



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d 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. Arington, one of its clerks, announced

CXIX—2267—Part 28

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 de-

lightful, 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-MELENDEZ

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

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 unani-

mous 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 unan-

imous 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
Badillo
Barrett
Bell
Blester
Blatnik
Burke, Calif.
Camp
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Conyers
Crane
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellums
Dent
Diggs
Dulski
Ellberg
Foley
Fuqua
Gettys
Gialmo
Gray

Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hanley
Hanna
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Hudnut
Jones, Tenn.
Keating
Kemp
Ketchum
Lent
McEwen
Maillard
Maraziti
Mazzoli
Mills, Ark.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Mollohan
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Nix
Parris

Patman
Podell
Powell, Ohio
Reid
Rhodes
Rodino
Roncalio, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Sandman
Stanton
James V.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Symington
Towell, Nev.
Walsh
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wydler

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 My Lai, 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 particularly 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 academies and I would, therefore, like to emphasize to the Members that this resolution that I urge them to adopt 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: Iran's 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 semifederal 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 likelihood 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,	Devine	Kemp
Calif.	Dickinson	King
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Kluczynski
Andrews, N.C.	Donohue	Koch
Andrews,	Dorn	Kuykendall
N. Dak.	Downing	Kyros
Annuzio	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	McClary
Beard	Fish	McCloskey
Bennett	Fisher	McCollister
Bergland	Flood	McCormack
Bevill	Flowers	McDade
Blaggi	Flynt	McFall
Blester	Foley	McKay
Bingham	Ford, Gerald R.	McKinney
Blackburn	Ford,	McSpadden
Boggs	William D.	Macdonald
Bolling	Forsythe	Madden
Bowen	Fountain	Madigan
Brademas	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Brasco	Frenzel	Mallory
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	Mezvisinsky
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,
Byron	Hamilton	Calif.
Carey, N.Y.	Hammer-	Moorhead, Pa.
Carney, Ohio	schmidt	Mosher
Carter	Hanrahan	Moss
Casey, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Hansen, Wash.	Myers
Chappell	Harsha	Natcher
Clancy	Harvey	Nedzi
Clausen,	Hastings	Nelson
Don H.	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	Hollifield	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	Ichord	Price, Tex.
W. Jr.	Jarman	Pritchard
Daniels,	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Dominick V.	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
Roncallo, Wyo.	Steele	Wilson, Bob
Rooney, N.Y.	Steelman	Wilson
Rose	Steiger, Ariz.	Charles H., Calif.
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
Schler	Thornton	Young, Alaska
Schneebell	Tierman	Young, Fla.
Sebellus	Treen	Young, Ill.
Seibering	Udall	Young, S.C.
Shipley	Ullman	Young, Tex.
Shoup	Van Deerlin	Zablocki
Shriver	Vander Jagt	Zion
Shuster	Vanik	Zwach
Sikes	Veysey	
	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	Stevens
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Stokes
Davis, Wis.	Maraziti	Stratton
Dellums	Mazzoli	Symington
Dent	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Mitchell, N.Y.	Towell, Nev.
Ellberg	Mizell	Walsh
Gettys	Mollohan	Widnall
Gialmo	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. Bolland with Mr. Wydler.
 Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Gialmo 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. Delums.

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 obsolete 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 tak-

ing 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 consideration 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 thereof;
- (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.

—2268—Part 28

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 Depart-

ment 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 would 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 handling 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 additional 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.....	145.2	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 realignment 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 extra-curricular 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
Blester	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	Guyser
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
Hollifield	Calif.	Shuster
Holtzman	Moorhead, Pa.	Sikes
Horton	Mosher	Slak
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	Stevens
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
McClary	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	Roncallo, Wyo.	Williams
Mallory	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
Metcalf	Ryan	Wyllie
Mezvisky	St Germain	Wyman
Michel	Sarasin	Yates
Millford	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
Blaggi	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	Ellberg	Morgan
Armstrong	Gaiamo	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.	Millis, 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. Ellberg 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. Brozman.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Molloy 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. Mail-

liard.
Mr. Gaiamo 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 extraterritorial 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 acknowledgment 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,	Brown, Calif.	Cotter
Calif.	Brown, Mich.	Coughlin
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Cronin
Andrews, N.C.	Broyhill, N.C.	Culver
Andrews,	Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Robert
N. Dak.	Buchanan	W., Jr.
Annunzio	Burgener	Daniels
Arends	Burke, Fla.	Dominick V.
Armstrong	Burke, Mass.	Danielson
Ashley	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
Aspin	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, S.C.
Bafalis	Burton	de la Garza
Baker	Butler	Delaney
Bergland	Byron	Dellenback
Bevill	Carey, N.Y.	Dellums
Biaggi	Carney, Ohio	Denholm
Blester	Carter	Dennis
Bingham	Casey, Tex.	Dent
Blackburn	Cederberg	Derwinski
Boggs	Chamberlain	Devine
Boland	Clancy	Dickinson
Bolling	Clausen	Dingell
Bowen	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,	Macdonald	Shoup
William D.	Madden	Shriver
Forsythe	Maddigan	Shuster
Fountain	Mahon	Sikes
Fraser	Mallary	Sisk
Frelinghuysen	Mann	Skubitz
Frenzel	Martin, Nebr.	Slack
Frey	Martin, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Froehlich	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Fulton	Matsunaga	Spence
Fuqua	Mayne	Staggers
Gaydos	Meeds	Stanton,
Gettys	Melcher	J. William
Gibbons	Metcalfe	Steed
Gonzalez	Mezvisky	Steele
Goodling	Michel	Steelman
Grasso	Milford	Steiger, Ariz.
Gray	Miller	Steiger, Wis.
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Stephens
Griffiths	Mink	Stratton
Grover	Minshall, Ohio	Stubblefield
Gubser	Mitchell, Md.	Stuckey
Gude	Moakley	Studds
Gunter	Moorhead,	Symington
Guyer	Calif.	Talcott
Haley	Moorhead, Pa.	Taylor, N.C.
Hamilton	Morgan	Teague, Calif.
Hammer-	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
schmidt	Moss	Thomson, Wis.
Hanrahan	Murphy, N.Y.	Thone
Hansen, Idaho	Myers	Thornton
Hansen, Wash.	Natcher	Tiernan
Harrington	Nedzi	Treen
Harsha	Nelsen	Udall
Harvey	Nichols	Ullman
Hastings	Obey	Van Deerlin
Hays	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara	Vanik
Heckler, Mass.	O'Neill	Veysey
Heinz	Owens	Vigorito
Helstoski	Parris	Waggonner
Henderson	Passman	Waldie
Hicks	Patten	Wampler
Hillis	Pepper	Ware
Hinshaw	Perkins	Whalen
Hogan	Pettis	White
Holtzman	Peyser	Whitehurst
Horton	Pickle	Widnall
Hosmer	Pike	Wiggins
Howard	Podell	Williams
Hungate	Preyer	Wilson, Bob
Hunt	Price, Ill.	Wilson,
Hutchinson	Pritchard	Charles H.,
Jarman	Quile	Calif.
Johnson, Calif.	Railsback	Wilson,
Johnson, Colo.	Randall	Charles, Tex.
Johnson, Pa.	Rangel	Winn
Jones, Ala.	Rees	Wright
Jones, N.C.	Regula	Wyatt
Jones, Okla.	Reuss	Wyllie
Jordan	Riegle	Wymann
Karth	Rinaldo	Yates
Kastenmeier	Roberts	Yatron
Kazen	Robinson, Va.	Young, Ga.
Kemp	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Ill.
King	Rodino	Young, S.C.
Kluczyński	Roe	Young, Tex.
Koch	Rogers	Zablocki
Kuykendall	Roncalio, Wyo.	Zion
Kyros	Rooney, N.Y.	Zwach
Landrum	Rosenthal	
Latta	Rostenkowski	

NAYS—39

Alexander	Gilman	Price, Tex.
Archer	Ginn	Quillen
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Rarick
Bauman	Gross	Roussell
Beard	Holt	Satterfield
Bennett	Huber	Scherle
Cochran	Ichord	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Symms
Conlan	Lott	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	McSpadden	Whitten
Daniel, Dan	Mathis, Ga.	Wolf
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,
Ellberg	Mazzoli	James V.
Ford, Gerald R.	Mills, Ark.	Stark
Gialmo	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stokes
Green, Pa.	Mizell	Sullivan
Hanley	Mollohan	Teague, Tex.
Hanna	Murphy, Ill.	Towell, Nev.
Hawkins	Nix	Walsh
Hébert	Patman	Wydler
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. Ellberg 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. Gialmo 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. McCLODY).

Mr. McCLODY. 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 wrongdoing 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 ju-

dicial 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 out-balanced 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 anti-busing 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).

XXIX—2269—Part 28

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 for-

mer 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 mil-

lion, 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

posals, 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,	Bennett	Brooks
Calif.	Bergland	Broomfield
Anderson, Ill.	Bevill	Brotzman
Andrews, N.C.	Biaggi	Brown, Calif.
Andrews,	Blester	Brown, Mich.
N. Dak.	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.	Pasman
Burton	Harrington	Patten
Butler	Harsha	Pepper
Byron	Harvey	Perkins
Carey, N.Y.	Hastings	Pettis
Carter	Hays	Peyser
Casper, 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	Quile
Collier	Hollifield	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	Johnson, Colo.	Rodino
W., Jr.	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Daniels	Jones, Ala.	Rogers
Dominick V.	Jones, N.C.	Roncallo, 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	Mallory	Stanton
Flowers	Mann	J. William
Flynt	Martin, Nebr.	Steed
Foley	Martin, N.C.	Steele
Ford	Mathias, Calif.	Steelman
William D.	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,	Thone
Goodling	Calif.	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	O'Hara	Ware
schmidt	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,	Wylie	Young, Tex.
Charles H.,	Wyman	Zablocki
Calif.	Yates	Zion
Wilson,	Yatron	Zwach
Charles, Tex.	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
Clark	McEwen	James V.
Clausen,	Mailliard	Stark
Don H.	Maraziti	Stokes
Conyers	Mazzoli	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Wis.	Mills, Ark.	Towell, Nev.
Diggs	Mitchell, N.Y.	Walsh
Eilberg	Mizell	Widnall
Ford, Gerald R.	Mollohan	Wyder
Glaimo	Murphy, Ill.	

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. 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. Wyder.
Mr. Carney of Ohio with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Glaimo 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 regrettably, 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 forthrightly 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

hijacking 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 soldiers 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 released 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 case-loads 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 illegitimate 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 non-whites 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 employees who have finished their working careers. Pension plans are paid for by employers (and in some cases employees 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 percent 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 employee stays at his job. Usually, an employee 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 employee 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 percent of the people ever get a pension." Such statistics 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 percent of his jobs produced a pension? Or could you more properly conclude that he was 100 percent successful in getting a pension?

Look at it from the employer's point of view: He wants to encourage good employees 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 employees who leave. The result is that long-term employees 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, Ore.

"... 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 BRADEMAMAS

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

Mr BRADEMAMAS. 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 BRADEMAMAS, WSJV-TV, SOUTH BEND-ELKHART, IND., NOVEMBER 7, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAMAS. 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 Services 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. BRADEMAMAS. 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. BRADEMAMAS. 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. BRADEMAMAS. 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, Ukrainians, 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 reason 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 interfering 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 pressure 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 fall-out 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 overriding 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 across the country, said recently that Senator 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 Washington 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 expeditiously. 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 committee'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 been further aggravated by the Midwest 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 Na-

tional 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 French Smith, 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 searching, 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 Special 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 already. 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., sup-

ported 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 those 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 school-bus 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 rule-making 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 accidentally 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 gentlemanly artist from Hammond, Ind., who financed his education working as a machinist 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 reporter 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 Decem-

ber. 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 Presi-

dent, 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 or 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 allowed 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 non-vetoable 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 oversized 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 beleaguered 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 begun 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. Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Five representatives of the Subcommittee 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 knowledgeable 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 it 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 co-operative 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 ap-

peared 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 percentage-wise 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 punctilio of honor"—the highest standard of conduct once described by Justice Benjamin Cardozo.

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 employees; 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 employees 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 uses 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 employee.

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 punctilio 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 insert 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 as-

sumptions 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 over-emphasis 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 complement 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 sup-

ported 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 rise 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. BURGNER.

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. 707; 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. FROELICH, 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 non-voting 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 LUCA, 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. GRIFITHS, 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 herself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BIAGI, 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]	
Bills (including committee action):	Congressional changes in 1974 outlays
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

on two regular 1974 appropriation bills is reflected in this report, with the major impact on budgeted outlays as follows:

	House (in millions)	Senate (in millions)
Labor-HEW	+\$490	+\$587
State-Justice	-40	-20

Legislative bills—backdoor and mandatory: Twenty-one legislative measures authorizing backdoor or mandatory outlays have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress.

House action on 10 such measures would increase fiscal 1974 budget outlays by about \$1.1 billion. Senate action on 13 such measures would increase budgeted 1974 outlays at least \$2.4 billion, including about \$1.4 billion for social security increases. The undetermined outlay effect of increased contract authority is excluded.

The scored backdoor or mandatory impact of these pending legislative bills includes the following major amounts in excess of the budgeted outlays:

	House (in millions)	Senate (in millions)
Civil Service minimum retirement (including social security increase)	+\$172	+\$1,600
Mass transit operating subsidies		+400
Trade reform—readjustment costs	+300	
Federal employee health insurance	+234	
Veterans pensions	+208	+172
Veterans drug treatment		+144

Revenue legislation

The October 18 budget revisions estimate revenue for fiscal 1974 at \$270 billion. This is an increase of \$14 billion over the original January estimate of \$256 billion, and \$4 billion over the June 1 estimate.

The new 1974 revenue estimate reflects upward revision due to a higher than anticipated rate of inflation, and it also includes a small reduction due to the impact of certain congressional action and inaction on revenue proposals.

Completed legislative action to date, has the effect of reducing 1974 revenue estimates by \$492 million, as follows:

Railroad Retirement: decrease of \$612 million due to failure to provide additional trust fund receipts requested.

Social security wage taxes: increase of \$120 million in trust fund revenue due to a wage base increase.

Deficit position

The 1974 deficit position is summarized below in terms of the original budget estimate, subsequent revisions and impact of congressional action to date:

	Billions
Original fiscal 1974 deficit estimate	\$12.7
Budget revisions of June 1: Increase in revenue estimate	10.0
Budget deficit as revised June 1	2.7
Budget revisions of October 18:	
Increase in revenue estimate	4.0
Increase in outlay estimate	1.3
Budget deficit as revised October 18	0
Budget amendment: Proposed increase in outlays for military assistance to Israel and Cambodia	0.6
Budget deficit, as revised and amended to date	0.6
Deduct: Portion of congressional action included in revisions of October 18:	
Revenue increase (net action and inaction)	0.1
Outlay increase	2.4

Budget surplus (excluding congressional action)	1.7
Congressional action through October 26, as shown in this report:	
Decrease in revenue	0.5
Increase in outlays	2.8

Budget deficit as revised, amended and reflecting congressional action to date

PART II—BUDGET AUTHORITY (APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY)

Although the October 18 revisions did not reflect a revised total for fiscal 1974 budget authority, adjustments commensurate with the outlay revisions supplied indicate that the revised and amended 1974 budget authority total is approximately \$293.7 billion.

The impact of congressional action through October 26 on 1974 budget authority, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

	House	Senate	Enacted
Congressional changes to date in requested 1974 budget authority (Committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action	-\$204	+\$592	+\$225
Pending action	+1,182	+1,783	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action	+2,144	+2,885	+2,213
Pending action	+1,094	+3,035	
Shifts between fiscal years 1973 and 1974 (net) due to timing of action on budget requests	+3,890	+3,890	+3,890
Total changes:			
Completed action	+5,830	+7,367	+6,329
Pending action	+2,276	+4,818	
Total	+8,106	+12,185	+6,329
Total changes, excluding shifts between fiscal years due to timing	+4,216	+8,295	+2,439

It should be noted that many significant actions are as yet incomplete. Further actions, through to the end of the current session, may materially affect the final impact of congressional action on the 1974 budget requests for appropriations and other obligating authority.

Completed Actions

The following is a summary of the major individual actions composing the \$2.4 billion total impact of completed congressional action to date on the 1974 budget requests for appropriations and other obligational authority:

Completed action on budget authority requests

	[In thousands]	Congressional changes in 1974 budget authority
Bills (including committee action):		
Appropriation bills:		
HUD-Space-Science-Veterans		+\$439,047
Agriculture		+108,116
Interior		+72,770
Public Works		-8,066
District of Columbia		-15,281
Par value of gold supplemental		-47,000
Legislative		-71,961
Transportation		-112,286
Treasury-Postal Service		-140,156
Subtotal, appropriation bills		+225,183
Legislative bills:		
Federal-aid highways (contract authority) (P.L. 93-87)		+1,307,220

Food stamp amendments (P.L. 93-86)	+724,000
Federal employee pay raise, Oct. 1, 1973 (S. Res. 171)	+357,900
Traffic safety (contract authority) (P.L. 93-87)	+281,000
School lunch amendments (H.R. 9639)	+210,000
Welfare-medicaid amendments (P.L. 93-66)	+122,000
Social security—liberalized income exemption (P.L. 93-66)	+120,000
Veterans national cemeteries (P.L. 93-43)	+110,000
Railroad retirement—failure to provide trust fund revenue requested (P.L. 93-69)	-612,000
REA loans—removed from budget (P.L. 93-32)	-579,000
Other	+172,315

Subtotal, legislative bills

Total

Pending action

The major incomplete legislative actions which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress are shown in detail on table 1, and are summarized below:

Appropriation bills: Pending action on 2 regular 1974 appropriation bills is reflected in this report, with the major impact on budget authority as follows:

	House (in millions)	Senate (in millions)
Labor-HEW	+\$1,264	+\$1,846
State-Justice	-82	-63

Legislative bills: Twenty-three legislative bills carrying backdoor or mandatory authorizations have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress.

House action pertaining to 11 such measures would increase budget authority by \$1.1 billion, and Senate action on 15 measures would increase budget authority by \$3 billion.

The scored backdoor or mandatory impact of these pending legislative bills includes the following major amounts in excess of the budget:

Freight car loan guarantee: additional backdoor borrowing authority of \$2 billion in the Senate.

Mass transit operating subsidies: additional backdoor contract authority of \$400 million in the Senate.

Trade reform: mandatory expansion of statutory readjustment benefits of \$300 million as pending in the House.

Federal employee health insurance: mandatory increase in federal contribution of \$234 million as passed by the House.

Veterans pensions: mandatory benefits of \$208 million in the House and \$172 million in the Senate.

Civil service retirement: mandatory increase in minimum retirement costs of about \$170 million as passed by the Senate and \$172 million as pending in the House.

Veterans drug treatment: mandatory benefits of \$144 million in the Senate.

Authorizing legislation

In its actions during the current session to date, the Congress has made increases in various legislative authorizing measures reflected in the budget for continuation of on-going programs (see table 8 for detail). While these actions in themselves do not mandate additional spending, and are not scored for purposes of this report, they do provide for higher discretionary funding levels.

Further, on its own initiative, the Congress has authorized nonmandatory spending pro-

grams which were not proposed by the administration. Such legislation may also create additional discretionary funding requirements—now or in the future. For example, in the case of legislation enacted to extend the unbudgeted Economic Development Administration, supplemental funding was subsequently requested by the President involving increased outlays of \$25 million.

Some of the major legislation of this type is listed below:

Major discretionary (nonmandatory) authorization increases

Congressional action increasing authorizations contemplated in the 1974 budget requests [in thousands]

Authorization of budget on-going programs:

Enacted:

Housing programs (P.L. 93-117) -----	\$777,000
Health programs (P.L. 93-45) -----	401,505
Clean air program, EPA (P.L. 93-15) -----	469,000
Vocational rehabilitation (P.L. 93-112) -----	260,904
Older Americans Act (P.L. 93-29) -----	117,600
Law enforcement assistance (P.L. 93-83) -----	108,876
Solid waste disposal (P.L. 93-14) -----	93,000
National Science Foundation (P.L. 93-96) -----	53,000
AMTRAK grants (S. 2016) --	56,200
NASA (P.L. 93-74) -----	48,500
Corporation for Public Broadcasting (P.L. 93-84) --	35,000

Pending in one or both Houses:

Manpower program (job training) (H.R. 7950, S. 1559)

New authorizations not included in 1974 budget:

Enacted:

Economic Development Administration (P.L. 93-46) -	430,000
Lead based paint poisoning prevention (S. 607) -----	63,000

¹ Funding requested by budget amendment: \$205 million in budget authority and additional \$25 million in outlays

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION TO HELP MONITOR MARKETPLACE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has recently begun a consumer deputy program. The program is aimed at recruiting citizen volunteers to canvass stores to make sure that toys on the Commission's banned products list are not being sold.

I intend to write to consumer organizations in Massachusetts to urge that they participate in this effort. To provide further information on the concept, I offer the following explanatory statement from the Commission:

CPSC CONSUMER DEPUTY PROGRAM TO HELP MONITOR MARKETPLACE

The Consumer Product Safety Commission today announced a Consumer Deputy Program to enlist the assistance of consumers to police the marketplace for banned products.

The program is underway in 14 cities where the Commission's regional offices are located: Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Consumer organizations and individual consumers who volunteer to serve as Consumer Deputies will be trained by Commission staff to canvass stores to insure that products which appear on the CPSC Banned Products List are not being sold.

Initially, the Consumer Deputies will focus on banned toys as part of the Commission's holiday season Toy Safety Campaign. Approximately 1,500 extremely dangerous toys have been banned under the authority of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act as amended by the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969.

Store surveillance is a normal activity of CPSC field inspectors, but the addition of volunteers, especially during the holiday season, provides a boost to Commission efforts to protect children from toy-related injuries.

After the holidays, the Consumer Deputies will check compliance with other safety regulations in force for products covered by the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Poison Prevention Packaging Act, and the Refrigerator Door Safety Act.

A Consumer Deputy is not an official employee of the Commission. If the Deputy sees a toy or other product for sale which is believed to have been banned, the Deputy will inform the shopkeeper and will ask the retailers to remove the product from sale and to check his supplier to ascertain whether, in fact, the product has been banned. Commission field staff will pick up the case at that point.

In instances where the retailer is uncooperative, the store will be visited by Commission inspectors. If a banned product is still being offered for sale, the retailer could be liable for criminal penalties.

A pilot Consumer Deputy Program was undertaken last year by the Food and Drug Administration. Some 134 volunteers participated in programs in six cities—Atlanta, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Consumers who would like to volunteer as Consumer Deputies should contact their nearest CPSC area office for further information.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION: AREA OFFICES

Atlanta—1430 West Peachtree Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30309, (404) 526-2259.

Boston—408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02110, (617) 223-5576.

Chicago—433 West Van Buren Street, Room 1222, Chicago, Illinois 60607, c/o Food and Drug Administration, (312) 353-8260.

Dallas—P.O. Box 15035, Dallas, Texas 75201, (214) 749-3951.

Denver—613 U.S. Customhouse, Denver, Colorado 80202, (303) 837-4917, c/o Food and Drug Administration.

Kansas City—911 Walnut Street, Room 1905, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, c/o Food and Drug Administration, (816) 374-2034.

Los Angeles—1521 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90015, (213) 688-7225.

Minneapolis—Fort Snelling Federal Building, Room 650, Twin Cities, Minnesota 55111, (612) 725-3424.

New Orleans—Room 323, Gateway Building, 124 Camp Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130, (504) 527-2101.

New York—850 Third Avenue, Seventh Floor, Brooklyn, New York 11232, c/o Food and Drug Administration, (212) 788-1456.

Philadelphia—Room 502, U.S. Customhouse, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106, (215) 597-9105.

San Francisco—50 Fulton Street, Room 518, San Francisco, California 94102, c/o Food and Drug Administration, (415) 556-1819.

Seattle—1131 Federal Office Building, 909

First Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104, (effective 10/15/73—no phone number available).

Cleveland—5225 Warrensville Center Road, Maple Heights, Ohio 44137, (216) 522-3131, Ext. 6023.

ON PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mayor Kevin H. White, of Boston, in which he proposes an amendment to the 1947 Presidential Succession Act which would provide for a special election in the event the offices of President and Vice President are simultaneously vacated. Mayor White leaves no question about what he has in mind, and that is the circumvention of the procedures specified in the 25th amendment to the Constitution providing for the appointment of a Vice President, subject to congressional confirmation, should that office be vacated.

As I make clear in my response to Mayor White, I consider this proposal a most cynical and partisan proposal under the present circumstances, and feel it would only compound the trauma and disruption which would attend the impeachment and removal of a President. I think the succession process which presently applies under the 1947 act and the 25th amendment is far preferable from the standpoint of national unity and stability. And furthermore, I think this Congress has a clear obligation to honor the spirit and intent of the 25th amendment in proceeding with the expeditious consideration of the nomination of Congressman GERALD R. FORD as Vice President. This is no time to be considering a major alteration in the Presidential succession structure for what is obviously blatantly narrow political purposes.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the exchange of correspondence between Mayor White and myself:

BOSTON, MASS.,
October 29, 1973.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am enclosing a proposal which should be of great interest to you because it is, I believe, of potentially great importance to our country.

In the present political and constitutional crisis, we are seemingly confronted with two unattractive alternatives. The first is to acquiesce to the disregard and abuse of constitutional powers by our current elected leadership, and to continuing controversy about the legitimacy of that leadership to govern the nation.

The second is to take steps to bring about the resignation, or impeachment and conviction, of the President. This is an unfamiliar process which will divide the country. It will result in succession to the Presidency of one of two honest and competent Congressmen, neither of whom has previously been thought of in connection with the Presidency, and each of whom, if he did succeed to that Office, would have the liability of being the

first leader in our history lacking a national electoral mandate.

There is, however, a third way. Last week I proposed that through simple legislation, Congress could call for a Special Election in 1974, if both the Office of President and Vice President are simultaneously vacant. This was, indeed, precisely what the framers of the Constitution expected to happen, and it was the law of the land for almost a century.

I believe a return to the intentions of the framers furnishes a possible way out of our current dilemma.

The legislation to accomplish this, which could be a simple Amendment to the Presidential Succession Act of 1947, ought to be promptly passed before the contingency which it is designed to meet should arise. This would help to resolve the confusions and uncertainties which now surround the possible consequences of the Presidency's becoming vacant.

I hope you will join with me in expressing your views to Congressman Rodino and Senator Eastland in urging their Committees to give prompt and favorable consideration to this timely legislation.

Sincerely,

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Mayor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1973.

HON. KEVIN H. WHITE,
Mayor, City of Boston, City Hall, Boston,
Mass.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: Thank you for your letter of Oct. 29 and the attached paper outlining your proposal for an amendment to the 1947 Presidential Succession Act which would provide for a special election in the event that the offices of President and Vice President are vacant simultaneously.

While I can understand your criticism of the present succession procedure which does make possible the elevation of persons to the presidency who have not been popularly elected nationally, I nevertheless feel that the procedures specified by the 25th amendment are preferable for several reasons.

I at least admire your candor in admitting that your proposal is aimed specifically at our present situation, and that what you have in mind is ignoring the requirements of the 25th amendment with respect to the confirmation of Mr. Ford and proceeding with the removal of President Nixon to thus force a special election. I am curious to know if you would be advancing the same proposal if a Democratic Administration were now in the same situation as the Republican Administration is, or, more to the point, whether you advanced this same proposal as an alternative at the time the 25th was under consideration in 1965. And keep in mind that the 25th Amendment was drafted and adopted by a Democratic Congress.

The main defect in your proposal as I see it is that it would have a tremendous disruptive and traumatic impact on our government and the nation, particularly between the time a President is removed and a new one is inaugurated, the interim elevation of the Speaker as Chief Executive notwithstanding. An impeachment proceeding in itself is fraught with enough trauma, but I think the additional requirements of your proposal would only compound that trauma. In addition, I am especially puzzled by your proposal that the new government be permitted to serve a full four-year term. Again, this seems to be more politically motivated than anything else.

I am at least pleased that the Democratic leadership in Congress is in agreement that we must abide by the intent and spirit of the 25th Amendment in expeditiously moving on the Ford nomination and not hold it political hostage pending the outcome of impeachment proceedings. To do otherwise, in my

opinion, would be a most cynical and narrow political ploy at odds with the national interest.

With all due respect to the work and thought you have put into this proposal, in the final analysis I think it runs contrary to the expeditious and orderly succession process which I feel is essential in the wake of a traumatic impeachment-conviction-removal upheaval. To prolong this agony by a protracted national election campaign which is bound to be bitter and divisive, especially when the Congress and White House are controlled by opposing parties, could do irreparable harm to our body politic. The 25th Amendment, on the other hand, despite its flaws and shortcomings, at least provides for some semblance of order, continuity and unity at a time when it would be most needed.

