinent a short time ago was never faced forthright by the United Nations. Pakistan was permitted to subjugate what is now Bangladesh, causing death and misery to millions and creating a refugee problem for India of incredible proportions. But because of great power politics and regional rivalries, the United Nations was helpless, until force resolved an intolerable situation.

When Biafra sought to break away from Nigeria, whatever the merits of the case, the United Nations again did nothing and incredible suffering resulted.

When General Amin of Uganda, pointing with praise at the example of Hitler, expelled the Indian minority in that Nation, under conditions as degrading as any in recent history, the United Nations did nothing.

When tribal warfare erupted in Burundi and Rwanda, and reports of genocide were well authenticated, the United Nations did nothing and the concept of respect for a nation's so-called "internal affairs" was permitted to cover up these atrocities.

When it is well documented that the Soviet Union persecutes minorities and violates in the most elemental ways the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Man, the United Nations does nothing.

When the world body was presented with the important problem of airplane highjacking and terrorism, a topic the U.N. was well-equipped to handle, the Arab bloc was able to prevent any effective action.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has just gone through the agony of having our own scldiers held captive by a nation that failed to honor the Geneva Convention's accords on the treatment of prisoners of war. We know better than any other Nation the anguish, indeed the agony now being suffered by the parents of the young Israeli soldiers being held captive or missing. It is incumbent upon every decent nation to act against Arab barbarism, and the United States should be in the forefront of the protest.

THE FAMILY, POVERTY, AND WELFARE PROGRAMS: FACTORS INFLUENCING FAMILY STABILITY

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention a study reelased November 4 by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee. This volume, entitled "The Family, Poverty, and Welfare Programs: Factors Influencing Family Stability," is paper No. 12, part 1, in the series "Studies in Public Welfare" issued by the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

This volume of studies indicates that welfare payments have contributed to the increase in the proportion of American families headed by the mother only. Five outstanding social scientists have analyzed the relationship between the American family and Government welfare programs, providing insight into what is happening to the low-income American family, as well as demonstrating how complex the issues are. These trends and their relation to Government policies and programs must be thoroughly examined if we are to formulate effective welfare reform measures.

The study reveals somewhat startling conclusions which I would like to share with my colleagues:

First, that "high" welfare payments independently and directly stimulate formation of single-parent families, those generally headed by the mother only. That is, there is now evidence that welfare does help break up families.

Second, that increases in income, including higher welfare payments, have allowed a rising proportion of already-broken families to set up their own households, rather than live in the household of parents or other adult relatives. This helps to explain the dramatic increase in families headed by women.

Third, that the number of persons receiving aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—doubled from 1967–70—even though the number eligible rose only 24 percent—because of a sharp rise in the utilization of welfare by eligible people.

Fourth, that the jump in AFDC caseloads may be over, since nearly all eligible families now collect benefits—an estimated 91 percent in 1970.

Fifth, that increases in illegitimacy may have resulted partly from improved living standards rather than from a deteriorating economic position of low-income groups; improved health conditions have hastened fertility, reduced sterility, and hence increased the chances for illegimate births.

In the last decade, the share of poor children living in one-parent families jumped from 27 percent to 51 percent. While half of the poor two-parent families lifted themselves from poverty with the help of economic growth, the number of poor one-parent families rose slightly, as these families benefited little from economic growth.

Along with the rise in fatherless families has come an alarming growth in illegitimacy. Between 1960 and 1968 illegitimate births as a share of all births doubled from 5 percent to 10 percent. Among the poor, the share of out-of-wedlock births has run as high as 30 to 35 percent in recent years.

This volume is available from the subcommittee office or from the Government Printing Office.

SUMMARY OF THE VOLUME

WELFARE PAYMENTS, DESERTION, AND FEMALE FAMILY HEADS

Earlier subcommittee staff studies showed that financial incentives are built into the welfare system for poor fathers to desert their families, or to at least feign desertion. Federal welfare cash is denied to intact families of fathers with a full-time job, no matter how poor the family, although such families are eligible for food stamps. The subcommittee has illustrated the desertion incentives with actual cases in which husband-wife families received far less Government help than a mother-headed family of the same size, and with the same earnings.

Now the subcommittee has released a study by Marjorie Honig of the National Insurance Institute in Israel, which provides statistical evidence that high welfare payments cause an increase in the share of families headed by women. Using a procedure that isolated the impact of high welfare payment levels from other factors, Dr. Honig found that a 10 percent higher welfare payment in a metropolitan area in 1960 seemed to induce a 3 to 4 percent higher share of families headed by women.

These results go well beyond the abundant anecdotal evidence that welfare causes family breakup. We must recognize that Government encouragement of family splitting is more than just a theoretical possibility.

LIVING STANDARDS, ILLEGITIMACY, AND FAMILY STABILITY

One surprising finding reported by the subcommittee in paper No. 12, part 1, is that improved living standards apparently caused some of the increase in illegitimacy. Dr. Phillips Cutright, an Indiana University sociologist, maintains that improved health standards were a primary cause of the large increase in illegitimacy. He attributes primarily to health-related factors almost 90 percent of increased illegitimacy among nonwhites and 20 percent of the increase among whites. Dr. Cutright says better nutrition and more adequate health care

increased fertility among younger girls and reduced miscarriages and involuntary sterility.

As far as solutions are concerned, Government policies to increase the use of birth control pills and IUD's will have only limited success in reducing illegitimacy according to Dr. Cutright. Since most illegitimate births are first births among young, poor, unmarried women whose sexual experience generally is infrequent and periodic, many of these women will either not participate in the programs or encounter high failure rates. Dr. Cutright argues that providing abortion services will cause a much greater reduction in illegitimacy than will encouraging the use of contraceptives.

Rising income also probably caused some of the increased numbers of mother-headed families, according to Robert Lerman of the subcommittee staff. Many people have pointed out that insufficient income can cause marital disruption which, in turn, forces women to head their own families. But mothers must have some income to establish and maintain separate households. In earlier years, incomes were so low—including that from public sources like AFDC—that such mothers had to share the households of relatives or friends. Hence, they were not counted then by the Census Bureau as separate mother-headed families. The growth in income and the rise in AFDC payment levels have allowed many mothers of broken families to set up independent households. Dr. Lerman reports that almost 90 percent of mothers without husbands headed their own households in 1970, compared with only 67 percent in 1950. Paradoxically, growing numbers of mother-headed families are partly a sign of higher living standards rather than simply the result of marital breakdown.

RECENT INCREASES IN WELFARE CASELOADS

Barbara Boland, of the Urban Institute, sheds light on why the monthly AFDC caseload doubled from about 1.3 million families in 1967 to 2.5 million in 1970.

Apparently an increasing share of eligible families actually claiming benefits caused the bulk of the growth in AFDC numbers. In 1967, 63 percent of eligible families headed by women received benefits; by 1970 participation had climbed to 91 percent. Now that nearly all eligible families received benefits, caseloads have begun to level off and should continue to do so.

Mrs. Boland reports that the number of families eligible for AFDC rose 24 percent during the 3-year period, chiefly because of higher benefit levels which expanded eligibility to higher income levels.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Mr. Speaker, the huge number of broken families creates difficult problems for Government antipoverty policies. On the one hand, families with only one parent present—almost always the mother—have the greatest difficulty in making ends meet. Those mothers fortunate enough to get a job often must work at low wages and bear heavy day care costs. After taxes and expenses, work may pay less to these women than welfare. Thus, providing the greatest help to these families might seem wise. Unfortunately, this policy can prove disastrous in the long run. There is now solid evidence that such current policies have encouraged family breakups. The present AFDC program is weak on many counts. Benefits are dispensed in such a way as to provide incentives for fathers to desert and disincentives for the deserted mother to work and try to raise her family's income. And, in many areas, benefit levels are too low to help any families attain decent living standards.

In my judgment, we need reforms in the welfare system so that families do not have to break up in order to receive income supplements. Family disruption is simply too high a price to extract. The breakdown of the family is already a widespread and growing tendency in our society with effects which range far beyond an impact on the welfare budget. The Government should be part of the solution, not part of the problem.

WEAKNESSES OF PENSION AND RETIREMENT SYSTEM

(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, over the last few years, extensive research efforts in this body and elsewhere have uncovered some startling facts about the inequities and the weaknesses of the pension and retirement system. The need to insure a better life for those millions of workers dependent upon pension benefits for their retirement years is an obvious one. Indeed, far too many individuals who participate throughout their working years in private or public pension plans find at retirement time that their plan ends up in only a hollow promise, great disillusionment, and often little or no cash to pay the bills.

May I say that I fully support the intent of pending legislation which seeks to correct this scandalous situation. At the same time, we must take care that our efforts not be so overdrawn as to lose sight of the real benefits and the contributions conveyed through some programs—lest we find that through our zeal the chance of receiving benefits for some might be impaired.

May I share two items recently brought to my attention. First, a guest editorial which appeared in the Oregon Journal entitled, "Private Pension System Requires Breathing Room To Be Effective." Written by Gerald Toy, a Portland consulting actuary, this editorial puts the task of pension fund reform in a thought provoking way.

The second item is an excerpt of a letter to the Oregon congressional delegation from James L. McGoffin, for the State of Oregon. Mr. McGoffin highlights some of the benefits conveyed through the State system and warns of the difficulties which may arise as a result of pending legislation.

PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEM REQUIRES BREATHING ROOM TO BE EFFECTIVE

(By Gerald G. Toy)

The private pension system is one which provides retirement benefits and security for employes who have finished their working careers. Pension plans are paid for by employers (and in some cases employes also contribute toward costs). Plans are designed to supplement the Social Security System.

Recently, the private pension system has come under study and frequently criticized by Ralph Nader and others. A recent editorial in this newspaper entitled "Private Pension Reform Urgent" touches on several points which imply great weaknesses in the system.

First, let's look at some of the strengths of the system:

1—There are over 6 million people drawing benefits of over $10 billion a year in regular retirement checks. These checks, when added to Social Security, keep thousands of people off the welfare rolls and help them to enjoy financial security.

2—Over 35 million currently employed individuals are covered by private plans.

3—Current contributions to pay for future pensions are in excess of $17 billion a year.

4—Average benefits per year have increased from $1,020 to $1,730 in recent years, and they are still rising rapidly.

5—Funding (advance payment for future benefits) is soundly provided in a great many of these plans.

Some weaknesses of the system:

1—Only about 50 per cent of workers in the United States are covered by private pension plans.

2—In some cases, "vesting" takes too long ("Vesting" is the guarantee that the plan will provide benefits whether or not the employe stays at his job. Usually, an employe is vested after certain age or service requirements are met.)

3—Under some plans, "eligibility" is too restrictive. ("Eligibility" means the conditions required before an employe can become a covered participant under a plan and start to earn pension benefits.)

4—There have been cases of dishonesty in handling of funds. Though these situations have been extremely rare, some pension plans have been hurt.

Our private pension system is relatively young. In almost every conceivable way, it has been expanding and improving every year.

Government, both at state and federal level, is moving in with additional laws and regulations. It may be that over-regulation will slow down or even stop growth of a system that has benefited many people and promises to benefit many more.

Since "vesting" is frequently cited as an area of weakness, let us take a close look at what it will mean if a law is passed requiring greatly liberalized vesting.

The cry often is heard that a pension is "lost" whenever a person leaves a job after a few years and before he becomes vested. Statistics are quoted that "only 10 per cent of the people ever get a pension." Such statictics can be misleading.

Suppose that a man works in 10 different jobs out of his 40-year working career from age 25 to age 65. The first nine jobs last one year each before he finally finds a job that he likes and stays with for the rest of his working life. He then retires and gets a pension. Is it logical to say that only 10 per cent of his jobs produced a pension? Or could you more properly conclude that he was 100 per cent successful in getting a pension?

Look at it from the employer's point of view: He wants to encourage good employes to stay with him and help him earn a profit. He wants to reward good and faithful service with good pension benefits, for which he

puts away certain sums of money periodically. With a moderate vesting requirement such as 15 years of service, he will be able to reward not only his people who stay 20, 30, or 40 years to retirement age (usually 65), but also those who quit after 15 years but before reaching retirement age.

If a new law is passed requiring five-year vesting, a large amount of money will go to the short-term employes who leave. The result is that long-term employes will get less. Alternatively the employer will have to put in more money—or face a combination of these two possibilities.

Another alternative is that he may decide that it's just not worth it and terminate his plan. Or an employer thinking of setting up a new plan may decide that he doesn't want to be exposed to the risk of greater and greater governmental restrictions on how his money should be spent.

Herein Oregon, a new law governing pension plans was passed by the 1973 Legislature. The federal government already regulates the private pension system through the Treasury Department (Internal Revenue Service) and through the Labor Department.

One has to live with these laws and regulations and fill out the multitude of required forms to really appreciate the required amount of paperwork. It is my honest opinion that our new Oregon law does little, if anything, to strengthen the private pension system. Indeed, it may even weaken it by adding still another layer of red tape and expense to the operation of pension plans.

The tragedy of the tussock moth damage to our forests should be a constant reminder of what government regulation can do when it is contrary to common sense.

We all have a legitimate concern in this matter and both sides of the coin should be examined before hasty "reform" laws are imposed on the health, growing private pension system.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES
RETIREMENT SYSTEM,
Portland, Oreg.

". . . We, as most other public retirement systems, now have adequate provisions covering the areas of vestment, funding and proper audit, which are far in excess of the requirements in H.R. 4200. The net effect of this bill would create extremely expensive, redundant and uncalled for additional reporting, describing and disclosing, only increasing our administrative expenses without providing one single iota of additional benefit or protection to the member over what he presently enjoys . . . We must have an extension of time beyond 1975 and a much clearer definition of all terms . . . Otherwise, only chaos will result in the actuarial funding of ours, as well as all other public retirement systems across the nation . . ."

The status of benefits for the Oregon Retirement System, its over 80,000 active employees and 20,000 retirees, has been enhanced and substantially increased, offering greater service and protection to the member, even in the past three bienniums. We now have total vesting with only five years of service; a complete and total return of all employee contributions coupled with total accumulated interest, upon separation from service; a 1% pension formula that generates approximately 50% of salary at 30 years of service; and early optional retirement benefits. This, coupled with disability and life and medical benefits funded over a 26 year statutory period with reserves in excess of 600 million dollars and a cash flow in excess of our obligations of over five million dollars a month, hardly requires, at this time, inclusion in such priority private-pension-legislation as H.R. 4200.

Yours very sincerely,
JAMES L. MCGOFFIN,
Director.

AN INTERVIEW OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS

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

Mr BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the transcript of a televised interview which I have conducted with the distinguished junior Senator from Washington, the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON.

The interview, another in a "Washington Insight" series I conduct for showing on WSJV–TV, the ABC affiliate in South Bend-Elkhart, Ind., will be viewed on Wednesday evening, November 7, 1973.

The transcript follows:

AN INTERVIEW OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, WSJV–TV, SOUTH BEND-ELKHART, IND., NOVEMBER 7, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. War in the Middle East, continued confrontation with the Soviet Union, threats made good by the Arab States to cut off their oil exports, and the possibility of serious energy shortages—these are among the most critical problems facing our country today. And they are all areas where Americans are looking for leadership to their elected National officials.

Here to discuss these and other issues with me today is one of the nation's top leaders, Senator Henry M. Jackson of the State of Washington.

Senator Jackson first came to Washington, D.C. as a Member of the House of Representatives, where he served for twelve years. In 1952, he was elected to the United States Senate, where he has served ever since.

Senator Jackson is chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, chairs the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and has headed a Congressional subcommittee to monitor the strategic arms limitation talks for the Senate Armed Serices Committee. He is widely regarded as a potential candidate for the Democratic nomination for President in 1976.

Senator, I'm glad to have you with me.

Senator JACKSON. Well, John, let me say I am honored to be with you and to be in your Congressional District tonight. It's a real pleasure. I am real proud of your great leadership, not only in the Education and Labor Committee, but in the House Leadership as Chief Deputy Whip. It's a very important assignment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, sir. I want to ask you some questions about the problem that I know has been troubling Americans all over the country. We all watched anxiously for the past month as the Middle East war developed into a possible confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. I wonder what your reaction is to the action of President Nixon in putting our forces on alert and giving us the feeling that we faced a crisis of the magnitude of the Cuban missile crisis?

UNITED STATES DELAYED REACTION TO SOVIET MOVES

Senator JACKSON. Well, I think the President was justified in putting our forces on alert. I had a chance to see the summary of the Russian note. As I described it at the time, the note was brutal. However, I do want to emphasize, and I want to be emphatic about it, that some of this could have been avoided if we started our aid, reinforcement and resupply to Israel, at the outset.

I think we sent the wrong signals, John, to the Soviets. We waited a whole week. It wasn't until some of us came out very strongly, forcefully, in a public way, as well as representations made privately, that they decided to move, about nine days after the fact. I think that delay encouraged the Russians to make commitments to the Arabs that they would not have made otherwise.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You will recall that there have been a number of questions here about the President's putting the Armed Forces on alert, and some have even suggested that may have been motivated by his Watergate troubles.

BUT ALERT WAS JUSTIFIED

Senator JACKSON. Yes, I know that statement was made, but that is not a fair appraisal, frankly, of the situation. You look at the Russian note, and then you look for independent corroboration. The Soviets had put on alert six airborne divisions; they had infantry divisions ready to go; they had the equipment there ready to move; they stopped the airlift of supplies to the Arab countries, and that airlift obviously would then be available to move those troops.

In addition, they had the largest concentration of ships in the Mediterranean in history. They had over 90 ships, and we, by the way, had 60.

But the most dangerous part of it all was not those ships, because we have a superior surface force, but it was the deployment of their submarines. And when you take this along with all of the other military moves that they were making, then I think we had no alternative but to blow the whistle on them and to make clear our determination that we were not going to permit the Soviet Union to achieve one of their cherished dreams, which goes back to Catherine the Great, of getting a real foothold with a military presence in the Middle East.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You've spoken of the Soviet military presence in the Middle East, and we're all aware that you have been a strong voice for a strong defense posture in the United States. What is your estimate of the prospect of the Soviets' tipping the military balance of power in their favor? And could you also in that connection comment on whether you think we can be reducing our defense budget in the post-Vietnam era?

SEES RUSSIANS TAKING RISKS

Senator JACKSON. Well, what the Soviets have been doing over the past many years is to build up this enormous defensive capability. And concurrent with that, they have built up a very large conventional force. The combination of the two makes it possible for them now to take risks that I think are extremely dangerous.

John, I just want to mention that when they didn't even have an atomic bomb, in 1948, they took Czechoslovakia. They kept pushing and pushing and we didn't respond. Then in 1962, in the Cuban Missile crisis, when we had a seven to one advantage, and we had total superiority in local forces, they nevertheless tried to put missiles into Cuba.

Now the problem that we face, not just now, but looking down the road a bit, and this affects the conduct of foreign policy, is that the Soviet Union will have an ever increasing advantage, unless we do something about it, in strategic arms and local arms. For example, in strategic arms, they now have with the SALT I agreement, a total of 1,618 land-based missiles to our 1,054, and in nuclear subs, they will have 62 to our 41.

And then you add what they've done in the way of surface sea forces and their huge advantage in ground forces, which makes it possible for them to take greater risks.

So I put it this way: when they had a totally inferior force, in strategic terms, they tried Cuba; they were successful in Czechoslovakia. It doesn't take much imagination to see that the level of their risk-taking is going up. This is what I'm trying to say.

People get to thinking in terms that are mechanistic in strategic arms, that is in terms of a nuclear exchange. I don't think that is the scenario. I don't think we are going to have a nuclear war. I think that what we have to face up to is what kind of conduct will we see here flowing from the Soviet Union with its ever increasing force? So what I have advocated is not arms control, but disarmament.