With all best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION AND THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in the RECORD today I have commented on the shortcomings of the United Nations. I have been asked by Jesse Gordon, author of an article in support of the United Nations, to place his comments in the RECORD. The article follows:

[From Free Mind, September 1973]

AHA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Jesse Gordon)

When delegates from 50 nations met at San Francisco in the spring of 1945, World War II was not yet over, but a determination to establish an international organization to keep the peace was paramount in the minds of the delegates. After two months of intense negotiations, the language of the Charter of the United Nations was agreed upon.

Twenty-eight years have passed since the nations of the world pledged themselves "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

In judging the political performance of the UN and in making the organization the scapegoat for the difficulties of its members, a number of important considerations are often conveniently forgotten. The first of these is the origin of the UN. The UN was not set up by small or medium powers. It was set up by the great powers themselves under the shock and experience of two devastating world wars. Kurt Waldheim, the secretary-general of the UN, states: "The UN was set up by the great powers to avoid in the future the mistakes, weaknesses and misunderstandings which, twice in less than 30 years, had led them into total war. We ignore this historical fact at our peril."

The American Humanist Association is active among the hundreds of non-governmental organizations sponsoring the UN.

The A.H.A. realizes there is an urgent need for greater understanding and support of the United Nations by the millions of citizens who are the constituents of non-governmental organizations. The A.H.A. is represented in the NGO group by Mrs. Henrietta Rogoff with Mr. Jesse Gordon, alternate.

In 1945, the UN came into existence accompanied by the usual flowery speeches. It was seen as "the great hope of humanity," "the hope of the world," and "the last, great hope for peace."

Has the UN fulfilled the "hope" that so many people placed in it as "The last great hope of humanity?" Or, is it just a useless debating society?

First of all, the UN has contended with a world of many revolutions—peaceful and otherwise. The original memberships of the UN was 51; it now numbers 135, with the two Germanys recently joining. The UN has many achievements to its credit. It can count among its successes, in the political area, the negotiated settlement of disputes affecting Indonesia, Kashmir, and West New Guinea, among others. The Middle East "question" has, of course, been before the UN almost continuously since 1947. It can be shown that UN presence in the area has prevented many incidents from developing into a wider war.

One might ask the question: What might have happened in the Congo and neighboring states in 1960 if it had not been for the UN peacekeeping force there? Critics point to Soviet intervention in Hungary and Czechoslovakia and the impotence of the UN to act in those situations.

It all comes down to big power politics and political objectives. The U.S. role in Indochina could similarly be examined for violations of the U.N. charter.

What are the principles of the charter?

The charter is based on seven main principles:

- (1) The equality and sovereignty of all member states.
- (2) Fulfillment "in good faith" by all members of obligations assumed under the charter.
- (3) Peaceful settlements of disputes.
- (4) Renunciation of the threat or use of force.
- (5) Cooperation with the UN in any action it takes.
- (6) Encouragement of non-member states to abide by its principles.
- (7) Non-intervention by the UN in the internal affairs of any state.

The Charter also calls for freedom of religion. Many faiths, each with a different conception of God, are represented at the UN. A moment of silence opens and closes each General Assembly session, and there is a Meditation Room at UN headquarters which is open at all times. There is no mention of God in the Charter just as there is none in the U.S. Constitution.

The UN Charter pledges all members to cooperate for the promotion of human rights. Although the authority of the United Nations is limited to debate, study, publicity, and recommendation, it has exerted immeasurable influence on behalf of human rights.

In 1948 the General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Its clauses on the civil, political, economic, and social rights of human beings have influenced the written constitutions of a number of new nations. Its provisions have been incorporated in several important peace treaties.

The General Assembly has also produced draft conventions—treaties—in the human rights field. Some forbid particular offenses such as genocide, forced labor, and slavery. Others set standards in particular areas such as political rights of women. Such conventions must be ratified by the individual UN members in accordance with their constitutional processes. In addition, the Assembly has produced two comprehensive human rights covenants, one on civil and political rights and one on economic and social rights, both ratified by more than 30 governments.

For many years UN experts have offered advisory services to governments on human rights questions. Various UN-sponsored international seminars on human rights have been held. The UN has also served as a central point to which aggrieved groups may complain of specific human rights violations. But there is disagreement as to how the UN should handle such complaints. One propos-

al would establish a UN office, that of High Commissioner for Human Rights, to receive inquiries and complaints from both governments and private parties and to advise and conciliate at their request. The High Commissioner would have no power to overrule a government, but his views would carry moral authority.

IN MEMORY OF ROBERT KENNAN,
JR.

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the District of Columbia have lost a very fine friend in the person of Robert Kennan, Jr., the late general counsel to the National Wildlife Federation. It is with a heavy heart that I share this loss with you.

At 35, Bob established himself as one of the leading conservationists in the country. He joined the Wildlife Federation in January 1971 after serving with the law firm of Purcell and Nelson for 6 years. He was a formidable opponent for those who attempted to infect the Nation's environment with unneeded and dangerous undertakings.

Many times, Bob stood up and fought against environmentally harmful and unneeded roads and highways. As general counsel to the federation, he led efforts to keep Federal interstate highways out of the Big Cypress Swamp in Florida and the Sandia Crest Mountains of New Mexico. His sincerity and determination was frequently rewarded as his success in these areas illustrates.

Bob Kennan's position did not keep him away from controversial issues. He was involved in one litigation to open the procedures of the Federal Highway Administration to public view and comment in an effort to bring them into compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. Efforts like this illustrates the purpose behind the life of Robert Kennan. Using the authority of the courts, he attempted, and succeeded to bring the Nation's environment under this protection.

Robert Kennan's last major case is a prime example of the cause he furthered on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation. In a suit he brought against the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration, 1,000 highway projects around the country were forced to meet environmental standards set forth by the Environmental Policy Act which Bob maintained as being fair and equitable to everyone it affected.

Locally, this dear friend of mine was a member of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City. He participated in the fight against urban freeways and was personally involved in halting construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac Freeway and Interstate 66 by using his personal time and talent in assisting to resolve the legal complexities which were involved in these issues.

Robert Kennan's personal life was, of course, as honorable and distinguished as his public image suggests. Born in

Kohala, Hawaii, he studied at Pomona College, Calif., under a George R. Baker scholarship, and at Oxford University, England, under a Marshall scholarship. He was also a graduate of the University of Washington School of Law, where he was editor of the Washington Law Review.

Robert Kennan was a man of impeccable character; dedicated to his family, job, and friends. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife Elizabeth and his son, Alexander. I am sure that they, along with all of us who knew him, will be forever impressed by the memory of such great a man.

ENTERPRISE STILL PAYS OFF

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the spirit of high adventure and success still prevails in U.S. business and that experiences in my busy western Pennsylvania district underscore the fact.

The district is the home of many small but markedly progressive carbide producing and fabricating firms, each a spin-off from the old Firth Sterling Co. which pioneered in carbide production in this country.

Most of the firms were started by and some still are in the hands of, machinists and toolmakers who first plied their trades at Firth Sterling and then took out on their own. They now make a wide variety of carbide dies and instruments. A few have been sold to large corporations.

Carbide, I point out, is not the only basis of industrial development back where I live. Just the other day, Precise Metals & Plastics, Inc., having outgrown its facilities in the McKeesport area, began construction of a new plant on a 20-acre site in nearby North Versailles Township.

The company today employs 280 workers and this figure is expected to rise when the new \$1.3 million plant is opened. Sales are up to the \$9 million annual mark and their steady pace of increase shows no signs of abating.

Of special interest to me, and to others who have followed the firm's advancement, is that Precise Metals & Plastics is the result of what once were the dreams of two Westinghouse Airbrake Co. toolmakers, Robert S. Mason and William O. Shaver. They pooled funds and skills and entered what to them seemed to be the promising plastics business. In 1964, they founded their company. Along the way they enlisted Arthur W. Roethlisberger as an associate and acquired other firms related to their operation. Later on they sold out to KDI Corp. of Cincinnati, Ohio, a diversified manufacturer, but retained a free hand for themselves in running the company they created.

According to William H. Wylie, business editor of the Pittsburgh Press, Mr. Mason and Mr. Shaver "had a good idea and perseverance to carry it out." In his story on the ground breaking for the new Precise plant, Mr. Wylie also reminded

his readers that "a good idea is the stuff of which jobs are made."

More than this, the Mason and Shaver idea has demonstrated again, and at a time when the forces of deadening socialism seem to be getting stronger elsewhere, that enterprise and ingenuity, plus good hard work, still are paying off in America. My district is grateful to be the location of Precise Metals & Plastics and the other companies born since World War II by the efforts of ambitious workmen who saw a chance to make good as industrialists and did so.

PATROLMAN GEORGE R. MEADE—
ANOTHER GALLANT POLICEMAN
IS CUT DOWN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of sorrow and outrage that I relate to my colleagues still another violent and untimely death of a policeman, Patrolman George R. Meade of the 42d Precinct in the Bronx, N.Y.

At 1:15 a.m. on October 10, Patrolman Meade, off duty, was sitting in an establishment in the Bronx. Suddenly three men entered and announced a robbery. Meade identified himself as a policeman, and attempted to apprehend the criminals. A gunbattle ensued, and when it was over two of the criminals, as well as Meade, lay dead of gunshot wounds. The third man escaped into the night.

Millions of New Yorkers awoke the next morning to read the account of this tragedy. Yet what they could read would not tell them of the extraordinary man and the fine human being who was killed.

George R. Meade was born in the Bronx on January 8, 1939. He served with distinction in the Navy between 1956 and 1959. He joined the New York City Police Department on March 28, 1963. He had an illustrious police career, highlighted by his being awarded two meritorious awards for outstanding police work. Ironically, his last award was earlier this year for successfully preventing another holdup.

Yet despite these significant accomplishments, the death of George Meade signified more than the loss of another great policeman. George Meade was a dedicated family man as well. He is survived by his wife Rosalie, and four children; Yvette, Yvonne, Andrea, and Antony, as well as his parents and countless other relatives and friends, all of whom mourn his death as a particularly tragic loss.

George Meade had a desire for excellence in everything he pursued in life. At the time of his death, he was attending Hostos Community College where he was an A student. As a tribute to this outstanding man, Hostos College has set up a scholarship fund in his honor.

Yet as decent and well-intentioned as memorials and testimonials are, they do not diminish the agony and suffering which must be endured by the families

and loved ones of men like George Meade.

As a former 23-year veteran of the New York City police force, I felt a sense of personal as well as comradeship loss over George Meade's death. As I sat at the funeral, I saw the anguish and pain which Mrs. Meade and family felt, and thought about the hundreds of other wives and families of policemen who have been forced to endure similar losses of their husbands and fathers.

It is a sorry time in this Nation when even one policeman is killed in the line of duty. Yet so far in 1973 alone, 107 policemen have been cut down in the line of duty by depraved criminals. Yet what will we as a society do? Do we express shock and outrage, and then wait for another one to be killed, or do we act? Inherent to a stable democracy is a strong and efficient law enforcement system. We must demand that the policemen of this Nation are better protected. Not only must we strengthen our system of justice and reduce crime, but we must provide for the widows and children of the men who die in the line of duty. Legislation to that effect is now long pending in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my profound honor to pay tribute to this fine man George Meade, and I know I speak for thousands of New Yorkers when I express my sincerest condolences to his widow and family. And to my colleagues I say, let us not wait for another policeman to be murdered before we act.

DULUTH—15 YEARS OF PORT PROGRESS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State, and indeed of the whole north-central region, are proud of the progress of the Port of Duluth-Superior. In the 14 years since the St. Lawrence Seaway opened, the Port of Duluth has handled 50 million tons of international cargo.

Import-export cargo movements have increased annually since the seaway was opened. Commerce through the Port of Duluth provides jobs not only in that city and in the State of Minnesota, but throughout the whole north-central region of this country. The \$40 million annually that is contributed to the Duluth community because of the port activity is a tiny fraction of the economic value that this one port gives to our area.

Minnesota has traditionally been heavily involved in international trade. Our cargoes, agricultural and manufactured, have found their ways to international markets through ports of the east, gulf, and west coasts for years. We are particularly proud of our newest port outlet in Duluth, and we congratulate the Seaway Port Authority of Duluth on another important milestone in its growth, its 50 millionth ton of international cargo.

The following article was prepared by the Seaway Port Authority of Duluth

and is inserted in the RECORD for the information of all Members:

FIFTEEN YEARS OF PORT PROGRESS

The 1973 navigation season is being heralded as a golden anniversary of sort for the Port of Duluth-Superior—a year in which the 50 millionth ton of international cargo moved through harbor terminals. The phrase "of sorts" deserves a bit of qualification since the port has been in existence for more than a century and, handling approximately 40 million tons of domestic cargoes annually, has continually been a major center of Great Lakes commerce.

It was in 1959 that the St. Lawrence Seaway opened to extend North America's Fourth Seacoast 2,300 miles inland to the head of Lake Superior. And, Duluth-Superior's reputation as a leading bulk port was further enhanced by it becoming an all-service port, a world port. Joining the familiar Great Lakes bulk carriers whose lengths had stretched to 700 feet and more were oceangoing vessels flying the flags of most maritime nations throughout the world. To accommodate these ships, more than \$25 million was invested in new grain and general cargo terminals and in modernizing existing facilities.

Duluth-Superior became the principal port for importers and exporters in 10 midwestern states and two Canadian provinces, a hinterland that encompasses highly industrialized big cities, bustling mining communities and vast midwestern plains that produce much of the world's food supply. Since 1959, grain has been shipped to Europe, Russia and the Far East. Powdered milk, flour and other agricultural products have been exported to developing nations at all compass points. Steel, automobiles, table wine, even billiard balls and greenhouse parts, are imported from Europe. From Malaysia comes foodstuffs and crude rubber. In short, the port handles all products made by people for people.

Import-export cargo movements started with a modest 1.9 million tons being handled in 1959 and grew to a record 5.2 million tons in 1972. This business provides employment for more than 2,000 persons along Duluth-Superior's waterfront and has contributed more than \$40 million a year directly into the economy of the community. In the State of Minnesota alone, 43,000 persons owe their jobs to international trade at an economic benefit to the state of \$140 million a year.

TRIBUTE TO MISS RUTH MORGAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the French philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau, once said, "What wisdom can you find that is greater than kindness?"

By this definition, Miss Ruth Morgan, who recently retired as the chief deputy city clerk of Gardena, Calif., is certainly one of the wisest persons in the land.

First coming to Los Angeles during World War II, Miss Morgan settled in Gardena in 1956 and was sworn in as deputy city clerk in 1958.

In this capacity, her pleasant personality and her skill in solving people's problems were rewarded by a promotion to chief deputy clerk in 1964, where her assets could be more effectively utilized.

A devoted public servant, Miss Morgan was always available to offer an empathetic ear and to commit her talents and energies to helping people deal with the city.

She became intimately involved in the administration of Gardena and was instrumental in establishing the orderly, professional procedures which are a hallmark of the Gardena city government.

After over 17 years of dedicated service to the people of Gardena, Miss Morgan has decided to take a well-earned rest from her duties with the city. However, retirement in her case is not synonymous with idleness.

Rather, this period in her life will give her even more time to devote to the civic and charitable activities with which she has become deeply involved.

A member of the American Legion Auxiliary for 25 years, Ruth Morgan served as the president of Auxiliary Post 187 from 1962 through 1963.

In addition, she plans to continue her years of volunteer work with the American Red Cross, in which she served as the safety services chairman for Gardena, a member of the Gardena branch board of directors, an organizer of Red Cross first aid classes in the area, and as a member of the Southern District Board.

Miss Morgan has also been active in the Junior Association for the Blind, the YMCA, YWCA, the Sister City Committee, Friends of the Library, and the Soroptomist.

Her love of people has been coupled with a love of animals, as evidenced by her membership in the National Wildlife Federation and the National Audubon Society.

Mr. Speaker, Ruth Morgan's greatest attribute is that she cares—she cares about people; their problems and concerns, and she has devoted her life to serve her fellow man. She is the type of person that has made our community and our Nation great and her services in City Hall will be missed.

SOVIETS NEED WESTERN TECHNOLOGY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the following letter by Edward A. Stern, professor of physics at the University of Washington, appeared in the October 7 edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Stern had the opportunity of recently visiting with Soviet Physicist Andrei Sakharov. As Mr. Stern writes—and as I have stated on numerous occasions—the Soviet Union has a desperate need for Western technology, investments, and organization to avert serious economic problems. The West should not extend these needed benefits to the Soviets without obtaining meaningful changes in Soviet society. At this point I include in the RECORD the text of Professor Stern's letter.

CAN THE WEST IGNORE SAKHAROV'S MESSAGE?

I had the honor of visiting the famous Soviet physicist Andrei D. Sakharov for four hours on the evening of Aug. 23 during my recent trip to the Soviet Union to attend a

scientific conference. Being a physicist myself and knowing some of the Soviet Jewish scientists who have been refused permission to emigrate to Israel, I was able to arrange through these contacts the visit with Sakharov.

At the time of our conversation Sakharov was aware of the impending attack against him by the authorities (which subsequently became public) and detailed to me several instances of pressure exerted against him in a covert fashion through loved ones who are made to suffer so as to hurt him and blackmail him into silence. In spite of all of these covert pressures and in spite of the recent covert pressures Sakharov courageously speaks out because his concern for his country and the world transcends his concern for his personal safety. Can the West afford to ignore Sakharov's message and permit the Soviets to crush such a man, as they surely will do without a strong outcry and use of the leverage made available by the impending detente?

The first priority of the Soviet authorities is to maintain themselves in power. Because they have fallen behind technologically and their economic base is becoming obsolete they desperately need Western technology, investments and organization to avert serious economic and military problems. Otherwise, the present Soviet leaders cannot hope to remain in power.

At the same time the Soviet authorities don't have enough confidence in their control over their society to expose it to Western ideas and influence, to maintain isolation in the face of the inevitable increase Western trade requires intimidating the average Soviet citizen to stay away from these foreigners. The latest publicized dissident trial of Yakir and Krasin and the simultaneous attacks on Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov prominently proclaim the crime of "clandestine meeting with foreigners."

The Soviets want to have detente on their terms where they can receive Western technology, investments and management and still maintain their isolation. As Sakharov points out, the West has a unique opportunity to use the leverage of aid, which the Soviets desperately need, to open Soviet society somewhat and move the Soviet Union toward a lasting world order. The Jackson-Mills-Vanik legislation is the bare minimum.

EDWARD A. STERN,
Professor of Physics,
University of Washington.

SEATTLE.

**HENRY ROBIN, OF SAN ANTONIO
LIGHT, NAMED TEXAS CARRIER
OF THE YEAR**

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Henry Robin, a carrier for the San Antonio Light, was recently named Texas Newspaper Carrier of the Year. Contesting with 30,000 carriers, this young man was given this recognition by the Texas Circulation Managers Association and the Texas Daily Newspaper Association.

I extend my own congratulations to this worthy young man. It is an achievement of which he can be justly proud. It bespeaks a quality which is truly outstanding. Equipped as Henry is with character, ambition, and ability, we can be sure his future endeavors will be equally as rewarding.

Under leave to extend my remarks,

I include details of the award and its significance:

HENRY ROBIN, CARRIER OF THE YEAR

Henry Robin, a carrier for the San Antonio Light, has been named Texas Carrier of the Year by the Texas Circulation Managers Association and the Texas Daily Newspaper Association.

He was entered in the statewide competition after being named Carrier of the Year for The Light.

In addition to a \$2,500 scholarship, which Henry plans to use to study computer technology at Texas A & M University, awards to the state's top newspaper carrier include a trip to the TCMA convention in Houston where he will be introduced to the assembled circulation managers and presented a savings bond, and a trip to Austin where he will be a special luncheon guest of Governor Dolph Briscoe.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry D. Robin of San Antonio, 17-year-old Henry is a senior at Churchill High School, where he has won many honors for both scholarship and extracurricular activities.

Nominees for Texas Carrier of the Year were judged on the basis of scholastic achievement, personal achievement, community service and newspaper route activity.

A Light carrier for two years, Henry has doubled the number of subscribers on his route, changing his route from the smallest in his circulation district to the largest. He has qualified for the Light carriers' Merit Club eight times in a row, been named District Leader five times and has won a trip to LBJ Ranch.

In addition to his Light route, Henry has held a part-time job at which he worked seven days a week for a year. At the same time, he maintained a high B average in school, participated in a number of extracurricular activities and placed well up in University Interscholastic League tournaments in number sense, math analysis and slide rule.

A member of Temple Beth-El, Henry is second vice-president of the Federation of Temple Youth. He was nominated for honors in the field of religion by the Optimists Clubs during Youth Appreciation Week last year.

Henry has been a member of the Churchill ROTC for three years, advancing to first sergeant, and last year was named outstanding first sergeant of the school.

He is also active in bowling leagues and plays chess, golf and bridge. He is a Life Scout, earning 23 merit badges during his four years in Boy Scouts.

A highlight of the past year for Henry was being chosen one of only 33 high school juniors and seniors in the country to attend an eight-week Summer Institute of Mathematics and Computer Programming at the University of Oklahoma. He paid his own expenses from his earnings.

With the money he has saved from his Light route and his job, Henry has bought much of his own wardrobe, books and his senior ring and paid for his school lunches. He also paid for carpeting the upstairs of his family home.

**THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
1956 HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, I had the privilege of addressing a group of participants in

that tragic and heroic grasp for freedom. Dr. Andras H. Pogany, president of the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters, delivered the following remarks at the anniversary celebration and I commend them to your attention. The parallels he draws between the world situation 17 years ago and today cannot be ignored. As Dr. Pogany points out, we should not sweep the hard facts of continued Soviet oppression under the rug simply because we are making an effort toward detente.

The remarks follow:

THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1956 HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

On the 17th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, we, the officers, members, friends and supporters of the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters, on three continents, rededicate ourselves to the principles and demands of that historic event in Hungary.

We are speaking and rededicating ourselves on behalf of the oppressed Hungarian people, whose last free voice was heard 17 years ago. This voice demanded freedom for Hungary and freedom for all and everywhere.

In 1956 the Free World was worried about Suez and, consequently, the freedom in Hungary had been let to die. Seventeen years passed by and there is still no peace around Suez; more so, now the freedom of the world is endangered much more than ever before. It is impossible not to remember the old saying: how little wisdom governs the world indeed!

Are we, Hungarian freedom fighter perhaps out-dated today? Should we change or reconsider our goals in the seventies?

We do not believe so, Ladies and Gentlemen. We cannot change, because the Communist totalitarianism did not change at all, as we could realize it quite easily in the events of this new, raging war, fully supplied for and encouraged again by the Soviet Union, supposedly pursuing a policy of happy "detente" toward us. We cannot and we are not willing to recognize a so-called status-quo, because no status-quo is possible with oppression, neo-colonialism and terror. There cannot be a status-quo, if the other side is doing its best to bury us, threatening our very life and existence. Unfortunately, the American public today is being systematically misled and lives in an utopian state of daydreaming. Many of us sincerely believe that a safe and peaceful world is just around the corner. Unfortunately, as it is, that such world cannot be called into existence by dramatic announcements, happy handshakings, engaging smiles and by sweeping hard, but unpleasant facts under the rug in the name of a "detente," which simply does not exist. If the Vietnam war did not teach us anything about the Soviet's idea of detente and co-existence, let's hope, that the new Middle East War will, if, hopefully, there is still a spark of reality left in the minds of our modern American apostles of detente.

So far, however, the voices of reality came rather of Moscow than of Washington, D.C. The voices of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn joined with the unbroken voice of the great living Hungarians, Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty and all of them told the same: beware . . . May God help us to understand these solemn warnings better, than we did it in the time of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

In such circumstances we, Hungarian freedom fighters are not willing to compromise. We repeat, with unswerving faith and loyalty the last message of our revolution: if freedom, human dignity and constitutional rights are oppressed by naked military force anywhere, the freedom of the world is in mortal danger and we have to face the challenge without double talk, made-up excuses or hesitation.

This year, a year of many disappointments and self-delusion for America; in a year when we had the opportunity to watch the Soviet red flag; with its hammer and sickle, unfurl in front of the White House, we turned our attention to our last hope: to the youth of America. You will remember, that since 1960—when then Vice-President Nixon received this Award—through the late Senator Dirksen, Ambassador Portuendo, up to Mr. David Lawrence in 1972, just to mention a few, many important and influential personalities received our Federation's Freedom Award: politicians, diplomats, newsmen, and television personalities, outstanding benefactors, both Americans and foreigners who, in a given year, made the most significant contribution to our uneven efforts for restoration of freedom and human dignity in Hungary.

This year we unanimously selected one of those outstanding groups of Americans whose activities were not shadowed by the present detente-hysteria. We selected the Editorial Board and Staff of a youthful Washington paper, the *Rising Tide*. I can say, without undue exaggeration, that there was and there is no American publication in presenting the case of the Hungarian people to the American public and reporting the activities of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, U.S.A. as the *Rising Tide* did and still doing it. The *Rising Tide* cannot yet claim a very large circulation, but this distinguished group of young women and men represent for us the unblemished and unspoiled real spirit of America. Their dedication, intellectual honesty as well as their professional skill are impressive indeed. True, these young people and their *Rising Tide* do not master the American present yet, but we pray, that it may show us an American future based on principles, tradition and on the love of freedom, like the *Rising Tide* of our days.

For this reason, even in this sorrowful year, we are sincerely glad and even honored to bestow our Freedom Award of 1973 on the Editors and Staff of the *Rising Tide* and through them to the unblemished faith, reputation and good-will of the youth of America.

BARRY L. BANKS, DELAWARE STUDENT INTERN PROGRAM

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, this week I have 11 high school juniors visiting me from Delaware to participate in my student congressional intern program. The students will be meeting Congressmen and Senators, viewing both Houses in action, attending committee meetings, and participating in various other activities in order to gain a greater understanding of the workings of Congress.

I have been impressed with the enthusiasm and interest displayed by the high school students throughout the SCIP program. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Barry L. Banks, one of the high school students visiting this week, on his 16th birthday and wish him many happy returns of the day. I hope that Barry, and all the students who participate in this program, will continue their interest in government.

NOT SO SIMPLE

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in many respects the civil rights revolution of the 1960's was a striking success. But in the area of education we have largely had a psychological victory and a practical failure. Many of our southern friends told us that things were not all so simple, and that there would be different reactions when the tough school integration problem came north. We know now how much of what they said was right.

Now we are faced with a nation bitterly divided over the question of busing and the vital, central issue of quality education for all children has been forgotten. If we are to prevent this country from further coming apart, it is necessary that our leaders be willing to lead, that hard truths be faced, that old preconceptions be challenged by all of us.

The plain fact is that a fair share of that desperately needed moral leadership burden has not been assumed by the White House, or by the Congress. Instead, both branches have unloaded on the courts the problem of coping with complex, emotional, and deadly serious social problems.

In this country we tend to overload institutions which work well, sometimes to the point where our returns diminish. Our schools are responsible for much of our success as a nation; and because they have worked so well, we continue to dump on them everything from sex education to driver instruction and, if some had their way, religious training. Because our courts have served us so faithfully in resolving disputes, we are inclined to load them down with such social problems as alcoholism, the failures of marriage and the family, the burden of automobile accidents, and all the rest.

The time has passed for Congress to be second-guessing the courts and harassing them from the sidelines; the time has come to us to provide some sensible guidelines and responsible leadership in the field of education and racial relations.

To this end, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) and I have introduced the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (H.R. 10991). We believe that Congress rather than the courts should establish a national educational policy, one that addresses itself to the busing controversy without retreating from the great gains already achieved in racial integration. We also believe such a policy should provide a framework for dealing with the allied problems of new methods of school financing and substandard schools. To date Congress has approached these problems piecemeal—through far-reaching, drastic constitutional amendments or blunderbuss "antibusing" amendments to educational legislation. These are largely efforts to modify, restrain, or reverse court action; they do not offer a comprehensive alternative to court ordered educational plans. In effect they

say "no busing." They do not go on to say, "Here is a better way than busing to achieve the goals of a desegregated school system."

Our bill, however, offers such an alternative. The heart of the bill is a federally sanctioned State plan, to achieve the objectives of improving and equalizing educational results and alleviating racial isolation.

The bill does not set out any final plan. What it says is "No one knows precisely the best way to achieve equal educational opportunities for minorities. But human ingenuity should be set free to explore innovative educational techniques to this end and not be locked into the sole solution of maximum racial balance." If Congress does not offer some alternative approach, the courts will almost be compelled to order the approach of maximum racial balance—which means massive busing.

John F. Kennedy once said that—

While we did not all come over on the same ship—we are all in the same boat.

Indeed we are. America's white majority simply cannot and must not turn its back on 25 million fellow citizens. But at the same time, we cannot rely on the courts to provide definitive, publicly acceptable solutions to the problem of busing. It is high time for the Congress to assume its fair share of moral leadership on the subject.

This legislation will not please those who want to go back to 1954, or those who do not understand the deep emotions and fears which many parents rightfully or wrongfully feel. But no single proposal I have heard holds more promise for a workable, permanent accommodation. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

THE NEW CAR REGULATIONS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from one of the many fine papers of Missouri's Ninth Congressional District, the *Mexico Ledger*. The editorial points out the many hazards to our right of privacy from the Department of Transportation's seat belt interlock system:

THE NEW CAR REGULATIONS

The New cars are better than ever. Except for what the do-gooders did to them.