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT UNDERWRITE SOVIET ARMS BUILDUP

If the Russians want all this economic help, six percent loans, by the way—and I know that some of you people out in Indiana find it difficult to get six percent loans, long term-credits—I'm willing to help—I want to help them economically—but why should we subsidize this huge military buildup? I believe in the reordering of Soviet priorities. I believe we should cut our level of strategic arms with the Soviets doing the same to get down to a level of parity. Let's say that both sides only have 900 land-based missiles. Why not both sides have 30–35 subs?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If we move in that direction, do you think there is some prospect that we could see a reduction of military spending in the foreseeable future?

ARMS PARITY WOULD SAVE BILLIONS

Senator JACKSON. Yes, we could see it in our own country and over there. We would save billions. What burns me is that they are asking for all this economic help from us, so we are in effect subsidizing their military buildup, because they can't do both and not have real internal trouble in the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you a question . . .

Senator JACKSON. May I just interject here, this all goes to the question of détente.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That's what I was going to ask about.

RUSSIAN ACTIONS INDICATE DISREGARD FOR DÉTENTE

Senator JACKSON. I want détente. But I want a human détente. I want one that is credible, that I really believe that some change is taking place in the Soviet Union. But when you look at the balance sheet here, what is it that they have done that makes things better for the world?

I was reading—I get the daily report of Tass and Pravda announcing that they were encouraging the Arabs to cut off oil to the United States. Now, I mean we're facing within days drastic developments in our own style of life here at home, John, and this to me is a very dangerous indicator of the real true attitude of the Soviets towards us when they are encouraging Arab countries, not only what they did in helping to get other Arab countries involved against Israel, but telling the Arab countries, cut off oil to the United States. Is that détente?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I happen to be, as you know, a cosponsor of the Jackson Amendment.

Senator JACKSON. You have not only been a cosponsor, but you have been most effective as an advocate.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you. Could you explain what the Jackson amendment to the Trade Bill is and then comment on the White House's apparent withdrawal of pressure for action on the trade bill right now.

IMPLEMENT U.N. DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Senator JACKSON. The amendment would simply provide that if the Soviets are going to get economic subsidies from the United States—that's in the area of credits and Most Favored Nation treatment—then all we say is look, 25 years ago, by vote of 88 to 0, the United Nations adopted a resolution known as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That declaration provides in article 13 that an individual in a given country shall have the right to leave that country and return to that country. All we're asking, twenty-five years later, is implement that right.

It applies, not just to Jews, it applies to a long list of minority groups in the Soviet Union. After all, the Great Russian is the minority in the totality of the population of the Soviet Union; but there are Germans who want to leave, there are Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Ukranians, the list is long. They should have the right to leave, that's all we're saying. And if they are willing to do that, we'll help them.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think I told you a few weeks ago I had the very moving experience of being at Schönau, the castle near Vienna which has served as a way station for Jews coming out of the Soviet Union on their way to Israel. Another member of Congress, Congressman William Lehman of Florida, and I arrived within a few minutes after the arrival of some 70 Jews from Warsaw and Brest-Litovsk, and, as I say, it was a very moving experience to see them. I know that the Austrian government has now decided that they are going to have to shut down that particular transit point, but I have been thinking about the problem of emigration of Jews which was affected by your amendment.

Senator JACKSON. May I say at that point, too, John, that one reson I think all of us can take great encouragement in the move we're making is that Dr. Andrei Sakharov, the father of the hydrogen bomb, their most distinguished scientist, brilliant nuclear physicist, wrote an open letter to Congress and said, look, support the amendment. Otherwise, my people here, my professional colleagues, are going to be seriously hurt.

Dr. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who is at the summit of his discipline, he is a man of letters, said the same thing. And it is interesting to note that some who oppose this over here see it as interferring in their affairs, and here the two top intellectuals of the Soviet Union, with great courage and with the danger of what might happen to them, are speaking out in behalf of this humanitarian proposal.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you a question about a remark in Time magazine not long ago saying that "Senator Jackson is Israel's best friend in Congress." You sponsored, I think, in 1969 an amendment that made it possible for President Nixon to send arms to Israel in this latest crisis, and I wonder, in view of the bipartisan commitment we've had in this country to Israel, if you could tell us, in the present circumstances, how far you think we should go to protect that commitment?

ISRAEL'S SURVIVAL CRUCIAL TO BALANCED MIDDLE EAST

Senator JACKSON. First, let me explain that my interest in Israel dates back to the time I was prosecutor at the age of 26 and I saw what certain hate groups in the United States were doing to the Jews—I'm referring to the Silver Shirts—and then after I got out of the Army and went back to my seat in the House during World War II, I saw Buchenwald right after it was taken by Patton's forces, and what I saw there caused me to make a commitment to never permit a thing like that to happen again.

And I have felt right along that our policy should be to make it possible for the Israelis to survive. And at no time, and this is the great thing about the Israelis, have they ever asked for a commitment of American troops or forces. They are one ally who says, "Give us the credits so that we can buy the equipment we'll defend ourselves," and that's precisely the extent of our commitment.

Now, when the Soviets come in and obviously seek not to just aid the Arabs, that's not their objective—it's an imperial objective that goes back centuries—to obtain a domination over this area, then I think all of the interests of the Western world are at stake.

Their immediate objective, John, is to reopen the Suez Canal. They want the Egyptians on both sides of the Canal. Reopen it and it will become a Russian waterway because we can't move our fleet through that Canal. It's not deep enough. It'll take eight, nine years to convert it for our ships. But they can move theirs and it'll cut the distance in two to reach the Persian Gulf.

Secondly, we can't move our tankers through there. These are the huge tankers that draw ninety to one hundred feet of water. Now that is their immediate objective, and not only the United States, but the whole Western world has a stake in that.

In the meantime, our commitment is not to bring American forces. I don't want American forces in there. The Israelis don't want American forces in there. The Russians want their forces in there. That's what that note was on and that's what I said was brutal because in 1788 Catherine the Great tried to do the same thing—to upset the Ottoman Empire in Egypt.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do you think there's any danger that President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger will put presure on the Israelis to make an accommodation that would be prejudicial to the survival of Israel?

ISRAEL MUST HAVE DEFENSIBLE BORDERS

Senator JACKSON. I'm really worried about two possibilities. One, that there will be a settlement which will make it almost impossible for the Israelis to defend themselves. I say that because I have little confidence until I see what is being proposed—and we're not being kept informed on any aspect of this—that it might be a proposal or settlement in which they would not have defensible borders with modern weapons. That really disturbs me.

Secondly, intertwined with all this is, and we haven't discussed this, the Persian Gulf. In the Persian Gulf we have, John, about 70 percent of the oil reserves of the world. This is the jugular of the Western World. This is what the Soviets are after: Saudia Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Iran and the sheikdoms.

FEARS VIOLATION OF U.S. INTERESTS IN FACADE OF DÉTENTE

So I am concerned to really find out what's going on. I am concerned that the Administration, in an effort to put the pieces of détente back together again so at least they will have the facade of détente, will do something that will in my judgment violate both interests.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me turn to ask you more about the implications of the oil situation for the United States. I guess we import about 11 percent of our refined and crude oil from the Arab states, something in that order of magnitude. Now the Arabs are cutting off oil to this country. What are the implications for our energy supplies in this country, and secondly, the implications of the situation for our allies in Western Europe and Japan?

MUST TAKE EMERGENCY ENERGY MEASURES TO OFFSET ARAB BLACKMAIL

Senator JACKSON. Well, I'll do the last first. It's absolutely disastrous for Japan. They get 90 percent of their oil from the Middle East; in the case of Europe, about 80 percent. You hit it right about on the nose at 11 percent. Actually, we're consuming—it's up about a million barrels a day from last month—we're consuming 18 million barrels a day, we're importing six, and of the six we get about 1.6 million barrels a day from that area. We can completely, John, offset that, and I have emergency legislation pending that will give us 3.3 million barrels. That will involve conservation and alternative sources on an emergency basis, including utilizing coal where it will not impair the health of our people from the standpoint of air quality.

I think the key thing we need to do now is to tighten our belt and just tell the Arab world and tell the Russians we're not going to be blackmailed.

Now the Europeans did submit to blackmail. They just took a hands-off policy in the Middle East and they proved that old, old adage that once you allow yourself to be blackmailed, you've had it. It continues. And so here they are getting cut off even though they didn't participate in the Middle East conflict!

Mr. BRADEMAS. What about the fact that the House and Senate have now passed mandatory fuel allocation bills to lessen the impact of shortages? Could you comment on that legislation and do so in the light of what the Administration is proposing to do to deal with the problem?

ADMINISTRATION FUEL POLICY TOTALLY INADEQUATE

Senator JACKSON. The Administration's proposal has been voluntary up to now. They have in effect a limited mandatory allocation program which is totally inadequate.

The Congressional program sets down the mandatory moves they must make in terms of priority, whereas the Administration program does not.

The effect of the Congressional program, I think, will be to take care of hardship situations much better, to take care of our schools, our hospitals, our utilities, the basic things that we need on a high priority basis, and I believe that the mandatory program will be the most effective.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me turn to another general area that is obviously of very great concern to the country right now, and that's Watergate, the confirmation of Gerald Ford, the possible impeachment proceedings of the President. Do you think the White House announcement last week that two of the Watergate tapes do not exist will intensify the pressure in Congress for a special prosecutor who is not subject to White House control?

WATERGATE TAPES ISSUE SHOCKS THE NATION

Senator JACKSON. I don't think there's any doubt about it, John. I must say that I was shocked and I am sure the nation was shocked after all the controversy over the tapes to announce that the two critical tapes never existed. Why didn't the White House say, "Well, look, gentlemen, you're arguing over something that doesn't exist." Now to come in at the last minute and to have the White House advise Judge Sirica that these tapes have never been in existence, I think just escalates the credibility question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You travel all over the United States, Senator, speaking and are very much in demand in every part of the country. What are you finding is the reaction that people give you to Watergate and what do think the meaning of Watergate is for this country?

WATERGATE DAMAGED AMERICAN PRIDE AS NEVER BEFORE

Senator JACKSON. Well, John, that's a tough one. The American people are a proud people. And if I were to summarize the whole situation, I would put it this way—that Watergate has hurt the pride of the American people as never before in our history. This applies to Democrats, to Independents and to Republicans. Some have become cynical of all politicians and they feel that somehow we must do better. And it's not a fallout in favor of any political party as such. They feel very deeply that they want to see this whole mess cleaned up and cleaned up as fast as possible.

That's the way I would summarize it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you another question. If you were to rattle off the three or four major problems facing the country, aside from the foreign policy issue in the Middle East and defense, which we've been discussing, and Watergate, to which we have just alluded, what would you say they are?

OVERRIDING ISSUE IS ECONOMY

Senator JACKSON. The overriding issue facing this nation is the proper management and direction of our economy. No doubt about it. Inflation has been devastating. We've had a continuous recession. Ask any housewife, ask the senior citizens who watch their savings recede, their earnings recede, their standard of living recede. This is the overiding issue.

Coupled with it is the whole energy problem, because, John, our energy problems are not going to be over this year. We've got there rough years ahead, minimum, and then we've got the long-term problem of making this country self-sufficient in energy.

But the heart of it is how we manage and direct our economy. By proper direction of our economy, proper growth with good environment, we can provide the revenue and the resources to do the things we must do in America to make it a better America.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me then turn, in view of your having said that, to recall, Senator, that Joseph Kraft, who, as you know, is a very widely respected columnist here in Washington and acrosss the country, said recently that Seantor Jackson of Washington has now emerged as "the top Democrat in the nation," and some are even suggesting that you might be a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Are you running for President, Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. Well, John, that's a tough question. Of course it's never been raised before. No, I must say, that all one needs to do is just observe what's happened the last three months—things are changing so fast—to look that far ahead is definitely an impossibility. Let's just summarize that one by saying I'm keeping my options open.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Senator Jackson.

You've been listening to a conversation with Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washintgon about some of the problems facing the people of the United States today.

PRESIDENT SIGNS PUBLIC LAW 93–135, THE AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection and this year's chairman of the conference between the House of Representatives and the Senate, I was very pleased to note that on October 24 the President signed into law—Public Law 93–135—the agriculture-environmental and consumer protection appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. The bill was carefully drafted by our subcommittee after many months of hearings. A number of changes were made to the bill when we brought it to the floor. Likewise, many changes were made to the bill by the Senate.

We had a very good conference and the final bill as it passed both the House and the Senate drew wide support from both sides of the aisle. The conference report passed the House by 348 to 24 and it passed the Senate by voice vote.

Because of the importance of this bill to the Nation, there are several items I would like to again call to the attention of the House. There are a number of important items in the bill and the reports.

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

With regard to those sections of the bill which relate to activities of the Department of Agriculture, I would like to point out that funding for programs under the Rural Development Act is provided for the first time. There is $163 million in grants and $720 million in loan authority. When the Department finally develops effective plans for new and innovative programs under this authority instead of substituting them for programs which have been effective for many years, additional funds will be provided.

The bill provides $175 million for the Agricultural Conservation Program. In this connection the conference report stipulates that ASCS county committees shall retain authority to select and approve cost sharing practices, including the application of minerals or other materials where such committees find such practices essential to land development or preservation.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

The committee directed the Council on Environmental Quality to include in their procedures the requirement that Federal agencies prepare and publish their comments on impact statements within a specified time limit. The committee will expect this directive to be implemented by the Council expediously. The delay of Federal projects because of excessive amounts of time spent on the preparation and review of impact statements cannot be permitted to continue.

In the case of the Environmental Protection Agency, the commitee's hearing record this year showed strong evidence that actions by the Environmental Protection Agency in carrying out the various environmental laws have contributed to the energy crisis, have increased the damage from floods because of the delay of flood and soil conservation projects, have increased the cost of production of food thereby contributing to higher consumer prices, and have greatly increased the danger to human health by banning DDT, which according to testimony has never injured a human being. In addition, actions by the Agency have placed American industry and American agriculture at a competitive disadvantage both at home and abroad.

The committee was convinced that the Environmental Protection Agency and its policies had contributed greatly to causing the energy crisis. The approval by the Agency of overly restrictive State plans, which called for the meeting of primary and secondary ambient air standards at the same time, resulted in the need for industry to convert from coal to low-sulfur fuels. This increased requirement for oil and gas has been a major contributor to our current fuel problems which have now bene further aggravated by the Mideast situation.

In addition, the automobile emission control standards imposed by the Agency have greatly increased the requirements

for gasoline, which is also in short supply and will probably require rationing.

The energy crisis has major implications with regard to our country's national security, foreign policy and balance of trade. These implications were not considered by the Agency in setting the standards and approving the plans that led to the problem. The potential impact on the economic and social well-being of this Nation of actions by the Agency is so great that it is absolutely essential that the Agency be required to consider the impact of their actions.

Therefore, since our committee is the only committee that reviews all of the Agency's programs, we provided a number of directives in order to help restore a sense of balance to our environmental efforts.

The bill includes $5,000,000 for a complete and thorough review of the programs of EPA by the National Academy of Sciences. This study will provide the information Congress needs to better assess whether or not the cost of our environmental efforts are equal to the benefits. EPA must submit periodic reports to the committee on the progress of the studies called for in the House report and copies of the final report must be provided to the appropriate executive departments and agencies and to the Congress.

The bill includes $5,000,000 and 50 positions for the testing of substitute chemicals by EPA. These funds should help the Agency to avoid taking actions based on insufficient knowledge as they have done in the past. The Agency was also directed to initiate a complete and thorough review, based on scientific evidence of the decision banning the use of DDT. This review of DDT must take into consideration all of the costs and benefits and the importance of protecting the Nation's supply of food and fiber and provide a comparison with the inadequacy and dangers of approved substitutions.

The bill includes $250,000 and 14 positions for the formation of an environmental impact statement review group within EPA. The major delays associated with impact statements frequently are not in the preparation time, but in the lengthy review process. Four of these positions will be located in Washington and one each will be located in each of EPA's 10 regional offices. These specialists will work with other Government agencies so that the views of EPA can be considered during the project development stage. These individuals will have sufficient authority to comment in behalf of the Agency.

In addition, the report directs that in those cases where an environmental impact statement is required in connection with a project that is already under construction, the cost/benefit ratio should be based on the cost to complete the project versus the total benefits of the project. Furthermore, the review of impact statements prepared for ongoing projects should in no event exceed 10 working days.

The bill also provides that EPA must prepare environmental impact statements as required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act on all proposed actions by the Agency, except where prohibited by law. To help the Agency in carrying out this directive of the Congress, the bill provides $5,000,000 and 50 positions.

On September 18, 1973, Russell E. Train, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency wrote to me as chairman of the subcommittee. The purpose of his letter was to advise the committee of EPA's position on the items in disagreement between the two versions of the bill as passed by the House and Senate. With regard to environmental impact statements, Administrator Train's letter stated:

> The House bill includes language that would require EPA to prepare "Environmental Impact Statements as required by section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act on all proposed actions" such as proposed standards, regulations and guidelines. The Senate bill includes language that would require EPA to prepare "environmental explanations" to accompany all proposed actions.

The House conferees did not agree that "environmental explanations" on actions "such as proposed standards, regulations and guidelines" would suffice and insisted on the House language. Some Senate conferees strongly supported the Senate language, but because of the record, and overwhelming congressional support, receded. Therefore, EPA must prepare environmental impact statements on all proposed actions, including standards, regulations and guidelines as was recognized by Administrator Train in his letter of September 18, 1973.

The committee takes note of the colloquy that was inserted in the RECORD in the Senate on pages 33540 through 33542 in connection with the adoption of the conference report on the bill. This colloquy, between the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MCGEE, and the Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE, and the colloquy between the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. FONG, and the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. BAKER, relates their views of the intentions of the House in including the language on impact statements in the bill. Their views did not prevail and the statement by the managers on the part of the House are controlling as to the intent. While the colloquy perhaps presents the opinions of some individual Senators, it in no way alters the directives of the Congress as expressed in the bill nor the conference report or statement on the part of the managers. During the colloquy it was stated that "an appropriation bill cannot alter the text of existing law." Even on this there are exceptions. However, appropriations bills do spell out the purposes for which funds are provided and the conference reports do constitute directives for the executive departments, which are binding. Certainly, the colloquy led by those whose views were not accepted in the conference can in no way constitute a controlling legislative history.

The language on impact statements in the bill states:

> For an amount to provide for the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements as required by section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act on all proposed actions by the Environmental Protection Agency, except where prohibited by law, $5,000,000.

This language is now in the law and must be complied with by the Agency.

CONSUMER PROTECTION PROGRAMS

The conference also agreed to two important provisions in the consumer protection area. The Food and Drug Administration is to conduct a study of the pros and cons of continuing the Delaney clause in its present form. Urgent questions have arisen in regard to the Delaney clause, and because of the importance of this study, the Congress has called for an initial report by January 1, 1974.

The conference also agreed to provide $1,000,000 to the Federal Trade Commission for a study of the energy industry. This study will be modeled on the recently completed study of the petroleum industry. Recent international events have made this study even more urgent, and the Federal Trade Commission should give high priority to initiation of this study.

The bill also provides a total of $2.5 billion for the food stamp program, and $97,123,000 for the special milk program.

PERSONNEL CEILINGS

The conferees were concerned that personnel ceilings might be established by the Office of Management and Budget that might negate the personnel increases provided by the Congress. To prevent this, the conferees directed that the additional personnel provided for fiscal year 1974 shall not be restricted by any personnel or monetary ceiling heretofore or hereafter applied, levied or charged against the Department or Agency and shall be considered an incremental increase in personnel ceiling to be accounted for separately. Also, additional personnel provided for laboratory staffing must be accounted for by laboratory. The conferees also directed that personnel engaged in the preparation of environmental impact statements shall be considered an addition to any personnel ceiling and shall be accounted for separately, including their cost.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, these provisions I have previously discussed all present an expression of congressional intent. The committee expects to follow closely Agency compliance during the coming year.

AN INDEPENDENT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the series of events which included the dismissal of special prosecutor Archibald Cox, the resignations of Attorney General Richardson and his deputy, William Ruckelshaus, and President Nixon's decision to give up the tapes, I called immediately for a new independent special prosecutor

who would not be answerable to the executive branch.

It seemed to me then, as it still does, that essential to the credibility and integrity of the "Watergate" investigation is the ability of the special prosecutor to follow the evidence wherever it may lead and to have available to him the documents and materials he needs in order to pursue this objective without any interference or threat of dismissal.

While, for instance, I can understand President Nixon's reluctance, on the basis of executive privilege, to turn over certain documents to any special prosecutor, it is my own belief that the necessity for an open and complete airing of all of the potential "Watergate" evidence as well as a speedy conclusion of the investigation is of paramount importance and should take precedence over the claims to executive privilege.

An appointment by the President to the post of special prosecutor under the same conditions that Mr. Cox assumed the post is no longer credible, nor would it serve the purpose of restoring confidence in the ability of our system of government to swiftly and fairly pursue justice. President Nixon's nomination of Senator WILLIAM SAXBE to be Attorney General and the naming of Leon Jaworski to be the new special prosecutor do not, in my opinion, reduce the need for this legislation. While I have no doubts about the integrity or ability of either individual, it remains imperative that the special prosecutor be guaranteed the independence he needs by an authority other than the executive branch, for without this sort of guarantee, I do not believe the American people will have the degree of confidence in this investigation that is essential to restoring its credibility. This fact, as much as I regret it, cannot be overlooked.

What has become evident since I first called for an independent special prosecutor, however, is the grave constitutional hurdle which apparently precludes the appointment of a new prosecutor by the Congress or the courts. We cannot afford a lengthy fight over the constitutionality of such a move, as attractive and useful as it might be.

As a result I have been searcing, along with many of my colleagues, for a proposal which, while avoiding any constitutional problems, would guarantee the needed independence of the special prosecutor.

While I did so with some misgivings, last week I cosponsored a resolution authored by Congressman BILL COHEN which called for the appointment of a new special prosecutor by a newly appointed Attorney General. A pledge for complete independence for the prosecutor would be a condition for confirmation of the Attorney General nominee and the special prosecutor would have been subject to Senate confirmation.

I cosponsored the bill to indicate my support for the reestablishment of the post of special prosecutor as well as my support for a stance for the position which I perceived to be stronger than existed previously. Frankly, the bill was deficient in that, in my opinion, sufficient independence was not guaranteed.

In an attempt to find a proposal that sufficiently guaranteed the independence of the special prosecutor, I learned of the proposal made last week by Senator CHARLES PERCY.

After reviewing it, I find that it more closely parallels my position than does the Cohen proposal and for that reason I am introducing it today.

In essence, Senator PERCY proposes that Congress, by statute, establish the Office of Spcial Prosecutor and Deputy Special Prosecutor. The President retains the right to nominate the individuals for those positions subject, however, to the advice and consent of the Senate. Furthermore, and most importantly, the bill specifies that removal from those positions can be accomplished only if Congress concurs and on the basis of three specified conditions—malfeasance in office, neglect of duty, or violation of the act creating the office.

Clearly, the adoption of this proposal gives the necessary strength to the special prosecutor, enabling him to pursue the "Watergate" investigation without the threat of interference or dismissal because of any effort he might undertake to obtain all evidence and documents needed for his inquiry—regardless of their source, Presidential or not.

By his action last week it is clear the President recognizes the need for a new special prosecutor. I regret that at this moment it appears he does not recognize the need for giving that individual the autonomy undeniably needed to assure the confidence of the American people in the integrity and credibility of his work.

It is with considerable pain and sorrow that I have been forced to conclude that the informal assurances given by the President—that is, achieving a consensus of support from congressional leaders before dismissing the newly appointed special prosecutor—will not suffice in this instance. Stronger action is called for and needed.

This Nation cannot afford any lengthy period of uncertainty as to the ability of our system of government to assure that justice, speedily achieved, will be done in this instance. The "Watergate" case has lingered on the domestic political scene far too long alreday. While it never will be put "behind us," for it is indelibly stamped in our history books, let us insure that those same history books are not forced to record a story of an inability to swiftly bring to justice those responsible for this sordid affair.

Let it be demonstrated that in this crisis we as a nation moved in a timely but decisive manner to remove the sores on the body politic—acted responsibly to restore the integrity of government—and moved swiftly to bring justice.

CITIZENS DENIED DUE PROCESS

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 1973, attorneys for Citizens for Community Schools, a countywide organization in Prince Georges County, Md., supported by voluntary donations, filed a petition with the U.S. Supreme Court seeking review of the forced busing decree imposed upon the children in the Prince Georges County school system. The essence of the appeal was that the citizens of Prince Georges County had been denied due process of law in that a trial had not been held on the question of whether segregation existed in the county's school system. Further, Judge Frank Kaufman's order in the U.S. District Court of Maryland, in my opinion, exceeded constitutional limits set by the U.S. Supreme Court in other cases. Shortly afterward, a petition for review was also filed by the attorney for the school board.

The Supreme Court today refused to review the case, and thus ends the courtroom battle to reverse what I believe to be a gross miscarriage of justice.

Although I have applauded the orderly manner in which the Prince Georges County citizens obeyed the busing order and sought to overturn it through the legal process, I have from the outset recognized that legislative action in this area is needed.

I am still of this opinion and have been working with my colleagues in Congress toward this objective. I am on the executive committee of the bipartisan Busing Strategy Committee of House Members seeking a solution to forced busing through legislative action in Congress.

It has now been 9 months since Judge Kaufman's order was implemented on virtually 30-days' notice. One could ask what has been accomplished in that period.

Concrete information is not readily available. Some data may not have been compiled; other data may be subject to analysis after the election of the school board tomorrow. But what is available does not appear optimistic for tohse who favor racial balancing through busing as contrasted with the neighborhood school.

At least it does appear that there have been some obvious and concrete results of the busing order of Judge Kaufman.

First. School hours now start as early as 7:30 a.m. and conclude as late as 4:30 p.m. This means that with busing, mothers may be required to have their children at the bus stops shortly after 6:30 a.m., and they may return home as late as 5:30 p.m. Mothers with children at several levels need much patience in meeting the new and varied bus times.

Second. At least 12,000 additional students were bused for the first time. The order added approximately 60 buses, so that the Prince Georges County schoolbus fleet now totals over 800. This is about six times the number of total public buses operating in Prince Georges County.

Third. Gasoline consumption for the additional buses certainly does not help the energy crisis. Gasoline consumption has increased probably 20 to 40 percent. Schoolbuses, because of start/stop operations, get only 5 to 5½ miles per gallon of gas.

Fourth. School attendance for the fall session is down 2,300 below the estimate.

an extraordinary power to the nonregulatory CPA.

The Federal Reserve Board originally did not answer this question concerning appeals, before I included their response in the RECORD. Subsequently, the Federal Reserve Board, with its usual high degree of responsiveness to congressional inquiries, filed with me an answer to this question which I shall share with the Members because of the great importance of this agency to our economy.

Counting the decisions referred to by the Fed as being listed in its 1972 Annual Report, there were 2,430 actual decisions of the Federal Reserve Board last year which could have been appealed by the CPA under all bills except the Fuqua-Brown bill. I say "actual" decisions, because failure to act—inaction—is also an appealable matter by the CPA under all bills except the Fuqua-Brown bill.

Mr. Speaker, to complete the response of the Fed, I now include in the RECORD that agency's answer to my question on the appeal rights of the CPA:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1973.

Hon. DON FUQUA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FUQUA: I am writing in further response to your letter of September 7 regarding agency functions which would be affected by the three bills—H.R. 14, 21 and 564—to establish a consumer protection agency.

I regret that, as you noted in the Congressional Record of October 18, we failed to respond to question #7 of your letter. The failure was inadvertent, and we would have been happy to comply if we subsequently had been requested to do so. Question #7 and our reply follow.

7. Excluding actions designed primarily to impose a fine, penalty or forfeiture, what final actions taken by your agency in calendar year 1972 could have been appealed to the courts for review by anyone under a statutory provision or judicial interpretation?

Answer. The Board of Governors follows the Administrative Procedure Act in its rulemaking proceedings. This Act provides that persons with legal standing may seek judicial review of an agency's final actions. Therefore, the final rulemaking actions described on pp. 67–96 of the Board's Annual Report for 1972 (previously furnished) would be subject to such review. In addition, the 23 actions on bank mergers described on pp. 210–11 of the Annual Report would also be subject to judicial review. Page 211 also contains a table listing the number of applications acted on by the Federal Reserve with regard to bank holding companies, and a reference to the fact that 36 determinations were made by the Board in accordance with sec. 4(a)(2) of the Bank Holding Company Act. All of these actions would be subject to court review.

The Board in 1972 approved 80 applications by member banks for permission to establish branches in foreign countries and overseas areas of the United States (Annual Report p. 213). Also in 1972, the Board issued final permits to 10 corporations to engage in international or foreign banking or other international or foreign financial operations. Finally, actions described on p. 214 of the Annual Report were taken under delegated authority in 1972.

All of the above-mentioned actions would be subject to judicial review on appeal of plaintiffs with legal standing.

I hope the foregoing information will prove helpful to you. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. CARDON,
Assistant to the Board.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON EXECUTIVE INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, to date some 44 separate measures, including my own bill, have been introduced in the House of Representatives calling for the creation of an independent special Watergate prosecutor. However, the whole question of Congress providing for the appointment of a new special prosecutor is fraught with constitutional difficulties and ambiguities. It was just such constitutional considerations that Archibald Cox, ousted special Watergate prosecutor, voiced recently on a television interview. On NBC's "Meet the Press," Cox stated:

But I have to say in honesty that there is room for argument on the other side (of the constitutionality of the judicially-appointed prosecutor) and the Congress will have to consider whether it is worth running the risk because if it is unconstitutional there would be further risk that indictments would be thrown out and justice would never be done.

Cox has since modified his concern over the constitutionality of proposals requiring the chief judge of the U.S. district court here to appoint a successor to the post Cox formerly held; however, he still admits that such action by Congress may be infringing on some constitutional prerogatives of the Executive. Acting Attorney General Robert H. Bork also told a Senate committee recently he believes there are constitutional problems surrounding a court appointed independent prosecutor.

For example, the Constitution expressly provides that the prosecution of criminal offenses is an executive function. Since all Executive powers are vested in the President, it is unclear whether Congress has the authority to authorize the appointment of a new special prosecutor.

If Congress does provide for the appointment of a new special prosecutor, this could result in a serious constitutional crisis between the President and the Congress.

According to James Madison, the President is impeachable only if he fails to properly superintend these executive functions. However, this is a difficult matter to prove since all investigations are, in effect, controlled by the President. This is a little like delegating the fox to investigate a theft in the chickenhouse, and is an open invitation for a whitewash or coverup, rather than a serious investigation of the facts.

In an effort to eliminate such constitutional problems and in the interest of creating a clearly defined process by which Congress and the judiciary can independently investigate serious allegations of Executive malfeasance, I have introduced an amendment to the U.S. Constitution entitled "The Executive Investigation and Prosecution Amendment." This amendment authorizes Congress "to appoint or provide for the appointment of a civil officer of the United States who shall have all executive powers necessary to undertake criminal prosecutions against the President, Vice President, and all other civil officers of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the approach that I am offering today is a reasonable and responsible approach to a problem of grave national concern. I have no illusions regarding the fact that the passage of a constitutional amendment is a lengthy and arduous process. While it is doubtful that this amendment could be passed and ratified in time to be applicable today, it is clear that such a constitutional change is necessary in order to preserve the integrity of our whole legal system in this country in the future.

POSITION REGARDING IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of Tuesday, October 23, I returned to Washington after having spent the weekend in my New Mexico district and was questioned by a colleague about a story in the Monday, October 22, Washington Post to the effect that I was one of 25 Members of Congress who had indicated support of a move to impeach the President following the firing of the special Watergate prosecutor and resignations of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned over this report, because I had not made any such statements either in New Mexico or in Washington. At my instruction, my press aide determined that report was based on an Associated Press story carried by the wire service on October 21 and 22 and written by Michael Putzel of the Washington, D.C., bureau.

My press aide contacted Mr. Putzel to determine the source of his report since I have never been interviewed by, or for that matter had any conversation with Mr. Putzel. He was told that the story was based on a report filed by the New Mexico Bureau of Associated Press. Because I knew that I had not made any statement calling for the President's impeachment, I asked for a copy of the report filed by the New Mexico Bureau and immediately contacted the Albuquerque Bureau of the Associated Press.

Since I had been in New Mexico to attend the annual convention of the New Mexico Press Association and I knew that no such statement had been carried by the New Mexico news media, I was not surprised when the New Mexico Associated Press staff denied writing any story indicating support on my part of impeachment of the President.

On October 21, the New Mexico Associated Press quoted me as stating that

I was "completely baffled" by the incident and that—

Congress will have to re-evaluate the situation and determine what is really going on in the executive branch.

On October 22, the New Mexico Associated Press wire reported:

Runnels, like the others (of the New Mexico delegation), declined to make a firm commitment in favor of impeachment, saying he would return to Washington and study the reaction further before joining an impeachment move.

United Press International's New Mexico Bureau on October 22 also quoted me as stating that I wanted to return to Washington to study the matter further before making any decision on my position.

On October 24, Mr. Putzel advised my press aide that he was unable to find any information in his files to support the story carried on the Associated Press wires.

Mr. Putzel, at my request has written a letter admitting that his news report was inaccurate and I submit the letter for the RECORD:

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1973.

Hon. HAROLD L. RUNNELS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RUNNELS: Your aide, Larry Morgan, informed me of your concern after reading your name on a list of House members who had indicated support for initiation of proceedings leading to impeachment of the President.

I compiled the list from numerous statements collected by our bureaus around the country and inadvertently added your name. The operative portion of your statement as sent to us from New Mexico said: "I think that with this condition (the firing of Cox and resignation of Richardson), Congress will have to re-evaluate the situation and determine what is really going on in the executive branch."

Whether I misinterpreted that statement or accidently placed it in the wrong stack of messages when making up the list, I simply don't remember. But I regret the inaccuracy.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL PUTZEL.

THE HONORABLE RAY J. MADDEN

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay tribute to one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, a man who has been elected to Congress 16 consecutive terms and who now occupies the significant and powerful position of chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House.

I refer, of course, to our beloved colleague, the distinguished Representative from the First Indiana District, the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN.

I should add, also, that, with his 16 terms of service, Mr. MADDEN is the dean of the Indiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

I take this particular time, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to RAY MADDEN, because only a few days ago occurred an event which, I know, meant a great deal to RAY and to all of us from Indiana who take pride in his achievements, the official unveiling of his portrait, which will now hang in the chambers of the Rules Committee.

Evidence of the high regard RAY MADDEN has earned by his service in the House was the presence on this occasion of both the distinguished former Speaker of the House, the Honorable John McCormack of Massachusetts, and the distinguished present Speaker of the House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, who said of RAY MADDEN:

You are one of the great Congressmen of your generation and one of the great Americans of all times.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of three articles concerning the unveiling of Mr. MADDEN's portrait.

The articles were published in the Indianapolis Star, the Gary Post-Tribune, and the Gary Herald.

The articles follow:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Oct. 26, 1973]

"MEANER GAVEL, PRETTIER SMILE"—MADDEN IN ELEGANT "HANGING"

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—They had an elegant hanging for Representative Ray J. Madden (D-Ind.) last night.

It all happened in the Carl Vinson room of the Rayburn House Office Building.

And it was the congressman's portrait, not himself, that got hung.

The portrait was painted by William Joseph Sabol, a soft-spoken and gentle-mannered artist from Hammond, Ind., who financed his education working as a machinst in a steel mill.

The unveiling of the picture, which will hang in the House Rules Committee chamber where Madden presides as chairman, was the occasion for sentimental speeches and praise for the 81-year-old dean of Indiana's congressional delegation.

Representative Richard Bolling (D-Mo.) presided over the ceremony and Madden's longtime friend, the Rev. Joseph B. Collins, S.S., of the Catholic University of America, pronounced the invocation.

Peter Calacci, president of the Lake and Porter County Central Labor Mission (AFL-CIO), made the presentation. The unions paid for the commissioning of the portrait.

Madden's grand nephew, a Georgetown University law student, unveiled the picture.

Speaker Carl Albert (D-Okla.) declared he owed Madden a "debt of undying gratitude" for the co-operation given him in "my infant days as speaker of the House." He called Madden "one of the great congressmen of this generation and one of the great Americans of all time.

Madden declared, "I haven't had so many verbal bouquets thrown at me since I missed getting married."

Former Speaker John M. McCormack (D-Mass.) described Madden as "a man of wisdom and prudence." He said Madden was marked for a place on the powerful rules committee he now leads "from the day he came to the House."

Representative John Young (D-Tex.), who vowed Madden had already served in Congress longer than he had lived some 30 years ago, took a careful look at the Sabol portrait. His conclusion was that above all, it caught Madden's youthful looks and his beneficent smile.

"Nobody has ever swung a meaner gavel with a prettier smile," Young declared.

Representative David Martin (R-Neb.), the ranking GOP member of Madden's committee, said it was the years Madden spent at Omaha, Neb., that have produced his vigor and assured his success.

For his part, Madden viewed his career in Congress as an experience that could come only in America. He recalled that he had served on the old Naval Affairs Committee with a lanky Texan named Lyndon Johnson, and later was a member of the Education and Labor Committee with John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson—both future presidents.

"I frequently make speeches to high school students," Madden said, recommending speeches to future voters as an excellent thing for his young colleagues. "Recently I spoke at Hammond High School and one of the students asked me why—if I had a way of serving with future presidents—that Hubert Humphrey and George McGovern didn't have the foresight to serve on a committee with me."

Madden's colleagues from both sides of the aisle crowded into the spacious Carl Vinson room for the unveiling ceremony. Among those attending were a number of former members who returned for the occasion.

Also proudly observing the proceedings was Madden's older sister, Sister Daniel, a Roman Catholic nun now living in a retirement home of her order in Minnesota. She was accompanied by two cousins, Sister Agnes Clair and Sister Columbine.

Madden said his sister, who received a standing ovation, had bossed him since childhood and only recently had admonished him when he visited her and spoke to her order, "Now, don't talk too long."

[From the Post-Tribune, Oct. 26, 1973]

GALA HAILS MADDEN

(By Ed Zuckerman)

WASHINGTON.—In a ritual reserved for special occasions, Rep. Ray J. Madden of Gary was formally ordained Thursday as a full member in the highest circle of congressional power.

The investiture ceremony was during the official unveiling of Madden's portrait, which will hang forever in the chambers of the House Rules Committee where the Indiana Democrat this year became chairman.

With a stenographer recording every word for a permanent record, organized labor and two speakers of the House paid unrestrained tribute to the 81-year-old congressman, who was born in Waseca, Minn., and has been elected to 16 House terms from Northwest Indiana.

"You are one of the great congressmen of your generation and one of the great Americans of all times," declared House Speaker Carl Albert, D-Okla.

"His philosophy of government was the same as mine and when we were in disagreement, there was no disagreeableness. I always found him fighting on the side of progressive legislation," eulogized the venerable former House Speaker John McCormack, D-Mass.