Take the seat belts, for example.

Every 1974 car under Federal Regulation now, will not start until the seat belt is fastened. What's more the seat belt is a shoulder strap and seat belt all in one piece. And that's not all, there is a buzzer.

It is no ordinary bumble-bee kind of buzzer.

This buzzer is a sub-human torture instrument no doubt designed by North Vietnam POW camp guards to break the morale, spirit and will of prisoners.

In 1974 cars—in all of them—the buzzer attacks you the minute you insert the key. It buzzes if the door is not closed; it buzzes if the seat belt is not fastened; it buzzes if

you put your hand on the front seat; it buzzes if you put a package, dog or cat on the front seat and don't fasten the seat belt around it. . . .

... But that isn't all.

Don't think by merely stopping the car you can escape the buzzer.

It is poised, crouching, waiting to rip into your peace of mind.

If you stop the car and open the door as you unfasten your seat belt . . . zap—the buzzer. You have to turn the key off first before you unbuckle the belt, before you open the door.

Obviously, the 1974 car buzzer is the bureaucrats' guarantee to end the pursuit of happiness.

It now ranks with scratching finger nails on school room blackboards, with knuckle popping, with the ear-splitting roar of a revved-up two-wheeled chopper.

However, we don't think the American public will resign to the buzzer. We believe they'll fight it from the bridge in Lexington to Iwo Jima.

As one lady told us recently about the buzzer and the seat belt "If I want to get thrown through the windshield that is my American right".

We're for her.

CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, every year the Chamber of Commerce of El Cajon selects one individual whose contribution to his community has been so outstanding as to justify the title "citizen of the year." The citizen of the year for 1972 is a man well known to those of us who have had the pleasure of living and working in San Diego County.

C. Rupert Linley has practiced law in El Cajon for 27 years. These have been eventful years for the city. They have been good years partially because "Rupe" has given of his time, his talents, and his heart in many ways and at many times.

Among the recipients of his efforts have been the Boys' Club and Kiwanis Club of El Cajon, the Downtown Optimists Club, and Goodwill Industries. But, in truth, we all have benefited from his service to his fellow man.

The city of El Cajon is the home of the annual Mother Goose Parade and Ball. This event has attracted national attention, bringing credit on the community while delighting thousands of youngsters every year. C. Rupert Linley has served as president of the Mother Goose Parade Association and was the recipient of the 25th anniversary award of that association.

As a member of the Chamber of Commerce Community Development Committee, Rupe was instrumental in the development and adoption of the El Cajon general plan. In addition, he served as a member of the joint powers authority which constructed the police facility.

Rupe has served the needs of the citizens of his community as a member of the citizens committee for planning and formation of the Grossmont Hospital District and as a member of the Lakeside School District Board of Trustees.

Our community is a better community

because C. Rupert Linley has lived and worked here. I am also convinced that our Nation is a better Nation because C. Rupert Linley has given of his time to make one of our communities better.

MR. NIXON SAVES THE CONSTITUTION

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans I have frequently felt amazement and a certain degree of awe as I have listened to the logical processes by which President Nixon has justified his various positions.

With the deftness that characterizes much of his writings, Columnist Arthur Hoppe has hypothesized a response Mr. Nixon might give to the news that the House is taking up impeachment in a serious manner. In this hypothetical television address to the American people, Mr. Nixon says,

Now, it would be very easy for me to go along with these impeachment proceedings. But I had to think first of the good of every American. Therefore, under the powers granted me by the Constitution to summon an emergency session of Congress, I have tonight declared an emergency adjournment of Congress.

And to safeguard our Constitution, I have ordered Federal troops to seal off Capitol Hill where that Constitution is kept.

There is just one thing that bothers me about Mr. Hoppe's column: I hope he wrote it. I hope it was not a leak from the White House reserve speech file.

I insert the column, "Mr. Nixon Saves the Constitution," from the San Francisco Chronicle of October 23, 1973, into the RECORD:

MR. NIXON SAVES THE CONSTITUTION

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good evening, my fellow Americans. In this hour of grave Constitutional crisis, I want to talk to you tonight about the steps I have taken to meet that crisis. The decisions have not been easy. But it is my sworn duty, as your President, to uphold that Constitution.

As you know, I have done everything humanly possible to avoid this Constitutional crisis. When former Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox sought to subpoena my private and confidential tape recordings, I, like any other citizen, pleaded my case in court.

When Judge Sirica saw fit to rule against me, I, like any other citizen, took my case to the Court of Appeals. When that court also ruled against me, I saw at once that a Constitutional crisis was in the making.

Now it would have been very easy for me to comply with the rulings of those courts. But you did not elect me to take the easy way out.

To uphold the Constitution, which is my sworn duty, I therefore determined to risk contempt proceedings and withhold these tape recordings—which, by the way, prove me totally innocent of any wrongdoing whatsoever.

Being innocent, I also ordered Mr. Cox to stop investigating me. When he stubbornly refused, I had no choice but to order the Attorney General to fire him. And while I had to keep firing Attorneys General until I found one who would fire Mr. Cox, let me point out to you that my perseverance in

upholding the Constitution was finally justified.

Now then, let me turn to the impeachment proceedings pending before the Congress. First, let me say, that, rightly or wrongly, I do not for one moment question Congress' right to institute impeachment proceedings. That right is guaranteed by the Constitution. And I have sworn to safeguard that Constitution.

But let me say this about that. As you know, impeachment proceedings—no matter how innocent, I, your President may be—are a long and drawn out process. They could last for months or even years. And during that time, my capacity to govern as your President would be severely impaired.

We face many problems today at home and abroad. While we have achieved unparalleled prosperity, we must still fight inflation. While we have achieved peace with honor in Vietnam, we must still face difficult and delicate negotiations to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East.

So I was forced to ask myself, "Can I, your President, continue to resolve these problems and safeguard the Constitution with my capacity to govern impaired?" I think every decent American would agree tonight that I could not.

Now it would be very easy for me to go along with these impeachment proceedings. But I had to think first of the good of every American. Therefore, under the powers granted me by the Constitution to summon an emergency session of Congress, I have tonight declared an emergency adjournment of Congress.

And to safeguard our Constitution, I have ordered Federal troops to seal off Capitol Hill where that Constitution is kept.

I realize that some critics will say I have fired Congress. This is not the case. Once Congress demonstrates its willingness to work with me in building a better America, I am sure it will be able to resume its duties.

At the same time, I am announcing my resignation as your President. Of course, someone must continue to safeguard our Constitution. I have therefore delegated that responsibility to Crown Prince David Eisenhower, who has pledged to safeguard it night and day.

Long live Princess Julie! Long live Princess Trish! Long live Queen Pat! Long live me!

INVESTIGATION MANIA THREATENS FREE GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for almost 200 years, the United States has been a republic deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Today, there is a question whether that phrase still is valid. Today, rather than being a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, some believe we are becoming a government of the investigating committee.

This question was developed in a recent editorial appearing in the Sherburne County Star News of Elk River, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, which I would like to share with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

INVESTIGATION MANIA THREATENS FREE GOVERNMENT

Congressional investigations have long been a part of the U.S. political scene. But what columnist William S. White calls the

"Investigation mania," which now besieges the country, poses a threat to self-government. Mr. White holds no brief for the wrongdoing of any politician from Richard Nixon downward, but he warns against the attitude of assuming crime and evil are automatically everywhere in politics. He says, "We are raising a question as to whether government is to be allowed to govern. We are chewing up our public men without waiting for the facts..." The world looks on in puzzlement.

As things are going, the question may seriously be asked whether any President, no matter how competent, can serve out a tenure of office and remain clear of the traps implicit in an atmosphere in which all await expectantly for scandal to rear its ugly head. The fact that the nation's last two Presidents—one a Democrat and the other a Republican—have all but been pushed out of office by the emotionalism of raw democracy is far from reassuring.

SOVIET UNION AND POISON GAS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the role of the Soviet Union as a troublemaker in the Middle East has again been nakedly revealed. The United States was hard pressed to match the enormous amount of weaponry that the Soviet Union was pouring into Arab states. By now the lack of scruples of the Soviet Union in this regard should be evident to all.

In this connection, an article appeared in the Detroit News on September 4 to the effect that the Soviets have supplied poison gas to Iraq for possible use against Iraq's Kurdish minority. This would be tragic, but it would not be unprecedented. It can be recalled that in 1967, the Soviet Union furnished poison gas to Egypt to use against the Yemeni Royalists. The case was documented by the International Committee of the Red Cross. Therefore, I think this item that follows deserves the closest attention of my colleagues.

IRAQ KURDS FEAR POISON GAS ATTACK

WASHINGTON.—Representatives of the Kurdish minority in Iraq charged yesterday that the Baghdad government had obtained poison gas from the Soviet Union in preparation for an extermination attempt against the Kurds.

Sources said the Baath regime in Baghdad had obtained 50,000 gas masks from the Soviet Union for Iraqi soldiers. The Soviets also have sent eight poison gas experts to train Baghdad's soldiers, said the sources.

The Kurds, who number about 100,000 in Iraq, are a non-Arab tribal people who occupy the mountains of Iraq and have been seeking an autonomous state of their own. They have fought several civil wars in the past century with various Iraqi governments, the last ending in 1970.

Under terms reached at that time, Baghdad promised the Kurds a semiautonomous region to be established by March 1974. Kurdish representatives now say Iraq is reneging on that agreement and has started military attacks on Kurdish outposts.

The latest such attacks, Kurdish officials here say, took place in mid-August in the Sinjar region of Iraq. The fighting ended with 30 Iraqi soldiers killed and several Kurdish officials wounded.

The sources claim Iraq used artillery and MIG aircraft in the fighting. They said they

had hoped the repulse of the Iraqi attack would have ended the Baghdad government's attempts to violate the 1970 agreement.

However, they now say the supply of gas from the Soviet Union indicates Baghdad is attempting a "final solution" similar to Hitler's extermination of Jews.

According to Kurdish spokesmen, the gas is stored at the Taji army camp west of Baghdad and at the headquarters of the 2nd Iraqi Division at Kirkuk and the 4th Division headquarters Mosul.

The spokesman said only world opinion could head off the use of poison gas against the Kurds and called upon the public to urge the Soviet Union to withdraw the gas and its advisers.

THE NOT-SO-UGLY AMERICAN

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1973, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Americans," written by Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian. The editorial was aired on June 5, 1973, on Mr. Sinclair's "Let's Be Personal" show over radio station CFRB in Toronto, Ontario.

Since that time, the editorial has been reprinted in newspapers across the country and I have received many letters on the matter, not only from my own district, but from North Carolina, California, Texas, and Illinois.

Apparently, the American people too often have been exposed to the "ugly American" image held by some of our "friends" abroad. They occasionally like to hear that Uncle Sam's efforts and their tax dollars are appreciated. As one of my correspondents said:

I think this is the kind of thing people need to hear about our wonderful country—just now.

For the benefit of those who might have missed the editorial, I would like to insert it in the RECORD for a second time:

AMERICANS

(By Gordon Sinclair)

The United States' dollar took another pounding on German, French and British exchanges this morning, hitting the lowest point ever known in West Germany.

It has declined there by 41 per cent since 1971 and this Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least appreciated people in all the earth.

As long as sixty years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did.

They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and the Niger.

Today the rich bottomland of the Mississippi is under water and no foreign land has sent a dollar to help.

Germany, Japan, and to a lesser extent Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions in debts.

None of those countries is today paying even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the streets of Paris.

I was there. I saw it.

When distant cities are hit by earthquake it is the United States that hurries in to help... Managua, Nicaragua, is one of the American communities have been flattened most recent examples. So far this Spring, 59 by tornadoes. Nobody has helped.

The Marshall Plan, the Truman Policy all pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent war-mongering Americans.

I'd like to see just one of those countries that is goading over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplanes.

Come on, let's hear it.

Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas 10?

If so, why don't they fly them? Why do all international lines except Russia fly American planes?

Why does no other land on earth even consider putting a man or woman on the moon?

You talk about Japanese technocracy and you get radios. You talk about German technocracy and you get automobiles.

You talk about American technocracy and you find men on the moon, not once but several times... and safely home again.

You talk about scandals and the Americans put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at.

Even their draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our streets, most of them... unless they are breaking Canadian laws, are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here.

When the Americans get out of this bind... as they will... who could blame them if they said the Hell with the rest of the world. Let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes.

When the railways of France, Germany and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. When the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

I can name to you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble.

Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble?

I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

Our neighbors have faced it alone and I'm one Canadian who is damned tired of hearing them kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

I hope Canada is not one of these.

But there are many smug, self-righteous Canadians.

And finally the American Red Cross was told at its 48th annual meeting in New Orleans this morning that it was broke.

This year's disasters... with the year less than half over... has taken it all and nobody... but nobody has helped.

INLAND WATER TRANSPORTATION'S IMPORTANCE IN THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is upon us and this Nation is finally beginning to feel the pinch. The

program of petroleum allocation, announced by the administration several weeks ago, became effective yesterday. Briefly, this program will limit supplies to customers based on their consumption for the calendar year 1972. Certainly this type of program is necessary, for the Nation is faced with a growing shortage. However, I feel it is essential that those administering this program recognize certain vital and absolutely essential needs within our economy. These needs must be given some form of priority within the system. In the forefront of these needs, I place agriculture and essential transportation.

In this spirit, I wish to have inserted at the conclusion of these remarks, a very pertinent letter written by Mr. Gresham Houghland, of Paducah, Ky., president of the Crounse Corp., an inland water carrier. Mr. Houghland's letter dramatically portrays the fuel shortage plight of the inland water transport industry within the country. This industry, which utilizes the all-important inland waterway system, is extremely vital to the production of the Nation's energy. Over 60 percent of all movements on the inland waterway system are directly involved in the production of energy. If inland water carriers, such as the Crounse Corp., cannot obtain adequate fuel supplies to move the raw materials which produce energy, such as coal and oil, this Nation will be truly faced with a crisis of ever-increasing proportions.

The text of Mr. Houghland's letter follows:

CROUNSE CORP.,

Paducah, Ky., October 29, 1973.

Mr. DON HAMMONS,
Regional Director, Office of Oil and Gas, Region IV, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. HAMMONS: An immediate effect of the fuel oil allocation order will be a drastic reduction in coal deliveries to electric generating plants served by our company. Another effect a short time later will be an equally drastic reduction in the production of electricity by these plants. We are confident that these effects were not anticipated or desired by the government; but they will occur unless we immediately receive an additional allocation of 250,000 gallons of No. 2 diesel fuel a month.

This company is engaged exclusively in the transportation of coal by barge on the Ohio, Kanawha, Green, Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers. Practically all the coal goes to electric power plants. Some are TVA plants, some are owned by public utility companies and two are owned by Big Rivers R.E.C.C. A number of these plants are solely dependent on us for coal transportation. Substitute barge transportation is not available. Substitute rail or truck transportation is not practical because of the location of the coal sources in relation to the plants. Several of the plants have no rail or truck facilities. Even if rail or truck service were practical, it takes more fuel per ton mile for rail or truck transportation than for barge transportation.

We own 350 barges of 1500 tons capacity and 18 diesel towboats and charter seven towboats. The owners of the chartered boats have their own fuel allocations. We do not yet have the details of those allocations, and this letter deals only with the allocation to us for our own boats.

Our own boats are now moving about 1,000,000 tons of coal a month in our own barges to plants in Kentucky, Indiana, Tennessee and Alabama. Our own boats are also towing about 450,000 tons of coal a month on the Green River in barges belonging to

other carriers. These carriers then deliver the coal to plants in Florida, Ohio, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota. No alternate source of towing is available on the Green.

We need 675,000 gallons a month to keep the 18 boats running, and this is only slightly more than we used last year. The problem is that Ashland Oil and Refining Company supplied over 95% of our fuel last year. We have been notified that we will get only 70% of our November, 1972, purchases, and that the allocation is 410,885 gallons. Another 250,000 gallons will bring us up to 660,000, and we hope to pick up the balance from the other sources from which we made small purchases.

It is impossible to save fuel on a towboat except by not running it. If we do not get the 250,000 gallons requested by this letter, at least six of our 18 boats will be tied up. Even if the seven chartered towboats can keep running, the coal delivered in our barges and towed on the Green will drop at least 500,000 tons a month.

The 500,000 tons of coal a month will generate approximately 1.1 billion KWH of electricity a month. On a national average basis, this is enough to supply the total electrical requirements of a population of 1,700,000 people.

The 500,000 tons of coal will produce about 320 times as much energy as the 250,000 gallons of diesel fuel we would burn to move it. To prevent such a gain in available energy is not a way to solve the energy crisis.

If we are to maintain deliveries we must have the additional allocation no later than November 8. We have no fuel except in the tanks on the boats and that averages only about a week's supply.

To be of use to us, the fuel must be available for direct loading into the boats' tanks and all or most of it must be from a facility or facilities on the Ohio between the Mouth of the Green and Paducah. The facilities available in this area are:

Mouth of Green River: Ashland.
Mount Vernon, Indiana: Texaco, Indiana Farm Bureau.

Paducah: Standard of Kentucky, Gulf, Shell, Texaco, Ashland.

We could use 35,000 gallons a month from Standard of Kentucky at Louisville with the balance available at one or more of the locations listed in the preceding paragraph.

Very truly yours,

GRESHAM HOUGHLAND,
President.

COMMENTS BY MR. NORTON SIMON

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, there are few in this House who would disagree with the fact that we are still a long way from making our railroads a meaningful and productive part of the transportation system.

Recently, I have been privileged to receive some comments on the alternatives for the railroad industry from Mr. Norton Simon, a distinguished Californian, and one of the most astute observers of contemporary American problems.

Mr. Simon quite properly notes that short term steps are expected from the Congress to meet the needs of individual rail carriers who are essential to our full national system. However, his warnings that such actions should not remain on a limited scale are central to the

argument over the eventual future direction and viability of rail service in America.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a portion of recent correspondence forwarded to me by Mr. Simon in relation to corporate diversity of railroads:

COMMENTS BY MR. NORTON SIMON

At present, railroad companies are involved in myriad conglomerations of industrial land development, downtown properties, service businesses, utility, natural resource and manufacturing activities. Not only does this divert management's attention away from the railroad, where it is obviously needed, but it also raises serious ethical problems of possible direct or indirect violations of existing laws, such as the Elkins Act, S.E.C. regulations and other laws or regulations involving conflicts of interests through interlocking boards of directors. The cash flow and projected profits generated to the railroad companies by these non-railroad activities often tends to mislead the investing public as well as the company's own management and board members and further obscures the actual financial state of affairs until a collapse is imminent. Penn Central has now become our classic example of this. There is little motivation for management to invest money in proper rail maintenance or in capital rolling stock, for example, when they can improve their near term reported earnings to a greater degree by investing in a realty venture to show a quick profit, real or not. As a consequence, the physical plant of American railroads has deteriorated and is continuing to deteriorate. Lack of full usage of road bed, poor service to the public and costly accidents are the end result. Further, these companies do serious disservice to the nation by the grossly inadequate manner in which they become involved in the business of developing other activities they own, control or deal in.

As an example of what I mean, nearly every major railroad has an "Industrial Development Department" which buys, develops and sells or leases real properties to rail customers. They will claim that they always get the full price for these properties in each transaction and, indeed, their books will show that they usually make more profit on this activity than a comparable real estate company would. The facts, of course, are that they appear to improve their results by failing to apply full overhead costs or to account for the significant diversion of top and middle management talent to these real estate activities. In a very real economic sense these sale or lease terms often constitute a form of rebate to the shipper for the rail business. The idea of a railroad company essentially subsidizing shippers at the same time they are claiming to the public that rates are inadequate is absurd. The requests of railroads asking for subsidies under these circumstances are without credibility. The problem has slowly grown out of hand because it has been perpetuated over the years by railroad boards of directors largely made up of shippers, bankers, investment firms and others who have prospered at the expense of the shareholders and general public. The Federal bureaucracy, and by that I mean the ICC and others in both Republican and Democratic administrations, has consistently ignored this credibility gap in the administration and operations of the so-called railroad business. We have recently seen attempts at closing the credibility gap in politics and government administration. It is certainly time to look at such gaps in some elements of business and with the terrific problems of the railroads, they appear to be likely candidates. Number one on the agenda should be: Railroads should run railroads—period!

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE
JERRY LITTON INTRODUCING A
NEWSPAPER ARTICLE HONORING
THE SERVICES OF JUDGE RICH-
ARD M. DUNCAN OF THE U.S. DIS-
TRICT COURT

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House an article appearing recently in the St. Joseph, Mo. News-Press honoring 75 years of public service on the part of our distinguished former colleague Judge Richard M. Duncan of the U.S. District Court.

As a Member of the House of Representatives in the New Deal years, from 1933 to 1943, Judge Duncan had much to do with construction of the social security system, and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee exerted influence of considerable importance on many other measures. He was truly regarded as a full-fledged leader of the House.

Upon his appointment to the Federal bench, Judge Duncan brought to his judicial labors the insights of a legislator at the national level, and in so doing became again a man of extraordinary power and authority respected by all.

The article on Judge Duncan appears below:

[From the St. Joseph News-Press,
Oct. 31, 1973]

**TIMELY OBSERVATIONS—A 75-YEAR RECORD OF
PUBLIC SERVICE BY JUDGE DUNCAN**

Black-robed Federal Judge Richard M. Duncan presided once again last week in the quiet dignity of his courtroom here—a most remarkable man who will reach his 84th birthday Nov. 10 and who has no intention of quitting. His is a record of public service stretching back 75 years. That's right, 75 years.

It started when he was nine years old and was appointed a page in the Missouri State Legislature by the representative of his native county of Platte—Walter Farley. Young Duncan gained a reputation there as the quickest and most courteous page in the General Assembly. He was a "venerable" 11-year old when he completed page duty for a second term there, and a few years later, although not a Catholic, he was enrolled in old Christian Brothers College here. He wound up as the first Protestant to be elected president of its alumni association.

Out of that institution of learning that specialized in discipline, Duncan was appointed a deputy circuit clerk by the late Ross C. Cox. He studied law on his own during those courthouse years and—without benefit of attending law school or college—won admission to the bar. He was practicing law in 1926 when Mayor Louis Stigall tapped him to become city counselor of St. Joseph, a post in which he achieved an outstanding record.

His next step was to Congress. He was elected to that body in 1932, the same year he was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention that nominated Franklin D. Roosevelt for a first term as President. He served there for five terms, ten years, was one of the architects of the Social Security Act, and won membership to the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the House. The same year he left the House he was named a federal judge by FDR.

One of the big changes that appointment meant in his life was his divorce from politics. Since boyhood he had been a thundering orator for the Democratic party. He had spoken at hundreds of rallies and often had been sent down into the well of the House in Washington by the majority to orate the views of the administration. But for a federal jurist, political speech making is verboten.

Technically, Richard M. Duncan retired as a federal judge June 30, 1965, but since then has remained as busy trying cases, listening to court arguments, accepting pleas, etc., as any federal judge in the land. Frequently he has been assigned to jurisdictions outside of Missouri in court matters. In California, he presided at the Irvine Trust trial that involved the disposition of \$600 million. For the 7th consecutive year, he recently was assigned to Florida duty and will be trying cases in that state from January through April.

In recent years leg trouble has plagued him, but his mind has stayed sharp. He has no intention of quitting the bench as long as he is mentally alert, "even if I have to show up in a wheelchair." His comments in court are sharp and thoughtful and he can be caustic when the situation warrants. Many a young defendant has been given a lecture by Judge Duncan, a lecture which if delivered earlier would have kept him out of trouble and out of court. He has been a strict judge, but a merciful one, particularly for those who didn't have the benefit of early advantages of life.

Along with honesty and integrity, Judge Duncan rates discipline and hard work as the most necessary attributes. He offers a living example himself, and may he long stay with us. We need men like him.

THE SMALL WORLD OF FOOD

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted into the RECORD an article from the Minneapolis Tribune of October 29 which chronicled some of the factors of the world's food situation. Today, I am inserting the second article of this four-part series by Staff Writer Al McConagha. It covers some of the observations which Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz has made regarding food supplies, fertilizer shortages, and rising prices. The article, as thought-provoking as the first one, follows:

**THE SMALL WORLD OF FOOD: BUTZ' OPINIONS
ON FOOD PRICES NOT COMFORTING**

(By Al McConagha)

(NOTE.—Food shortages, surpluses, costs and boycotts are in the headlines nearly every day. To find out why food has become a major concern, Staff Correspondent Al McConagha has investigated the relationships of food problems around the world. This is the second of four articles.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—There goes the Secretary of agriculture, winging all over the country, telling housewives that it is good for the nation to pay higher food prices than it has in the past.

That takes courage and at another time one might joke that Earl L. Butz has the guts of a burglar—or even a plumber. Under the circumstances, however, this might be misunderstood.

So it is enough to report that Butz seems immune to normal fears and goes right on carrying his fell tidings to homemakers

whose outrage rises with the price of pot roast.

If the present farm boom appears to have come as quickly as a summer storm, the housewife thinks she is up to her neck in a flash flood of rising costs at the checkout counter.

This is partly a result of bad crops overseas, burgeoning domestic and foreign demand and the U.S. decision to reduce its grain stocks and get into the world market in a big way.

Butz particularly stresses the impact on food prices of general inflation—or the rising cost of everything, including tractor oil, packaging materials and butchers' wages.

To the degree that the price hikes are the result of a changing relationship between demand and supply, they underscore the planet's interdependence for its food.

The world has become so intricately linked that prices in Minneapolis markets can reflect the failure of grain crops in nations thousands of miles away.

At the same time the ability of a Blue Earth County farmer to sell his corn in such distant markets has a bearing on the price paid for gasoline by shoppers in north Minneapolis.

It is widespread lack of recognition of such buy-sell relationships that leads the touring Butz to complain of the "low level of economic intelligence" he finds in the complaints of price-dazed consumers.

"If it has not been for this (export of American farm products) our gasoline would probably cost us 10 or 15 or 20 percent more now if we could get it at all," Butz says.

So he valiantly sallies forth again and again contending "you can't get more for less" and "if there's no profit in agriculture, there won't be any farmers and therefore no food."

BUTZ'S THEME IS UNREGULATED MARKET

But Butz also brings good news. He reports to the farmers that their net income this year will approach \$24 billion. This is almost twice the average annual figure for the decade prior to 1969.

Good news or bad, the secretary's prevailing theme is his belief in the unregulated and foreign markets with "some" farm profit.

"You can't convince me a Minnesota livestock dealer walks around a muddy feed lot on a March morning because he likes to associate with the steers. I think he wants a little money out of it."

"Our goal has been for our farmers to get their income in the marketplace and not from the government," the former Purdue University administrator-educator added in a recent interview.

He stressed that in the past taxpayers paid nearly \$4 billion annually in direct subsidies to farmers and \$200 million more each year to store the once seemingly inevitable surplus.

All of that government-stored surplus is now gone—largely because of overseas demand—and Butz predicts that all direct farm subsidies next year will be reduced to \$500 million.

Next year, for the first time in 40 years, American farmers will not be paid for not producing a major crop. Some 341 million acres, all the nation's economically productive soil, will be planted.

"This is the first time in 25 years that the government is not in the commodity business," Butz observed, "I don't think it belongs in the commodity business and I want to keep it out."

But adherence to a free market for agricultural production (the new farm law, of course, provides a farm income floor) means rejecting consumer pleas for measures to roll back prices.

"Controls on food were a disaster," Butz tells audiences seeking price ceilings. To those wishing trade embargoes to reduce do-

mestic prices, he adds, "Controls on exports were a disaster."

In response to consumer demand, a 60-day food price freeze was imposed on July 19. July 27 embargo on foreign sales of soybeans has gradually been lifted with the approach of the harvest.

To Butz (and to many others) America's highly efficient agriculture is its trading strength—the key to the dollar's international value and the means to continue importing.

"The United States used to be a good place to buy steel," Butz said, "It isn't any more. It used to be a good place to buy automobiles. It isn't any more. To buy textiles. It isn't any more."

"It is still a good place to buy farm products. This (export of agricultural commodities) is our best major source of foreign exchange. It should be encouraged, not curtailed."

"The American public has opted to purchase a large number of things abroad. A large share of our small automobiles are made abroad. A large share of our shoes are made abroad."

"We import from a third to a fourth of our total energy and that is going to have to grow. How do we pay for it? Well, last year (Fiscal 1973) we had a net surplus in agricultural balance of trade of \$5.5 billion."

FERTILIZER SHORTAGE IS CURRENT CONCERN

The department unofficially predicts farm exports up to \$20 billion next year. It thinks good crops overseas will reduce demand the following year but that exports will build back to \$18 billion in about three years.

Butz also is quick to observe that exports help the domestic economy, too. The department says up to 5,000 jobs are created to handle each \$100 million of grain exports.

Domestically, Butz believes the big food price increase (up 17.6 percent from January through August, according to the consumer price index) is over and he predicts a slight decline for the rest of the year.