"I haven't had so many verbal bouquets thrown at me since I missed getting married a few years ago," mused the veteran bachelor from Gary in grateful response. "This is an event that happens once in a lifetime to very few people in this nation."

Partisan politics were absent from the walnut-paneled Carl Vinson Room in the Rayburn Office Building. Coming at a time when presidential impeachment and Watergate-related scandals are the leading conversational topics, the hour of flowery rhetoric avoided President Nixon's name.

The President's name was brought up only when Madden, in telling the greatness of American political tradition, recalled the day in 1948 when two freshmen congressmen—John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon—both took their seats on the House Education and Labor Committee where Madden was already a member.

Marking the significance of the occasion,

House Minority Leader and vice president-designate Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., circulated among the crowd of Madden supporters at a post-ceremony reception shaking hands and having his photograph taken with several of the Gary Democrat's friends—despite Madden's repeated calls in recent days for President Nixon's impeachment and for delaying Ford's vice presidential confirmation.

Joining in the tributes to Madden were AFL–CIO President George Meany and United Steelworkers of America President I. W. Abel. Although the two labor leaders were unable to attend, both sent personal envoys to read their statements into the record.

In his message, Meany credited Madden for his "long and illustrious congressional career . . . he has been helpful in promoting and perfecting the rights of American working men."

Added Abel's spokesman: "USW members hold Ray Madden in very high esteem."

Both McCormack and Albert stressed the important and unique role the House Rules Committee fills in the scheme of Congress.

"It is said," McCormack emphasized, "that the Rules Committee is the political arm of the speaker."

The retired Massachusetts Democrat said members of the panel are carefully screened by the speaker and "from the day Ray Madden came to the House, he was marked by the leadership for a committee appointment of responsibility . . . he was marked for the Rules Committee when the first opportunity came."

Albert called the Rules panel, which sets the debating ground rules for every important piece of legislation and has the power to kill legislation by refusing to grant a rule, "an institution within the House which is almost a concentrated image of the House itself . . . it deals with the entire legislative business of the House and this group must have an unimpaired national feeling."

Albert added that membership of the important panel "must be reserved for very strong and fearless House members." While Congress is filled with outstanding people, the committee "must be made up of more than ordinary outstanding members," he said.

The Oklahoma Democrat, who is second in line to the presidency until a vice presidential nomination wins congressional approval, noted that "during the depression, many of my relatives left Oklahoma and went to the industrial Northwest Indiana in search of employment."

"I've been to the district and it warmed the cockles of my heart to mingle among his constituents and learn how much they love and respect this man."

[From the Herald, Oct. 31, 1973]

TOP TRIBUTE TO MADDEN

(By Teddie Razzini)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—During a congressional ceremony, reserved only for special occasions, Rep. Ray J. Madden, D–Ind., was formally inducted into the highest circle of congressional power.

The occasion was the official unveiling of Madden's portrait, which will now hang in the chambers of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

A Speaker of the House, a former Speaker, leaders of organized labor, and the county chairman of his home district paid high tribute to Madden, who—this year—became chairman of what is considered the most powerful committee of the House. Born in Waseca, Minnesota and educated in Omaha, Nebraska, Madden has been elected to 16 terms in the House by his constituents in Northwest Indiana.

Speaker of the House Rep. Carl Albert, D–Okla., addressing the 81-year-old First District Congressman directly, said: "You have been and are one of the greatest Americans of all time."

Personal remarks were also directed to the honoree by former House Speaker John McCormack, D–Mass., when he said that ". . . he (Madden) was always concerned with the needs of people." Commenting upon their association, "McCormack continued: "His philosophy of government was the same as mine; when we were in disagreement, we were never disagreeable . . . I always found him fighting on the side of progressive legislation. . . ."

Referring to the Rules Committee, Speaker Albert said: "It is an institution within the House, which is a concentrated image of the House itself." Commending Madden as a man worthy of such responsibility, Albert added that ". . . membership of the important panel—reserved for very strong and fearless house members—must be made up of more than outstanding members."

In his comments made during the presentation of the portrait, Lake and Porter Counties AFL/CIO President and United Steelworkers Sub district 2 director Peter Calacci stated: "Congressman Madden has been helpful in promoting and perfecting the rights of American working men . . . organized labor holds Ray Madden in very high esteem . . . he has distinguished himself as a legislator with true compassion for the rights of individuals."

Lake County Democratic Chairman, East Chicago Mayor Robert A. Pastrick paid tribute to Madden as ". . . a man of great concern, with a commitment to his constituents—and to his country. . . . He has always been a credit to the district he represents. . . . Although he is a popular individual, I think it is more important that he is obviously a person in whom people can place their faith and trust. . . . and, during his sixteen terms in congress, he has never betrayed that trust."

The bachelor congressman from Gary thanked all of those present, ". . . and all the people from my district who have seen fit to send me to Washington for sixteen terms. . . . This is an event that happens only once in a life time, and to very few people. . . . I only hope that I can live up to the wonderfully kind things which have been said about me here today."

Partisan politics were removed from the significance of the occasion. House Minority Leader and vice-presidential designate Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., mingled with Democrats and Republicans, alike, taking particular care to single out many of Madden's supporters and friends.

Speaker Albert—second in line to the presidency until a vice-presidential nomination wins congressional approval—spoke warmly of Madden as ". . . a close and trusted friend . . .," commenting that he has visited industrial Northwest Indiana, he said: "I've been to the district, and I've met many of the citizens there. . . . They are warm people. . . . It was a wonderful thing for me to meet with his (Madden's) constituents and to learn how much they love and respect this man."

CARL BALDWIN, DISTINGUISHED JOURNALIST, RETIRES

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1973, Carl R. Baldwin of Belleville, Ill., retired. He thus ended a distinguished journalism career after nearly 50 years of news writing and investigative reporting for the East St. Louis Journal and St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The citizens of East St. Louis and the entire St. Louis metropolitan area can be grateful for Carl's past courageous and conscientious reporting of local crime and corruption in public office. We had a true guardian at his typewriter.

In addition to his reporting, Carl has been a leader in local journalistic societies. He served as president of the St. Louis Press Club from 1969 to 1970 and is currently chairman of the Journalism Foundation of Metropolitan St. Louis.

Carl has taught journalism classes at Southern Illinois University, Washington University in St. Louis, and the University of Missouri. Throughout his career, he has fostered high standards of reporting and writing in younger newspapermen. Our sadness at the end of Carl's career is mitigated by the knowledge that he left something of himself in these young reporters. The valuable influence of Carl Baldwin will be felt for many years in the future.

Carl will now undertake to write a history of the city of East St. Louis. I can think of no one better fitted to that task than the man who covered that city as a reporer for so long and with such dedication.

Mr. Speaker, Carl Baldwin should be an inspiration not only to his colleagues in journalism but to all of us. Carl's devotion to the public good, his unselfish leadership and his true courage are qualities everyone would do well to emulate. Our gratitude and best wishes go with him as he closes a most distinguished career.

At this point, I include an October 21 article which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch highlighting Carl Baldwin's remarkable career:

CARL R. BALDWIN ENDS LONG CAREER ON PAPER

Carl R. Baldwin has just ended a career of 42 years on the Post-Dispatch news staff. It was a career highlighted by war without end on two fronts—against racketeering and corruption in public office, and on crimes against the English language.

He retired Oct. 1, when publication had been suspended because of a strike.

On the first front, he achieved his greatest accomplishment with a long series of stories he started developing in 1951, in which he dug out facts about wholesale shakedowns by labor leaders in the construction industry. As a result, 41 men went to prison.

On the second front, he scored his greatest gains as director of the Post-Dispatch training, beginning in 1966. In that work, he was a teacher in the handling of news and feature stories, primarily for younger newcomers to the staff.

When he stepped out of harness to lead the quiet life with his wife, Rose, in Belleville, their home for many years, he had been a journalist for 48 of his 65 years. He started as a sports writer on space rates for the East St. Louis Journal in his last two years in high school. But he switched to general news a few months after graduation in 1927.

Four years later, he joined the Post-Dispatch. But he was left on the East Side for the next 17 years—"interred," he called it—and so his career as a reporter, writer, editor and teacher of journalism was relatively late in coming to full flower.

He might have considered himself bogged down on the East Side. But life on that side of the river was extremely full in those days, and he was always in the midst of it. He was a police reporter, and violence was his daily

diet. Baldwin was not afraid of gangsters, but he lived in fear of his city editor.

"I had to deliver for him," he says of his first city editor, Ben Reese. "I was a very timid kid. Even after I was out of my teens, it was difficult for me to ask a girl for a date. So it was tough when Reese told me to ask a young woman if she was pregnant when she shot her boyfriend to death in a theater. She said she was, but it turned out that she was not."

Baldwin got one of his best stories in August 1932, when he was covering a violent strike of boilermakers against a pipeline company. The company had brought in about 400 strikebreakers, and Baldwin heard that the union business agent, Oliver Alden Moore, was going to be killed by gangsters.

Baldwin went to great pains to arrange an interview with Moore. As they were talking in an automobile, with the labor leader's bodyguards standing by, Moore dropped to the floor of the car, saying he had seen some men who were out to get him.

Baldwin finished the interview. Forty-five minutes later, Moore was mowed down by machine-gun fire from the rear of a passing truck. Baldwin filled two pages of the next day's Post-Dispatch, and Reese gave him a $5 bonus—a day's pay.

Baldwin was still an East Side reporter when he was drafted into the Navy in 1943. For the next two years, he was a Seabee in the Pacific.

One of his duties on Guam was to read the nightly news on the radio, and that job helped him in his writing. For the first time, he had to write words to be spoken. This tended to make him write more smoothly.

In the training program, he could call the tune. And he never tired of trying to teach the young men and women the advantages of organizing information into sentences that would be easy on the ear if spoken—and easy also on the eyes and mind.

It was late in his career that he made direct use of the spoken word by extending his fields of interest. He developed an easy presence in front of a microphone, which helped him as president of the St. Louis chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society (1964–66), as president of the Press Club (1969–70), and as chairman of the Journalism Foundation of Metropolitan St. Louis, a job he has agreed to keep until a successor can be found.

In a tape recording made recently for this article, Baldwin looked back over his nearly half-century of newspapering and ventured a few conclusions.

"Newspapermen run into so much corruption, occasionally in their own field, that they can become awfully embittered," he said. "They have to take the attitude that poor man just isn't far enough away from the ape. That's the only way to retain sanity.

"We can't become too personally involved. We have to stand off a bit and have a certain amount of compassion. One thing I've always tried to tell my students. They should be incensed at wrongdoing and go after the crooks. I tell them they'll find that they can't change the world very much, but they can make it uncomfortable for some people who deserve that uncomfortable feeling.

"I've contributed to sending 41 men to prison, getting a lawyer (a state's attorney) suspended, forcing a United States Attorney to quit because he failed to pay income tax or questionable income, getting a United States marshal fired, and helping a grand jury get indictments against two mayors, an ex-sheriff, the state's attorney and high-ranking policemen on the East Side. I have no regrets for any of this, because I think the bastards had it coming to them."

Baldwin has taught journalism classes at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and at Washington University. He now teaches at the University of Missouri at St. Louis, where he will continue until December. Then he will devote full time to further work on a history of East St. Louis.

Speaking of his university students, as well as those of his classes in his own "Baldwin U." at the Post Dispatch, he said he had been "happy to share my experience with these young people—to give them some short cuts that I had to learn on my own.

"When one of them does something good, I can see something of myself in it, and that is a great satisfaction. In a way, I suppose it gives a measure of immortality, to be a little boastful about it. I just hope I can go on helping young people develop. I always tell them the worst part of the newspaper business and try to persuade those who are not cut out for it to get out before it breaks their heart."

Baldwin likes young persons. He understands their language but makes one requirement above all—that they be able to write his, which is English.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR A SPECIAL PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the country finds itself confronted with a situation which no one ever believed could occur; a dual vacancy in both the Office of President and the Office of the Vice President. With more than 3 years remaining in the current Presidential term if President Nixon should resign, under present law the Office of the President would be filled by a person not elected to that position by the people, and the Office of the Vice President likewise. The prescribed order of succession is adequate for short periods of time or provided the President is elected by the people, such as was the case which Truman and Johnson became President as they were both elected as Vice Presidents.

I find in discussing the matter of impeachment of President Nixon that one of the difficult questions to be considered is the prospect of Congress bringing about the nonelected succession to the Presidency, because in this instance the elected Vice President has already resigned in disgrace. Under these circumstances, the only proper course is to not have Congress be required to make a choice between unacceptable alternatives but to let the people make a determination on who shall be President.

I believe under these unusual circumstances we should call for a special election of a new President and Vice President. By doing this we will be furthering the democratic system rather than superimposing our will on the electorate. Rather than creating more disunity, an election will tend to unify the people after this traumatic experience.

If we accept the proposition that a special election is the best solution to the current dilemma, the next issue involves the procedures for conducting one. My analysis indicates that the best way to hold a special election would be to amend our Constitution for that purpose.

Presently, the Constitution in article II, section 1, provides that—

> The Congress may by law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

Thus, it is possible for Congress to pass—with the President's signature or by overriding a veto—a statute prescribing a special election in the current situation. Because of another constitutional provision, however, there is substantial reason to believe that any such election must be for a full 4 years. Article I, section 1 of the Constitution specifically states of the President:

> He shall hold his Office during the Term of four years . . .

Because of this requirement, if a special Presidential election were held in 1975, subsequent Presidential elections would be held in 1979, 1983, 1987, and so on.

Clearly, to provide for a special election by mere statutory law instead of a constitutional amendment would cause a basic disruption in our historic election process. Instead of running with candidates for the House and Senate, the Presidential candidates might have to run separately in an odd-numbered year. Only by passing a constitutional amendment limiting the term of a President elected in any special election to the remaining years of the term then current, could we guarantee that such disruption would be prevented.

There is, of course, the objection that a constitutional amendment is difficult to obtain and would require too much time to resolve the existing crisis. I believe, however, that a proper amendment could be passed by the Congress this year and then ratified by the required number of States early next year. Wide public and political support exists for an alternative to decreeing a nonelected President for as long as 3 years. Wide public and political support exists for letting the people decide who will be their President and Vice President. An amendment could be enacted swiftly in the States, perhaps in less than a month.

Most State legislatures will convene in January, 1974. Only five States definitely are not scheduled to meet next year, Alabama, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and Oregon, and the unique need for action on a constitutional amendment might prompt special sessions even in those States. Thirty-five States will hold annual sessions. In five of these States, Colorado, Connecticut, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the even-year sessions are limited to budget and fiscal matters, but here again, given the extraordinary circumstances, the possibility exists that legislators then meeting could find a way to take up an amendment. Six States, Arkansas, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, and Vermont, which meet only in odd years may split the session so they can meet in 1974 as well. Ohio is required by law to hold the second session and the five others will probably meet in 1974, although the Arkansas legislature may meet only in order to adjourn sine die. Maine, which meets only in odd years, appropriated only enough funds for 1 year but will reconvene in 1974 and the legislature can determine the subjects

which will be dealt with. Texas is voting this week on a constitutional amendment to provide for annual sessions and if the amendment passes its legislature may convene in 1974. Washington probably will meet, at the call of the Governor. Since action by only 38 States is required to ratify an amendment to the Constitution, I believe there is reasonable assurance that this number can be obtained early in 1974 if Congress acts quickly on this amendment.

In order to provide a means for Congress to take up the special election alternative, I am today introducing legislation to amend the constitution. This amendment would provide for a special election if a vacancy exists in both the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, and a year or more remains in the term. Under the amendment, States would provide for the qualification of Presidential and Vice-Presidential nominees within 30 days of the creation of the Presidential vacancy, with the special election being held within an additional 30 days thereafter.

Following this nomination and campaign period, totaling 60 days, the electoral college would meet within 5 days to certify results. The President and Vice President would be inaugurated within 10 days thereafter. Within 75 days we could have a newly elected President and Vice President which is what I believe the people want.

In the interim between the Presidential vacancy and the inauguration of a new President for the remainder of the term, the House Speaker would serve as acting President. If a vacancy existed in the Speakership, which is unlikely, the officer next in order of succession under existing law would act as President. Upon inauguration of a new President, the officer would resume his former position.

My amendment would make as little change in the existing Presidential election system as possible. It confers authority on Congress to carry out the provisions by legislation, as is the case in existing law. An accompanying bill would set forth a special election system similar to the existing system for holding regular Presidential elections, only confined to the 60-day time frame.

My amendment and bill envision the two national political parties adopting procedures to select a nominee. It could be by the delegates to the previous national convention or by the national committee. States would be authorized to permit third/fourth party names to be placed on the Presidential and Vice-Presidential ballot in accordance with their own law and within the constitutional time frame.

I believe this legislation is the most desirable and feasible method of restoring public confidence in the Presidency, should a dual vacancy occur. It is based on the people choosing the President rather than having a President in office for as long as 3 years under a nonelective process. It avoids the constitutional pitfalls of the statutory approach.

It seems to me that this legislation should be taken up by the Congress on an expeditious basis regardless of each of our views on impeachment so that the American people will be assured of an election whenever feasible for the Office of President should a vacancy occur in that Office at the same time that there exists a vacancy in the Office of the Vice President. To enable my colleagues to examine the proposal in specific detail, I have attached the text of the constitutional amendment and accompanying bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

H.J. RES. 811

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for an election for the office of President and the office of Vice President in the case of a vacancy both in the office of President and the office of Vice President.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

"Article —

"Section 1. In case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives or, in the case of a vacancy in the office of Speaker, such other officer as the Congress may declare, shall act as President until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

"Section 2. In case there is one year of more remaining in the then current Presidential term, each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors for President and Vice President equal to the number of Senators and Representatives to which the State is entitled in the Congress. The electors shall meet in their respective States and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

"Section 3. The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes. The time of choosing the electors shall be the same throughout the United States and shall be not later than sixty days after the Speaker of the House of Representatives or such other officer as the Congress declares assumes the powers and duties of the office of President, or no later than sixty days after the ratification of this article in case an officer of the United States is acting as President at the time of such ratification because of the removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President. Each State shall provide that a person who seeks to be elected President or Vice President as provided by this article shall qualify, in such manner as the legislature of the State may direct, no later than thirty days before the close of the sixty-day period which applies as provided by this section.

"Section 4. A person elected President or Vice President as provided by this article shall hold his office until the expiration of the then current Presidential term. If the then current Presidential term is less than two years, a person elected President as provided by this article may be elected President two other times; otherwise he may be so elected one other time.

"Section 5. If the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives acts as President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, may resume the powers and duties of his office after the election of a President as provided by this article.

"Section 6. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

H.R. 11284

A bill to amend section 19 of title 3, United States Code, to provide for an election for the office of President and the office of Vice President in the case of vacancies in both the office of President and the office of Vice President

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 19 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) If, in any case in which there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of the President, there is one year or more remaining in the then current Presidential term, then electors of the President and Vice President shall be appointed or chosen in the several States on the sixtieth day after the beginning of the period during which any individual acts as President under this section, or in any other manner directed by the Constitution.

"(h) The electors of the President and Vice President appointed or chosen under subsection (g) shall meet and give their votes on the tenth day after they are appointed or chosen.

"(i) The term for which a President or Vice President is elected under this section shall be for the unexpired portion of the then current Presidential term and shall commence on the tenth day after the electors of the President and Vice President meet and give their votes under subsection (h)."

Sec. 2. Section 19(c) and section 19(d)(2) of title 3, United States Code, are amended by striking out "the expiration of the then current Presidential term" and inserting in lieu thereof "a President shall be elected".

Sec. 3. The item relating to section 19 in the table of sections for chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code, and the caption of section 19 of title 3, United States Code, are amended by inserting immediately after "act" the following: "; special election".