"There may be modest increases in prices at retail in 1974 chiefly because distributors will pass through non-food costs that have been going up," the secretary added.

The department's most recent 1973 forecast predicts record harvests of wheat, corn and soybeans. Wheat will be up 12 percent over last year, the second highest harvest in history.

The department foresees material increases in these harvests next year. This is a mathematical projection, however, and assumes adequate supplies despite current concern over a fertilizer shortage.

High food prices are hard on the poor. And critics of Butz and his assault on overseas markets insist that those prices are hardest on the destitute millions of the poorest nations.

Officials in private relief organizations contend that the administration has cut back its humanitarian food programs in an overzealous attempt to reduce the federal budget.

Butz answered, "Some of these people in the relief organizations have gotten to the point where relief becomes the end in itself, where their organization becomes the end in itself."

"We are continuing our humanitarian programs with food. I'm squeezing the water out of it. We are taking a hard look . . . but if they're legitimate (food requests), they're being met."

"It is a question of relative priorities. India, for example, is buying food with her precious foreign exchange reserves. This becomes top priority if you need it. They use it less wastefully and make it go further."

BUTZ: IN LONG RUN, MALTHUS WAS RIGHT

The usual counterargument is that developing countries need capitalization so desperately that using their relatively small cash accumulations for food perpetuates oppressive poverty.

In any case, Butz favors technological foreign aid: "This is one place where the United States can make a contribution; one of the great untapped production reserves is tropical agriculture."

Uncontrolled, profitable, market-oriented agriculture will adequately feed the world for the rest of the century: "We can do it through research," he said. "We can do it through capital."

But the department's well known optimism about food supply, founded largely on having survived many "crises" and years of wrestling with surpluses, is far from open-ended.

"After the year 2,000, population simply must be brought under control," Butz went on. "We can't continue to increase the world population as we are."

"In the long run Malthus was right. There can be no question about it. I think we are approaching the time when many of us are dusting off our copy of Malthus and reviewing what he said."

The Rev. Thomas R. Malthus is the pioneer English economist who predicted that growth of population would some day exceed the supply of food. In 1798, he said:

"Famine seems to be the last, the most dreadful resource of nature."

"The power of population is so superior to the power in earth to produce subsistence for man that premature death must in some shape or other visit the human race."

REMARKS ON CURRENT ENERGY CRISIS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by recent events in Washington and their clouding of other vital issues that face our country. I agree that we must encourage thorough investigation of political wrongdoing and let the chips fall where they may. We cannot, however, afford to become so obsessed with these matters that we lose sight of priorities.

We are faced with very serious oil shortages that have been compounded by our position in the Mideast conflict. We can no longer hide our heads in the sand. We must look at this problem and begin now to provide long-term solutions.

The daily consumption of petroleum in the United States is 17,000,000 barrels. This is projected to increase by 7 to 10 percent per year. Oil and gas provide power for 75 percent of our economy and virtually all of our transportation.

I will not quarrel with our actions in the Mideast crisis but must point out the "rewards" we have accrued. Exports to the United States from Saudi Arabia have been cut by 650,000 barrels per day, Libyan oil by 200,000 barrels, Algerian by 165,000 barrels and oil from Abu Dhabi by 40,000 barrels. This totals 1,055,000 barrels daily or 6 percent of our daily consumption.

Repercussions are already being felt. Major airlines have begun to drop flights to save fuel. The administration is reviewing plans for rationing gasoline to motorists. Legislation has been proposed to impose 50 miles per hour speed limits on our highways. Efforts are being made to convert oil and gas burning power-

plants to coal. These do not speak well for our petroleum resource situation.

Our increasing dependence on petroleum coupled with decreasing supplies is moving us into an untenable position. Domestic sources now provide us with 75 percent of our petroleum. By 1975 demand will have moved up to 21 million barrels daily nearly half of which we will be importing. There is, of course, no guarantee that foreign suppliers will make this available.

What then are we to do? The Alaska pipeline apparently will become reality. Most optimistic timetables call for a 3-year construction period. At least 600,000 barrels per day will come through that pipeline that first year, about 3 percent of our daily needs and 1,200,000 barrels per day will be pumped for the next 4 years working up to capacity of 2 million barrels after 5 years.

All this is tied to our energy problem and while there are ways in which we can conserve fuels, this is not the answer. We can do a better job of insulating our homes, carpooling, using mass transit and smaller cars but we must also move to alternate sources of energy.

Short term considerations dictate that we move quickly to develop our domestic supplies of natural gas, petroleum and coal. These fossil fuels are in tight supply but we have only touched our offshore potential and are only now dipping into our rich western coal reserves.

When I say short term I do mean exactly that. Oil and gas are very limited and we do have other uses for coal. Coal gasification is getting a good deal of attention and again is probably necessary as a short term measure. There are objections; valid ones. The process converts one type of fuel into another type of fuel at the expense of the ultimate consumer.

More important is the need to conserve gas and coal for the petrochemical industry. Many of the products of this \$20 billion a year industry are of vital importance to us. Nitrogen fertilizers are a product of the industry and are already in short supply. We simply cannot afford to expend our fossil fuel reserves on the production of energy alone.

Our energy problems will not solve themselves and there is no magic panacea for these ills. I am convinced, however, that ultimately we must harness both geothermal energy and solar energy or be relegated to second-class status economically and industrially in the community of nations.

Current estimates of geothermal energy percentage of total national electrical power capacity by the year 2000 range from a low of 1 percent to a high of better than 20 percent. The low estimate is predicated on existing technology; that generation equipment now in use in the production of electricity from the heat of the Earth. The high estimates depend on development of closed systems and effective heat exchangers for hot dry rock geothermal areas.

Solar energy can serve to supplement our electrical needs. Dr. Alfred Eggers, assistant director of the National Science Foundation's RANN—Research Applied to National Needs—program appeared before the Interior Committee in June of this year. He told the committee that

work with solar energy space heating systems indicates that they can be less costly than electric heating and competitive with gas and oil in many locations. Goals for the turn of the century are 35 percent of heating and cooling, the energy equivalent of 30 percent of the Nation's gas fuel, 10 percent of the nation's liquid fuel and 20 percent of the nation's electric energy.

All this was predicted in the face of a paltry budget. What could be done with a "put a man on the Moon" budget? Consider that 25 percent of our energy usage goes into the heating and cooling of buildings. Is this not of such significance that we should now be putting forth maximum efforts to harness solar energy for this purpose?

We certainly must pursue the goals of harnessing geothermal and solar energy. Perhaps this Mideast crisis will bring on such an energy crunch that we will all be shaken out of our lethargy and will finally come to the conclusion that there is indeed an energy crisis.

We will only survive as a world leader with adequate energy. The options are now before us. Do we move to utilize clean, infinite energy sources or begin a long trip downhill by sticking with traditional supplies? They have served us well but it is surely time to move in a new direction.

WITH THIS ATTITUDE, WHY A TRIAL?

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the recent report by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals is an absolute travesty. Early in the year President Nixon laid down some hard ground rules for the direction we should be proceeding in our courts. He vigorously criticized "soft-headed" judges who show their concern for the rights of the convicted rather than those of the victim.

We do not need to travel very far to see leniency on the bench in action. Last week, right in Fairfax County, Va., young Natasha Semler was found murdered. Natasha Semler would probably be alive today if her murderer had not received a clean bill of mental health by psychiatrists, who for the most part are more wrong than right half the time, and an OK by an equally "soft headed" judge. The murderer had already been arrested in the attempted murder of another 14-year-old girl just a couple of years ago, at the same place, the Madeira School in Fairfax County, Va.

I am sick, tired, and outraged every time I have to pick up the paper and read these horror stories. The degree of incompetence shown by the doctors and the judge is truly nonprofessional, in fact, it is repulsive.

If we cannot get these people to abide in a way that is beneficial to the majority of our society, then perhaps we should lay down laws which would incriminate,

and hold them responsible for further crimes committed by those whom they have previously sentenced. There is no longer any excuse for any of us to feel remorse for the criminal. He should be locked up and kept locked up, if he has murdered, we can get the death penalty restored.

There is no need any longer to kid ourselves that millions and millions of dollars for rehabilitation programs are going to rid our society of wrongdoers. It is perhaps more appropriate to build more prisons, to accommodate those who are society's misfits.

Mr. Speaker, while our interest and revulsion is still running high over Natasha's violent death, I want to bring the following article, from the Columbus Evening Dispatch to the attention of my colleagues, and pray that each and every one sees it for what it really is. We do not need more tombstones with the names of young persons on them, we need more cell doors, with numbers on them, locked permanently.

The article follows:

EDITORIAL HITS COMMISSION REPORT

It must be startlingly shocking for a crime victim to read of the concern expressed for felons by a National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals and then to learn he has been ignored by the \$1.75 million report.

The report clashes head-on with recent declaration of President Nixon who is urging a tougher federal criminal code.

Mr. Nixon exclaimed: "The time has come for soft-headed judges and probation officers to show as much concern for the rights of innocent victims of crime as they do for the rights of convicted criminals."

Most criminals should be treated as leniently as possible, asserted the commissioners who apparently never have been victims of a robbery, mugging or theft of valuables.

Prisons, they added, should be reserved for only hard core criminals and many offenders should go free with not more punishment than arrest and trial. We might question: With this attitude, why trial?

If a person works hard, he merits the rewards of his endeavor. Likewise, if he violates the laws governing man, he then merits the punishment demanded by justice.

The permissiveness advocated by the report not only is shocking but dangerous. One of the main reasons for incarceration is to protect society—those who live by the law—from those who respect neither the spirit nor the letter of the law.

We urge the president, the police and judges to continue the pursuit of justice based on the all-important merits. Protection of the potential victims of crime should be tantamount. Criminal reform should not be an unbridled, irresponsible permissiveness.

TRIBUTE TO ABE KOFMAN

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 1973, I will have the opportunity to pay tribute to one of the most outstanding citizens of California's Eighth Congressional District, Abe Kofman. On that night many of his friends will gather to recognize this man and his good works. Mr. Kofman, a newspaper publisher and

loyal Democrat, began his career at age 16 as a publisher's representative in Brockton, Mass. He learned the newspaper business well and in 1939 moved to Alameda, Calif., where he purchased the Times-Star, the newspaper he operates today.

Mr. Kofman has compiled a personal history of accomplishments which command the respect of all who know him. The list is long: California State highway commissioner; past chancellor commander, Knights of Pythias; past president of Oakland Lodge B'nai B'rith; past president, Alameda-Contra Costa Counties, Jewish Welfare Federation; honorary member, Junior Chamber of Commerce of Alameda and San Leandro; recipient of Eagles, National John Peter Zenger Freedom of the Press Award; member of American Bicentennial Commission; recipient of resolution of commendation from the State Assembly for his distinguished public service; member of Elks and Masons.

Winner of distinguished service awards from Japanese-American Citizens League, March of Dimes, Lions Club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, PTA, U.S. Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, United Crusade, U.S. Post Office, Jewish Welfare Federation, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red Cross, Alameda Boys Club, and Alameda Chamber of Commerce.

He also found time for active participation in citizen politics, and was named alternate delegate to the 1960 Democratic National Convention.

Mr. Kofman and his wife, Sara, have three sons, Morton, Stephen, and Kenneth, and eight grandchildren. Ken and Mort have joined their father in operating the newspaper and Stephen is a successful businessman.

Mr. Kofman takes an active hand in the operation of the Times-Star and has become locally famous for his regular page 1 column, "From My Notebook."

In summary, the description that immediately comes to mind when I think of Abe Kofman is a man of shrewd political wisdom, a tough competitor, a sincere and fair human being. I am proud to call Abe Kofman my friend. I know my colleagues in the House will want to join me in honoring him.

JEAN ERB NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of her exceptional contributions to the St. John's community, Mrs. Jean Erb has been named as Woman of the Year by the Business and Professional Women's Club of St. John, Virgin Islands.

I am pleased to place in the Record an article from the Daily News describing some of Mrs. Erb's many activities which won her this honor. In these times of domestic stress, it is reassuring to learn of the selfless devotion on the part of our citizens such as Mrs. Erb who are contributing so much to our social well-being.

The article follows:

JEAN ERB, ST. JOHN WOMAN OF THE YEAR

The Business & Professional Womens Club of St. John has chosen Mrs. Jean Erb as "Woman Of The Year." Mrs. Erb was selected for this honor in recognition of her personal, voluntary services to the needy, sick, shut-ins, senior citizens and physically-handicapped of the community.

Mrs. Erb was born in Allentown, Pa., and received an education in the field of Social Services, which apparently accounts for her avid interest in social welfare work.

She has been residing at Caneel Bay, St. John, for over seven years, and has been active in making home visits, helping in personal or family crises, helping persons on St. John to get the services offered (Federal & Local) which they need, and to which they are entitled.

She also cooperated with volunteer and other organizations on St. John and government agencies to make their projects successful—such as Glaucoma Drive, Talking Books-Braille, and furnishing transportation to and from the Clinic, etc.

She is associated with the following organizations: Helping Hands, which she organized 3½ years ago; and which has been very helpful to those in need; The League of Women Voters introduced to St. John through her initiative; and the V.I. Conservative Society.

"She has shown interest in all community problems, is always willing to work toward assisting to solve them, and has proven to be very civic-minded."

"In naming Mrs. Erb as 'Woman of the Year', the club is expressing to her the community's appreciation for the dedicated public service," a spokesman for the club said.

The club will hold buffet dinner at The Mill at Caneel Bay, on Sunday evening, to honor the "Woman of the Year," and "Woman of Achievement," Mrs. Dolores Williams.

ON THE ARAB OIL BOYCOTT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the editorial below eloquently argues, the message of the Arab oil boycott is clear. First it represents a challenge to the United States not to capitulate to blackmail in its support for a beleaguered Israel. Second, and perhaps more telling, the boycott demonstrates the need for this country to become energy independent.

The editorial, which appeared in today's edition of the Wall Street Journal, follows:

TO WHAT END?

The Arab oil boycott is proving to have more immediate impact than many of us expected, as Ray Vicker reports on this page today. The production cutback will mean inconvenience for the United States and quite possibly real suffering for Europe and Japan. Whether it will gain anything for the Arabs, though, is quite another matter.

The Arab world, for all its oil, is a collection of poor and backward states. The United States remains the strongest nation on earth, dependent on the Middle East for just a small fraction of its lush energy consumption. Do the Arabs really believe they can dictate American foreign policy? Do they believe there is any sort of boycott that would force the United States to stand aside as Israel is thrown into the sea, with all the memories of Auschwitz and Buchenwald

that would evoke? And if not this, precisely what is the boycott supposed to accomplish?

The good offices of the United States have all along been available, after all, for a compromise settlement to the Arab-Israeli dispute. No doubt the oil weapon gives the Arabs more diplomatic leverage in shaping any compromise, but this works only so far. When Arabs terrorize airliners and shoot up the Olympics it can be dismissed as an act of an irrational fringe, but it is not so easy for the world to excuse the heads of government who gather to decide to punish the citizens of Europe and Japan in the hope of winning concessions from the United States. Unless the Arabs are going to mortgage their souls to the Soviet Union, they need a certain amount of help, cooperation and goodwill from Europe and Japan.

If this showdown had to come, as we said previously, it is just as well it comes now, before the United States is heavily dependent on Middle Eastern oil. We still fail to see any reason the United States cannot weather the crisis, though it has to find the cohesion for planning and the will to suffer inconveniences. But it is worth inconvenience to maintain the ability to resist unreasonable demands in foreign policy.

Perhaps Secretary of State Kissinger will be able to work his negotiator's magic on his current Middle Eastern trip, and the crisis can somehow be resolved. The Arabs are smart enough to recognize the limits to their current policy. We suspect that many of the oil producers would like to return to business as normal, though of course with higher prices. As the latest round of emotionalism subsides, their economic interests will prevail.

But for the longer term, the message of the boycott is clear enough. The United States has to get started with fuel conservation and further energy development, which of necessity will concentrate on the development of its vast coal reserves. If we wish to remain an independent power in the world, dependence on Arab oil is a luxury we cannot afford.

THE LANSCO CORP.

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing New York City and other large urban centers in our Nation today is the battle to retain large businesses and leading corporations in those communities.

Indeed, the survival of the cities is dependent in large measure on those corporations staying in those cities. They are the root of the cities' economy; they mean jobs; they mean tax revenues; and they mean stabilization.

In light of this situation, one commercial leasing company, the Lansco Corp., has been making innovative moves to keep corporations in the cities, by striving for harmony between building owners and their corporate tenants.

The Lansco Corp., a New York-based firm, has taken surveys among both owners and tenants to determine exactly the special needs of each group. In negotiating leases, they have used this information to conclude leases that are satisfactory to both.

With the premise in mind that neither owner nor tenant can live happily in the cities without the other, Lansco has

pressed in their negotiations to make both sides happy. They have pointed out to their tenant clients that owners are faced with rising expenses that must be taken into consideration by the firms moving into their buildings.

Likewise, they have spelled out to owners that tenants have rights that must be respected and that tenant demands for proper elevator service, air conditioning, and good building maintenance are not exaggerated requests.

They have called upon suburban leaders to recognize that the future of their own communities are dependent on the future of the large cities—that if the cities fail, then so will the economy of the suburbs surrounding those cities.

They have striven in their negotiations to persuade a tenant's attorney and broker to work together, rather than against each other which, too often, has been the case in the past.

They have produced in New York City a give-and-take atmosphere in working to reach agreement in leases.

The leases—both long and short term—that they have negotiated show that their system of compromise has worked. By letting both owners and tenants know there are two sides to every story and every coin, they have made an important contribution to the effort to keep corporations based in New York under happy circumstances—happy to both the building owner and to the corporate tenant who have signed the lease. I think the Lansco Corp. should be commended for its spirit of seeking equity in their business to all parties concerned in their transactions.

MRS. FRANK W. BOYD

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, last week my good friend and colleague, the Honorable GARNER E. SHRIVER, placed in the RECORD a tribute to Mrs. Mamie Alexander Boyd. Congressman SHRIVER correctly and eloquently described Mrs. Boyd as the "patron saint" or perhaps the "matriarch" of Kansas and commended to the attention of my colleagues three editorial tributes to her memory.

I should like to join my colleague in paying tribute to "Mamie" with an article written by her son, McDill "Huck" Boyd. Mr. Boyd writes about the life of his mother in a manner that I feel has meaning for all of us. The following article is a modest account of the life of the most widely known and loved woman in Kansas during the past century:

[From the Jewell County Record and the Phillipsburg County Review, October 18, 1973]

MRS. FRANK W. BOYD

After 96 years on this earth, a bright spirit flickered out early Monday morning, Oct. 15, when Mrs. Frank W. "Mamie" Boyd died quietly in her sleep.

She had entered St. Joseph's hospital in Concordia three weeks earlier following a congestive heart attack, and while her strength had gradually ebbed away, she had remained alert. Sunday, she enjoyed visiting

family and friends, and sat up in a chair in her hospital room for a brief period Sunday night. As I said good night long after visiting hours, a soft smile crossed her face. Three hours later she slipped away.

Mamie Alexander Boyd, daughter of Joseph and Hester Alexander, was born on a farm near Humboldt, Kan., Dec. 13, 1876. Most of her girlhood was spent on a farm near Welda, and she worked for her board and room to go to school in Garnett. She soon earned a teacher's certificate; then sold her heifer calf for \$17.50, found a job at Manhattan and enrolled at Kansas State Agricultural College.

There she met Frank W. Boyd, who was also working his way through college in the printing office, and they started "keeping company." In caring for a roommate, who died of consumption, Mamie contracted the disease herself, and following graduation in 1902, went to Colorado to recuperate. Mr. Boyd finally convinced her she could get well just as fast in Phillipsburg, where he had entered the newspaper business in 1904, and they were married Aug. 15, 1905.

To this union, two sons were born: McDill and F. W. Boyd, Jr. As they matured in newspaper surroundings, both entered the family partnership, one which has been continued throughout the intervening years. It was first broken in 1947 when F. W. Boyd, Sr., passed away; and again July 15, 1972, upon the death of F. W. Boyd, Jr.

And Mamie Boyd was an active partner. When her first-born was old enough to trundle around in a baby buggy, she was "gathering news"—and throughout her long and active life, "made her rounds", wrote her columns, and won wide acclaim as one of the best-known newspaperwomen of her generation.

Her awards are legion. Her activities are legendary, but I will remember her best for her sincere interest in people and her pride in her family.

Before I was old enough to go to school, she was teaching girls how to cook and to sew in a volunteer class that met in her home after school. She simply felt that every girl should have some homemaking skills, and no such courses were offered in high school at that time. "Wayward girls" on parole, found a "half-way house" in the Boyd home.

As the family grew, the front yard was cluttered with jumping standards and pits. Neighborhood boys were welcome. When the weather was inclement, our front room carpet was available to marble players; and the big couch in the corner was pressed into service for fledgling football players learning to block. The fringe on the carpet and the frame of the couch paid a fearful penalty, but kids had a warm welcome.

When it was basketball tournament time, Mamie "kept" a team, putting pallets on the floor. When it was game time for the Sunday School basketball team, the big old 7-passenger Paige would accommodate them all.

When World War I came along, Mamie organized a Red Cross knitting class, and for many years afterwards, her nimble fingers were seldom still—making garments to give away. When one of the ladies of the community who "took in" washing for a living became ill, I was pressed into service to pump water from the cistern. Mother did the washing for her so she wouldn't lose her customers.

She really cared about people.

She organized one of the first study clubs in Phillipsburg; was president of the first BPW club when it sponsored the first city library and was a member of the Library Board for many years. She was a member of the first State Crippled Children's commission; and a charter member of the first Tuberculosis Association in Kansas.

She did things for people.

In 1927, when I was in college, two Phillipsburg banks "went broke" within a single week. I hitchhiked home to see how much

damage had been done to the family fortunes. Dad said "don't worry about it. We'll get along"; and Mother said: "We want you to stay in school." Pressed for a more definite answer, she admitted that between the two of them, they had \$6.30—so I stayed home.

Everything had gone down the drain. It was necessary to let the printers go. There was no money to pay wages. Dad set the ads, I set the type, Mother got the news, and between us, we got the paper out, with an assist from brother Bus, who was still in high school.

Throughout all of this distressing financial period, there was never a word of complaint, of discontent. Mother was just happy to be working and to have the family together. When Bus and I were married, we were fortunate to choose girls who fit into this mold, and they became capable newspaper people in their own right.

In 1939, the newspaper operation expanded and F. W. Boyd, Jr., became editor of the Jewell County Record at Mankato. When he joined the Navy, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Boyd assumed management and Mrs. Boyd was associate editor from 1947 until her death and wrote a widely quoted column, "Mainstreet." She was active in chamber of commerce work, a member of the Modern Minerva club and an honorary member of the junior Clio club, V.F.W. Auxiliary, American Legion Auxiliary, D.A.R. and Daughters of the War of 1812.

Mother's most difficult period of adjustment came following the death of her lifelong companion. "Work and travel were my only salvation" she wrote in her autobiography, published in book form when she was 95. But her philosophy was strengthened and she was able to survive the heartbreak of the death of her younger son 15 months ago with surprising inner strength.

Since that time, Mrs. F. W. Boyd, Jr., has edited the Record. Bob Boyd and Jim Logback edit the Hill City Times, Dick Boyd edits the Norton Daily Telegram.

Mother continued to drive her little car, "Pepper" until February of this year, when concern for her safety was voiced by the highway patrol. She was called upon to take a driver's license examination. Her eyesight was failing, and the examiner, with reluctance, decided that it was time for her to surrender her license. She shrunk back: "That will be the end of me," she said, and he relented: "I'll let you keep your license, but you must have a qualified driver in the seat by you at all times."

She was content. She still had her license. But she was smart, too, and never again sat behind the wheel of her little car. She continued her work at the Jewell County Record office, answering the phone, writing copy, taking subscriptions, up until the final day before her hospitalization when she attended the K-State football game at Manhattan.

An avid sports fan, she had held an honorary chair in "football surveillance" in the President's box at the K-State stadium for 20 years, and a special seat on the floor of the fieldhouse for basketball games. She had been an inadvertent TV star during sports broadcasts time and time again, as the "little lady" caught the roving eye of a camera.

As awards and recognition came her way, she retained a basic humility. She had walked with the mighty; she had worked with the poor, and "had learned as much from one as from the other." She had always regarded herself an "ugly duckling", a throwback to the days when she was known among schoolmates as "Alexander, the mule skinner." When people heaped praise upon her for accomplishments, she would respond: "I've just lived longer than most."

Along the way, she was president of the Women's Kansas Day Club; president of the Native Daughters of Kansas; president of the Kansas Authors' Club; organizer and first president of the Kansas Press Women; first

woman president of the Kansas State Alumni Association; and editor of the "Kansas Presswoman" and "National Presswoman."

She was chosen "Kansas of the Year" in 1959; Boyd Hall, a women's dormitory at K-State was named in her honor in 1960. She was presented the distinguished service award in journalism at K-State in 1957; and won the William Allen White Award for Journalistic Merit in 1967. In 1966, she was the first recipient of the Emma C. McKinney award, given annually to the most outstanding woman journalist among non-metropolitan newspapers by the National Newspaper Association. In 1968, she was named "Woman of Achievement" by the National Presswomen's Association. She was named "Kansas Mother of the Year" in 1965.

At 92, she won first place in column writing (Division 3) in the Kansas Better Newspaper contest; and at 95 she published her book: "Rode A Heifer Calf Through College," an achievement given special recognition with a bronze plaque at the annual meeting of the Kansas Authors' Club held a week before her death.

She was a member of state advisory boards and commissions under five state administrations—Kansas State Park Board; State Textbook Commission; State Advisory Commission on Institutional Management; and Committee on Status of Women.

She was a member of the Phillipsburg Presbyterian church, Cultus, Domestic Science and B.P.W. clubs, organizer and first president of chapter BE of P.E.O.; past president Sixth District Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs; past president of the Northwest Kansas Association of University Women; and one of three winners of gold medallions for 50 years of newspaper service, presented by Theta Sigma Phi, honorary journalism society for women.

The list is virtually endless, carrying out the theme of her life, as best described in the creed of the White Horse Knight, which hangs on the wall of her office:

"I shall pass this way but once. Therefore any good deed that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now, and not defer it for I shall not pass this way again."

Let that be her epitaph. The world was just a little bit better because she was here.

She is survived by her son, McDill and his wife, Marie of Phillipsburg; their two daughters, Mrs. Patricia Hiss of Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Mrs. Marcia Krauss of Grand Junction, Colo., and their families; her daughter-in-law, Mrs. F. W. Boyd, Jr., of Mankato and her family; Robert A. Boyd, Hill City; Richard D. Boyd, Norton; Mrs. Frances Logback, Hill City, and their families and Betty Boyd, Silver Spring, Md., and 12 great grandchildren; two sisters, Mrs. Winifred Smiles, Courtland; and Mrs. Howard George, McCune, Kans.

Memorial services will be conducted at the Methodist church in Mankato at 10:30 Thursday morning and at the Presbyterian church in Phillipsburg at 2:30 Thursday afternoon. Interment will be at Fairview Cemetery in the family plot.

THE TALK OF IMPEACHMENT IS UNFORTUNATE

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, the impression is widespread that all segments of the news media are calling for the resignation or impeachment of the President. On October 23, the radio station

with the largest listening audience in my district—WTVN—aired an editorial which I commend to my colleagues.

THE TALK OF IMPEACHMENT IS UNFORTUNATE

President Nixon's weekend decisions on Archibald Cox and William Ruckelshaus came as another surprise chapter in the endless story begun with the now-infamous Watergate breakin.

Now, talk of impeaching President Nixon has sprung up in Congress, mostly from its liberal members. All of this talk is unfortunate.

Impeachment is considered when Congress suspects the President, as the Constitution puts it, "of high crimes and misdemeanors." We believe at this time that a move toward impeachment proceedings against President Nixon would be a grave mistake. Whether or not you agree with what the President did this past weekend, he had every right to do it.

It is now up to Congress and the courts to proceed with their duties in the Watergate affair in an intelligent manner and with foresight to their responsibilities.

FINAL RESULTS OF THE 1973 BAKER OPINION POLL

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, with the help of many volunteers, my staff and I have been able to complete the tabulation of the opinion poll mailed to my constituents earlier this year. I respectfully direct the attention of my colleagues to the position of the residents of the Third District of Tennessee have taken on a wide-ranging selection of major issues including food stamps for strikers, mandatory wage and price controls, aid to North Vietnam, amnesty, the death penalty, impoundment of funds, right to work, increase in taxes, and other issues.

I think that they will find it significant, as I have, that there are overwhelming majorities against food stamps for strikers, aid to North Vietnam, amnesty for draft evaders, and a tax increase to keep Federal programs alive.

Third District voters are just as strong in their views for selectively reinstating the death penalty, for protecting the legal right to work, and for asking newsmen to reveal their sources under certain circumstances.