Sec. 4. Sections 1, 7, and 101 of title 3, United States Code, are amended by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided by section 19, the".

CONGRESS OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT TWO GRAVE MISTAKES

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in voting to override the veto of House Joint Resolution 542, Congress will have an opportunity to correct two grave mistakes—the mistake of having allowed our constitutional responsibilities in the area of war powers to be eroded, and the mistake the President made in his bases for the veto.

On the first point, there is almost unanimous agreement that it is past time for Congress to reassume the powers granted in article I, section 8, of the Constitution; and to limit the President to those set forth in article II, section 2. House Joint Resolution 542 clarifies those powers, without lessening the authority of either branch of our Government.

Our Nation has spent too many years and too many lives in recent times in undeclared wars conducted by the executive

branch and unchecked by the legislative branch. This legislation is not aimed maliciously at the present occupant of the White House; it is intended to draw upon the experience of past years to prevent future Congresses' shirking war-making and peacekeeping duties, and to insure that future Chief Executives do not exceed constitutional limits of authority.

It is ironic that opponents of the legislation include liberals arguing that too much power is given to the Executive, and conservatives fearful that the President would be unable to act in emergency situations. In fact, neither charge is justified.

The veto message alleges that the President would have been unable to respond as he did during the Mideast crisis last month. That simply is not true. Had House Joint Resolution 542 been law, the President could have taken exactly the same steps he took in ordering the alert and deploying the ships. What he could not have done under the resolution—and did not do without it, in this case—was to have ordered our troops into combat for more than 60 days without Congress' consent. If there had been danger of troop safety involved in the 60-day withdrawal, he would have had an additional 30 days to complete the pullback.

The question arises: Should he be able to ignore Congress and catapult us into another Vietnam by Executive order, or should Congress assert its constitutional responsibility for declaring war?

Enactment of House Joint Resolution 542 will assure Congress part in such serious decisions, by requiring the President to report to Congress within 48 hours, and to withdraw the troops from hostilities within 60 days in the absence of a congressional directive to the contrary.

The veto message has interpreted this as Congress being able to force the President into troop withdrawal merely by taking no action. That interpretation is not only misleading, it is false.

There are provisions whereby any resolution of approval or disapproval of the President's action must be acted upon within clearly defined time limits, and an "up and down" vote taken. Consequently, if one Member of the House or Senate introduced a resolution to permit the President to extend the troop commitment beyond the 60-day period, that resolution would have to receive priority consideration by both House and Senate.

Is the current President afraid that he would be unable to persuade even 1 of 535 Members of Congress to introduce a resolution of approval? If not one Member agreed with his position, what does that say about his position? Such a situation is extremely unlikely, however.

Or is the fear that, once brought to the floor, he could not get a simple majority of both Houses to agree with him? If more than half the American people's elected representatives are opposed to keeping our men in combat, should the President be alowed to do so—again?

The veto message claims that this legislation would take away constitutional authorities that the President has exercised for 200 years. It would not take away any authorities granted by the Constitution to either branch. It would establish an orderly procedure for both branches, with the President able to react swiftly in emergencies, with the Congress advised of the emergency conditions, but with Congress the properly assigned decisionmaker on a state of war. What it does take away is the bold assumption of powers of past administrations to carry on secret bombings and open battles with no congressional curbs.

It is true that Congress can refuse to appropriate money, but we have been notoriously reluctant to do so. And, we have seen attempts at restraint vetoed, then sustained by barely over a third of the membership of one House.

Which brings us to another of the veto message objections: The use of the nonvetoable concurrent resolution to require the President to disengage troops. The President, naturally, wants to veto attempts to stop what he has started, and then to rely on the fact that he would stand a good chance of holding the one-third-plus-one membership on his side—this is, by the way, a contradiction to the earlier premise that he could not obtain support for introduction of a resolution—or is it that he thinks he could win a third of the membership to his view, but not a majority?

The veto protests are groundless again. Far from being "an action which does not normally have the force of law" there is sound precedent for use of the concurrent resolution to end an authorization, as legal and constitutional experts have testified. In recent years, concurrent resolutions were provided to bring to an end the Lend-Lease Act, First War Powers Act, Emergency Price Control Act, Stabilization Act of 1942, War Labor Disputes Act, Middle East resolution, and Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

The entire veto message is riddled with such specious statements. I refer my colleagues to the point-by-point reply to the message prepared by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and sent to each of us last week. A close reading of the document indicates either that the administration's credibility gap is open again, or that the President had some bad information about the legislation.

The American people are calling for Congress to assert itself and to assume responsibility. That is what this bill is all about. It is not about a President with personal problems, or about a vindictive Congress, or about granting new powers or taking away old ones. It is, purely and solely, a recognition of a long-standing need to redefine limits and establish clarity in a very murky area. It is not a hastily drawn piece of legislation. It is the result of years of research, study, and revision.

Mr. Speaker, it is a good measure. I urge an override of the veto of House Joint Resolution 542, and a return by the Congress to constitutional responsibility.

INTRODUCTION OF THE JOHN W. McCORMACK SENIOR CITIZEN INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation creating a senior citizen internship program in honor of the former Speaker of the House, John W. McCormack.

At the age of 82, Speaker McCormack is clearly one of America's outstanding senior citizens. He served his country in the House of Representatives for a total of 42 years. For more than 30 of those years he was one of its leaders. At the age of 71 he was elected Speaker and served with distinction in the capacity for 8 years. This was a longer period of continuous service than any other Speaker. Only Speaker McCormack's great friend and predecessor, "Mr. Sam" Rayburn, served as Speaker for a longer period in toto.

What could be more appropriate than to name a program to involve senior citizens in the work of the House after this great American?

The program I propose will provide for the employment in each congressional office of two John W. McCormack senior citizen interns for a 1-week period or one such intern for a 2-week period each year. In addition to introducing the intricate workings of our legislative system to senior citizens in a way never before tried, internship will provide each Member of the House with a new line of communication to a growing and unfortunately all too often neglected segment of the community.

When I first introduced the National Senior Community Service Corps bill in the 89th Congress, I envisioned a program similar to that embodied in the resolution introduced today. In each Congress thereafter I introduced the legislation, and though long delayed, I welcomed its enactment as part of the comprehensive Social Security Amendments of 1973. The community employment concept had been carried on for several years without explicit statutory authorization, and has met with great success providing senior citizens useful and constructive employment serving the community and themselves. There is no reason why a congressional senior citizen internship program should not be equally successful.

It is easy for government to forget its senior citizens, even after they have raised families and worked long hours to provide the best possible future for their children and their Nation. This legislation gives Congress an opportunity to repay our elderly in a small way for their lifelong contribution to our society. The same type of program that enables college students to work in congressional offices can also be used to open up a new line of communication with our aged. We will certainly learn as much from our senior citizen interns as they will from us.

I invite my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring a program that will be a fine tribute not only to a great American but to our senior citizens as well. The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved, That (a) until otherwise provided by law and notwithstanding any other provision of law, each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commis-

sioner from Puerto Rico and the Delegates from the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands are authorized to hire either one additional employee for two weeks in any year, or two additional employees for one week, to be known as John W. McCormack congressional interns in honor of the former Speaker of the House of Representatives. Each such intern shall serve either within the District of Columbia or within the district which the employing Member or Commissioner or Delegate represents. Each Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall have available annually for payment of compensation to such interns a gross allowance of $200, to be payable to each such intern at a rate not to exceed $100 per week, out of the contingent fund of the House.

(b) No person shall be paid compensation as a John McCormack congressional intern who does not have on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, at all times during the period of employment as such intern, an appropriate certificate that such intern is sixty years of age or older and a resident of the district which the employing Member or Commissioner or Delegate represents.

(c) The compensation paid to each such intern shall not affect any other benefits allowed under any other law.

SEC. 2. The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this resolution shall become effective on July 1, 1974.

WORDS OF COMMENDATION FOR THE LOCKHEED C–5A

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a word of commendation for one of this Nation's hardest working, ablest, and yet generally most underrated citizens, the Lockheed C–5A.

We all remember, Mr. Speaker, when this Chamber was a forum for blistering attacks on the C–5A, including everything from charges of large cost growth to claims that the mammoth cargo plane was a technological disaster, to still more charges that it was unable to adequately perform its job.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that cost growth is by no means confined to the C–5A, that at least three other major weapons systems have experienced a higher percentage of cost growth than the C–5A, and that many, many civilian programs, which did not involve developing technology as did the C–5A program, had greater cost growth than did the Lockheed giant.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the C–5A's unique technical advances have been proven time after time to be solid contributions to aviation, from its drive through capability to its highly sophisticated multimode radar with terrain avoidance and terrain following capacity.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the C–5A has demonstrated its ability to perform the job it was designed to do—in natural disasters, in emergencies of all types, in peacetime and in the heat of battle.

Many of those in this Chamber will recall having read of the C–5A's remarkable cargo achievements during the Vietnam war, including the transportation of tanks and helicopters—21 light observation choppers in one load—too large to be carried by any other airplane. Many of you will also recall newspaper accounts of a C–5A ferrying a 74-ton turbine generator from England to Taiwan, of C–5's responding to the terrible Nicaraguan earthquake by flying in outsized water purification units and bulky communications equipment, and of a C–5A which transported large diameter pipe and heavy pumps to Iceland to help stem the destructive lava flow from an active volcano.

The C–5A was in the headlines again last week, Mr. Speaker, as the leading light of the American airlift to beleagured Israel. It is only right that we should be proud of its performance—in sheer tonnage figures alone it stands head and shoulders above any other aircraft involved in either the American or the Russian airlift.

But the performance of the C–5A meant something else beyond simply being able to resupply tiny Israel with material vital to her survival. During the Mideast war, a belligerent Soviet Union threatened to further entrench itself in this most sensitive area, largely at the expense of American interests of cooperation with both Arabs and Israelis. The United States, in the face of a brutal oil shortage this winter and Arab threats of holding their oil hostage for a new American posture in the Mideast, was faced with an imminent decision concerning long and short term goals in the Mideast. This Nation made the determination that we and our NATO allies could not afford to see overt hostile Soviet intervention in what is essentially a regional conflict.

Once that decision was made we responded to the challenge of unilateral Soviet action by offering a realistic deterrent, predicated in large part upon our superior air mobility and capacity. It is important to remember that, at this point in time, the Soviets had already began a massive airlift in an effort to resupply the faltering Arab armies, and it is said that they had up to 50,000 troops prepared to enter the conflict.

It was in this hostile context that the Lockheed C–5A demonstrated conclusively to the Soviet Union that this country has the greatest air mobility of any nation on the face of the earth. Over a period of little more than 2 weeks, 300 round-the-clock sorties of C–5A and C–141 aircraft, averaging 20 missions a day, delivered over 24 million pounds of vital supplies, equipment, tanks and aircraft to tiny Israel. Included in the cargo were F–4 and A–4 fighter aircraft, carried virtually intact in the giant C–5A, air-to-air and air-to-ground missiles, conventional munitions and, of course, heavy tanks.

During a 3-week period the Russians airlifted almost 30 million pounds to the Arab nations. But of key importance is the fact that it took the Russians three times as many sorties—900 in all—to deliver their 15,000 tons of supplies, as it took our C–141's and C–5's to deliver their 12,000-ton load.

Additionally, we must remember that our aircraft involved in this mission were prohibited by most of our European allies from utilizing their landing strips, thus forcing our planes to stop for refueling in the Azores. On the second leg of their trip to the Middle East, American planes had to carry an oversized load of fuel and a smaller amount of cargo than would otherwise have been able to be transported.

With particular reference to the C–5A, it should be noted that the Lockheed giant can carry over four times the load of the other workhorse of the Mideast mission, the C–141, with the C–5A's capacity running at about 130 tons. The closest the Soviet Union can come to this is its AN–22 Cock which can carry between 40 and 60 tons. The other Soviet aircraft which flew Mideast resupply missions, the AN–12 Cub, holds only one-tenth the capacity of the C–5A, or 12 tons.

According to official Pentagon statistics, if we had not had the C–5A during our recent airlift, our C–141's would have had to fly four times as many trips and they still would not have been able to carry some of the oversized cargo which only the C–5A can transport. Falling into this category is the M–60 tank, which weighs in at 105,000 pounds, and jet fighters which must be drastically disassembled before being loaded into a C–141. The C–5A can carry two M–60 tanks at a time and can carry fighter aircraft with a minimum of disassemblage.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why the Russians did not inject their troops into the Mideast is not because we changed their desire to attain the fruits which further entrenchment would have brought them. Nor is it because we changed their moral attitude about interfering in sensitive internal matters of other nations.

It is because the Soviet Union was made fully aware that this country would stand up for her interests in that region, and that this country has the capability to back up that commitment. As we now know, this posture was made possible in large part because of the superior air mobility which the United States had the foresight to create, despite strong pressures to abandon or curtail that plan.

Many are quick to criticize defense systems when things go wrong, but all too often seem to overlook the successful performances of these vital tools. No one could argue that we set high standards for the C–5A, and no one can now deny that this aircraft has met that challenge and succeeded. In view of the fact that this radically new plane, embodying technology on the cutting edge of man's knowledge, has long been under the searching scrutiny of the public limelight and has endured at times frenetic criticism from the press and from this House, I believe it only fair for us publicly to recognize the crucial role this same plane played during the most severe confrontation of United States and Soviet power since the Cuban missile crisis.

Yesterday, it was a crisis in the Middle East. Today it might be in Europe, in South America or anywhere else in the world. Tomorrow it could even be on our own shores. But as long as we have ma-

chines of the C–5A's caliber, Mr. Speaker, we can be assured that the United States will not blink when it stands eye to eye with an opponent and that it will not turn tail and run when its interests are threatened. That is one lesson the world has learned, I believe, from the events of the last week, and for a change, it is a lesson which should give us comfort in the uncertain times ahead.

TIME TO CHANGE THE FISCAL YEAR

(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, I am cosponsoring a bill with Representative MICHEL and others to change the fiscal year in Government to parallel the calendar year. The logic behind such a change is clear and I think persuasive. It has been many years since the work of Congress on authorizations and appropriations has been completed at the beginning of the fiscal year which is now established as July 1. Some bills affecting both authorization and appropriation for the fiscal year do not receive final approval until just before the adjournment of Congress. An adjournment seldom is accomplished until late December.

The result is uncertainty and confusion in the various departments of Government. Most of them now operate after July 1 on the basis of continuing resolutions but with little in the way of clear guidelines to determine their spending levels. Meaningful planning and spending is virtually impossible under these conditions.

As long as it is the end of the year before Congress is able to complete its budget work, the departments will be required to work for half the fiscal year on the confusion which accompanies continuing resolutions. If the fiscal year is changed to begin on January 1, the Congress will have a full year of work ahead in which to complete its budget consideration. This would remove the intolerable situation in which both Congress and the departments now are placed.

There is another aspect. Under the present law, Congress is expected to complete the appropriations processes by June 30. When we take into account that we are appropriating the taxpayers' money in amounts in excess of $200 billion each year, a scant 6 months is barely sufficient for the task.

Departments, on the other hand, also should be able to plan for their needs and the needs of those they serve. In such important areas as housing and defense as well as health care and other vitally important aspects of Federal spending, 6 months in limbo followed by 6 months in fiscal clover is hardly acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this proposal to change the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year. Such a change will serve the best interests of the taxpayers of the United States, the various Government departments and those they are charged to serve, and the Congress whose job it is to make certain only needed expenditures are funded. This proposed change will give us time to do our jobs, a circumstance which does not now exist.

SLAVERY STILL EXISTS

(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, it is shocking to realize that slavery still exists in this modern and supposedly enlightened age. Slavery is an ugly memory of a period many years ago when human beings were chattels to be bought and sold and whose lives were subject to the will of their owners. Yet the custom of slavery is known to have continued to persist and the Christian Science Monitor recently spelled out specific acts of slavery stating that tens of millions of people are held in some form of servitude in at least 40 countries of the world. Three specific examples were listed, and I include them in this statement:

The services of a child reportedly can be bought at £15 (about $37) for 10 years in many Eastern lands from Lebanon to Indonesia.

Fifty schoolgirls from Ghana were officially conceded earlier this year to have been sold to buyers in Lebanon.

Four 16-year-old Asian girls of Persian descent have endured three years of forced marriage to members of the revolutionary council in the East African island of Zanzibar.

Slavery is outlawed in every nation of the world and the United Nations is on record against slavery. In 1956, 85 nations in the U.N. ratified a resolution abolishing slavery. Yet there has been no international policing of the practice of slavery. The only world organization of official stature is the U.N. Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Five representatives of the Subcommission now propose to meet 3 days a year to receive evidence of slavery. However, privately financed and organized antislavery groups, which are active against slavery, are very skeptical that anything will come of these meetings or that the U.N. will take any action against slavery. It has been urged, without avail, that a permanent adviser of world stature be designated by the U.N. to probe slavery full time.

The forms of slavery which still exist include debt bondage, which is reported to be widespread in India and Burma; serfdom, where people are bound to the land, is said to be practiced in Afghanistan and on some large South American estates; exploitation of children is reported in Latin America, the Middle East, West Africa, and Southeast Asia, including Hong Kong; servile forms of marriage in which forced and bought marriages are said to persist in some 30 Islamic and part-Islamic countries.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO ARBOR DAY?

(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, Dr. Joseph E. Howland has written an excellent guest editorial on Arbor Day. It was published in the magazine American Forests in its October 1973 issue. I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO ARBOR DAY?

(By Dr. Joseph E. Howland)

When we were a boy, Arbor Day, the annual tree planting day, was a big event on our school calendar. It had status because, like Thanksgiving Day, it was proclaimed by the Governor. Pupils and teachers cooperated on equal terms. It gave us a sense of importance. And best of all it took us out of doors.

Each year we dug the holes and did the actual planting, watering and staking of one or more trees. In eight years of grammar school this naturally gave us kids a tremendous sense of personal identification with the school's landscaping. The planting was "ours" and so vandalism was unthinkable.

Today the trees we planted when we were young have grown up and are shading new generations. But how many youngsters planted something this past spring? In some communities Arbor Day is still of real significance. But where it is being neglected we are all losers.

Agitation for a more beautiful America has gained tremendous impetus these past few years and conversation has become big news. But it would be a mistake to think of it only in national terms. While we are trying to save the redwoods for the children of America to enjoy "tomorrow" we shouldn't overlook the local park, the parking lot and the schoolyard that they see every day. Arbor Day gives them the chance—*in an organized way*—to discover at firsthand the joy of planting something and watching it grow. For many youngsters, even in suburbia it may be the only time they will plant anything themselves.

We have heard the excuse, more than once, that the school budget did not provide for trees. As far as new buildings go that may be deplorably true. But as far as Arbor Day is concerned it is nonsense. The cost of material is trivial. Parents would be happy to contribute. And it would be a poor sort of garden club or fraternal society that wouldn't jump at a chance to help out.

Why bring it up now when Arbor Day is in April? Because when planting time comes round again it is usually too late to make arrangements. If Arbor Day is being overlooked in your community the time to bring it up at PTA is as soon after Labor Day as possible.

SENATOR McGEE ADDRESSES NATIONAL POSTAL FORUM

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate on October 2 addressed the National Postal Forum in an able address dealing with the Post Office Department and the effects of the Postal Reorganization Act. From his knowledgable position, Senator GALE MCGEE gives a very valuable dissertation upon the whole problem of the quality of our postal service and the manner in which is should be operated. Since Senator MCGEE is an old friend of mine I take particular pleasure in asking that his outstanding address be included in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

REMARKS BY SENATOR GALE McGEE

General Klassen, distinguished guests, I appreciate very much this opportunity to join with representatives of the business community and with the managers of the Postal Service in your discussions leading to cooperative effort. I applaud the spirit of this Forum, a meeting where problems can be explored and solutions sought.

Mr. John Gardner, who has just concluded his remarks, has written that "The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water".

His observation is apt for this occasion. You will recall that the Kappel Commission Report on Postal Reorganization, the report which recommended postal reorganization, was entitled "Toward Postal Excellence."

One of the reasons why the Postal Reorganization Act moved through Congress as rapidly as it did was that it had broad popular support, not only from private enterprise, but from the average citizen who uses the mail chiefly to pay his bills and to write his relatives. You are aware, I'm sure, that the people of this country feel very strongly about not passable, not good, but excellent postal service. They really care about postal excellence, and they expressed their views very vocally to the Congress during those hectic months in 1970 when the Reorganization Act was being hammered out in both Houses. I think that the American people watch the Postal Service as closely as they do because it is something universal; it touches the life of everyone, and it affects the way we feel in general about the efficiency and progressiveness of our society. It has something to do with the way people feel about how things are going and whether they are working right.

Thus, postal excellence is not just the movement of billions of pieces of printed materials through the pipelines we call the delivery system. Indeed no, it is the value we assign to the written word. Without that method of contact, the community is diminished; and if the community is diminished, our theories of brotherhood and of full-scale participatory democracy do not hold water. I'm glad to say that it is my hope that we are now on the way toward providing that kind of service for all mailers, large and small.

What about the plumbing that Mr. Gardner spoke of? In this case, the Postal Service as a system. Do the pipes hold water? I take the name of this gathering quite literally; it is a forum in the particular sense of the word, and it is not advertised as being a mutual admiration society. And so I am confident that it will be appropriate for me to speak plainly about what has happened during the three years which have elapsed since the enactment of the Postal Reorganization Act. No one man can supply the answers to all the problems which have arisen during those three years, but I think we can agree that certain facts have become clearly apparent and that, in order to do anything about them, we must recognize them and reason together on what they mean to the future of the Postal Service in this country.

CHALLENGE FACED BY THE POSTAL SERVICE

As one of the authors of the Act, I can only wish success for the Postmaster General, his staff, the small army of postal employees, and the Postal Service itself. As an American and as a United States Senator charged with certain specific postal responsibilities, I share with the average citizen a strong concern about the liveliness of the postal establishment. The past few years have demonstrated that the Reorganization Act provided no magic formula. True, it marked a milestone in our thinking about how the Postal Service ought to fit into the matrix of our complex society. Nevertheless, some of the problems which plagued us in the late 60's still exist. The hard economic facts controlling the destiny of the Postal Service just won't go away, no matter what the Congress in its wisdom decides about postal reorganization.

Let's consider some of the facts. In 1968 there were some 700,000 postal employees who, under the leadership of a member of the President's Cabinet, were doing a pretty good job of delivering the mail. Today, almost the same number of postal employees, under the leadership of a very able officer who heads an independent government agency, are still doing a pretty good job of delivering the mail. But there is a dramatic difference. Today, those employees are being paid approximately 40% more than they were receiving five years ago. Now, a 40% increase in personnel costs in a labor-intensive industry is bad enough; but let us also realize that all of the Postmaster General's other costs have increased as well—machinery, buildings, vehicles, transportation rates, and fuel.

As businessmen, you know about those costs, Each of you can calculate in his own head how much his own cost of doing business has skyrocketed in the past five years.

Now, these are problems which the Postmaster General faces, and I think we should all recognize them before we cry out in dismay and alarm at the rate increases which he last week recommended to the Postal Rate Commission.

In my view, Ted Klassen has done a very fine job under extreme difficulties. He has altered organization structures, re-emphasized the criterion of service when it was being forgotten in a mad rush to balance the books, and he has dealt with old problems he himself did not create. He has acted forthrightly and with executive dispatch to bring his costs in line and at the same time to try to preserve service standards which Americans expect and deserve. He has made headway in an effort to obtain committed space on airlines so that first-class mail can move by air on dependable schedules. He is making an effective effort to recapture lost parcel post business, and he is looking to the future by acquiring very promising high-speed letter-sorting machines. And I ask you to remember that he is acting under a mandate to bring his enterprise to the break-even point by 1984, and to move the mail within the confines of that mandate. I think he understands as well as you and I that the announcement of an across-the-board postal rate increase is greeted with something less than a warm welcome by the general public and by the business community.

THE CHALLENGES FACED BY THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

The past three years have also revealed some changes in the views of the business community with regard to postal reorganization. I can remember how avidly businessmen in general endorsed the idea of postal reorganization in 1969 and 1970. They reflected a view fairly common at that time that a hard-headed business-oriented management team, goaded by the profit motive, would bring such new efficiency to postal operations that rates would be stabilized. But the controlling economic facts which I cited earlier have apparently changed those views. For example, I have just left an Executive Session of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee at which the Committee's Members were considering a bill strongly advocated by the business community to spread out the time during which some business mailers would be required to pay full postage rates. Essentially, these mailers are asking that the Government continue its subsidy to them for longer than the Postal Reorganization Act stipulates.

I do not consider this request unreasonable. The costs of all major mailers, including postal rates, have risen dramatically during the past few years, and these postal customers seek relief because they believe that their mail matter is of intrinsic benefit to all of the American people and is worthy of subsidy. I cannot say how the Committee, the Senate, or the Congress as a whole will respond to this petition for relief; and I cite this bill simply to show that a substantial segment of the business community now believes that there is a definite place for a government subsidy in our postal planning.

Three years ago the opposite view prevailed. It was strongly maintained that the Congress should get out of the postal rate-making business entirely, that subsidies should in ten years at most be ended for good, and that there was no reason whatever why the Postal Service, like any other big business, should not be able to provide its customers with reasonable rates and at the same time balance revenues with expenditures.

And so, this is one of the problems faced by the business community. I know that the Postmaster General's recently announced increases that he has recommended are substantial—25% for first-class, 38% for second-class, and 22% for third-class. I can only suggest, without endorsing them, that these rates represent the economic facts of life. The Postal Service faces a deficit of some $1.3 billion this fiscal year.

THE CHALLENGE FACED BY THE CONGRESS

I have mentioned the problems faced by the Postmaster General, and I think that I have been able to isolate some of the problems with which you, as large mailers, must in the future come to grips. The Congress, too, shares a large measure of responsibility for how well the Postal Service operates and how effectively it serves your needs. Thus, the Congress has its own problems in connection with this issue. A major question is one typified by the legislation which I just described. What is the responsibility of the Congress when it is asked to subsidize postage?

In an economic crunch such as the kind we face today, it is only natural for business mailers to petition Congress for the kind of aid it used to receive prior to the Reorganization Act. At the same time, I see in the Congress a reluctance on the part of Members to go back to the old days of random rate-making. There is no inclination to turn back the clock. The general Congressional view, as I see it, is that the Postal Rate Commission has shown itself able to assume the rate-making role and that the Commission will continue to serve in the future as the forum in which rate questions will be answered. As for the bill I have described, I see it as a unique case—almost an emergency measure. The need is there and it is urgent. How Congress will respond I do not know.

Nothing, of course, is final. The Congressional view as I have represented it may change as it has in the past. Perhaps in the years ahead, Congress will conclude that, in the public interest, a continuing subsidy should be authorized; that the break-even ideal, so avidly advocated three years ago, must be abandoned. I hope not. As an author of postal reorganization, I believed in the underlying precepts of the Reorganization Act. I still do, and I want the present system to work.

The problems that I have outlined represent formidable challenges for all of us. The Reorganization Act has succeeded extremely well in some areas but, for all the good intentions of its proponents, it has not yet been able to prevail against the economic realities of these inflationary times.

And so I think that our best efforts will be required in the years ahead to work together—the Postal Service, the business community which constitutes the largest single

segment of mailers, and the Congress—each aware of the other's problems and each willing to proceed with a great deal of patience, understanding, good faith, and good will, until the postal excellence envisioned in the Kappel Commission Report is totally realized.

In the end, however, no matter how we categorize these problems, it is the rank and file citizens who will judge whether we have met the challenge. Whether, in fact, our theories hold water.

ACCOUNTING FOR 1,300 MIA'S

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a memorial adopted by the Florida State Legislature in regular session 1973. This memorial to the Congress of the United States, urges Congress to take immediate steps to account for the more than 1,300 Americans still missing in action in Southeast Asia and to secure the immediate release from captivity of those still alive.

I concur with the views expressed in this memorial that it is imperative we determine whether these men are still alive and do everything in our power to secure their immediate release.

The memorial follows:

HOUSE MEMORIAL No. 1307

A memorial to the Congress of the United States, urging Congress to take immediate steps to account for the more than thirteen hundred Americans still missing in action in Southeast Asia.

Whereas, American involvement in the Southeast Asian conflict has begun to draw to a close with the signing of a truce agreement calling for return of all American prisoners of war, and

Whereas, almost all American military forces in the Republic of Vietnam have been withdrawn pursuant to that truce agreement, and

Whereas, although almost five hundred Americans missing in action and held as prisoners of war have been accounted for and released from captivity, there remain at least thirteen hundred of their fellow Americans yet unaccounted for in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, it is the responsibility of the people of this nation to do everything in their power to determine whether these men are still alive and, if so, to secure their immediate release from captivity, now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

That the Congress of the United States is urged and requested to take every possible step and to make every possible effort to account for the more than thirteen hundred American servicemen still missing in Southeast Asia and to secure the immediate release from captivity of those still alive.

Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's issue of the Miami Herald there appeared an article by me dealing with what many call the crisis in confidence in public officials generally in this country. In this article I pointed out that from a long association with national, State, and local officeholders it was my conclusion that those in public office were percentagewise less guilty of dishonesty or unethical conduct than the general population, yet pointing out some of the problems and temptations which those holding public office had to face.

I concluded with the hope that the misconduct of many public officials in the country, although a conspicuous minority of the whole, would lead the people to a new demand for the highest standard of conduct by those entrusted with the opportunity and the responsibility to hold public office, and express the hope that that demand would be "the punctillo of honor"—the highest standard of conduct once described by Justice Benjamin Cardoza.

I insert my article in the November 4, 1973, issue of the Miami Herald entitled "Politicians Tempted on All Sides" in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

POLITICIANS TEMPTED ON ALL SIDES

(NOTE.—CLAUDE PEPPER, with more than 40 years in public office, has served in both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.)

(By CLAUDE PEPPER)

Unmistakably there is a crisis of confidence in public officials in general.

And there is good reason for the people's concern about their officials when they see such revelations as the Watergate hearings have disclosed; the plea of guilty to income-tax violations by the vice president of the United States while he was governor of his state; former Cabinet officers indicted; top members of President Nixon's staff indicted or under investigation; members of Congress sentenced to prison for bribery, income tax evasion or requiring kickbacks from employes; a high-level judge convicted for income-tax evasion and bribery while governor of his state; many state, county and municipal officials throughout the country convicted or under indictment; and even the President under investigation for possible wrongdoing.

Such corruption and lack of integrity must be punished fairly and impartially. An honest and vigorous investigation must be made wherever there is a breach of public trust. Laws must be tightened and strengthened where necessary.

The President unhappily has not encouraged public confidence in public officials by discharging a special prosecutor who was recognized as an able, honorable and fearless prosecutor and investigator—Prof. Archibald Cox. It is difficult to see how anyone else in the Department of Justice can take up Cox's role in light of the President's prohibition to Cox of full independence in his investigation and prosecution of wrongdoing in this administration.

But, after all, the number of public officials who have been indicted or convicted or are under deep suspicion and investigation is a small part of the total number of public officials in the country.

It may shock many to have me say that after more than 40 years of close contact with public officials at the national, state and local levels and after 25 years in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, public officials—politicians—are above the average of the population in honesty, integrity and ethical considerations.

The reason obviously is that public officials have been through a screening process. They have been elected by the people or appointed by public authority and, by the large, they have a deep sense of pride in their office and a sincere feeling of duty to serve creditably. They want to be liked by the people and they seek to make a record that will be both satisfying to their ego and meaningful to the people they serve.

Furthermore, the offenses committed by most public officials are related to money—taking a bribe, failing to pay due income taxes, taking kickbacks from employes and the like, and this is an area where public officials are not different from their fellow citizens.

For bankers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, writers, even ministers of the gospel share the same covetous instincts. But I believe percentage wise the rate of such offense is lower among politicians than among the general population, even when allowance is made for a certain possible favoritism on the part of public officials toward one another.

It's not the system that's bad; it's the individuals within the system whose greed leads them to corruption. Some—too many—politicians do yield to the desire to live beyond their means, have money along with power and take advantage of the many opportunities they have to get money illegally either through taking a bribe for the exercise of power or pocketing for personal use campaign contributions without paying income tax thereon or otherwise.

But the overwhelming majority of the public officeholders, like the overwhelming majority of the members of other honorable groups in the country, don't do that. The ones who do are the conspicuous exceptions.

I don't know of a vice president since Colfax in the Grant Administration who has been charged with crime. In more than 100 years no national administration has had scandals and corruption at the top since the Grant Administration in the 1860's, except for the Harding Administration in the early 20s and now the Nixon Administration.

Among the thousands of members of Congress whom I've known, I don't recall more than a dozen at the outside who have been indicted. Of the thousands of judges in our country only a few have been false to their trust. The same is true of the officers at the state and local legislative and executive levels generally. In spite of the bad reputation of politicians and officeholders generally, we ordinarily have confidence in the ones we personally know—those who represent us or whose performance we constantly observe.

The man in public office, especially elective office, has many temptations and many problems. He has to have money to get elected. In many campaigns, especially state and national campaigns, he has to have a lot of money. In a race for governor or U.S. senator even in a state the size of Florida, he must have several hundred thousand or a million or more dollars.

For representatives in Congress the law now provides that he may spend up to $75,000 and he generally is required to have from $50,000 to $75,000 to get elected. That is a lot of money for one who is not rich, and even one who is wealthy can spend only $25,000 of his own money under present federal law in a race for Congress. Raising this money is one of the greatest problems a candidate has—to get the money without selling out the public interest or compromising his freedom of judgment or his integrity as a public official when elected.

I have had only one brazen proposal made to me in respect to campaign contributions. After I left the Senate and before I returned to the House, I was considering running again for the Senate and went to see a wealthy man who had been my friend and contributor to my campaign in the past—a man who had never tied a condition to his contribution. I was seated on the foot of a bed in a hotel room and he towered over me standing right in front of me. He said: "I

don't want you to run for the Senate. I want you to run for governor and if you will run for the governor I will underwrite $75,000 for your campaign cost, but on the condition that you will let me run the State Road Department."

My first impulse was to kick the man in the groin. Then I felt saddened because this man had been my friend, and I his, and he never had made an improper suggestion to me before. I knew this was going to estrange us. Without getting up I quietly said: "I don't want to be governor and I never intend to be, but if I am governor, I will run the State Road Department through my appointee. My relations with you would be the same as they were when I was in the Senate. You could come to me and talk to me about anything but you knew it would be I who would make the decision, not you." I got up and left and that man and I did not have another conversation for many years and we never have regained our old friendship.

Yet what does a candidate do who doesn't have the money himself to conduct the kind of a campaign he needs to conduct and who sees his opponent, as mine did in 1950, come up with 10 times as much money as he has? This then is the area of a politician's greatest temptation.

With increasing costs of using the various means of campaigning for almost any elective office, the candidate has to have a considerable sum of money. The candidate simply has to screen his contributions as closely as possible, checking not only for illegality but for contributions that would be an embarrassment to him during the campaign or after being elected. The statutes, federal and state, have been greatly strengthened in respect to campaign contributions but they must be tightened up a great deal more.

For example, a cash campaign contribution in excess of $10 should be forbidden. All contributions should be required to be by check so they can be traced. And each individual should be limited in the amount he or she can contribute directly or indirectly to a candidate or to all candidates.

Public contributions of public financing for elective campaigns should be further studied. Tax deductions should be encouraged for small contributions, especially for presidential campaigns, and a definite limit on presidential expenditures should be imposed.

Another great temptation for an office holder is to accept excessive favors, including social favors, from those who have an important interest upon which the office holder has to vote or act.

I know a man in the U.S. Senate who so constantly used the facilities of an airline and who was so close to that airline that he constantly spoke and worked for that line as if he were an officer or employe.

I never have been offered a bribe and I think most public officeholders will say the same thing. I suspect it's like the fact that most ladies who conduct themselves properly are not disrespectfully approached. Most elected officials draw the line between small favors and courtesies to those who befriend them and doing things that are against their judgment or conscience. We all know that no real friend will ask you to do something you think is contrary to the public interest or wrong.

I recall one time in the Senate that a man who headed a Florida sugar company threatened me if I tried to get more quota for other sugar companies in Florida. When he made his threat, I walked down the hall and testified before a Senate committee just as I told him I would. But this man was the exception.

Most contributors and friends respect the officeholder who respects himself and never will ask him to do anything he doesn't think is right. In my first Senate race in 1934, and thereafter, I was supported strongly by many road contractors of Florida. But I proudly recall that, not only did that group of men never ask me to do anything wrong, they would have severely rebuked and reproached me if they had found me doing anything wrong.

Public officials should observe a higher standard of honor and ethics than others, for they have been chosen for their tasks because they were trusted and they should have a keener-than-usual sense of responsibility and integrity. To hold public office is a great honor and a challenging opportunity for notable public service. Every officeholder, therefore, should be particularly sensitive to the trust reposed in him and to the obligation he bears.

Let us hope that the shock of criminal or unethical conduct that we see in so many places all over America today, shocking and lamentable as it is, will arouse the people of the country to a new demand for the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of public office—not only honesty in respect to money but to the highest sense of honor in the performance of all the duties and responsibilities with which the official is charged—"the punctillo of an honor" as the highest standard of conduct once was described by the great Justice Benjamin Cardozo.

WE MUST HAVE AN INDEPENDENT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, today a dark shadow is cast across our Nation. The Watergate scandal and other allegations of presidential wrongdoing have been greeted with shock and dismay by the American people. Most Americans, nevertheless, had prior to October 20 suspended their final verdict regarding the President's complicity or lack of complicity pending the outcome of the investigation being conducted by special prosecutor Archibald Cox.

However, President Nixon's precipitous firing of Mr. Cox, which provoked massive public outrage, has left many vital questions unanswered. As a consequence, the presidency has been crippled by the pall of accusation and suspicion that today hangs over the White House. Until the truth is conclusively determined, it will be impossible for us to get on with the other business before this Nation.

The Middle East crisis, the energy crisis, the environmental crisis, inflation, unemployment, and a raft of other problems face this Nation today and cry out for strong and decisive leadership. Thus, we must put Watergate and the other sordid political crimes behind us as soon as possible. This requires that we get to the bottom of this affair as soon as possible.

The President's intemperate action of the weekend of October 20 leaves no alternative for Congress but to take the initiative, and in so doing demonstrate that no man—not even the President of the United States—is above the law. On May 1, the President stated publicly his commitment to "uncover the whole truth," however, recent events have called into question his commitment.

I make these remarks because I have recently introduced a resolution which would reestablish an office of the special prosecutor, this time under the aegis of the Congress. My measure provides for a prosecutor completely independent in both financing and authority from the executive branch of Government, as is noted in section 3 of our resolution. Although it provides that the chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia be empowered to appoint the new prosecutor, he will be subject to both confirmation and removal by the Congress.

In conclusion, what is needed at this critical moment in this Nation's history is a frank, forthright, and open investigation of all the allegations of executive malfeasance of office. I am convinced that a majority of the Members of Congress, as well as a large majority of the American people desire a fully independent prosecutor to carry forward the investigation. Congress, by acting decisively, will not only write a new chapter in executive accountability, but will assure that the whole truth is uncovered.