On the question of return to mandatory wage and price controls, the vote was 56 percent in favor and 44 percent opposed. On whether the Watergate issue is a reflection on the integrity of the President, 55 percent voted "yes" with 45 percent registering "no." The votes were evenly divided on whether a disaster fund should be established by placing a surcharge on casualty insurance premiums—49 percent voted "yes"; 51 percent "no." The vote on the question of fairness in the news media shows that only 33 percent feel that newspapers and TV fairly represent all sides on most news issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the response to my 1973 opinion poll questionnaire. These expressions of opinion are not only helpful to me in my consideration of these issues, but they are also helpful to those whose business it is

to check the barometers of public opinion. I insert the final results of this poll at this point in the RECORD. The questions and the yes-and-no percentages on each of them follow:

FINAL RESULTS OF LAMAR BAKER OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR 1973

[All in percent]

1. Should strikers be eligible to receive food stamps?	
Yes	20
No	80
2. Should we return to mandatory wage and price controls on all goods and services?	
Yes	56
No	44
3. Would you favor U.S. assistance in rebuilding North Vietnam?	
Yes	10
No	90
4. Would you support establishing some conditions whereby amnesty could be extended to draft evaders?	
Yes	18
No	82
5. Should the death penalty be selectively reinstated?	
Yes	86
No	14
6. Do you consider the Watergate incident a reflection on the President's integrity?	
Yes	55
No	45
7. Would you favor establishing a disaster fund financed by a surcharge on casualty insurance premiums plus a federal contribution?	
Yes	49
No	51
8. Should a newsmen be required to reveal the sources of his published statements where slander is involved?	
Yes	65
No	35
9. Do you consider newspapers and TV as fairly representing all sides of most news issues?	
Yes	33
No	67
10. Should a non-union worker have a legal right to work on a job even though a majority of the workers have voted for a closed shop?	
Yes	67
No	33
11. President Nixon has withheld funds which might terminate a number of federal social service programs. Do you approve of this action?	
Yes	71
No	29
12. Would you be willing to pay more taxes to keep all our federal programs intact without increasing the federal deficit?	
Yes	13
No	87

FRANK MENSEL DISCUSSES "PERSONNEL—THE AWAKENING CAMPUS PRIORITY"

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a well-known spokesman for higher education, R. Frank Mensel, recently has taken on

a new challenge. Many of us in Congress came to know him in the 5 years that he ably headed Federal liaison for the 2-year colleges, in his capacity as vice president for governmental affairs of the American Association of Community & Junior Colleges, and in his equally vital role as president of the Committee for Full Funding.

Mr. Mensel now is the executive director of the College & University Personnel Association—CUPA. In a recent address to the annual meeting of CUPA in Knoxville, Tenn., he explained that he has taken on this challenge out of his conviction that personnel decisions and personnel standards will be increasingly vital to the progress of higher education. He voices the concern that personnel development could well be a key to some of the difficulties confronting higher education today. Faculty alone is not the answer to the colleges' leadership needs. By greater emphasis on personnel and management functions, on manpower planning and staff development, the colleges can improve their capacity to deal with new and changing needs. I insert Mr. Mensel's remarks in the RECORD:

A NEWCOMER LOOKS AT CUPA

(By R. Frank Mensel, Executive Director, CUPA)

At this point, barely three months into the job, I am still more an outsider than an insider to CUPA. This convention has been my first opportunity to meet a broad cross-section of the constituency—outside the Board itself. The plunge is proving delightful and enlightening indeed!

I want to get my early impressions on the record for several reasons: for review and comparison later on—after I've gotten much deeper into what I hope will be a long and productive affiliation. A sort of taking of stock—of things as I see them at the point of just having landed in the middle.

I have seen educational enterprise from many sides. From a university public relations unit that was then based right in the President's suite. From a working seat among the performing arts. From Capitol Hill, and most recently, from the lobbyist's role with a great association of colleges.

One of my lasting impressions of the enterprise is that we as educators—like the insiders of most large and rather in-bred vested interests—have a hard time viewing ourselves as outsiders see us. So I want to make a conscious effort to keep a larger perspective, and hopefully to see our work as the grassroots and the public might see us.

Hopefully, these early impressions will also give us some targets. Things we can all be shooting at. And please feel free to take some shots at me. I very much need your help in directing and redirecting our efforts.

I took this job early out of the desire to contribute to a cause I think has massive potential for higher education.

I took this job because I believe the personnel function looms increasingly large to the future and the progress of higher education. And, I am tempted to say—to its survival.

I see two great dimensions to the expansion of your role. The one probably giving you the most pressure right now centers on federal standards. Right? The individual safeguards that were bound one day to flow from constitutional roots.

As you sweat these standards through in your own shops, I hope you can see and grasp the added measure of stature they give your function. Suddenly you emerge—or should emerge—as the resident expert on affirmative action, equal pay, labor relations, human rights, safety and health standards.

The second dimension I see as still larger

... the function of adviser and broker (I use the word advisedly) of human resources.

In all the progress, technology and complexity that the campus has helped to generate, the operation itself grows more and more complicated. The college must search harder for identity and mission. It must start with a complete rundown of its own resources. Above all else, that means the human resources. I don't mean faculty alone. And I don't mean faculty first, and staff second.

I wish I had time to tell you how much I think higher education has hurt itself historically by such a double standard, or internal caste system. I only think that you—at least some of you—have hurt yourselves by accepting that system. The human resource managers, the personnel leadership, should be the last to accept it. And any who accept it now are, I feel, a party to further institutional crisis and possible decline.

I hope each of us can take a more global view of our work, and develop an understanding of just how much our campus and the community need our human resources leadership.

These are the most troubled days higher education has faced in a long time.

Many of its problems—perhaps nearly all—trace in whole or in part to staffing needs, or management gaps. Some of the problems could be less acute, others might never have arisen, if the institutions had given more attention to staff selection and development, and to organization and management. Challenges and crises crowding our schools today that might have been blunted by better manpower planning and staffing include, to name a few—

Community relations and student tension (image or credibility gaps).

Budget squeezes (the support gaps).

Faculty unrest and unionization.

Compliance pressures on federal standards, including affirmative action, equal pay, safety and health.

My list is hardly inclusive. Each of you could add a score of your own problems. Each of you ought to have such a list, and you ought to ponder very carefully the personnel needed to handle each problem.

It is my conviction that, solicited or unsolicited, you should be running personnel projections on some of these obvious needs for your administration. Perhaps it's the purist instincts of the profession, but I think educators often think they should wait to be asked to do a job that obviously belongs in their hands.

If the personnel administrators would fly in the face of some of the campus drift they see around them, they would win peer rank in the system, and achieve the recognition long overdue for our function, far faster than we ever will by turning out scholarly publications.

One of the ironies I bump into all too often in higher education is that tendency, when thinking of development, to think first of outside resources. Of federal grants. Or contracts with industry. Or alumni gifts. Or foundations.

The first and foremost resource of any college—always has been and always will be—is its own people. The human resources! And I mean the total manpower—staff, faculty, and administration. When the institution builds a development plan, or thinks of new projects, that is the first ingredient it should catalog.

And you, the personnel administrator, should be front and center with that contribution.

A related tendency that often hurts higher education is that of waiting to reshape programs, or offer new services, until new resources are first in hand. You can spot it when someone says, "we could do that, if we just had a grant." On most campuses there is not enough concerted effort to spell out and map out the service mission of the institution, then fix goals, priorities, and deadlines.

We wait on outside gifts to start something important. If the priority is high, then we ought to drop lesser priorities, and restructure resources in-house to make it go. Staff development might be such a priority.

Surely you can help build the priority-making and decision-making processes in your institution. As I've already stressed, we can't afford to have our institutions take us for granted. More important, they can't afford it.

Please understand I am not unaware of some of the booby-traps in these ideas. There will be those who will resent our filling vacuums—though they would never raise a hand to fill them. And we may bump heads in a few places, or step on a corn now and then.

We can help each other. That's why we're here.

It bothers me that CUPA's membership is as small as it is. Not because I shrink at the building job ahead. But because again it may be symptomatic of self-image—of attitudes.

If only every other institution and its personnel staff belong to the primary national network in the campus personnel field, then at least some personnel leaders must still be asking themselves, "Does the personnel function have—do I have—a place in national affairs?" My answer, and yours, is an emphatic yes.

One target then is more converts. Membership growth, and service growth, can only go hand in hand. A couple of yardsticks come quickly to mind.

With some 1,200 two-year colleges flourishing in the land, why do only 105 belong to CUPA? If there ever was and is an institution where the staffing development, the human resources . . . the personnel function . . . is the very soul of the operation, it is the community college.

If a service like the College Entrance Examination Board, whose leadership and program I incidentally very much admire, yet whose work focuses essentially on student standards and testing functions, can enroll some 1,800 institutional members, then surely the personnel leadership can do at least as well.

My personal goal for 1975-76 is 1,500 members. We're pushing 900 right now as against 833 last year. As we move to 1,500 and on to 2,000, we'll more than double our present staff. Triple it in fact. And we'll then have our own in-house faculty on some of the pressures that pinch us most—labor relations; federal standards; new legislation, etc.

A tiny crew of four in the Washington office can't make the push alone. I think every State ought to have a CUPA chapter. I don't say this idly. To help, I would like to get every State in the span of the next two years. In other words, I will try to respond to every invitation that offers a gathering of your personnel leadership—whether it be the annual meeting of a chapter, a meeting to form a chapter, or simply some annual social, luncheon or dinner that draws our clan together.

I believe it is as much in the interest of your own communications, and professional development, as in the interest of CUPA growth, that you promote such gatherings.

Some of our friends in the Pacific Northwest are pushing the idea of a new CUPA region there, and we will give them all the help we can.

Not only do we want to gear this annual International Conference more heavily to issues, work, and expert people, I want to encourage the same thrust in the regional meetings. I think we can be a resource to you in these programs. Certainly that is one of our functions as a Washington base. We'll track the best talent available, if you simply ask us to help.

I can't tell you entirely where or how far we'll go with our seminar series. I just don't think a tiny staff can quite carry all the

pieces (faculty, materials, promotion, etc.) of 24 seminars in one season—but that's the camel we're riding right now. Of course, in some, the registration may not prove sufficient to do them at all. But I'll tell you this—we'll go just as far as your needs demand.

Your board is taking a strong interest in some new directions. We'd like to be more flexible in our seminar programming, and try perhaps some variations like these:

The present three-day format for the intensive, in-depth seminars compressed into two days. Maybe start Sunday night, informally, as we do now, then go hard Monday and Tuesday rather than stretch through Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday.

Intensive, single-issue, one-day seminars, at a much lower fee. Drive-in seminars, so to speak—likely geared chiefly to state or metropolitan groups. Of course, this kind of treatment might also be adaptable to the regional meetings.

I see these largely as custom workshops that in effect you design. You call us and tell us what's worrying your group—and we bring you the best experts in the land on that problem.

Incidentally, your responses to our recent membership needs survey clearly show that the one-day shot, the drive-in workshop is something a lot of you would like us to try.

There's another workshop we want to try this year. And your Board has given us the green-light. It will be a national workshop, hopefully next spring—on federal standards and national trends.

It would be a two-day, or two-and-a-half day affair. The panels would run in depth, and would be repeated, so that you as audience can rotate to cover your key concerns. The panels would give you a direct crack at the highest authorities in the land in these critical areas—equal pay, affirmative action, safety and health, unemployment compensation, manpower planning, impending legislation.

We can do it for a modest registration, perhaps \$50. And that would include two luncheons. We can do it because we would expect a substantial turnout, and also because many of our experts are right there in the federal agencies. You could bring along some of your top administrators who badly need schooling on these issues.

There are other development possibilities the Board, and the Long-Range Planning Committee, want to look at.

We hope foundation help can be found to help CUPA build a personnel development institute, to tackle the broad staff development challenges we've talked about.

Such an institute potentially could evolve into several centers. One perhaps in Washington, D.C. focusing on the national goals and the national standards impacting institutions. Another geared to the special staffing problems and training needs of senior colleges. Another keyed to the needs of community colleges. They could build intensive one- and two-week courses for renewal and improvement of personnel officers and other professional staff.

The Board likes, too, the idea of a CUPA National Advisory Council, to help the Association develop projects of this kind, and to help bring the management strength of industry and the community to bear on campus problems.

We need to explore thoroughly the Inter-governmental Personnel Act. Campus leaders hardly begin to participate as broadly as they should in the kinds of personnel exchanges that offer management experience in another setting. This great Act is intended to foster just such professional growth.

These are just a few of the prospects and the challenges we want to close ranks with you in pursuing. We can't let personnel play a back-seat role—and still meet the tests that now confront higher education. The possibilities ahead are great. That goes for

all of us. Give us your ideas. I think you can see that I am excited at the prospects, and happy to be on board.

AN EDUCATOR'S VIEW OF FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, recently in the mail, I received a pamphlet from the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services entitled "Innovative Education Practices." This booklet lists a number of projects that have been developed under the auspices of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Since the House Education and Labor Committee, on which I serve, is presently marking up the bill to extend this program, I thought it would be worthwhile to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the activities that are being supported by the Federal tax dollar.

After one has seen what some of these projects are, one is inclined to wonder what will be gained by the further Federal financing of elementary and secondary education. Senator GEORGE McGOVERN recently sent me a critique on Federal educational assistance prepared by T. C. Tollefson, director of secondary education, Sioux Falls Independent School District, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Although Mr. Tollefson believes in Federal funding on a much larger scale—a point with which I disagree—he also believes, as do I, that the thrust of Federal funding must be drastically altered to be effective. Mr. Tollefson, in his study, asks, "Who has benefited from Federal funding; that is, of education—during the past 14 years?" His answers are worth noting. As Mr. Tollefson puts it, those who have gained the most are those who were added to the payrolls of HEW, universities, colleges, and school systems to write, review, and evaluate proposals; teachers who received subsidized education; those who were added to the payrolls of school districts as aides, extra teachers, clerks; those who worked on summer projects generated by Federal funds; science and language laboratory furniture companies and many others who are enumerated in the article that follows.

Mr. Tollefson then presents his ideas on the best solution to ESEA funding. Since the first part of his report, however, raises some excellent points about what has already transpired with Federal funding, I would like to insert it in the RECORD for the serious consideration of my colleagues. This, together with the listing of some various ESEA title III programs certainly must give one pause as to the benefits of extending this legislation:

A CRITIQUE OF 14 YEARS OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND A PROPOSAL FOR AN IMPROVED METHOD OF FUNDING

The title of this piece and what follows should not be interpreted as a diatribe against Federal funding. I believe in Federal funding at a much larger scale than is now, it has been, practiced; but I also believe the

thrust of Federal funding needs to be altered drastically to be effective.

I wish in no way to detract from the many fine Federally funded projects that have been executed, but it is important to remember that the results of these projects have not entered the educational mainstream.

Since 1959 the Federal government has helped fund elementary and secondary education.

A. Because of certain historic events, legislation was enacted to improve the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

B. Later legislation was enacted to provide funds for teaching "disadvantaged" children, both those in school and those not yet of traditional school age.

C. Funds were made available to improve libraries and classroom materials and equipment in certain academic areas.

D. More funding was made available for "innovative" projects and to help State Departments of Education hire additional staff to provide more "services" and to help decide which "innovative" proposals to fund.

E. More recently, the Congress has provided funds for such diverse areas as:

1. Guidance.
2. Handicapped.
3. Career education.
4. "Drug" education.
5. Humanities.
6. Etc., etc.

WHAT HAVE THESE FUNDINGS ACCOMPLISHED?

Do research data exist that demonstrate on a large scale:

- A. Improved teaching?
- B. Improved learning?
- C. A more intelligent, humane, and informed citizenry?
- D. More interest and higher achievement in science, mathematics, or foreign languages?

E. More "innovative" approaches to teaching and learning throughout the U.S.?

F. More attention to individual differences, especially to very talented, highly motivated and extremely intelligent young people?

G. A shift in teacher orientation from a "teaching" role toward a "management" and/or "facilitator" role.

What improvements have been generated by fourteen years of accelerated Federal funding? What changes are evident? If 1,000 randomly selected teachers in 1959 had been carefully observed for a period of one week and then observed again in 1973, is anyone willing to argue that the 1973 reports would show significant improvements of the 1959 reports?

There have been changes during the past fourteen years that are observable, measurable, and widespread:

- A. There is an increase of audio-visual materials and equipment.
- B. There are more books in libraries.
- C. There are more and updated maps and globes.
- D. There is more science equipment and furniture.
- E. There are more language laboratories and accompanying soft ware.
- F. There are many schools with fewer walls and more carpet.

G. More teachers have Masters degrees and Masters plus 30, especially in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

H. More university and college professors receive a portion of their salaries from Federal funds, especially those in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

I. Many new jobs have been generated:

1. In HEW.
2. In regional offices.
3. In State Departments of Education.
4. In universities and colleges.
5. In school districts.

These new jobs usually cluster around three major thrusts:

1. Writing proposals.
2. Reading proposals.

3. Evaluating proposals.

J. There are more paraprofessionals (aides).

K. There are more guidance counselors.

WHO HAS BENEFITTED FROM FEDERAL FUNDING DURING THE PAST 14 YEARS?

A. Science and language laboratory furniture companies.

B. Science equipment companies.

C. Audio-Visual companies, in both hard and soft ware.

D. Map and globe companies.

E. Book publishers.

F. Teachers who received subsidized education.

G. Those who were added to the payrolls of H.E.W., universities and colleges, and school systems to write, review, and evaluate proposals.

H. Those who were added to payrolls of school districts as aides, extra teachers, clerks, and those who worked on summer projects generated by Federal funds.

I. Even though schools are in existence for one purpose—to educate young people to the limit of their potentials, one is hard pressed (some say it is impossible) to demonstrate any lasting benefits to students because of Federal funding of elementary and secondary education.

WHERE DID WE GO WRONG?

A. Nothing has been done to radically change the curriculum! The same basic content is taught in 1973 that was taught in 1959 (or perhaps 1949, or even 1939).

B. The "teaching" process is basically unchanged from 1959?

C. Pre-service teacher education, for the most part, still operates in the isolation of departments of education.

D. A secondary school student still chooses from a "menu" of from between 60-400 courses, depending on the size of his school. His education is fragmented.

E. For the most part the student is forced into a "book" oriented process and an atmosphere of "middle class" values.

F. Foreign language enrollments are dropping.

G. Fewer students choose science electives than in 1959.

I submit we went wrong when the assumption was made that more books, more hardware, more soft ware, and more semester hours for teachers would improve education.

"INNOVATIVE EDUCATION PRACTICES"—A GUIDE TO ESEA TITLE III PROGRAMS

DEVELOPING CURRICULA FOR EDUCATION OF YOUTH IN MEETING MODERN PROBLEMS—THE CONSTRUCTIVE CONTROL OF AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR

The basic objective of the project was to prepare curricular materials that would assist students to develop a process for determining social and human values and to develop attitudes involved in the constructive control of aggressive behavior. Meaningful attitudinal and behavioral objectives were developed at each level and the project staff was to prepare a sequence of learning experiences designed to achieve these objectives. The curriculum dealt with the nature of frustrations, procedures for constructively resolving them, and the process of making decisions in terms of effects of various courses of action on human development. As the curriculum was developed, it was tried in the classroom, tested for effectiveness and revised on the basis of the results of the testing. Grade level: 1-12. John R. Rowe, Coordinator; 16600 Hilliard Road, Lakewood, Ohio 44107; (216 579-4267). No. 102

DECISION MAKING THROUGH INQUIRY

This project placed emphasis on teaching students to utilize skills of inquiry in the social studies. Teaching units prepared by the project staff provided vehicles such as role-playing; simulation games; pictorial, site, and artifact analysis; and data gathering for implementing inquiry skills. Pilot

centers for the evaluation of social studies instruction were organized and workshop sessions were conducted to improve effectiveness in the use of procedures and resources. The interest and enthusiasm of outside resource personnel were encouraged to further supplement and enrich the program. Director; Carcroft Elementary School, Grade level: 1-6. Lucille K. Sherman, Project Mount Pleasant School District, Wilmington, Delaware 19803; (302 762-6110x217). No. 85

A COUNTY TRAINING PROGRAM IN BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION

This project offers training in behavior modification techniques to teachers, other professional staff members, paraprofessionals, and parents. The approach is based on the assumption that behavior is learned as a function of its consequences. If these consequences are restructured, students will change self-defeating behaviors and learn productive ones. Training is carried out through inservice workshops which combine lectures, task group activities, role-playing, and videotape demonstrations. Trainees learn basic reinforcement principles, specific applications, criteria for devising and evaluating interventions, and tools for analyzing their own behavior as well as that of their students. Grade level: K-12, Barbara Pentre and Hilde Weisert, Project Directors; Palisades Park Schools, 249 Leonia Avenue, Bogota, New Jersey 07603; (201 487-2707). No. 5

PARENT-PARTNERS TRAINEESHIP—PPT

Parent-Partners Traineeship (PPT) is an experimental investigation of the premise that parental involvement is a motivating influence on a child's school success. Through a traineeship which includes seminars, a practicum, and an open-education laboratory, parents are included in meaningful participation in classroom programs. Staff configuration focuses on the parent-partner, a volunteer member of the school staff, who is regularly scheduled in the school for one day a week. The parent receives a stipend, which serves both as an incentive and as an indication that such services are valued. The educational climate of the project evolved as a natural spin-off, with the presence of the parent-partner felt in subtle ways. An atmosphere of acceptance and mutual trust is evident in the classrooms. Phyllis Hobson, Project Director; Maude Aiton Elementary School, 533 48th Place, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20019; (202 396-4316/629-6971). No. 14

SOLVE

Project SOLVE was conceived out of a need to investigate how architecturally open facilities could better meet individualization of instruction and to organize varying approaches to staff development utilizing conceptual models of cooperative teaching. Five schools from different districts consolidated and served as a base of investigation for this effort. Based on a mathematics program that was skills-oriented and behavioralized, a systems approach to curriculum development was designed as a document for use by the staff in planning a total school program. An evaluation indicated that the project's innovativeness had a various range of effects on students. Removal of undesirable behavior patterns greatly reduced disciplinary measures. Eliminating the causes of frustration created an atmosphere of relaxation and spread enthusiasm for learning. Grade level: K-12. Glendon C. Belden, Project Director; 37 Pleasant Street, Concord, New Hampshire 03301; (603 224-9461). No. 19

ESEA TITLE III PARENT-CHILD MOBILE CLASSROOMS

The classrooms on wheels are van-type housemobiles which make two stops daily. During the first hour of the morning, 20 three-year-olds and their parents come for instruction. After their departure, 20 four-year-olds and their parents arrive for a one-

hour weekly class session. After the lunch hour, the staff drives the bus to another stop within the community where the pattern is repeated. This schedule operates four days a week, with the fifth day reserved for inservice training of all staff members. Each unit has a teacher who serves as leader of the three-member team and works for one hour with each group of children. A classroom aide acquaints the adults with the materials and concepts introduced to the children, as well as the games, puzzles, toys, and construction projects which they are to share with their children during the week. The third member of the team is a community worker who serves as the liaison between the home and the school. She enrolls children and parents, interpreting the program to them; contacts persons who serve as resource speakers at the regular monthly parent meetings; arranges for children's attendance at immunization clinics; and assists parents in making contact with various social service agencies. For each child the basic goal is to acquire those concepts, perceptions, meanings, and feelings which will prepare him for learning how to learn, explore, understand, and manage himself and his environment. For each parent the most important objective is to acquire new understandings, deeper knowledge, and a commitment for guiding the growth of the child. Age level: 3-4. Carrie B. Dawson, Project Director; School City of Gary, 620 East 10th Place, Gary, Indiana 46402; (219 886-3111). No. 64

PARENT READINESS EDUCATION PROJECT

The Parent Readiness Education Project is an effort to ameliorate the deficiencies of high-risk preschool children by training parents to become change agents and enrich their home environments and interactions with their children. The first objective of the program is to identify children with potential learning problems and develop a plan of intervention. All children are tested during the year prior to kindergarten entrance, and preference for admission in selection was given to children with younger siblings. Forty-eight children attend class once a week while their mothers attend a separate class. Classroom activities and prescriptive home activities are selected in Expressive Language, Visual Skills, Auditory Skills, Small Muscle Coordination, Large Muscle Coordination, Enhancing the Self-Concept, and the World Around Us. A second goal is to teach parents how to develop in their children the skills necessary for future academic achievement through specific activities and an enriched environment. Mothers attend classes one morning each week and help with daily home assignments, and both parents attend a series of evening parent group meetings with a social worker. Parents are encouraged to help develop positive self-concepts and a "can do" attitude. The third project goal is to train high school students for their future roles as parents through practical experiences in working with preschool children. Diane K. Bert, Project Director; Redford Union School District, 18499 Beech Daly Road, Detroit, Michigan 48240; (313 535-2000 x 201). No. 67

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS HOWELL MARCHING VIKINGS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the Francis Howell Marching Vikings of Weldon Springs, in St. Charles County, Mo., which has brought home three first place and four second place trophies within a 3-week period.

The Francis Howell Marching Vikings took first place at the first annual Greater St. Louis Marching Band Festival, which is held in conjunction with the Washington University, University of which is held in conjunction with the Missouri, and the Veiled Prophet Parade in St. Louis. They took second place in the field competition, finishing four points behind the Poplar Bluff High School from Poplar Bluff, Mo.

In the Washington, Mo. marching band competition a week later, the Howell Marching Vikings came away with first place trophy in parade marching and second place in field competition.

For the second consecutive year, the Lead Banner Carriers and their Pom-Pom Corps received the "Outstanding Band Front" trophy at Central Methodist College in Fayette, Mo. The band took second place honors in overall competition.

We Missourians are proud of the good sportsmanship that was displayed and the outstanding pride these young men and women have in their music and presentation.

ELIMINATE BUZZER SYSTEMS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, more and more I am hearing from the folks at home who do not want the auto buzzer. Why should we demand that each driver be forced to wear equipment which in certain accidents will be fatal to him. In America we founded our country on freedom of the individual, and not on the idea that the bureaucrats in Washington know how you should live from sunup to sundown.

I want to add another followup on my previous reports on the interlock seat belt harness buzzer system.

A Canadian study shows seat belts and shoulder harnesses could be dangerous. The preceding sentence is the headline in the excellent article which was news release No. 23, by the National Motor Vehicle Safety Foundation, Inc., of Lee, N.H. You will be interested in reading some sections of this factual report:

AUTO BUZZER

Legislation requiring automobile drivers to wear seat belts and shoulder harnesses would be a "waste of time and could be dangerous," says a professor at the University of Toronto in Canada. Patrick Foley, industrial engineering professor, commented on proposed laws now under discussion for adoption requiring that car users "buckle-up" or pay a fine.

Commenting on Professor Foley's stand on the "seat-belt" matter, A. J. White, director of Motor Vehicle Research of New Hampshire said, "It is indeed refreshing to see data backed by actual real-life research in this era of time when so-called consumer advocates and misguided agencies are claiming that the world can be saved if certain unproven actions are made mandatory by law."

White further stated, "Car buyers are besieged with claims that they can save their lives by buying and using 'safety devices' which are, in fact, dangerous. It is time that advocates be held strictly accountable when

such devices are used and the persons who use them suffer injuries or death.

Professor Foley initiated a study of seatbelts and shoulder harness for "wear-ability" using a team of fourth year students who used 3 imported cars and seven North American built cars of various sizes.

The results of this study indicated that many drivers, especially small people, could not easily reach important car controls while wearing shoulder harnesses. The team concluded that some women would not be able to start their cars. The group tested two women, one representing the 5 percent of the female population and the other, the average female. They used a male subject representing the tallest 5 percent of the male population.

The subjects were instructed to manipulate the controls of each car while strapped into standard seat belts in various models.

The investigating group discovered that the problem of reaching controls can be acute for smaller members of the driving population. Unless there are changes in the designs of restraining devices and if the importance of these devices is further emphasized and made mandatory by law to be used, certain people should avoid using them.

Such primary controls as steering wheels, gas and brake pedals, parking brakes, ignition systems and shifting levers were investigated. Also, secondary control systems were studied, which included horns and turn signals. Visibility controls were also studied which included windshield wipers and washers, headlights, high beam switches and rear-view mirrors. Controls for heat, air conditioning, window and air vents were investigated.

This study points up that restraint systems might have to be custom tailored for individuals and particular model cars; a task that could be classed as an insurmountable one. One can imagine the confusion that will result if the ignition interlock system becomes mandatory on all vehicles starting with the 1974 models.

The inclusion of the inertia reel system in the 1973 system was brought about in an effort to reduce the problems of "choking" a small motorist whose shoulder strap lays dangerously close to his throat. Rotation of the upper torso of a woman during a crash deceleration could result in radical breast, which is medically referred to as breast removal. Submarining action, during a crash, of a wearer's body could cause serious stress loading of the throat area, resulting in death, as reported in the text book, *Passenger Car Safety Dynamics* by Motor Vehicle Research of New Hampshire, after tests of restraint systems using actual vehicles and anthropometric & anthropomorphic dummies in full scale crashes in Connecticut and New Hampshire, over a several year period of time.