We must restore the trust of the American people in their Government. In 1968, President Nixon said that "men are accountable for what they do," and that "guilty men must pay the penalty for their crimes." I could not agree more with the President: and it is to this end that I have introduced this legislation.

ATHLETIC INJURIES AND SAFETY: DIMENSIONS OF THE AMERICAN ATHLETIC CRISIS

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, this spring Sports for People, a public interest organization in Chapel Hill, N.C., published an extremely informative and important study of the dimensions of the athletic safety crisis.

With the rising concern over this issue, I would like to now inert this study into the RECORD for the use by my colleagues:

ATHLETIC INJURIES AND SAFETY: DIMENSIONS OF THE AMERICAN ATHLETIC CRISIS

(A Report on the results of a national opinion survey)

PREFACE

About "Sports for People"

Sports For People is a community-oriented group of friends and neighbors in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, which is providing opportunities for people to express themselves in new ways through sports. We conceive of ourselves as a growing circle of life, dedicated to exposing people to a variety of recreation opportunities through which they can build physical self-confidence and develop positive attitudes toward other people. We conceive of sports as a vehicle by which all people can come together on common ground, to share the rhythm of movement and the joy of physical exertion. We believe that sports based on this approach to human interaction and development can promote a healthy community, and that attitudes of caring and self-confidence can be transferred to other activities in community life, both personal and professional. Hence, Sports For People is seeking to build a healthy community which cares about its people through positive, attitude-changing, spontaneous, life-giving sports.

Historically, Sports For People is the successor to the Committee of Concerned Athletes which was reconstituted January 31, 1973. Having achieved its objectives of promoting athletic safety on the University of North Carolina campus at Chapel Hill, and having brought athletic safety to the attention of Congress, it seemed appropriate for the Committee to reconstitute itself as Sports For People with a new set of objectives.

Sports For People retains the fundamental notion that life is an objective we need to work toward in contemporary sports. It is significant that the Committee, founded in September, 1971 after the death of UNC football player Bill Arnold, is continuing with its emphasis on life-giving sports. Respecting this tragic death and understanding its causes. and dynamics, Sports For People is now developing means of promoting life-giving sports.

About the survey

In November, 1971, the Committee (referred to hereafter in its new title Sports For People, SFP) approached Congressman Ronald Dellums about the feasibility of national legislation on athletic safety. Through its experience at Chapel Hill and exposure to statistics about injuries across the country, SFP learned that Arnold's death was not a unique circumstance; that thousands and thousands of injuries occur each year in a number of major and minor sports at all levels of play. It was felt by both Representative Dellums and SFP that athletic safety should be a national public policy and Congressional concern. On August 17, 1972, Rep. Dellums introduced the "Athletic Safety Act," into Congress, as an amendment to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. The Act received an initial hearing on September 13, 1972.

SFP had felt for a long time that the concerns of many coaches, players, sports writers, and researchers around the country on the issues of athletic safety needed a national focus. Assisting Rep. Dellums with the Act provided an opportunity to develop this focus, hence this survey and report. With the generous assistance of Rep. Dellums, his staff, Jack Scott of the Oberlin Athletic Department, and Dr. Benjamin Lowe of Temple University, Sports For People conducted a national athletic safety opinion survey during November, 1972–February, 1973. The following summary report represents both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the responses.

The format of this report is designed to present a summary of the responses of 110 individuals' attitudes concerning a wide range of safety-related issues. The people who responded represent a highly sophisticated and knowledgeable group of individuals directly involved in athletics as players, coaches, writers, researchers, parents or spectators. Familiar with a broad range of issues, these people have provided the public with a rare insight into what sports-related professionals think about the current state of American athletics, particularly in relation to safety and injuries.

Through a combination of ranking scales and open-ended questions, the survey was designed to examine opinions about athletic safety from a perspective broader than just its medical aspects. A copy of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix A. SFP believes from its experience that injuries and safety in athletics have educational, sociological, and psychological parameters as well as health concerns. This report attempts to illuminate the opinions of sports experts on these parameters in the hopes of providing us all with a clearer perspective on ways through which we can actively seek and promote athletic safety.

American athletics is in a state of crisis. Perhaps the single, clearest conclusion of this survey is that contemporary sports are facing a profound and sustained series of challenges to its basic and traditional assumptions and operations, not only from former players reacting to negative experiences, or from researchers, sports writers, coaches or fans, but more seriously from within its own basic structures, values and means of operation. We hope to provide some clarity to these challenges and concerns, from the perspective of players, writers, researchers and coaches in terms of the structural and value problems which are reflected through American sports.

The wide variety of people from all over the country who responded to the survey have demonstrated in their opinions that the crisis in American sports, as reflected in injury statistics and other abuses, is a multifaceted, complex and interconnected problem of values and procedures, institutions, attitudes and human needs. There is no single individual, institution or sport responsible for the incredible high rate of injuries, though this survey suggests several major contact sports as being primarily responsible.* That their high number and often severe nature occur throughout all sports at all levels suggests to us that there is a much larger and complex issue than just sports alone. Similarly, attempts by institutions or individuals to excuse specific accidents as isolated incidents or medical problems, is not warranted either by the national statistics, or by the responses to this survey. What we face as a society engulfed in sports of all kinds at all levels of play is a crisis of major proportions in terms of our priorities and values—specifically whether we want athletics to be for athletes, to be safe and for fun, or whether we wish to perpetuate a system which is characterized by high pressure, commercialism, over-professionalization, high injury rates, competitive abuses, and a philosophy of winning at any cost.

A second major finding of the survey is that injuries are not felt to be the primary problem in contemporary athletics. Injuries are merely symptomatic of a much larger concern, an index of the extent to which we have allowed primarily the major sports to become more concerned with winning than the health, welfare and needs of each individual player. The areas of greatest interest and concern to those responding emphasized that the values and priorities existent within our society—winning in particular—are magnified in the sports arena through a high pressure system, resulting in an increasing number of abuses and injuries. As a former U.S. Olympic athlete stated in the survey, "The near neurotic frenzy to win is permeating virtually every stratum of athletics now, including the little leagues." This comment was reinforced by a university physical education professor concerned with the sociology of sport and coaching when he said, "The pressure to win is certainly the most crippling of all the pressures that confront sport." As another university P.E. professor very succinctly summarized the basic problem of the athletic crisis—

"The root cause of the problem is to be found in those values that comprise the dominant value structure in American society. When we begin to deal with Society's obsessive concern for material well-being, conformity, and competition-winning, then we can begin to address ourselves to the problems of drug-taking, recruiting, coaching procedures, pressures." . . .

The concern over the value of winning at any cost was coupled with a major concern about the pressures which have come to characterize athletics where large amounts of money and prestige are involved. Experts responding to the survey linked pressure and winning in a number of situations such as recruitment, the use of drugs to achieve better performance or merely to stay even competitively, psychological and physical pressure to obtain better playing, and so on. As a judge put it:

"I have played various sports since childhood. I am very concerned about the overemphasis on winning and lack of concern for individuals, especially on high school and college levels. Coaches are putting too much pressure on athletes in order to compile good records for themselves. Such emphasis on winning records has altered the purpose of athletic competition. Double standards exist, especially on the college level, where athletes are being torn between coaches who want to advance themselves, pro offers, possibility of serious injury, etc. The athletes must be confused and someone has to speak out and try to stop these practices."

The coach, we found, is at the apex of the pressure system which places winning above all other priorities. As a college physical education coach said:

"I see the problem as one of society's emphasis on winning at all costs, the coach's success being based upon win-loss records more than the joy he inculcates into the activity as a major problem. Legislation can be a stop-gap, but sports will become humanistic only when our society undergoes some basic changes in values."

The basic value of winning and its attendant pressures on coaches and athletes alike, the professionalization of scholastic sports, monopoly control and profits, and insufficient medical and athletic training and coaching procedures, all were felt to be the central, interrelated parameters of the sports crisis. Whether sports is to be for the health and development of each individual athlete, to be legislatively protected if necessary, is the immediate challenge we face today. The long-term challenge is whether there can be sufficient procedural, institutional and attitude change to eliminate injuries altogether and to promote the safety and health of every athlete without federal legislation, and whether sports can once again be fun and for the athlete. Thus, the solution to the American sports crisis as reflected in injury rates and other abuses lies in the reordering of our priorities toward a philosophy and practice of sports based on individual physical development, health and welfare.

Such a reordering of priorities is the responsibility of every spectator, parent, athlete, coach, sports writer and commercial interest. The responsibility and stimulus for initiating such a reordering of priorities, however, seems to lie in the hands of Congress. The Athletic Safety Act is the first step, the catalyst for this broad national effort to articulate the problems and parameters of athletic safety, and to provide constructive approaches and alternatives to remedying some of the more basic problems. Those responding have generally endorsed the Athletic Safety Act as a necessary first step in a long journey toward achieving a sense of balance in the athletic crisis.

Who responded to the survey?

Close to 400 questionnaires were distributed to selected individuals around the country, of whom 110 (102 men and 8 women) or 27.5% responded. Twenty-nine states were represented with the largest responses coming from the largest states: California (21), New York (19), and Pennsylvania (12). A variety of professions as well were represented with university and college physical education, sociology and psychology professors being predominant. All levels of schools except junior college and junior high school were represented. A large number of medical doctors (9) and sports writers or editors (13) were represented as were pro, amateur, college and high school athletes, coaches, a lawyer, a judge, sports associations and community groups. While academics and sports writers predominated, their wide familiarity with all

* The Food and Drug Administration has access to national injury statistics and to the National Electronic Injury survey which is a selective sample of injuries across the nation. The Library of Congress is also a repository for a wide variety of papers and reports on injuries.

sports at all levels and the basic concepts underpinning athletics suggests a high level of knowledge and competent judgment.

The information on the positions of these people can be supplemented by their expressed concerns and interests, rounding out a picture of who it was who responded. Concerns about athletics ranged across a wide spectrum of issues centering on sports sociology, psychology and philosophy (18). Coaching, sports administration, human rights, women's sports, training, sports medicine, and legislation were also noted as concerns. Other areas of interest included values, competition, drugs, injuries, education vs. sports, financial aspects of sports, equipment, racism, professionalization, and a host of specific interests in individual sports such as track, wrestling, soccer, gymnastics, rugby, distance running, football, tennis and basketball. In sum, the 110 people who responded represent a broad geographical and professional spectrum with equally diverse concerns in contemporary athletics.

What were the major issues?

As the sample questionnaire demonstrates, 12 major issues with suggestive questions were listed, asking for an indication of concern and leaving room for comments. We will be primarily concerned with the top five issues, and briefly comment on the others below.

I. Drugs: Drugs and drug abuse was clearly the primary concern, with 75% of those responding selecting it as a major concern of theirs. The two problems repeatedly pointed to in the survey as being critical were:

a. The use of drugs such as anabolic steroids and amphetamines to improve performance or to be competitive.

b. The use of pain killers to get players back into games.

As the sports editor of a major national magazine pointed out, the lack of controls on drug use contributes to their abuse—

"While a sport like horse racing draws clear lines between permissible pain killers and ones that endanger animals, human athletes are treated in a vague and loosely regulated fashion—a major challenge to leaders of almost all sports."

Other opinions ranged from a high school football coach saying that coaches use drugs to increase physical size, to a sociology professor noting the tacit acceptance of drug use by many in the sports world, to a college football player deploring the use of amphetamines and steroids.

II. Education vs. Athletics: The second major parameter of the American sports crises was felt by 68% to be the contradictory pressures and demands of athletics in the educational system. As a university P.E. professor so well summarized the dilemma—

"There is no question that for the most part, athletes mean little more personally to coaches than automobiles do to workers on the assembly line. And this suggests to me that athletics presently has relatively little educational value. We must give sport back to the players if it is to remain in the educational domain. Otherwise, take it out of education and let it survive on its own merits."

Overprofessionalization of college athletics, the pressures on coaches to win to retain their jobs, the treatment of players as entertainment or as means to an end rather than as individuals, the career patterns existing from high school through to the pros in major sports, and the vested financial interests in the sports industry have made our respondents question the compatibility of contemporary athletics in the educational system.

While some felt that perhaps athletics should be removed from schools because of the abuses, others felt that athletics and education compliment each other and that sports should be subordinate to education. As a professor of sport sociology suggested, "If sport is to have any chance of realizing its educational potential, it must be supported as an educational expense. . . ." Some schools have withdrawn from intercollegiate competition and offer an alternative approach to either no sports or commercial sports. As one university P.E. professor said:

"Our emphasis is on physical activity classes, intramurals, and recreation, and lastly student sport clubs. Faculty, staff and students intermingle. Enjoyment, fun and conditioning (are) stressed. The real test of a well-trained, coached and educated athletic team is for its coach to sit in the stands or the press box until the contest is concluded."

This range of opinions about the role and prospects for scholastic athletics reflects a crisis in priorities, an overwhelming feeling that winning, profit and status have taken over athletics as an academic enterprise. Our schools seem to reflect the question of priorities of athletics for athletes vs. for profit, a question at all levels of sport in our society.

III. Coaching Procedures: 65% of the people responding to the survey found the milieu of the coach to be a major concern. Comments on coaching procedures illuminate further the societal crisis caused by a need to win at any cost. The coach is the middleman. His job is on the line on the basis of a win-loss record. To win he implements an authoritarian system of discipline (usually) which he feels comfortable with, passing the pressure he feels to perform on to the players in the form of depersonalized and often brutal treatment, physically and psychologically.

As the sports editor of a national magazine commented:

"Too many coaches are encouraged to place the priority on winning above even the safety of competitors. Regulation is one answer, but a reevaluation of these priorities should go deeper than that."

The authoritarianism of coaches came under strong attack by a number of people, which when coupled with a concern about their lack of training suggests a major need for better trained coaches and perhaps a licensing procedure. A college PE professor noted—

"The area of my concern has been through the ethical values of the men who teach and administer the game. Generally these people have failed probably because of the pressure put on them, but more because of the lack of understanding of the real purpose of sport."

Using injured players, "ego trips," inflexibility, inability to treat athletes as humans and individuals, were all complaints registered in the survey. These complaints, however, need to be placed in the context of the "winner-take-all" value predominant in our society, which places the coach at the very apex of the pressure system. Demands by alumni and trustees, athletes, financiers, pro and college recruiters, sportscasters and writers—all make demands on the coach. With more training, some standardized licensing or degree requirements, and academic appointments for coaches, it was felt we could move immediately toward more humane and individualized treatment of athletes.

IV. Pressure: Of those responding, 60% felt that pressure in athletics was a major issue. Many responses noted that there was too much pressure too early in an athlete's life, that parents pressuring their children in little league to win is unnecessary. And yet the pressure system seems to reflect society's priorities. As the sports editor of a national magazine put it—

"What is important is the degree of emphasis on winning over everything, whether it is practices on some sandlot where intense fathers drive kids to throw curve balls at age 12 or execute perfect crackback blocks on 12-year-old knees, or at a big time football college where coaches make their own jobs easier by simply driving off the allegedly unfit at whatever costs."

The pressure is of several kinds and comes from several directions resulting in multiple impacts. Certainly fathers pushing their children toward athletic perfection are not the only source of pressure. Coaches, alumni, politicians, sports writers, spectators and athletes all receive and exert pressure to win. The concept of a pressure system suggests no one single source, although the value of winning above everything else seems to be the engine for this system.

Pressure may be internal or external. As one sports magazine editor said, "Self-imposed pressure is the worst kind." Playing for perfection, to retain scholarships, or for a variety of psychological reasons all contribute to the pressure system. The results are most clearly shown in the injury statistics. Two people, both college football players, felt that pressure increases the number of injuries. More games, longer seasons, poor equipment, "running-off" techniques of eliminating unwanted players, all seem to suggest that an increase in pressure to win at any cost will result in a concomitant raise in injuries.

V. Equipment: The fifth priority concern in the survey for 57% was athletic equipment, in particular artificial surfaces, protective equipment and their relationship to athletic safety. The most critical concern for people was the existence and expanding use of astroturf and other artificial surfaces to save money for the institutions at the expense of the players. As a high school football coach said about astroturf—

"Almost no players like the stuff after having played some games on it, yet more and more schools use it for the benefit of spectators watching the game and (for) status effect."

The usual justification for using astroturf is that it is necessary for schools to remain competitive with other schools who have it. To reverse this inertia requires a school to take a position which may not be beneficial to their ability to win. Knee injuries were pointed out as a major problem with artificial surfaces, and more information on their effects was felt needed. In any case, as one sports editor said, there is "a crying need for athlete representation in decision-making" on such issues.

For women, the artificial surface question is not even the issue—any surfaces at all seem to be more relevant concerns. As one college P.E. teacher pointed out, "women play on worse fields, (with) pot holes and no grass in some cases." In at least three major universities and colleges, it was discovered as well that vast discrepancies exist between budget allotments to women's sports and those to men's—$7,000 and $450,000 in two instances.

At the high school and college levels, the paucity or nonexistence of protective equipment standards is directly reflected in the injury statistics. One newspaper sports writer who did a high school survey of football injuries concluded that "equipment is outdated or inadequate." A college athletic director was even skeptical of existing protective equipment, since it may "eventually be used as weapons. Note the use of the helmet in speartackling and forearm protections as weapons."

In sum, no standards, the need for enforcement, the need for evaluation and reduction or elimination of the use of artificial surfaces, and parity budget allocations for women's athletics were the highlights of the survey results on equipment. That substandard equipment is directly related to a high injury rate appears to be the fact, but poor equipment is only part of a winning-oriented, athletic pressure system which places winning above the health and safety of individual players.

Highlights of other major issues

1. Training Procedures: 56% felt this to be a major concern. Certification of trainers was felt to be a major need, as was the

presence of trainers at every practice session. As the head athletic trainer at one university commented:

"Additional state legislation requiring the licensure of certified athletic trainers, coupled with a law of some kind requiring the school . . . to employ an athletic trainer certainly is a necessary step."

2. Financial Aspects: 56% noted this issue as a concern. The role of monopoly institutions, the athletic programs' dependence on gate receipts for their survival, and some suggested graft were noted as parameters of athletic finances. As a member of the 1968 U.S. Olympic Team said:

"The institutionalized, big money athletic concerns need to be carefully scrutinized by the legislative branch—graft, monopoly questions, potential abuse of individuals for the sake of more dollars."

The dependence of scholastic athletic programs on alumni contributions, gate receipts, and winning seasons all add to the pressure put on coaches and players.

3. Recruiting Procedures: 53%. Many felt there was too much pressure in recruitment efforts, particularly at the high school level, and a considerable amount of dishonesty or "under the table" offers. It was felt by one national magazine sports writer that recruitment is a "price example of hypocrisy in sports." Scholars are not recruited into college, which caused one person to suggest that recruiting is educationally unjustifiable. In addition, a college teacher of women's sports said "women must be more highly qualified academically than men and (receive) no money." Thus recruitment problems continue to reflect the basic issues of this survey—too much pressure, winning at any cost, disparities between men's and women's sports, and questions about the athletics-education relationship.

4. Injury Rates: 52%. As noted throughout this analysis, injury rates are merely an index, a symptom of the larger problem, and a reflection of disoriented priorities in contemporary sports. While the coach is at the apex of the pressure system, the players are at the apex of the pressure system's results. As a college P.E. coach asked—

"Athletics are presumably supposed to build healthy bodies—all too often athletes end up with a myriad of elbow, shoulder, and other joint problems for years after their glory-filled careers. What's happened here?"