Will car buyers be spending this money to be annoyed by the system, or will he defeat the system? These questions are not totally answered and the future of DOT could be jeopardized if they have made a mistake. The future in time and billions of dollars will supply the answers.

As quoted by A. J. White, director of Motor Vehicle Research of New Hampshire, "The high accident record indicates that highway safety will not yield readily to wholesale solution and may have to be solved by each individual himself," could be sound.

WHAT IS SO SPECIAL ABOUT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR?

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about who should

be the special prosecutor in the Watergate case. Everyone seems to take for granted that the regular local district court prosecutor should not pursue the case. I really do not understand the reasoning.

Many cases of notoriety have occurred in recent days and years and so far as I know, the regular prosecutor performed well.

In this regard, I ask my colleagues to read an article from the Cincinnati Enquirer written by Bob Brumfield.

WHO NEEDS A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR?

(By Bob Brumfield)

With all due respect to the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government (which is precious little, in my opinion), I wish they would drop this special prosecutor nonsense and get down to the business they are being overpaid to do—running the damned country.

There is no need for any special prosecutors. We've got all the prosecutors we need. If an alleged offense needs prosecuting, there is a qualified, elected prosecutor in whatever county, city or municipality it might have occurred.

If we are to strip the President of all executive privilege and treat him like any other citizen, then he should be prosecuted like any other citizen.

Congress doesn't have the power to appoint a prosecutor under existing law. So some of its members are talking about passing a new law to give them this power. That's the craziest thing I ever heard of. Hell, if they want to nail the President, why not just pass a law making it a criminal offense to be named Nixon, or to have a daughter named Julie? Why not pass a law making it a felony to criticize the news media? They'd have a prima facie case either way that even a boot assistant prosecutor from Boondocksville could get a conviction on.

And what yo-yo dreamed up the cuckoo idea of having a judge appoint a special prosecutor? Can you imagine where that would put a defense attorney in the case?

"Your honor, I object!"

"Shut up, you! The prosecutor I appointed has made a valid point—a point which I warn the jury it had better pay special attention to, incidentally, in reaching its guilty verdict."

No thanks, man. I think I'll just take my chances shooting it out with the police.

It's just as ridiculous to expect President Nixon to appoint a prosecutor he thinks has a good chance of nailing him on something. Would you do it? Not me, brother. I'm clean as far as I know, but if I had to hire somebody for the specific task of digging up something on me, I think I'd choose a real lazy dude.

I don't know if President Nixon was involved in any financial hanky panky or not. If he was, the local authorities can handle it. We trusted them with Charles Manson and that little creepo who wasted Bobby Kennedy. They did a tune on Richard Speck, James Earl Ray, Arthur Bremer and other assorted baddies. They know their business.

If Congress really feels that it really has to get into the judicial functions of our government, maybe they should appoint a special prosecutor to prosecute themselves. I don't know if any money was piddled away at San Clemente or not, but there's plenty of evidence the Treasury Department lost a lot of loot when Congress killed the Boeing SST. It's a documented fact that it cost several million dollars more to cancel the SST contracts than it would have cost to build two flying prototypes. And that's not to mention the big rip-off—a loss of up to \$6.5 billion in foreign sales of the SST during the next 10 years.

Make me a special prosecutor, and I'll haul old Sanctimonious Sam Ervin into court and ask him to explain every campaign donation he ever received. Maybe he'd come up with a satisfactory explanation for every dime, but who would ever remember that when it was all over? All they'd ever remember were the news accounts that Sam Ervin was being investigated for alleged irregularities in campaign funding. It's the old "where there's smoke there's fire" syndrome.

No, we don't need any more prosecutors. Matter of fact, we don't need any more lawyers riding the Watergate gravy train on both sides of the fence. I'm up to here with lawyers. Everywhere you look there's another lawyer. Lawyers, reporters, commentators and news analysts. There are just too many of us, and most of us don't know what the hell we're talking about half the time. Sheesh, don't kids study engineering anymore in school?

SCANLON POSTMASTER OF YEAR FOR 1973

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the postmaster of Cincinnati, Joseph J. Scanlon has been named the Postmaster-of-the-Year by the Direct Mail Advertising Association in nationwide competition.

Mr. Scanlon has worked hard in the Cincinnati community for many years and greatly deserves this honor. I would like to include in the RECORD at this time a newspaper article outlining Postmaster Scanlon's achievements:

SCANLON POSTMASTER OF YEAR FOR 1973

CINCINNATI.—Postmaster Joseph J. Scanlon, 690 Cedar Crest Ln., has been named 1973 Postmaster-of-the-Year in an annual contest sponsored by the Direct Mail Advertising Assn. (DMAA). Presentation of the award was made Sept. 17 at the Annual Convention of the National Assn. of Postmasters of the U.S. held in Kemesha Lake, N.Y.

The Postmaster-of-the-Year Award is presented annually by the DMAA to the Nation's outstanding Postmaster. The selection from numerous entries was made by a panel of judges on the basis of four guidelines: 1) His accomplishments as Postmaster; 2) his cooperation with business mailers and customers; 3) the Postmaster's standing as a citizen in his community; and 4) his participation in local affairs.

Postmaster Scanlon was nominated for the DMAA Award by Calvin Ingram, president, American Advertising Service, Cincinnati. In his capacity as Postmaster and District Manager responsible for 177 Post Offices, Scanlon has been commended by postal officials and business mailers for the efficient mail handling systems of the Cincinnati Post Office. His accomplishments in the area of public service has also brought him high praise and numerous awards.

The Direct Mail Advertising Assn., the Association of Direct Marketing, is dedicated to the more effective use of the \$3.4 billion direct mail advertising medium, the country's third largest. DMAA's 1600 member firms—users, creators, producers and suppliers of direct mail—are located in 47 states and 30 foreign countries. DMAA is headquartered at 230 Park Ave., New York, N.Y., and maintains a Washington Office at 968 National Press Building.

OIL COMPANY PROFITS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, a lack of understanding of the basic facts of economics may be a root cause of many of our national problems. I am convinced that it is one of the sources of today's energy supply problems. The conditions that caused these energy shortages were not corrected in time because of a pervading fear that the public would not understand the necessity for actions that might add to the costs of fuel. As a result of these delays and procrastinations, the public may have to pay a much higher price for energy in the years ahead than would have been necessary if effective solutions had been adopted in time.

In this same connection, the Wall Street Journal of October 26, 1973, had a most instructive editorial on the subject of oil company profits. I insert this editorial in the RECORD because of the light it sheds on this badly misunderstood subject of profits and earnings.

If our energy supply problems are to be solved, the points about profits and investment requirements spelled out in this editorial should be made clear to the consuming public.

The editorial follows:

THOSE OIL COMPANY PROFITS

Our heart goes out to the oil industry, now choking with embarrassment over third-quarter profits. At the very moment the Arabs have us in an oil squeeze and the nation is being asked to turn down the thermostats to save fuel, the oil bigs are forced to admit a tidal wave of earnings.

The Exxon Corp., the biggest of all, turned a \$638 million profit in the third quarter on revenues of \$7.32 billion, a spectacular earnings surge of 80% over the same period of 1972. Mobil's profits are up 64% to \$231 million. Gulf Oil jumped 91% to \$210 million. Shell is less shamefaced with an earnings jump of only 23%.

The only relief in sight for this embarrassment of riches is the possibility that the Middle East oil squeeze will force the industry to cut back on its capacity, especially in Eastern Hemisphere operations where the greatest surge in profits has come this year. And profit margins are bound to be adversely affected by the steep increases in tax and royalty payments dictated by the producing countries. But as long as they can get the crude, the major oil companies can hardly escape tidy profits for quite a while.

What seems quite remarkable to us is the defensive posture that majors have struck in trying to apologize for or explain away as anomalous the profits they are now reaping. Of course, some of the increases reflect a rebound from the diminished profits of 1972. Yes, accounting practices on treatment of inventories when coupled with the inflation of 1973 have produced some temporary profit illusions. And it's true that much of the steep earnings curve can be attributed to foreign, not domestic earnings, which have climbed more nearly in parallel with volume.

Put all these apologies aside, though, and it remains that the oil industry is doing very well indeed, and for a nation beset with energy shortages that is very good news. How else can the United States pull itself out of

the energy hole if not through an industry that finds itself able to generate the capital that task will require? Early this year, Chase Manhattan Bank estimated that the world oil industry would require capital investment of \$565 billion between 1970 and 1985, and another \$35 billion of geological, geophysical and leasing expenses. The industry certainly could not hope to attract that kind of capital if it were stumbling along on the average profits of, say, the railroads.

The reason profits have soared is that the industry has been operating flat out in the production, refining and marketing of oil products. There is no excess capacity in the system and efficiencies are at a peak. The reason there is no excess capacity is that it was not built when it should have been, because the government was both limiting the importation of oil and holding down earnings with price controls.

With corporate coffers now finally filling with cash, the industry is getting in a position where it can afford to add to refinery capacity, to develop synthetic fuels, to explore for and develop new sources of petroleum. In fact, specialists at Chase Manhattan estimate that the industry's income growth, which now averages 8.1% a year over the past decade, has to go to an annual increase of 16% if the industry is to meet the stupendous capital requirements it faces. There's no need for corporate spokesmen to apologize for the third quarter. As long as they don't squander their earnings, the nation will be well served if they do even better in the quarters ahead.

LITTLE BROTHER OF THE WOLF

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all too often wild animals are portrayed to the public as either Disney-like characters with human characteristics or as savage beasts that kill only for fun. Neither of these views, however, is accurate and, as a result, misconceptions regarding wildlife abound.

The noted naturalist and conservationist Cleveland Amory, in an article entitled "Little Brother of the Wolf," has attempted to set the record straight and present an accurate, realistic picture of the coyote. His article, short and simple, describes the everyday turmoil of the coyote and gives evidence to destroy many of the myths relating to this mysterious, yet clever cousin of the dog.

Most importantly, Mr. Amory presents articulate and persuasive arguments to dispel the notion held by some that coyotes should be eradicated from the face of the Earth. Specifically, he details reasons for the passage of legislation such as H.R. 4759 which would prohibit the use of nonselective poisons, such as Compound 1080. In addition, Mr. Amory makes a compelling argument for the enactment of proposals such as H.R. 8065, a measure I introduced to ban the use of cruel steel leg-hold traps.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert this fine article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

[From the American Way, October 1973]

LITTLE BROTHER OF THE WOLF

(By Cleveland Amory)

Pronounce him "ki-oat" or "ki-o-tee." Either is correct, and he won't care. But mark him well, and do not allow the mystery and marvel of him to be lost in familiarity.

All right, he is familiar. He has been located in virtually every state in the Union and he even appears regularly, usually along with the late-late show, in Los Angeles' backyard. And if he is present only in the Western Hemisphere, he is familiar the world over as perhaps the most American of all wild animals. Indeed, many countries regard him as the symbol of the American West.

Highly photogenic, with an eerie, never-to-be forgotten howl—one with which he sings to the sun, to the moon and in heart-breaking relays to his own kind—he is the little brother of the wolf, yet a close cousin of the dog. If, on one hand he is incredibly quick, sharp-witted, cunning and resourceful—no other animal has all three senses, sight, smell and hearing, as keen as his—on the other he is loyal, playful, humorous and even philosophical.

Basically monogamous, coyotes mate for long periods, if not for life. And if two unmated males are fighting for the same unmated female, after it is all over, she is likely to choose not the one who won, but the one who lost.

When the pups come, they are taught to hunt at the age of two months, not by the mother but by the father. And discipline is severe. It is not unusual to see a father coyote returning to his den and his pups rushing out to meet him, but no matter how far away the father is, at a certain invisible line—obviously the greatest distance they are allowed to go from the den—the pups will stop short.

"Next to God," goes the Mexican saying, "the coyote is the smartest person on earth." Even if this is exaggerated, the fact remains that the coyote, if not the most intelligent of all animals, is certainly the cleverest. He would have to be.

Man has made his very name suspect. The second definition for the word "coyote" in the new *American Heritage Dictionary* is "contemptible sneak." For two hundred years, the coyote has faced a steadily increasing campaign to eradicate him from the face of the earth. Many animals have faced such campaigns, but against no other animal has the campaign reached such heights of cruelty.

In the old days, the coyote was hunted for his pelt. When pelts dropped in price, he was hunted because he was supposed to be a cattle killer. When it was proven he wasn't a cattle killer—he lives almost exclusively on mice, moles, rabbits, insects, snakes and even eats fruit for dessert—he was hunted because he was supposed to be a sheep killer. Finally, when it was proven he wasn't a sheep killer, he was hunted because—well, he was supposed to hunt what man wanted to hunt. The coyote is classed, simply, as a "varmint."

As such, there is no season for hunting coyote. For him, it is always open season. He is hunted by land and by air. He has learned that the air can be dangerous; when he hears or sees a plane he takes cover, and, like a trained guerilla fighter, camouflages himself. The coyote is regularly jack-hunted by light at night, something forbidden by law for most animals. "Most hunters," says one hunting magazine, "clamp a powerful light directly to their guns and keep it on at all times."

In the winter, snowmobiles hunt the coyote down, with the hunters signaling to each other by walkie-talkies. In the summer,

trained hunting dogs run him down in relays. Often, the coyote is chased by dogs riding in automobiles. When he begins to tire, the automobiles are stopped and the dogs are released.

In such situations, the coyote's only hope lies in his cleverness. And stories of coyotes outwitting hunters are legion. Coyotes will work in teams, alternately resting and running to escape dogs set upon them. They have even been known to jump on automobiles and flat cars to escape dogs. And they have also successfully resisted bombing. Lewis Nordyke reports that once when a favorite coyote haunt in Texas became a practice range for bombing, the coyotes left—temporarily. Soon they were back to investigate and found that the bombing kept people out. They decided to stay. Meanwhile, they learned the bombing schedule and avoided the bombs.

Many a coyote has gotten along with its lower jaw shot off. Joe Van Wormer reports a coyote in Idaho whose mouth had been cruelly wired shut. It was able to open it only half an inch, but nonetheless had been able to survive. A coyote in Montana also had her jaw wired shut—she was used by a hunter to "train" his dogs. And a female coyote killed in Tule Lake in northern California was found to have four healthy pups in her den. She had managed to fend for them although she herself had been shot in both eyes with a shotgun and was totally blind.

From some hunts, of course, there is no escape. John Farrar, in his *Autobiography of a Hunter*, writes of an all too typical hunt in the sandhill region of Nebraska. It was, he writes, "a well-planned military maneuver," with a plane overhead to spot the coyotes and, below, hundreds of hunters. "They came in pickups," he says, "armed with shortwave radios, powerful engines, clinging snow tires . . . each nervously fingering a high-powered rifle with telescopic sight."

"At the next section line 12 men awaited [the coyote's] approach. At 100 yards head-on, it began. His faltering speed spared him as bullets churned the snow ahead. As he reached the ditch he sank shoulder deep and floundered desperately. Astonished, ashamed or angry, no one fired. As he struggled across the road and into the next section, he seemed to crawl. As if he were shielded, 30 or more rounds left him untouched. In a weedy draw he could run no further. In cover no more than 12 inches high, he disappeared."

"The plane circled and then the men closed in afoot. Talk of letting this one go passed idly. Twenty-five armed men closed in on one terrified, exhausted animal. The enclosed area dwindled to the size of a football field and less. Still no coyote."

"Then he appeared, staggering, worn, mouth agape. He weaved pitifully up the hill among the hunters, as if defying death, or seeking it."

"Then man, the rational animal, the pinnacle of evolution, the great humanitarian, gunned him down."

"There was little laughing or joking, little back slapping. Just a sickening, nauseating silence. The day ended. With it ended my coyote hunting."

When the coyote is not hunted, he is trapped. For the coyote, there are especially horrible traps—to match his ingenuity. So-called "passion bait" is soaked in a piece of wool and put under a pan. When the coyote investigates, the slightest pressure releases the deadly steel leghold.

Once the coyote is caught, he has been known to chew off his own leg rather than remain in the trap. Literally thousands of coyotes have existed for life on three legs. Also, amazingly, there are thousands of two-legged coyotes. One female coyote in Michigan had only stubs for front legs—she ran like a kangaroo—and yet, when killed, was bearing five unborn pups. A coyote in Colorado existed for more than a year missing

two feet—the left front and right hind. In New Mexico, a coyote got along somehow with both feet missing from his right side, and still managed to raise a family. Trapper Art Cooper once caught a coyote in two traps at once. One trap caught him by a front foot, one by a hind. The two-trap set was fastened to an iron drag, and when Cooper and a companion came upon the coyote he was trying to cross a plowed field. Seeing the man, the coyote grabbed the drag in his mouth and took off.

Marguerite Smelser tells an even more remarkable coyote trapping story. Two government trappers spent weeks tracking down and trying to kill a whole coyote family. First the nursing mother was trapped, then released after the trappers had fastened a collar and tire chain to her. By the trail of the dragging chain, the trappers expected to follow her to her den where they could wipe out the pups.

But for two weeks the mother coyote did not betray her family. Her mate brought food to her at night and kept the pups fed. And so, after days of frustration, convinced the mother would never endanger her young, the trappers tracked her down and killed her.

Later, however, they did get a chance at the pups. The trappers came upon them playing at the far side of the dam. At this juncture, however, the father coyote suddenly appeared and, acting as a decoy, managed to divert the trappers' attention until he was shot. His young had safely disappeared into the brush.

I have on my desk something called a "Humane Coyote-Getter," which is advertised as the "Marvel of the 20th Century." Humane? It is literally a whole trap gun. A bait is soaked in urine and covered with a jacket, then placed over a bullet cartridge, the whole being set in the ground. When the coyote investigates, the bullet is set off by a spring and shoots the coyote in the mouth with sodium cyanide. This in turn, on contact with the moisture in the coyote's mouth, or eyes, or wherever it hits him, releases gas and the coyote gasses himself to death.

This Coyote-Getter is, by coyote-getting standards, actually humane—at least compared to the more general way of killing coyotes. That is, plainly and simply, by poisoning them. One state, for example, put out in one year 300,000 strychnine tablets—tablets which are slipped into an inch-square of suet made out of sheep fat. But even strychnine is as nothing compared to the dread Compound 1080 or sodium fluoracetate. This is a poison so lethal that there is no known antidote. It is chain-reacting. Thus, when a meadow mouse eats it and is in turn eaten by a larger animal, who is in turn eaten by a coyote, who is in turn eaten by a mountain lion, 1080 will have poisoned them all.

Perhaps the most horrible thing about Compound 1080 is that it is administered in small doses. Not because it is expensive—unfortunately it isn't, it is cheap. But it is administered in small doses so that the coyote will get as far away from the bait as possible before he dies and thus his body will not be able to warn other possible victims. Coyotes have been known to travel over twenty miles to die—in agony.

The United States government has poisoned more than a million coyotes. The real irony, though, is not that poisoning is done by the government, it is that it is done on public land. After the findings of the Leopold Report, the government's "Predator and Rodent Control Board" had to change its name to "Wildlife Services." But still, the sheep men graze their sheep on public land, which they do for a nominal fee, and then have the government poison coyotes merely on the suspicion that they kill their sheep. And this despite the Leopold Report's warning, "For every person whose sheep may be molested by a coyote, there are perhaps a

thousand others who would thrill to hear a coyote chorus in the night."

Texas rancher Arthur Lytton, who for forty years has run a 20,000-acre spread, said, "I would never allow a predator to be killed on my land. They are necessary for the balance of nature. Kill them and you're in for nothing but trouble from rabbits and rodents and everything."

In 1971, the coyote poisoning program cost the public over \$8 million. And, of course, the program didn't just poison coyotes. In a typical year, the wildlife "body count" was as follows: 89,653 coyotes, 24,273 foxes, 20,780 bobcats, 19,052 skunks, 10,078 raccoons, 7,615 opossums, 6,941 badgers, 6,685 porcupines, 2,771 red wolves, 1,170 beavers and 842 bears.

Finally, after years of effort by the Defenders of Wildlife, Audubon, the Fund for Animals and other societies, President Nixon issued his now-historic Executive Order 11643, in February, 1972, banning the use of most predator poisons on public lands. The order continues to be opposed by the National Wool Growers Association and others. Coyote hunters, meanwhile, seemed to be redoubling their efforts. One hunt in particular, out of Karval, Colorado, which boasted nine pickup trucks with specially bred "coyote dogs" (mixes of greyhounds with Irish and Russian wolfhounds) penned in quick-release cages in the back, was billed as "The Biggest Coyote Hunt in Colorado History." Scores of hunters and dozens of dogs hunted all day. Their total kill—five coyotes.

Such hunts—this latter hunt even included an official "observer" from the Department of the Interior—have outraged coyote friends. The Fund for Animals announced a reward of \$500 for prior information which led to the stopping of any such hunt, and also announced that it would back any group engaged in breaking up such hunts by any means short of actual violence. One such group, The Defenders of the Coyote, already includes more than a hundred college and high school students as well as businessmen and housewives.

In the long run, some coyote friends believe the only answer is to make a pet out of him—and there has been signal success in this regard, the coyote's charm and loyalty overcoming all difficulties. Others believe that the answer is to meet the coyote literally halfway. Have him, in other words, as he is, half pet and half wild. One who believes this is Los Angeles' Gerald Coward, a man who, on a lonely walk up a canyon a few years ago, managed to make a lasting friend of a coyote. Coward, a photographer and writer, gave up his job and from that day on, every day for two and a half years, he walked up his canyon. And every day, for two and a half years, his coyote faithfully met him. All day they played, romped and explored together, learning about each other—and then, at the end of each day, they said goodbye. When the coyote mated, he even brought his companion to Coward at the same rendezvous. It was a remarkable idyll that existed until the terrible Los Angeles fire—when Mr. Coward saw his coyote no more. "The coyote," he said, "is the greatest animal there is."

"OUR TOWN" POLL BACKS IMPEACHMENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Our Town, a community newspaper in New York City, has just conducted a poll on the question of impeachment. Some of the 632 Manhattan residents polled live on

the Upper East Side in my congressional district.

The results of the poll are eloquent testimony of the sentiment of Americans who feel that the time has come for impeachment; 92.4 percent of those asked oppose the President's handling of the Watergate tapes; 78.8 percent support impeachment:

NIXON WATERGATE POLL

1. What do you think of President Nixon's actions regarding the Watergate Tapes?

	Number	percentage
Support -----	48	7.60
Against -----	584	92.40
Total -----	632	100.00

2. Do you believe he should be impeached?

	Number	percentage
Yes -----	498	78.80
No -----	134	21.20
Total -----	632	100.00

NEW HAMPSHIRE GENERAL COURT PUSHES VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that the framers of the Constitution had absolutely no intent to prohibit voluntary prayer in the public schools of the Nation. Indeed, the first amendment says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Which appears expressly intended to safeguard this right. In this language I find the basis for clear distinction between officially prescribed—and hence impermissible—prayer and voluntary prayer reflecting individual conviction.

Accordingly, in the last session I supported a constitutional amendment to restore this right, which had been wrongly struck down by the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, it did not receive the two-thirds vote necessary, although a majority did vote for it. In this session I am cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 760 with the same objective.

My position has been strengthened by the knowledge that it enjoys widespread support among the American people and the people of New Hampshire. This support has been reflected in Concurrent Resolution No. 6 of the New Hampshire General Court, adopted May 24, 1973.

The resolution, accompanied by authenticating certification by the secretary of state of New Hampshire, follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, OFFICE OF
SECRETARY OF STATE

I, Robert L. Stark, Secretary of State of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 6 to petition the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting voluntary prayer in public schools (Adopted May 24, 1973) as on file in this office and held in my custody as Secretary of State.

In testimony whereof, I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the Seal of the State, at Concord, this 28th day of May A.D. 1973.

ROBERT L. STARK,

Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 6

To petition the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting voluntary prayer in public schools

Memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress Together Assembled,

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire in General Court Assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

Whereas, Article 1 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the United States which provides "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances," has been construed by the United States Supreme Court to not permit organized prayer in public schools; and

Whereas, the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire believes that voluntary prayer in public schools should be permitted as being consistent with the guarantees the founding fathers of the United States of America intended; and

Whereas, the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire believes that Article 5, Part First, of the Constitution of New Hampshire has recognized every individual's natural and inalienable right to freedom of worship in accordance to the dictates of their own conscience, and this the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire believes to encompass the right of individual students in public schools to voluntarily say prayers of their own choosing on appropriate occasions in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience;

Now therefore be it resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

I. That the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, hereby, and pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, make application to the Congress of the United States, to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the effect that: "Voluntary Prayers Shall Be Permitted in Public Schools at Appropriate Times, Daily."

II. That attested copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress and to each member of the New Hampshire delegation in Congress, and that printed copies thereof, showing that said concurrent resolution was adopted by the Legislature of New Hampshire, be sent to each House of each legislature of each state of the United States;

III. That this application hereby made by the legislature of the State of New Hampshire shall constitute a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States shall have made similar applications pursuant to Article V.

IV. That since this is an exercise by a state of the United States of a power granted to it under the Constitution, the request is hereby made that the official journals and records of both Houses of Congress shall include the resolution or a notice of its receipt by the Congress, together with similar applications from other states, so that the Congress and the various states shall be apprised of the time when the necessary number of states

shall have so exercised their power under Article V of the Constitution;

V. That since this method of proposing amendments to the Constitution has never been completed to the point of calling a convention and no interpretation of the power of the states in the exercise of this right has ever been made by any court or any qualified tribunal, if there be such, and since the exercise of the power is a matter of basic sovereign rights and the interpretation thereof is primarily in the sovereign government making such exercise and since the power to use such right in full also carries the power to use such right in part, the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire interprets Article V to mean that if two-thirds of the states make application for a convention to propose an identical amendment to the Constitution for ratification with a limitation that such amendment be the only matter before it, that such convention would have power only to propose the specified amendment and would be limited to such proposal and would not have power to vary with the text thereof nor would it have power to propose other amendments on the same or different propositions;

VI. That the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire does not, by this exercise of its power under Article V, authorize the Congress to call a convention for any purpose other than the proposing of the specific amendment which is a part hereof, nor does it authorize any representative of the State of New Hampshire who may participate in such convention to consider or to agree to the proposing of any amendment other than the one made a part hereof;

VII. That by its actions in these premises, the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire does not in any way limit in any other proceeding its right to exercise its power to the full extent;

VIII. That the Congress, in exercising its power of decision as to the method of ratification of the proposed article by the legislatures or by conventions, is hereby requested to require that the ratification be by the legislatures.

JAMES E. O'NEIL,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DAVID L. NIXON,

President of the Senate.

Adopted May 24, 1973.

SOME STANDARDS FOR OUR PERPLEXING TIMES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Randal Cornell Teague received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Allen University in Columbia, S.C., in August of this year. Allen University is a predominantly black college, fully accredited, principally supported by the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the largest black denomination in America.

Mr. Teague's address at the university's convocation stands in contradistinction to those stylized, stereotypical addresses to which our Nation's college graduates are often subjected each spring and summer. As a succinct exposition of fundamental libertarian principles, it is superb. Mr. Teague received a standing ovation upon the completion of his remarks from the graduates of this predominantly black university. To those concerned about the

applicability and currency of libertarian principles to the lives of people in the 1970's, Mr. Teague's address and the response thereto are most gratifying.

Excerpts from this commencement address follow:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF RANDAL CORNELL TEAGUE

It is customary for a commencement speaker to dwell at what often appears to be interminable lengths upon the obvious:

That today is a beginning, not an end.
That it is harder to survive "out there" than it ever was in a classroom.

You are already part of a society and a world turned topsy-turvy by the rhetoric of an age in which the maximum degree of a man's or a nation's focus is often upon a minimum of genuinely important concerns. While on the one hand we have seen in our short life time accomplishments which rank easily among the most notable of man's achievements, we have on the other hand seen the apparent degeneration of the spirit and soul which hold men's mind intact and civilizations together. Of what do I speak?

In the name of "peace," men wage war.
In the name of "love," men foment hatred and violence.

In the name of "liberation," one half of the world's people has been subjugated.

In the name of "the quality of life," our courts sanction the destruction of human fetuses.

Why do I bring these points to your attention? Because I hope to show how you must proceed through this course of life now before you. In the jargon of today, we say, "you've gotta keep your eye on the ball," and that really is what it is all about, this terrible responsibility of meaningful human existence thrust upon each of us by conception. Merely to survive in this world, one need only hang on amongst the vast majority. To live meaningfully is to be one of those who really knows what is going on around us. You must train your mind and be ever vigil upon the substance of our times. It is substance—not rhetoric, not procedure—upon which your mind's eye must be focused. It is not an easy task.

And from what perspective and according to what benchmarks are we to view the substance of life? In this permissive time, to merely mention the existence of standards, much less adherence to them, is to be heretical. In no place is this more true than in academia. But I stand before you today not as this era's stereotype commencement speaker. I am not a relativist, nor a collectivist, nor a limousine liberal, nor even a democrat. I am a proponent of the values of institutions, an individualist, a traditionalist, and a republican. While this may make me something of an oddity, it does mean I have to hold no punches with this world in which we live and about which you and I, perhaps from the same perspective but most probably from different ones, are, nonetheless, dismayed.