In addition to an increased national importance given to sports, a sports journalist and former editor of a national sports magazine says—

"One reason often overlooked, is increased schedules by teams on all levels—high school, college and pros. This is best exemplified by colleges, who played 7 games in the 1930's and up to 13 games in 1972 (football). Pro schedules, too, have been expanded—from a dozen games in the 1940's to 25 now if you count post-season, pre-season and All-Star games. High School kids in Texas are playing up to 13–14 games. Double the number of games and double injuries."

Practices as well account for a large portion of injuries, such as "running-off" techniques described by Gary Shaw in *Meat on the Hoof*, St. Martins Press, 1972. Concussions, brain damage, paralysis, death, broken arms, legs, backs and necks in all sports at all levels can only tell us that high pressure, poor education of coaches and trainers, inadequate medical care, and substandard equipment all require immediate attention.

5. Medical Care: 52%. Attitude on whether doctors provide adequate care range from judgments of their incompetence to a greater reliance on their role. A recent survey of high school football injuries concluded that "doctors aren't there when you need them or can't diagnose medical injuries." That qualified doctors be present at all practice sessions and games in all sports seems to be required. Adequate medical screening also seems necessary.

6. Game Practices: 50%. More adequate medical facilities and personnel are a major concern.

7. Enforcement of Rules: 47%. Opinions on whether rule enforcement was too strict or too lax were predominantly saying it was too lax, although some felt it was not a problem. Who makes what rules was felt by a high school coach to be an issue. Selective enforcement was seen as a problem by another person. In any case, a review of rules and enforcement procedures seems necessary.

What sports are felt to be the most dangerous?

Although a difficult section to tabulate, we were trying to determine what people *felt* were the most dangerous sports. Listed below are the top five sports, ranked as most dangerous by the number of times each was ranked in the top five out of twelve sports.

TABLE I

Sport	Number responding	Percent
Football	79	97
Hockey	56	69
Boxing	50	62
Rugby	42	52
Auto racing	40	50

Note: Total responding was 81.

A number of people did not feel auto racing was a sport, although the spectator nature of it, its recreational intent, and its incidence of accidents, death and injury, as well as its violence seemed to justify its inclusion. Of the five levels of sports play considered, the levels mentioned most often as one of the three most dangerous are presented in the following table.

TABLE II

Level of play	Number responding	Percent
College	59	91
High School	55	85
Professional	52	80

Note: Total responding was 65.

What corrective actions were recommended?

The extensive comments on corrective measures requires that we analyze responses in four major categories: regulation and the role of government, survey issues, other specific measures, and further suggested research.

Regulation and the Role of Government: Opinions on the role of the government in promoting athletic safety vary across the spectrum from no involvement to total control. The predominant feeling of persons responding was that while voluntary efforts are preferable, existing voluntary organizations have been ineffective, thus making national legislation necessary. A number of people, however, felt that legislation makes no difference in terms of attitude change needed to have safe athletics. As a university psychologist of sports summarized it—

"Though I strongly support the (Athletic) Safety Act, it does not get at the real causes of high injury rates in sports, but it probably is all the progress we can make at the moment."

Opinions about the extent and types of regulation ranged from restrictions on levels of competition, requirements for minimum safety procedures and medical facilities, to standards for equipment and facilities.

Survey Issue Recommendations: Under the issues noted above, a number of recommendations were already made. The following are an effort to summarize the wide range and diversity of corrective recommendations made.

1. Drugs: Although considered the first major athletic safety problem, there were few corrective actions suggested beyond more education and research, regulation of all drugs to athletes, and even their complete elimination from athletics.

2. Education vs. Athletics: The second major problem area cited above received a moderate (14) number of suggestions. A central focus was on removing commercialism from scholastic sports by eliminating athletic scholarships, financing athletics out of the general educational fund, and eliminating preferential entry requirements.

3. Coaching: By far the most volatile issue, coaching procedures received 24 recommendations for change. Most felt that they need to be certified through a qualification procedure which would include psychological testing. A number felt that coaches should be held personally responsible for injuries on their teams, and finally that they should be judged on their teaching rather than their winning abilities.

4. Equipment: 18 responses were fielded with a major recommendation being more research on artificial surfaces. Equipment standards for equipment and fields was also a major suggestion.

5. Trainers: Similar to the coaches, the major recommendation was for establishing a certification requirement at all schools.

6. Finances: A few people alarmed by financial abuses felt profits should be eliminated from athletics, or that athletics be made publicly accountable through open stocks and lower gate fees.

7. Recruiting: Only a few people made recommendations here, but most wanted some clarification of ethical standards and closer scrutiny of the operations.

8. Injuries: A wide variety (15) of responses were generated here ranging from a desire for more national injury data, to guidelines for playing conditions, and to knee injury protection.

9. Medical Care: While considered a tenth major issue, it was second in recommended corrective actions, with 21 responses. Most felt doctors needed more training and should be required at all sporting events. Independence of team doctors from coach controls was also felt needed to preserve their integrity and objectivity in their work.

10. Rule Enforcement: Most of the 11 responses recommended stricter enforcement from an agency outside the sports world, such as an independent regulatory agency with regional and/or local offices.

Other Specific Measures: A number of individuals recommended some form of national agency to coordinate or control local safety programs. Such an organization would concern itself with research on injuries, infractions of the law, sports sociology, psychology and medicine, and would have authority over existing independent institutions such as the NCAA or AAU.

A second measure suggested was the establishment of statewide insurance programs to cover individual athletes or compulsory liability insurance which would make institutions responsible for injuries incurred within their jurisdictions.

A third and significant recommendation made by 11 people concerned giving more decision-making control to the athletes and to promote a concept of sports which respects the dignity of each athlete over the necessity of winning.

A fourth minor recommendation was for the establishment of a code of ethics for the conduct of athletics.

Finally, a wide range (14) of specific controls was suggested, from the elimination of red-shirting to crowd control at games, to local or regional officers to insure athletic safety.

Further Research: A considerable amount of information is needed by athletes, coaches, parents, and the public about the dangers and safety in specific sports. In addition the following research issues were noted:

1. Pro sport franchises and gambling in pro sports.
2. The finances of the US Olympic Committee and other institutions governing sports.
3. The coaching system and the coach's social role.
4. Recruiting procedures and abuses.
5. Injuries and equipment.
6. Intercollegiate athletics.
7. Abuses which result from a "win at any cost" philosophy.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this analysis has been to summarize and describe the elements and issues which comprise the crisis in American athletics. We began the survey from an observation that the extent and character of athletic injuries require a diagnosis beyond their medical context. We found from the survey results that this was true, and that athletic injuries per se were not felt to be the primary issue. Rather, the value of winning as a primary athletic priority, and its attendant high pressure system were felt to be primary causes for abuses of all kinds in a variety of sports activities, from drugs, coaching or recruiting, to medical practices in scholastic athletics. While injuries cannot be analyzed in isolation from a high pressure system, poor equipment or training, or inadequate medical care, determining the precise causes for injuries remains a highly complex issue requiring further research.

In terms of corrective actions the survey clearly indicates a need for more education, research and initial legislative action. The Athletic Safety Act is certainly an important first step toward guaranteeing the safety and health of athletes, although more affirmative action toward basic attitude-value change is necessary. In particular, the training and licensing of coaches and trainers was felt to be a major need. Financial controls and limits on commercial athletics in the educational system, more research on artificial surfaces, and the training of physicians and their required presence at all sporting events was also suggested. Finally, a liability insurance program and national organization to stimulate and monitor sports activities were recommended as measures needing immediate attention.

This survey hopefully points concerned individuals in a number of different directions where concerted action might be taken to alleviate pressure and promote athletic safety and health. Sports for People wishes to thank all those who participated in this effort for their insights and concerns.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and balance of week, on account of death of a staff member.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma), for November 6 and 7, 1973, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITTEN, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SYMMS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHNEEBELI, for 1 hour, on November 12.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FISH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RUNNELS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $731.50.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in five instances.

Mr. RARICK, to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 8219 today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SYMMS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES in five instances.
Mr. KEATING.
Mr. KEMP.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. BURGENER.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. BAKER.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. SHOUP.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.
Mr. CONLAN in three instances.
Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.
Mr. HOGAN in two instances.
Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. WYLIE.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. SEBELIUS in two instances.
Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.
Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. DU PONT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.
Mr. LITTON.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.
Mr. FISHER in four instances.
Mr. BRADEMAS in six instances.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.
Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.
Mr. FAUNTROY in five instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.
Mr. MILFORD.
Mr. LEGGETT.
Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.
Mr. KARTH.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mr. DE LUGO.
Mr. RANDALL.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. MAHON.
Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.
Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.
Mr. KYROS.
Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.
Mr. HUNGATE in 10 instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1070. An act to implement the International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 1969; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1432. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died while employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier after 20 or more years of such employment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2651. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize reduced rate transportation for handicapped persons and for persons who are 65 years of age or older or 21 years of age or younger; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9286. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and the military training student loads, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 7, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1518. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal

year 1974 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 93–177); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1519. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974 for the Department of Transportation, the Department of the Treasury, the General Services Administration, and the Postal Service (H. Doc. No. 93–178); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1520. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for an appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States (H. Doc. No. 93–179); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1521. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 93–180); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1522. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1523. A letter from the Chairman, Cost Accounting Standards Board, transmitting a proposed cost accounting standards establishing criteria to be used by contractors in selecting time periods to be used as cost accounting periods, pursuant to section 719(h)(3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 91–379; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1524. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 57, *Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, et al.*, Plaintiffs, v. *The United States of America*, Defendant, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1525. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide a remedy for postal interruptions in patent and trademark cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1526. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 29, 1972, submitting a report on Charlotte Harbor (Port Charlotte), Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1527. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 30, 1972, submitting a report on Alapaha River and tributaries, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1528. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing construction of a Federal Office Building at Carbondale, Ill., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4864. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 687. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11104. A bill to provide for a temporary increase of $13 billion in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974. (Rept. No. 93–622). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 688. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9142. A bill to restore, support, and maintain modern, efficient rail service in the northeast region of the United States, to designate a system of essential rail lines in the northeast region, to provide financial assistance to rail carriers in the northeast region, to improve competitive equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93–623). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11255. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, as amended, to provide financial assistance to small business concerns in converting to the metric system of weight and measures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 11256. A bill to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 11257. A bill to create the position of ombudsman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 11258. A bill to require the U.S. Postal Service to provide postal lock boxes for certain persons who reside in rural areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 11259. A bill to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of peanuts and rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FREY, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HUBER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 11260. A bill to amend chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain election campaign practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WARE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 11261. A bill to amend chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain election campaign practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 11262. 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.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 11263. A bill to define the powers and duties and to place restrictions upon the grounds for removal of the Special Prosecutor appointed by the Acting Attorney General of the United States on November 5, 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H.R. 11264. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. PODELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 11265. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to restrict persons who are not citizens of the United States from acquiring more than 35 percent of the nonvoting securities or more than 5 percent of the voting securities of any issuer whose securities are registered under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. STEELE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H.R. 11266. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory and depredating animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory and depredating animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DU PONT (for himself, Mr. ANderson of Illinois, Mr. BELL, Ms. BURKE of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HOGAN, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LENT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHROEDER, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 11267. A bill to insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DU PONT (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. THONE, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11268. A bill to insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 11269. A bill to designate the Weminuche Wilderness, Rio Grande, and San Juan National Forests, in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CULVER, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 11270. A bill to provide housing for persons in rural areas of the United States on an emergency basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 11271. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to provide for the extension thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 11272. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 11273. A bill to provide for the regulation of the movement in foreign commerce of noxious weeds and potential carriers thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11274. A bill to amend section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to equalize the retired pay of certain officers of the uniformed services retired prior to October 1, 1949, under the same law and with the same service, as those retired after September 30, 1949 but prior to June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. STARK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. HUBER):

H.R. 11275. A bill to provide standards of fair personal information practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. O'HARA, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ZION, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. SHOUP):

H.R. 11276. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit the disclosure of an individual's social security number or related records for any purpose without his consent unless specifically required by law, and to provide that (unless so required) no individual may be compelled to disclose or furnish his social security number for any purpose not directly related to the operation of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANRAHAN (for himself, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 11277. 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. HOWARD:

H.R. 11278. 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:

H.R. 11279. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to provide for the application of price controls to certain export sales; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11280. 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.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 11281. A bill to prohibit the export of agricultural grain to any country which reduces the quantity of oil normally exported by such country to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H.R. 11282. A bill to amend 5 U.S.C. 5343 (c)(1) to expand the data base for Federal wage surveys in certain areas of the United States wherein there is insufficient private industry to determine comparable wages or where State and local governments exert a major influence on wage rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GINN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. STEPHENS):

H.R. 11283. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for security device expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11284. A bill to amend section 19 of title 3, United States Code to provide for an election for the Office of President and the Office of Vice President in the case of vacancies in both the Office of President and the Office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 11285. A bill to limit the expenditure of public funds for the construction of improvements for the physical safety and security of the President to only one private residence; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 11286. A bill to amend title 3 of the United States Code to provide for the order of succession in the case of a vacancy both in the Office of President and Office of the Vice President, to provide for a special election procedure in the case of such vacancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11287. A bill to amend title 3 of the United States Code to provide for the order of succession in the case of a vacancy both in the Office of President and Office of the Vice President, to provide for a special election procedure in the case of such vacancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 11288. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to provide mass transportation assistance essential for the movement of basic commodities and energy resources to and from production areas and major distribution and processing centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 11289. A bill to establish an Independent Office of Special Prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11290. A bill to amend title 3 of the United States Code to provide for the order of succession in the case of a vacancy both in the Office of President and Office of the Vice President, to provide for a special election procedure in the case of such vacancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 11291. A bill to establish an Independent Special Prosecution Office, as an independent agency of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11292. 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. SCHERLE:

H.R. 11293. A bill to establish an Independent Office of Special Prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H.R. 11294. A bill to exempt State lotteries from certain Federal prohibitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. STEELE, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 11295. A bill to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act in order to extend the authorization for appropriations to carry out such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 11296. A bill to provide for a 7-percent increase in social security benefits beginning with benefits payable for the month of January 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 11297. A bill to provide for the use of certain funds to promote scholarly, cultural, and artistic activities between Japan and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 11298. A bill to amend the Walsh-Healey Act and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act to change the workday for employees who are employed under contracts subject to those acts from 8 to 10 hours per day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 11299. A bill to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds utilize the best practicable technology for the conservation and use of energy; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution to set aside regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 206 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONLAN:

H.J. Res. 808. Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution, a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 811. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for an election for the Office of President and the Office of Vice President in the case of a vacancy both in the Office of President and Office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of a civil officer to undertake criminal prosecutions against the President, Vice President, and other civil officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 375. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document the booklet entitled "the Supreme Court of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Res. 681. Resolution to establish as part of the congressional internship program an internship program for senior citizens in honor of John McCormack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Res. 682. Resolution to seek peace in the Middle East and to continue to support Israel's deterrent strength through transfer of Phantom aircraft and other military supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 683. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 684. Resolution to request the resignation of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WHITE):

H. Res. 685. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and investigate whether grounds exist for the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H. Res. 686. Resolution for the impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 11300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. L. O. Crawford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 11301. A bill for the relief of George V. Vincin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JORDAN:

H.R. 11302. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lawrence C. B. Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 11303. A bill for the relief of Choon Kyu Oh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 8—1974

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members, their staffs, and others, excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 8, as of October 26," prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

This report shows that the impact of congressional actions completed to October 26 would be to increase budgeted 1974 outlays by about $2.9 billion. This, together with certain revenue actions, would have the effect of raising the estimated deficit for fiscal year 1974 by more than $3.4 billion.

The excerpts from the report which I am inserting here include the highlights of completed legislative action, and point up the major areas of pending action which may materially affect the final impact of congressional action in this session. These excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 8, AS OF OCTOBER 26, 1973

PART I—BUDGET OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES)

The 1974 budget revisions of October 18: Budget revisions for fiscal 1974 were officially transmitted on October 18 in connection with hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on pending debt ceiling legislation. Outlays were estimated at $270 billion and revenue at $270 billion.

The revisions reflected substantial reestimates in budget outlays and revenue largely due to economic factors—including specifically "higher than anticipated price increases". The revisions also reflect estimates of congressional actions increasing outlays by $2.4 billion and revenue by $0.1 billion.

Subsequent to the October 18 revisions, and not reflected therein, the Administration transmitted a budget amendment requesting additional funds for military assistance to Israel and Cambodia. This amendment increases 1974 budget authority by $2.4 billion and outlays by $600 million.

The 1974 unified budget totals as revised October 18 and subsequently amended are shown below, as compared to the original January budget estimates and the June 1 revised estimates:

[In billions]

	Fiscal year 1974			
	Jan. 29 estimate	June 1 revision	October revisions	Change from Jan. 29 estimate
Unified budget:				
Receipts	$256.0	$266.0	$270.0	$14.0
Outlays	268.7	268.7	270.6	1.9
Deficit	−12.7	−2.7	−.6	12.1

1974 scorekeeping outlay highlights: The impact of congressional action through October 26 on the President's fiscal year 1974 budget outlay requests as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted
1974 budget outlay (expenditure) estimate as revised and amended to date	$270,624	$270,624	$270,624
Deduct: portion of congressional action included in revised estimates	−2,443	−2,443	−2,443
1974 budget outlay estimate exclusive of congressional action	268,181	268,181	268,181
Congressional changes to date (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action	+609	+964	+799
Pending action	+450	+567	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action	+1,381	+2,456	+2,071
Pending action	+1,069	+2,440	
Total changes:			
Completed action	+1,990	+3,420	+2,870
Pending action	+1,519	+3,007	
Total	+3,509	+6,427	+2,870
1974 budget outlays as adjusted by Congressional changes to date	271,690	274,608	271,051

While this reports reflects enacted congressional increases in budgeted outlays of about $2.9 billion, many significant actions are as yet incomplete which may materially affect the final impact of congressional action or inaction on budgeted 1974 outlays.

Completed actions

A summary of major individual actions composing the $2.9 billion total outlay impact of completed congressional action to date on 1974 budgeted outlays follows:

Completed action on budgeted outlays (expenditures)

[In thousands]

	Congressional changes in 1974 outlays
Bills (including committee action):	
Appropriation bills:	
Regular 1974 bills:	
Agriculture	+$250,000
Interior	+75,000
Public Works	+20,000
District of Columbia	−14,500
Legislative	−15,800
Transportation	−30,000
Treasury-Postal Service	−42,000
1973 supplemental bills (1974 outlay impact)	+556,600
Subtotal, appropriation bills	+799,300
Legislative bills—backdoor and mandatory:	
Food stamp amendments (P.L. 93-86)	+724,000
Repeal of "bread tax" (P.L. 93-86)	+400,000
Federal employee pay raise, Oct. 1, 1973 (S. Res. 171)	+357,900
Welfare—medicaid amendments (P.L. 93-66)	+122,000
Unemployment benefits extension (P.L. 93-53)	+115,700
Veterans national cemeteries (P.L. 93-43)	+110,000
Social Security—liberalized income exemption (P.L. 93-66)	+100,000
School lunch amendments (H.R. 9639)	+100,000
Winema forest expansion (P.L. 93-102)	+70,000
Veterans dependents' health care (P.L. 93-82)	+64,915
Civil Service retirement (P.L. 93-39 and 93-136)	+$37,400
Airport development (P.L. 93-44)	+15,000
REA—removed from budget (P.L. 93-32)	−146,000
Subtotal legislative bills	+2,070,915
Total, 1974 outlay impact of completed congressional action	+2,870,215

Pending action

The major incomplete legislative actions affecting budget outlays which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress are shown in detail on tables 1, and are summarized below:

Appropriation bills: Incomplete action