What then are those guideposts? They are few, but they are strong.

Truth. We "do not deny the existence of undiscovered truths," but we make a critical assumption: That "those truths that have already been apprehended are more important to cultivate than those yet undiscovered ones," seemingly always close to the grasp but never within hand. We make "the tacit acknowledgement that all that is finally important" to the spirit and soul of man "is behind us; that the crucial explorations have been undertaken, and that it is given to man to know what are the great truths that emerged from them. Whatever is to come cannot outweigh the importance to man of what has gone before."

Obedience. We mean to live our lives as obedient men, but obedient to God, "sub-

servient to the wisdom of our ancestors; never to the authority of political truths arrived at yesterday at the voting booth."

War. "War is the second worst activity of mankind, the worst being acquiescence in slavery."

Individualism. "You cannot paint the Mona Lisa by assigning one dab each to a thousand painters."

Peace. "All civilized men want peace . . . [But] all truly civilized men must despise pacifism. Pacifism is a Christian heresy that springs from crucial misunderstandings. Peace on earth is a plea for those conditions on earth—love, charity, temperance—which make peace thinkable. Peace is unthinkable in a community in which plunderers have hold of the city at night. . . . In praying for peace, we pray that grace will settle in the hearts and minds of those bellicose people in the world who are critically situated, and cause them to exercise that restraint which makes peace possible. If peace were the first goal of man, you would not have to pray for it: you would have it."

Economic Freedom. Political freedom "cannot long exist without economic freedom. . . . When government interferes with the work of the market economy, it tends to reduce the moral and physical strength of the nation." When government "takes from one man to bestow on another, it diminishes the incentive of the first, the integrity of the second, and the moral autonomy of both."

Purposes of Government. The purposes of government are to protect our political and economic freedoms "through the preservation of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice." "When government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty."

Responsibility. That in these times of moral and political crises, it is the responsibility of young people to reaffirm these eternal truths.

These truths come together into a set of inextricably intertwined responsibilities. To meet foursquarely these responsibilities is to nobly achieve a mission in this life. To abandon them, or even to meet them without sureness of thought or action, is to fail in this life.

To what, then, does this add up? This: Call no thing in this life truly your own but your own moral conscience. Call no thing in the next truly your own but your soul. And rest eternally assured of this: That the status of the second derives from the essence of the first.

THE CASE FOR HOUSING ALLOWANCES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Samuel C. Jackson, the able former Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has written an article for the October 1973 issue of *Focus*, the monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies, which deserves the attention of the Members of the House.

In this article, entitled "The Case for Housing Allowances," Mr. Jackson reviews the experience of European nations with housing allowance programs and reports on the experiments with housing allowance programs tried by Model Cities agencies in Wilmington, Del., and Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. Jackson, writing for local minority elected officials, which the Joint Center for Political Studies serves, makes a case for at least the continued study of housing allowance programs, but more significantly, he defines criteria which we all should use in judging the worth of this or any other approach to our Nation's housing crisis: what will be its effect upon the overall supply of housing and the ability of the poor to afford available housing?

THE CASE FOR HOUSING ALLOWANCES

(By Samuel C. Jackson)

The moratorium on the construction of new and rehabilitated low income housing is now into its tenth month. It was imposed to permit a search for better ways to administer subsidy programs. As we seek new ways to deliver on the national commitment of a decent home in a suitable living environment for all American citizens, income support programs assume increasing relevance.

One of the most important of these is the housing allowance program. As defined for the purpose of this article, a housing allowance is a series of regular periodic payments made to an individual or family currently unable to afford decent housing in a suitable living environment. Family need in relation to the cost of standard housing units in moderate housing cost neighborhoods determines the amount of the allowance. The individual or family involved must use the allowance to make rental or home ownership payments.

Housing allowances have been used as an instrument of national economic and housing policy in many European nations, which offer a variety of models.

In Sweden, every family which has filed a tax return indicating the presence of a child in the house receives an application for a housing allowance. Because this is the only requirement for eligibility, the administrative costs are low.

Housing allowances were recently introduced in England initially as a component of a policy of disengagement by the national government in the housing market.

In England, unlike Sweden, allowances are only available to individuals who are renting units. British government officials reasoned that homeowners would receive a double allowance if they were allowed to participate, as they were already allowed to deduct real estate taxes and mortgage interest payments for income tax purposes.

The cost of a housing allowance system, in both England and Sweden, is borne by several layers of government. In Sweden, the national government provides matching funds to municipalities on a one-to-one basis in certain clearly delineated situations. On the other hand, in the United Kingdom, the national government shares up to 90 per cent of costs accruing to local housing authorities as a result of required rebates.

The concept of a housing allowance has not been limited to European shores. Forms of housing allowances were discussed in Congress as early as 1949, although no action was taken until 1969 and 1970, when the Department of Housing and Urban Development supported research designed to determine how much a national program would cost and what effect it would have on the rental market.

In late 1970, Model Cities agencies in Kansas City, Missouri, and Wilmington, Delaware, began programs designed to test the feasibility of housing allowances as a means of providing decent housing for low and moderate income families.

Because the design and operations of the Kansas City and Wilmington programs were nearly identical, I shall limit my discussion to the Kansas City program which was administered by the Kansas City Model City's Housing Development Corporation.

While 180 families were participating in this project as of September, 1972, during its peak 222 were enrolled. The project was funded to provide \$250,000 a year for allowances over a five-year period and \$36,000 a year for administrative costs over the same period. Recipients of allowances were allowed to participate in the program for a period of three years.

Allowances were offered to families or elderly individuals living in the Kansas City Model Neighborhood who would have qualified for participation in the federal rent supplement program (one of the low-income housing subsidies suspended last January). First priority was given to households living in public housing and substandard housing. The large majority of households served by this program were low-income black families. Recipients of assistance were allowed to participate in the program for a three-year period and received approximately \$100 a month.

Evaluation of the Kansas City experiment is continuing, but here are some of the preliminary findings:

1. A housing allowance program enables a large number of families to move from substandard to standard housing within a short period of time.

2. Households with extremely low socioeconomic characteristics may be served by a housing allowance program.

3. The housing allowance program may increase the quality of housing which is available for eligible households.

4. Participants in such a program exercise sound judgment in selecting rental housing.

5. A housing allowance program may serve to encourage desegregation of minority groups.

On January 8, 1973, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development launched an even more extensive evaluation of existing housing programs and their alternatives. Basic questions are being asked about the housing allowance program including:

- (1) How will families use their allowances?
- (2) How will the housing market respond to allowances—will rental prices rise?
- (3) How should an allowance system be administered?

Answers are being sought to these questions in three types of experiments at nine sites throughout the country. Under this program, between 15,000 and 20,000 families will receive allowances.

The first of these is the "demand experiment," which will analyze the use of housing allowances by up to 1,000 families in each of at least two metropolitan areas with populations greater than 500,000. The second study is the "supply experiment" which will analyze any effects on the housing supply that result from offering housing allowances to between 4,000 and 8,000 families in two metropolitan areas with populations of around 250,000.

The third and final experiment is the "administrative agency experiment," designed to determine how to most effectively administer the program. Among the agencies participating in the third experiment are two local housing authorities, two metropolitan area county government agencies, two state community development agencies and two welfare agencies.

Given both the European experience and current experiments in this country, the case for making a housing allowance program an important component of our national housing strategy is quite persuasive. Such a program could reduce both poverty and the number of low-quality dwellings. In addition, it would lower the administrative costs involved in providing our disadvantaged citizens with decent housing. The experience in Sweden cited above is the clearest example of the beneficial effects of such a program.

One major advantage of a housing allowance program is that it can increase a fam-

ily's ability to select housing in an area which it regards as desirable. Because payments are made to a family and not to housing operators, they will follow a family from one section of a metropolitan area to another, so long as its income is sufficiently low as to require the assistance. This increased mobility can well foster the free movement of black and Spanish-speaking families in the housing market.

On the other hand, such families may choose to live in areas with which they are familiar, choosing to remain near friends and build a viable political base. In both Kansas City and Wilmington, low income participants tended to follow the movement patterns of their racial ethnic groups and showed a proclivity for staying in the Model Neighborhood. Wilmington households which stayed in the Model Neighborhood, however, obtained larger housing at a lower cost while retaining the ability to enjoy Model Neighborhood services, the security of a familiar environment and the support of family and friends.

A second advantage of the housing allowance program is its ability to respond to a broader segment of the families eligible for subsidy because they are less costly per unit. The Office of Management and Budget argues that only a small number of families eligible to participate in the subsidized programs have an opportunity to purchase or rent housing under the Section 235-236 programs each year (these were the programs suspended last January). The housing allowance thus becomes a form of family income maintenance.

Finally, administrative costs should be lower than they are in a production subsidy program because fewer people will be needed to administer the subsidy. Appraisers, mortgage credit specialists, architects, loan officers and management specialists will be unnecessary in a housing allowance program. The role of the federal government would, like social security, be largely limited to determining eligibility and writing checks.

Several arguments have been raised in opposition to a housing allowance program. The most significant of these, from the point of view of black elected officials, is that such a system necessarily relies upon a supply of older existing housing being available for low income families while more costly new construction would be largely limited to families who can afford it without a direct subsidy. Thus, it is argued, low income families might well be limited to older housing requiring high maintenance costs.

Several factors which are ongoing in most communities should serve to avoid this result. Among them are:

1. The upgrading of local building codes,
2. Increased use of programs for housing rehabilitation,
3. Implementation of fair housing laws at all levels of government, and
4. Increasing family incomes for black families which should assure an expanding housing supply.

Thus, a viable housing allowance program would have an administrative requirement that before a family can use an allowance to rent or purchase housing, the owner would be required to produce a certificate that the housing meets local building code requirements for the basic housing systems, e.g., foundation, roof, plumbing, heating and electrical.

Local black elected officials must examine new components in our national housing strategy with a critical eye. Acceptance or rejection of such a housing allowance must be based upon a critical analysis of their effects upon the overall supply of housing available to the minority community and to an adequate family income to afford the units.

What we must not do is allow the richest of all nations to renege on its promise of a decent home for every citizen.

INVESTIGATION CALLS FOR CAMPAIGN REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, one result of recent investigations of the 1972 election has been a call for campaign reform legislation which would correct the deficiencies in the present law. I believe this call is a necessary and urgent one. If we are to maintain a system of government that is representative of the people then the election process—that vital function that selects those who will represent—must be inherently credible.

While literally hundreds of bills have been introduced by Congressmen and Senators to this end, many with meritorious provisions, there are, I believe, several special "pressure points" that have not as yet been adequately addressed. I have recently introduced legislation that, while patterned after the recently passed Senate bill, makes several strong additions which I hope the House will consider.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION WITH INVESTIGATORY AND ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Like the legislation that has passed the Senate, my bill sets up an independent policing commission that has the power to investigate candidates' records and take violators to court. Additionally, my legislation provides that the procedures and manpower of the Internal Revenue Service will be utilized by the Commission.

LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Again, like the Senate bill, I would place strict limitations on both contributions and expenditures. However, if we are to truly do away with vested interests in campaigns, it is necessary not only to limit the amount individuals can give, but to prohibit all giving by associations and groups. Further, I think it is essential that there is only one campaign committee through which all money is funneled. As Common Cause has continually stressed, accountability is of paramount importance. My provision would eliminate the proliferation of committees we have witnessed in past campaigns, and would make accountability a simple routine rather than the difficult and time-consuming practice it is today.

Along this line, the Elections Commission will be empowered to pay special attention to contributions other than those in dollars—that is, individuals in unions, corporations, and associations who work on campaigns on that group's time.

FOCUSING RESPONSIBILITY ON THE CANDIDATE

In the past each candidate has set up a number of political committees with the chairman or the treasurer of each committee responsible under the law for any violations. I believe that the candidate himself should be held responsible for any violations. Moreover, my bill would provide that the House and Senate must review and take action on any officeholder or their respective bodies who violate the law. This would insure

that a candidate for Federal office would devote more attention to the financial details of his campaign, and would be unable to hide behind a facade of ignorance.

EQUALIZING THE GAP BETWEEN THE INCUMBENT AND CHALLENGER

This is one of the most important tasks we face if we are to really reform campaign practices. It is also one which has been sorely neglected by the many pieces of legislation now before us. The incumbent has a number of very important tools that give him or her a built-in edge over the challenger. One of these is the franking privilege. I believe strongly that if we are to have effective government there must be frequent and open communication between a Representative and those he represents, and the frank is an important means of achieving that goal. However, that privilege should not be available to the incumbent 60 days prior to the election. Furthermore, my bill provides both the incumbent and the challenger with the use of one franked mailing as a means of informing the voters of his stand on issues and inviting the voters' financial support.

TAX CREDIT

I believe a necessary goal is to encourage widespread financial participation on the part of the electorate, rather than limited special interest giving. My bill provides for a tax credit of up to \$50 for an individual who wishes to contribute either to a party or to an individual candidate.

AFFECTING STATE AND LOCAL ELECTIONS

While Federal legislation will only directly affect campaigns for the House, Senate, and the Presidency, an important feature of my bill provides that the Election Commission shall work with State and local election commissions formed to regulate State and local races. Matching funds are providing for the establishment of such commissions and the services of the Internal Revenue Service is authorized to be made available to State commissions for investigative purposes.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am publicly releasing today a recent General Accounting Office report critical of efforts by the General Services Administration to conserve energy in the operation of Federal office buildings.

GAO's criticism is centered on the unwillingness of some GSA personnel to enforce existing regulations requiring energy conservation.

In its report, GAO said:

Building managers were not always adhering to GSA guidelines for energy conservation.

The GAO said:

The conclusion reached as a result of our survey and limited review is that substantial improvement can be made in implementing energy conservation practices.

According to the GAO, one of the worst problems is the operation of electrical, heating, and cooling systems 24 hours a day even though office workers occupy the buildings only 8 hours a day.

GAO said:

Some buildings were found to be operating on a 24 hour basis even though less than 5% of the building occupants were present during the night time hours . . . yet entire buildings or large building segments were found to be fully illuminated and ventilated and in some cases, air conditioned.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a comprehensive energy conservation program can save energy and cut the Federal Government's overall spending for energy.

In August, as my colleagues may know, President Nixon announced that the Federal Government will attempt to cut its energy consumption by 7 percent.

I am hopeful that the General Accounting Office will eventually determine how successful the administration has been in cutting energy consumption. Since the Federal Government is the largest single energy consumer in the Nation, it is crucial that the goal of 7 percent reduction in consumption be achieved.

RODINO'S CHALLENGE

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, during a trying period in our Nation's history it falls to a House committee and its able chairman to execute responsibility of a particularly taxing nature. The Washington Star-News of November 4 contains an editorial comment on this assignment which I hereby commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House. The editorial follows:

RODINO'S CHALLENGE

Upon no other member of Congress—even the redoubtable Sam Ervin—has fallen the weight of responsibility now carried by Representative Peter W. Rodino of New Jersey. Suddenly the House Judiciary Committee which Rodino heads must deal—like it or not—with some of the most controversial and momentous matters ever to arise: resolutions to impeach the President, which no longer can be counted as trivial, and bills calling for a special Watergate prosecutor outside the Nixon administration, to name the hotter ones. It must process legislation to extend the life of the Watergate grand jury. And amid all this, it must hold hearings on Representative Gerald Ford's nomination to be vice president.

The latter is the most urgently pressing task, because the country will rest easier once the vice presidential vacancy is filled. If it is filled without undue delay by a person of the party that won the last presidential election, at least some of the public suspicion about political designs in this city will be relieved. A normal succession to the presidency, in any case, simply has to be provided. Fortunately, there seems little inclination in Congress to hold Ford's nomination hostage, and Rodino's "full steam ahead" assurance on committee action is encouraging. But time is getting away, and we hope he will set the dates this week for early hearings into Ford's qualifications. The Senate, after all, is a good deal ahead of the House on this.

But the Senate, of course, is not having to explore the deadly serious question of impeachment, which House Judiciary moved into last Tuesday with results far from encouraging. An acrimonious committee battle over authority to issue subpoenas (finally vested altogether in Rodino) seemed to presage a bitter polarization along party lines. We hope this will be avoided, for the House's iron power in such an inquiry—which equals its responsibility to find the truth—could spark a debilitating battle. Much will depend on Rodino's judiciousness in wielding power, and the quality of the staff leadership he assembles for this awesome undertaking. Only the best of talent and rectitude will suffice.

LAW OF THE SEA NEGOTIATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, three of our colleagues, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. PRITCHARD, and I recently circulated a letter to all Members of the House reporting on the Geneva meeting this summer of the U.N. Seabeds Committee which we attended as advisers on the U.S. delegation.

The letter gives the current status of the preparatory work for the Law of the Sea Conference which is scheduled to hold its organizational session in New York next month, and then reconvene next spring in Caracas, Venezuela, for substantive negotiations.

The Law of the Sea Conference will be perhaps the most important international lawmaking meeting ever held, and the most important conference held under United Nations auspices. Its task is to conclude a treaty to govern the uses of the oceans and their subsoil for the nations of the world. International law embodied in the treaty can therefore affect every American citizen.

I insert the letter signed by Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. PRITCHARD, and myself in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 19, 1973.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: During the August recess we attended the meeting of the United Nations Seabeds Committee in Geneva as Congressional advisors on the U.S. delegation. We are taking this opportunity to report to you the current status of the work of the Committee in preparation for the Law of the Sea Conference which is scheduled to hold its opening session in New York later this year.

The main task of the Seabeds Committee is to arrange alternative treaty texts in workable form for the Law of the Sea Conference, reducing the large number of draft articles so that the Conference can address itself to resolution of the major differences among a few relatively well-defined positions. This, we have learned is not easy to accomplish in a forum of 91 nations representing a wide range of interests. But a broad multilateral conference is the only means by which agreement can be reached on universal law for use of the ocean and its resources.

There is widespread support among the members of the Seabeds Committee for a comprehensive agreement including a twelve-mile territorial sea, broad coastal state jurisdiction beyond the territorial sea over living and mineral resources, and an international regime for deep seabed exploitation beyond coastal state jurisdiction. The Geneva meeting succeeding in completing al-

ternative treaty texts on principles, machinery and structure of the international seabed regime and important aspects of marine environment standards. Resolution of major substantive issues involved in breadth of the territorial sea, transit through international straits, fisheries, economic resource jurisdiction and scientific research would be facilitated if means were found to reduce and clarify the main alternatives before substantive negotiations begin. The American delegation has been effective in having the essential points in U.S. policy included among the alternative texts adopted by the Committee and we are hopeful that the Law of the Sea Conference will be successful from the standpoint of our national interests.

We believe the policy of the United States in the law of the sea negotiations is a constructive one which realistically balances national and international interests. Both the House and Senate passed resolution this year supporting the general objectives being pursued. Notable points of contention in the Seabeds Committee, as they presently relate to U.S. policy, are as follows:

1. The international seabed regime—for managing exploitation of deep seabed minerals as "the common heritage of mankind," the U.S. proposal for a regime governed by a strong Council consisting of a limited number of nations which would license private industry to exploit minerals has met opposition from those favoring a regime with its own operating capacity governed by an Assembly of many nations.

2. Economic resource jurisdiction—the U.S. advocates international criteria, and compulsory settlement of disputes, as a check on unlimited coastal state control over resources in the area beyond the territorial sea while others propose virtually unlimited coastal state jurisdiction for 200-miles or more.

3. Marine environment—as in the case of economic resource jurisdiction, the U.S. position for international standards is opposed by countries favoring strong coastal state jurisdiction and discretion.

4. International straits—the position of the U.S. for unhindered "free transit" (including overflight and submerged passage) is opposed by those states bordering straits who prefer the more limited "innocent passage" concept in straits overlapped by territorial waters.

5. Fisheries—the U.S. proposals for coastal state management of coastal and anadromous species (such as salmon) has considerable support, but there is formidable opposition to international management of highly migratory species (such as tuna).

In the event of a substantial delay in the Law of the Sea negotiations as a result of either further postponement of the Conference or polarization of positions, the four of us are not in complete agreement as to appropriate Congressional action. However, some of us would be prepared to give serious consideration to interim national legislation to prevent erosion of national interests and natural resources. All of us look with favor on the U.S. proposal for provisional application of certain treaty articles as soon as possible after the treaty is signed provided Congress has given its approval.

We believe issues on law of the sea are important to all Americans and hope that this information will be useful to you. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the issues in more detail with you personally.

Sincerely,

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
DONALD M. FRASER,
JOEL PRITCHARD.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 41

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago Sam Koenig was shot by five youngsters, one of whom is only 15 years old.

The tensions in our society which encourage 15-year-olds to participate in murders are many and will take decades to decrease. But such murders could be reduced tomorrow if Congress would only pass simple gun control legislation.

At this time, I include the article by Arthur Noble and William McFadden from the October 6 New York Daily News. The article follows:

[From The Daily News (N.Y.) Oct. 16, 1973]

NAB THREE IN MURDER OF HARLEM STORE OWNER

(By Arthur Noble and William McFadden)

Three Harlem teenagers were arrested yesterday as suspects in the execution-style slaying of 125th St. toy storeowner Sam Koenig.

The arrest came a day after Koenig was surprised by five youths in his store at 24 W. 125th St., handcuffed behind his back and shot dead by a single bullet behind his right ear.

All three youths were taken to the E. 119th St. station house. They were placed in a lineup and, police said, seven witnesses identified them as the killers.

ONE NAME WITHHELD

They are Anthony Cooper, 18, of 2496 Eighth Ave., George Borrow, 19, of 2236 Seventh Ave., and a 15-year-old boy whose name was withheld.

Police credited the arrests to "marvelous cooperation from the community," especially to learning from businessmen that the youths had called each other by nicknames during the stickup.

Armed with that, Capt. Timothy Dowd—a former deputy inspector who had been reduced in rank last Wednesday under Police Commissioner Donald Cawley's controversial reevaluation program—put 20 detectives on the case working around the clock.

At 4 p.m. a team of detectives under Detective Richard Marcus closed in on the three youths at a housing development on Eighth Ave. at 140th St.

During the attack on Koenig, the youths stole two minibikes. But neither of those vehicles, nor the murder gun, has been recovered. A spent shell was recovered in Koenig's store, however.

FUNERAL IS HELD

Dowd said the hunt for the two remaining suspects will continue.

The three suspects were captured as private funeral services were being held for Koenig, 52, in the Robert Schoem memorial chapel in Paramus, N.J. Operator of the Harlem store for 30 years, Koenig lived in Fort Lee, N.J.

His murder—the second in six days within a two-block area and the third of a Harlem merchant within five weeks—had stunned the Harlem business community.

In response, police yesterday assigned a force of 31 additional cops to duty along 125th St.

Inspector Hamilton Robinson, commander of the W. 123d St. station, announced that 20 police officers, in radio cars and on foot, five cops on horseback and six plainclothesmen have been assigned exclusively to the street, from Seventh to Lexington Aves.

Theodore Chatoff, 55, owner of the Chatoff

Brothers' Store, at 131 E. 125th St., with his brother, Irving, 57, said yesterday:

"In our more than 40 years here on this street, we have never seen crime this bad. It's terrible. We don't know what to do. Our life is in this store and we can't sell and move out."

Irving Chatoff said: "Nearly everybody on the street carries a knife. It's not just the criminals, it's everybody. Decent citizens carry knives because they are afraid."

THREE ROBBERIES IN 6 WEEKS

A few doors away, at Brown's Bargain Store, 121 E. 125th St., store manager Sidney Kaufman said:

"We have been robbed three times within the last six weeks. Nowadays they (the criminal justice system) let young punks get away with everything. There is no respect any more."

Kenneth N. Sherwood, 43, president of the Kenwood Corp., at 148 W. 125th St., and a member of the State Athletic Commission, who owns several businesses in the area, announced that he and a group of other Harlem businessmen will meet Wednesday with Commissioner Cawley over the new crime wave.

"Not since the death of the late Dr. Martin Luther King have I been so filled with anger and bitterness," he said. "These people are not 'brothers,' they are just plain criminals who need to be apprehended and treated accordingly."

Ronnie Holly, 34, owner of Ronnie's Casuals, at 268 W. 125th St., conceded that "crime is bad here," but he added: "It's not all confined to the Harlem area. There is crime in the white suburbs, but they keep it hidden under the rug."

Holly said that the criminals "represent only a small percentage, like one-half per cent, of the community," and that one of the solutions is to employ more black police officers and fewer white ones.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11104, the debt ceiling bill, comes to the floor tomorrow under a rule reported out today, House Resolution 687. There will be an attempt to substitute for House Resolution 687, the following language:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11104) to provide for a temporary increase of \$13,000,000,000 in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, one amendment to the bill H.R. 11104 consisting of the texts of the bills H.R. 11155 and H.R. 11158. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H.R. 11104 for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto

to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 55 years ago the proud and courageous people of Poland, determined to obtain and preserve a free and united Poland, announced their independence. November 11, 1918, will continue to be appropriately honored by Poles and their descendants as "Polish Independence Day."

Prior to 1918, however, the people of Poland were faced with both triumph and disappointment. A successful attempt to establish a constitutional government in the late 1700's demonstrated the Polish desire to become a self-governing nation, and its capability of self-determination. Unfortunately, however, the powerful Russian Army destroyed this form of government following only 1 year of existence, and soon divided this small country with Prussia.

Poland, a nation that took great and justifiable pride in its long and glorious history, disappeared from the map of Europe in the latter part of the 18th century when three partitions by Austria, Prussia, and Russia eventually robbed it of all its territory. It was not to become free again for almost a century and a quarter.

Germany and Austria-Hungary fought against Russia during World War I, which meant that Poles fought on both sides, brother against brother. The collapse of Russia in March 1917, and the final defeat of the central powers a year and a half later gave Polish patriots, who had been busy behind the scenes, their opportunity to reestablish the nation whose people had suffered so much from their oppressors.

Poland declared its independence on November 11, 1918, a declaration that was recognized the following summer by the treaty of Versailles. No longer were Poles to be referred to as Austrian Poles, German Poles, and Russian Poles. They were now Poles, no more and no less, citizens of a free country.

Poland enjoyed the blessings of independence for only 20 years. In 1939 the Nazis and the Communists divided its territory, the fourth partition of Poland. Nazism was destined to be defeated after 5½ years of bitter fighting, but communism remains firmly entrenched today and unhappy Poland is one of the many colonies that make up the farflung Soviet Empire.

Mr. Speaker, although the years of renewed liberation and self-government were short-lived for these courageous people, their struggle to be free continues. It is, therefore, particularly appropriate that we, in the United States, acknowledge this great accomplishment. I proudly join Americans of Polish descent in my own 11th Congressional Dis-

trict of Illinois, which I am proud to represent, the city of Chicago, and all over the Nation as they pay special tribute to "Polish Independence Day."

JOHN RYBAK RETIRES WITH HONORS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 30 a testimonial dinner will be given in Buffalo for a most remarkable and admirable man, John Peter Rybak, the retiring vocational principal and athletic director at St. Mary's School for the Deaf.

I have known John since our school days, and no one is more deserving of the honors being showered on him. John was a great athlete with even greater promise of achievement and fame when he elected to join the staff at St. Mary's 38 years ago. Although he did not have a career in the national or international sports field, he surely must look back on one of the most fulfilling careers a man could have.

Touching tributes were paid to John Rybak last week, when students and faculty held a surprise party for him. I would like to insert an article written by a distinguished columnist, Bob Curran, and to join the throngs of friends and well-wishers in saying, "Congratulations on a job well done, John." The article follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News,
Nov. 1 1973]

JOHN RYBAK KNOWS "THANK YOUS" COME
UNSPOKEN FROM THE HEART

(By Bob Curran)

As I was walking across the parking lot at St. Mary's School for the Deaf Wednesday morning I ran into a character who did a double-take and then said, "What are you doing out so early? Is your brother-in-law back in town?"

My answer was that I was on my way to a surprise retirement party for John Rybak and that I would make such a party no matter what time of day or night it was staged.

John Peter Rybak, vocational principal and athletic director at St. Mary's, will be honored at a large testimonial dinner Nov. 30 that is being thrown by the battalions of people who know what he has done in the 38 years he has been at the school.

Of course I'll be there and I'll be surprised if some time during the night I don't hear someone say, "I wonder why a guy who had so much going for him would do what he did? What does he have to show for it?"

The person or persons who ask that question on Nov. 30 would have had part of the answer if they had been in the school auditorium Wednesday morning when the good sisters, civilian workers and students had their surprise party for John.

I know that if they were there they would never forget, as I won't, the sight of the children from 5 to 18 giving John their best wishes in sign language and with their faces.

The home-made cards that were presented didn't surprise a man who had been exposed to these lovable youngsters a few times before. One said, "Dear John Rybak: John

worked here for 38 years. We are sad. We will honor him today." On the front of the card was a loving cup with a star in the middle.

Another showed a U.S.A. athlete standing on the winner's Olympic stand while athletes from two other countries were in the Nos. 2 and 3 places. The message read, "Thank you for helping St. Mary's for the Deaf Athletics." As many of you know, John brought some of the school's athletes to the Deaf Olympics in 1961.

Another carried a message that many of the friends of St. Mary's would re-echo, "I wish you would stay here for the year."

From other sources I had learned after our first meeting 5 years ago that John Rybak was one of the greatest athletes Canisius College ever saw. And so when we sat in his office late Wednesday morning I asked what had brought him to St. Mary's 38 years ago.

"Athletics had a hand in it," he answered, but in a strange way. Sister Rose Gertrude, our retired superintendent, asked Father Francis Dougherty of Canisius to recommend a young graduate who could work with some deaf boys on a farm in Ellicottville. And I was picked.

"But when I went to see Sister Gertrude she told me that the farm project had been abandoned and she apologized because she had no job to offer. I said that I was sorry to hear that and added that I wasn't all that letdown because I had several other prospects.

"She called me the next week and said that she had the feeling that I was interested in helping the youngsters at her school and that I should join the staff and 'make my own job.' But she added a warning—and that was that no civilian from the hearing world had ever worked out in their program.

"She was right about my interest and that's where the athletic part came into the picture. As an athlete, I had learned to love challenges and I thought it would be a real challenge to coach these youngsters from the silent world."

What happened after that is a story that can't be done justice to in this space. For 4 years John lived at the school, woke up the boys in the morning, coached the varsity squads and developed an intra-mural program. With the help of the boys and a deaf teacher named Russell Martina, he learned the language of the youngsters he counseled and coached. There are those who were there in the first year who say that there never was a communication gap between John and the boys from the day he started at the school.

In 1940 he helped Msgr. William Martin and Father John Fornes start the Catholic League that among other things gave his boys the chance to play against teams from the hearing world.

From that league came many trophies that could be seen and many victories that were unsung. Those came when men from the hearing world who had played against St. Mary's hired the deaf boys John sent to them and whom they knew as reliable, resourceful performers.

There were so many other quiet victories along the way with his wife Dorothy helping in the background. On Nov. 30 some very articulate people will stand up at John's dinner and talk about them. Some of the men from the silent world who could add so much won't be putting their stories into words.

But none of the speakers on Nov. 30 will say any words that John will remember more than the words that were on the sign on the stage of the auditorium Wednesday morning—words that some day will be appreciated by the tykes who on Wednesday didn't know what the hubbub was all about.

Those words, put on the sign by the older youngsters who know the man who was leaving them, were:

"Thanks, God, for Mr. Rybak."

VETERANS OUTREACH PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the valuable work that the Los Angeles Veterans Outreach Program has done since 1970. This program, which has successfully operated in my district since its inception, has acquainted veterans with educational and job possibility and assisted them in obtaining review of discharges and other veteran related problems.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE VETERANS OUTREACH PROGRAM: PAST AND PRESENT

In 1970, after studying the tremendous influx of Vietnam veterans back into disadvantaged communities, the county of Los Angeles and the U.S. Department of Labor initiated a program in an attempt to bridge the gap between the needs of the young veteran and existing service agencies, particularly those dealing with educational development. Since its beginnings, the Veterans Outreach Program has succeeded in making an impact on a sizeable segment of the veteran population in terms of education, job development, assistance in review of discharges and other veteran-related problems. This success, however, was not easily attained in view of the administrative difficulties which were encountered on the way.

Although the U.S. Department of Labor had funded the program through the county of Los Angeles in 1970, the initial phase of the program was subcontracted to the California Department of Human Resources Development. Such negotiations caused delays in the implementation of proposed activities and in the hiring of staff. A total of 6 months passed before the program could be staffed with its full complement of one supervisor, five student-workers, and one clerk-typist. However, such difficulties did not prevent the program from achieving a high degree of competence and success among the veteran community of East Los Angeles. This was also a time of developing recognition and credibility among the educational and employment institutions of the Los Angeles area who were responding to the needs of the Vietnam veteran.

During the initial phase of the program, the staff and responsibilities were limited, in that the target area was exclusively the East Los Angeles community. In November of 1971, the program received full funding from the U.S. Department of Labor though the county of Los Angeles intended to extend the program's target area to the entire county. In addition to the existing East Los Angeles office, one in the San Fernando-Pacoima area and one in the Venice-Watts area were established. This expansion allowed the concepts and services of the program to benefit the veterans of other communities and to increase

the available resources by establishing contact with more agencies and institutions.

At this time, the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, in conjunction with the Greater Los Angeles Urban Coalition, initiated a veterans program in the Los Angeles area. Being aware that the county already had established a successful outreach program, Urban Coalition assigned six part-time workers to the program in order to assist in the outreach effort. These workers and Urban Coalition have been most cooperative with the county program and have contributed to its effectiveness.

The present organization of the veterans outreach program is very different from what it was 2 years ago. Its effectiveness, however, has increased, principally because the program has remained flexible and has resisted those bureaucratic trends which could hinder its development and effectiveness. Recent recognition of the program's impact is represented by the reception of the annual achievement award from the National Association of Counties for a new and creative program involving a county and the Federal Government.

II. PROMINENT PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the past year of operation, the program's principal objective has remained the educational development of Vietnam-era veterans. This development has been on all levels of education, from the adult school level on through the college and university level. The staff of the program has worked closely with existing educational projects, such as UCLA's special educational program and the Los Angeles city schools' GED preparation program, and has succeeded in establishing a good working relationship with administrators of these and other institutions. In short, the program has created for itself, with the veteran community it serves and with the educational establishment, a reputation for expertise in the area of educational development.

In addition to working with existing programs, the staff of the veterans outreach program has assisted other agencies and groups in initiating veteran programs, not only in the Los Angeles area, but also in other parts of the country. These agencies became aware of the successes of this program through workshops, conferences, and other personal contacts and approached the program staff for assistance in proposal writing and project planning. We felt that, since the program was a pioneer in the field of veteran outreach, the staff should take the leadership in the development of this expanding area of concern.

In recent months the program has become increasingly involved in employment, particularly through the Emergency Employment Act. In reality, the program has become the veteran recruitment arm of the county's public employment program and that of the county's contract cities and other cities and agencies involved in EEA. Through our recruitment effort, hundreds of veterans in the Los Angeles County area have been

employed either on a full-time or part-time basis. Of particular benefit have been the latter which have afforded veterans, enrolled in school, the opportunity to continue their education with a full-time schedule. These jobs have ranged from student-workers in county offices to teacher assistants for the Los Angeles City School District. This type of employment has been the most important, in our view, since it coincides with the educational goals set by the program plan.

The program was also involved in implementing EEA by attempting to solve its many administrative problems, such as the excessive time needed to process a veteran applicant. Through our recruitment and screening efforts, the processing time was reduced in order to assure that no unnecessary economic hardship would be borne by the veteran.

Another area of activity, which was not originally planned, has been the assisting of veterans seeking a review of discharge. Since March of 1972, over 40 review cases have been prepared by two counselors who have specialized in this area. This activity was initiated upon President Nixon's amnesty order for veterans involved in drugs. However, these counselors have worked on all types of discharges, not necessarily drug-related ones. The review procedures and preparations, if they are to be efficacious, had to be done very carefully and with a great deal of research and documentation. As a consequence, each case was extremely time-consuming and for all practical purposes restricted these two counselors to this activity. To date three discharges have been changed to honorable; although this may not appear significant, it reflects the current percentage of reversals. And for these three veterans the effect on their lives is incalculable.

In the future we can expect an increase in these cases because of the changing attitudes concerning these matters. We feel that this activity complements our other services very well and that, since very few other agencies concern themselves with less than honorable discharges, we are obliged to assist the veteran in this regard. During the early part of this year, auditors from the GAO investigated our files and procedures as part of a study recommending changes in the discharge procedures. This study will be presented to Congress for consideration shortly. We have also been contacted by the National Council of Churches which is considering funding a project to train counselors in the area of less-than-honorable discharges.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT: A LOOK AT THE A-10**HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Fairchild Industries of Hagerstown, has been a

longtime major employer in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, providing our Nation with some of its finest military hardware. It is with this in mind, as well as my interest in our country's national security, that I wish to share the following letter with my colleagues in the House. The letter is from Edward Uhl, president and chief executive officer of Fairchild Industries, and discusses a specific and vital phase of our military procurement program:

FAIRCHILD INDUSTRIES,
Germantown, Md., October 31, 1973.
HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BYRON: With the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli War, October 6, 1973, a number of new Soviet weapons were introduced into the precarious Middle East military balance. These new weapons affect not only the Israelis, but must be of concern to those who have responsibility for the defense of the United States.

It is apparent that this latest Middle East War was a proving ground for the latest in Soviet military hardware. In the early hours of the conflict, the Israel Air Force suffered heavy losses to Soviet-built air defense systems, especially to the new Soviet SAM-6 surface-to-air-missile. Israeli Major General Mordechai Hod said: "These are the latest and best missiles the Russians have."

Already evident are several lessons which must concern Capitol Hill and the Department of Defense. Present day United States inventory jet aircraft flown by the Israelis have been ineffective in destroying enemy armor. They have not demonstrated a capability to do the job and survive. Instead, they have been shown vulnerable to the newest Soviet surface-to-air-missiles and 23 mm anti-aircraft guns, and further have shown an inability to provide close air support to troops on the ground.

By foresight the United States has developed an aircraft to meet this latest requirement. The aircraft—A-10—has already been flown more than 400 hours and will give this and other nations the following capabilities:

Ability to destroy the latest enemy armor, achieved by an internal 30 mm cannon and sufficient ammunition to allow ten passes.

Ability to take direct hits from 23 mm anti-aircraft fire. The pilot is protected by a "bathtub" of titanium armor. The aircraft has twin engine survivability.

Ability to outmaneuver existing jet fighters and work in closer to the ground armies than any attack aircraft in existence.

Agility to avoid hits from SAM-type threats such as the SA-6 and SA-7 missiles. The A-10 is very agile even with large bomb loads.

Ability to fly substantial combat loads from 1,000-foot long austere air strips.

Ability to be maintained for 9.2 maintenance man hours per flight hours, thus allowing maximum utilization in a conflict.

Ability to loiter over the battlefield for extremely long periods of up to three hours with substantial armament loads.

It is important to note that the lessons learned in the Middle East over the past few weeks also apply to Central Europe where NATO forces face the heaviest concentration of modern weapons. The tank battles experienced in the desert are very similar to those which may be experienced in Central Europe. The Warsaw Pact forces are estimated to have 18,000 tanks facing NATO.

Unfortunately, the A-10 Program, which was conceived to counter this serious threat and which has been progressing remarkably well, was set back on October 11, 1973, by House and Senate conferees' action on the FY 1974 authorization bill for weapons systems procurement. The conferees agreed to \$107.4 million for R&D (\$5 million less than requested), a reduction from ten to six test aircraft; but, more serious, they eliminated

\$30 million requested by the Department of Defense for advance procurement funds. These funds were to procure long lead items to enable efficient, economical and orderly production at that point when production go-ahead would be approved in November, 1975.

There is no doubt that unless this nation moves out immediately relative to having at least one aircraft in its inventory that can serve in the attack role in support of the Army, we may find ourselves unable to utilize aircraft in the middle to high intensity combat zone. The Middle East conflict has proven without a doubt that the moment of truth is here. To ignore the fact that 100 fighters with their priceless occupants have been blown out of the sky in a period of days borders on negligence. One of the most difficult things in life is to be flexible enough to understand the problem and react in a timely fashion. The lessons of recent air combat are ample justification for approving the \$30 million procurement funds for the A-10 now, without further delay.

Sincerely,

EDWARD G. UHL,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

CAN THE WHALES BE SAVED?

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Post an important editorial appeared which I commend to the attention of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate. Entitled "Can the Whales Be Saved?" This editorial aptly expresses the frustration and alarm shared by many of us, both in and out of Congress, when we hear that Japan and the Soviet Union are refusing to adhere to a hard-won moratorium on the killing of whales, a moratorium which is being respected by 12 other nations. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and express my own support for our Department of Commerce, and particularly NOAA Administrator Robert M. White, in vigorously protesting this defiance of an international agreement which was years in the making and must not be allowed to collapse.

The editorial follows:

CAN THE WHALES BE SAVED?

Few of the some 900 species of endangered or threatened animals have received as much international attention as a whale. It is among the most majestic and intelligent creatures of the sea, and the blue whale is said to be the largest animal that has ever lived. For decades, however, destruction of whales has been systematic and large; as a result, five of eight species of great whales are currently in danger of extinction.

Although a long time was needed for this message to get across, a number of whaling nations finally agreed to put away the harpoons and end the slaughter. The problem is that not all nations are willing to stop. Japan and the Soviet Union still go to the high seas to kill whales. Their defiance of a moratorium—to which 12 other nations adhere—is such that the U.S. Department of Commerce is now strongly protesting. In continuing to ignore the moratorium on fin whales, for example, Japanese companies cite a demand for whale meat in Japan. But Dr. Robert M. White, administrator of the Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said that the protein yield from fin whales amounts to an insignificant contribution to the meat requirements of Japan.

In going its own way, Japan and the Soviet Union are flouting the authority of the International Whaling Commission. The commission—which met last June in London—recommended a worldwide ban on killing blue, gray, bowhead, humpback and right whales, and urged strict quotas on several other species. A coalition of conservation and wildlife groups—who correctly see that by eliminating these leviathans the fragile balance of oceanic life may be irrevocably damaged—are now so alarmed that they are calling for a boycott of Japanese products in the U.S. marketplace. The membership of such groups hopes to exert the kind of economic pressure that international political pressure has not yet done.

Killing whales might be understandable if the dead beasts had any serious social uses. But they do not. Such frivolous purposes as dog, cat and mink food, automobile lubricants, cosmetics and food additives all have easily available substitutes. It is exactly the opposite for whales; once they vanish, they will not be back.

THE AEGIS AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on October 31 I engaged in a colloquy with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable F. EDWARD HEBERT, in which we both agreed that the Aegis air defense missile system was of utmost importance to the fleet. It was agreed by Chairman HEBERT that a reprogramming request to fund Aegis would receive prompt and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this system is vital to the defense of our fleet. Because of its importance, I submit herewith an article from the Government Executive describing the Aegis system and its importance. The article follows:

[From Government Executive, October 1973]

AEGIS WEAPON SYSTEM SEA TRIALS NEXT

(By Charles D. LaFond)

Aegis, the Navy's future fleet defense weapon system, is now undergoing final shore testing in New Jersey before sea tests begin from the West Coast later this year. Employing the first fully electronic steerable phased-array antenna designed for shipboard use, the system is expected to provide hemispheric radar coverage and missile control against all forms of air- and surface-to-surface missile attack.

Although the technology required for Aegis has been in research and development for roughly a decade, the development program itself was not initiated until late in 1969 with award of the prime contract by the Naval Ordnance Systems Command to RCA's Missile and Surface Radar Division, Moorestown, N.J.

The overall program for the Aegis Weapon System Mark 7 currently is a \$450-million effort, of which RCA's portion will be at least \$280 million. RCA's manufacturing responsibility, in addition to overseeing integration of all elements of the weapon system, lies with the design and fabrication of all components in the highly sophisticated phased-array radar, the AN/SPY-1; the Command and Control System, MK 130; the Operational Readiness Test System, MK 545; plus all the common computer programs involved in the system.

Assistance with the latter was provided by Computer Sciences Corporation. Another

major subcontractor has been Raytheon, which provided the SPY-1 S-band radar transmitter, both equipment and computer programming for the MK 12 Weapon Direction System and the MK 99 Fire Control System.

Other elements of the Aegis provided directly to the Navy are the MK 26 Missile Launching System by Northern Ordnance and the SM-2 Guided Missile by General Dynamics. The basic computer system around which Aegis was designed is the Navy's third-generation AN/UYSK-7, developed and produced by Sperry Rand's Univac Division.

In a recent first demonstration of the system at its Land Based Test Site (LBTS) at Moorestown for invited members of the press, Division Vice President William V. Goodwin emphasized that the Navy's approach to the development of Aegis was based on the requirement to achieve a "fully integrated weapon system providing defense in depth."

The overall design of the system is intended to give the Navy assured tactical control of the sea in the face of the ever growing Soviet naval strength. Goodwin declared that through Aegis, the Navy believes it can provide impunity of its carrier strike capability, maintain its seaborne logistics and, when needed, rapidly establish localized defense.

The threat to the Navy's defensive capability certainly exists. Soviet naval forces, Goodwin pointed out, have shown a strong capability of command and control, for real-time, all-weather air operations and for a thorough grasp of effective electronic countermeasures.

In addition to the observed Soviet strength in manned aircraft and air-to-surface missiles, it reportedly has been steadily strengthening its surface and undersea fleets. Moreover, Aegis will be required to counter the newest naval threat posed by the USSR through its multicapability guided missile cruisers.

For example, the *Nikolayev*, lead ship of the *Kara* class missile cruisers, has a displacement of 9,100 tons and a modern sophisticated armament system designed for all forms of defense and attack—air, surface and undersea. It also is provided with an effective electronic warfare capability.

Therefore, Aegis had to be designed to meet all the known defensive needs of the late 1970s, providing fast reaction time, the ability to survive an attack and still return with killing firepower, environmental (man-made and natural) immunity, long-term availability at sea and assurance of a viable area defense coverage.

The Aegis system, which may be installed modularly, could be deployed on a variety of ships. For example, employed on a nuclear carrier it could provide considerable improvement as a radar system for air traffic control; used on USS *Virginia* class nuclear frigates (DLGN), it would serve to exploit fully the available firepower.

However, the Navy has recently decreed that principal use of the Aegis system will be aboard 6,000-ton fleet escorts to make them essentially anti-air-warfare vessels.

If the massive central data processing system is its brain, then the eyes of Aegis are its computer-controlled, phased-array radars. The complete system requires four separate installations of planar arrays, two paired forward and two aft. In the developmental system, each antenna face measures approximately 12x12 feet and a single array weighs 17,000 lbs. The operational arrays are expected to be reduced in weight to about 15,000 lbs.

With 4,480 radiating elements on each face that shape and direct the transmitted energy, a scanning capability greater than $\pm 60^\circ$ is provided from the broadside antenna position; elevation coverage is 90° .

The computer provides beam stabilization for the three axes of motion to obviate the

ship's motion—within the limits of up to 30° roll and 10° pitch. Moreover, during periods of operation in heavy roll, a target high in the zenith would continue to be tracked by means of repeated handover automatically between the paired phased arrays.

In operation, the SPY-1 can perform long-range search from horizon to horizon. Once a target is detected and acquired it is transitioned into radar track and the information goes into the command and control system for evaluation.

If a target is determined to be a threat, the weapon director system is ordered to develop the fire control solution and missiles are selected and loaded on an appropriate launcher. Meanwhile, the SPY-1 furnishes target-track data to the fire control system and the latter designates the launcher firing position through the weapon direction system. Coincident with the monopulse tracking of the hostile target, long range search continues and new targets may be determined to require tracking for subsequent missile engagement.

Missile firing is initiated by a fire control officer. Following launch, the SPY-1 radar guides the missile through midcourse.

Meanwhile, the Mark 99 fire control system radar, which is slaved to the phased array for its direction, illuminates the target with a separate beam. The reflections of these radar signals from the target provide the terminal homing guidance to a radar receiver in the missile. This provides final control of the aerodynamic fins in the missile up to the point of intercept.

With arrays of this complexity and the amount of power employed (a 125,000-watt output from each of the 32 crossed-field amplifiers that alternatively feed each array face), it is obvious that the saturation level for the system must be very high. As might be expected, this figure along with range and the repetition rates of the radar are highly classified. Nevertheless, one Navy program official did indicate that the system will readily accommodate a minimum of 250 separate targets with the radars operating at only nominal repetition rates. In any event, missile engagement is handled on a priority basis by the computer.

He also noted, to give some degree of comparison, that the SPY-1 represents an order-of-magnitude improvement in performance over the first-generation electronic array employed on the missile cruiser USS *Long Beach*.

ORTS FINDS MALFUNCTIONS

To avoid problems previously experienced by the Navy with the shipboard cooling of electronics, Aegis management and design engineers went to sea to study existing systems under actual operating conditions. Subsequently, they isolated the most frequent malfunctions; poor component performance, lack of redundancy and piping design that disallows on-line maintenance.

As a result, RCA believes that these traditional problems now have been solved and a cooling system has been integrated within the overall Aegis design to provide "100% availability." For example, to obtain a "never-down" capability, a decision was made to provide a dedicated demineralizer-water-cooler and airconditioning system integral to the SPY-1 radar and the Mark 99 Fire Control System. Although supported by the ship, it is otherwise independent and the cooling system has no demand on it other than the Aegis requirements.

Considerable redundancy has been employed throughout and separate supply and return lines are cross-connected for additional redundancy between those two major Aegis subsystems. This parallelism allows the isolation of either system if one becomes inoperable.

A final element of Aegis but none less critical, is the Mark 545 Operational Readiness Test System. Operating on a real-time basis, ORTS helps assure the continuous availability

of each Aegis subsystem by monitoring all aspects of their operation.

Through the more than 10,000 test points in a complete Aegis facility, ORTS is able to detect, isolate and report malfunctions and potential malfunctions (by following apparent performance degradation). ORTS also can provide data for operational reconfiguration to bypass an identified failure if prompt repair must be deferred for operation reasons.

Computer controlled, it offers an additional feature with a capability to provide operator training.

In actual operation, ORTS accumulates test data from the addressable system test points and it can extract performance oriented data by running on-line simulated targets through the system. For the SPY-1 radar alone, 39 simulation tests can be run on-line in just a few minutes.

RCA officials disclosed that all of the computer programs required for ORTS control have been written and successfully tested.

Because of the capability of ORTS, Navy officials believe the level of technical and diagnostic skill of technicians can be significantly reduced as compared with that needed with current shipboard weapons systems. In addition to a lower skill level required, fewer maintenance personnel are needed.

TEST RESULTS SHOW

RCA's Aegis program is milestone oriented. In October 1970, the first was passed with the acceptance of the preliminary Aegis design. Milestone B, a critical design review, was passed in February 1972.

Performance testing of the SPY-1 phased-array antenna pattern was completed in December 1972. Under computer control, according to RCA, more than two million data points were recorded and analyzed for over 11,000 beam positions. Test results showed total tracking error of the array was well within the target tracking requirement by the Navy of 0.04 beamwidth.

AGSIS SUBSYSTEMS

In April of this year, Milestone C (Demonstration No. 1) was completed successfully and additional demonstrations to complete this level of requirements are now under way at the Moorestown Land Based Test Site. The full-scale mockup with its instrumented deckhouse at the LBTS looks into the congested air traffic of the New York terminal area and outward to the Atlantic Ocean. Consoles employed at the site display a 256-mile range.

Upcoming tests will see aircraft from the Naval Air Facility at Warminster, Penna., making high-altitude and low-altitude attack runs within the Aegis control area. Testing will include employment of the full capability of Navy electronic warfare aircraft for jamming and countermeasures.

When these tests are completed, probably in late October, Aegis subsystems will be air-lifted aboard a Lockheed C-5A to Long Beach, Calif., and reinstalled aboard the test ship. At-sea trials aboard the USS *Norton Sound* are scheduled to be carried out during the next 12 months.

Shipboard demonstrations will be required to prove out Aegis reaction time, launcher integration, guided-missile coverage and inherent firepower, and environmental immunity. An ongoing portion of the at-sea trials will be a final demonstration of full system availability.

The Aegis program is being managed by the Navy's Ordnance Systems Command. Project Manager is Capt. Paul L. Anderson. Anderson reports to Capt. Wayne Meyer, Surface Missile Systems Project Manager, who is also a former manager of the Aegis program. Meyer reports to Rear Adm. Roger E. Spreen, Commander of the Naval Ordnance Systems Command, part of the Naval Material Command. Aegis is from the Greek, meaning "shield" or "buckler" and is billed hopefully by the Navy as "The Shield of the Fleet."

Although production of this weapon system is still several years away, RCA officials believe a realistic estimate of a complete Aegis ship installation will be of the order of \$45 million.

TARGET PRIORITIES RELATE DIRECTLY TO SATURATION OF SYSTEM ELEMENTS

Aegis, as with any computer/radar-directed weapon system, is subject to some finite saturation level. In other words, a point can be reached where the number of targets exceeds the handling capacity of at least one major subsystem. RCA developers and the Navy, however, believe Aegis has been designed to meet expected peak attack levels, even under adverse environmental conditions that degrade radar signals.

Dr. Walter Weinstock, former Technical Director of the RCA Aegis contractor team and currently involved in the computer control aspects of the Aegis phased-array radar, describes some of the basic principles faced by program designers:

The radar system represents a resource which must be allocated on a priority basis. The resource can be described in many ways. One is to consider the radar power and dwell time associated with the radar hardware, and the processing time and computer memory associated with the radar controller.

The radar resource of time becomes more tied up with long-range targets, while power becomes more tied up with tactical functions. Localized interference may require an increase in power to maintain track data quality. In summary, long range targets in a difficult environmental situation are most demanding of radar resource.

The data processing limitations arise on an entirely different basis. The amount of processing time per target dwell will, in general, be independent of its range. The amount of computer memory needed to support a target is also independent of target range and signal-to-noise ratio. Thus, the way to approach the saturation limit of the computer is to input many data points/units time. This ties up the processor and the memory of the controller.

Yet, this limiting condition may not necessarily tax the radar. For example, if we had to track a large number of short-range (large-signal-return) targets, this would imply modest power and minimal radar time. This represents a relatively undemanding problem for the radar.

From the viewpoint of the computer, it represents a saturation situation—especially if the large number of returns are associated with many targets. Thus, radar system saturation can come about in many ways. It is extremely important that system performance stay at maximum level when saturation occurs—both in the radar and in its controller. This implies some form of priority system which is self-protective.

CONCEPTUALLY DIFFICULT

The reason for our concern about saturation is that one can only design reasonably for likely peak conditions and, when they occur, for averaging out the impact of the extreme demand. In general, this will be done by deferring tasks which are not as time critical.

The problem of memory is basically tied to the number of targets that can be handled. For a given system, a ceiling exists on target capacity, based on a given memory resource.

The problem of processing time management is, conceptually, more difficult. In a real-time system, we must be sure that the highest priority jobs can be accomplished on a timely basis. In general, an extreme peak occurs when a number of high priority targets enter the system in a short period of time. The entry of a number of targets into high-data-rate tracking in short interval, for example, can produce this situation. Like-

wise, the detection of a number of new targets, which demand time-critical transition-to-track, can produce this peak situation.

The processing concept must allow the various processes to progress in the machine in parallel and, when peak conditions arise, the less critical processes are held in abeyance until the critical ones are done. Thus, if the processing alternates between search-and-detect and track maintenance during a period of moderate load, the machine may switch over to tracking only if a priority loading arises.

Processing must be capable of responding to these transient peak loads in a timely manner, without throwing away the results of partially-completed lower-priority jobs. Furthermore, it must be capable of handling these problems efficiently relative to the amount of processing effected per unit of time. For the case of the saturating load, operation on low priority tasks can be suspended until the peak load has tapered.

To put numbers into a comparison of cases, the requirement to handle a large number of short-range track points can drive processor utilization to 100%, while requiring that search operations be reduced. Yet only 66% of available radar execution time may be needed. In general, this type of situation does not stress the radar unduly on a time or a power basis—since we are dealing with a multiplicity of short-range tracks.

The companion case, involving long-range targets, may force radar utilization to occur at the 96% level, while the processor operates at the 76% point. This case is demanding of radar time and power, while not stressing the processor unduly.

Thus, the mechanism of saturation is sensitive to the target-mix problem imposed on the system.

FEDERAL SPENDING: GIVE WITH ONE HAND, TAKE AWAY WITH THE OTHER

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, nothing is easier for a bureaucracy than to spend money. But beyond some point, everything that the Government gives out with one hand, it must take back with the other. The budget is only a proposal of the President's choice of priorities among alternative expenditures. As such, it is subject to alternation to reflect the collective judgment of both the President and the Congress. Although I do not agree with all the administration's proposals, I endorse setting a firm spending ceiling and staying with it. It is necessary to examine the hundreds of Federal programs which have become entrenched sacred cows and determine if their continued existence is justified in light of their performance and other priority considerations.

Congress can either contribute to a fiscally sound budget for fiscal year 1974, or it can bear the economic albatross of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a thought-provoking editorial appearing in the October 24, 1973, Lancaster, Ohio, Eagle-Gazette. I commend the editors of the Eagle-Gazette for spelling out the dan-

gers of over-zealous Federal spending and for suggesting how we can put our financial house in order.

The editorial follows:

[From the Lancaster Eagle-Gazette, Oct. 24, 1973]

WHAT CONGRESS MUST DO

Congress must tighten controls more on federal spending before the national government is left with only the options of a tax increase or a sizable and crippling economic crisis.

Citizens and taxpayers should make more direct contact with their congressmen and senators to galvanize effective action on this situation at the earliest time possible.

The latest non-profit Tax Foundation, Inc., research study points up the fact that 75 per cent of the current \$268.7 billion federal budget was "really uncontrollable" and continuation of programs mandated in prior years in removing the authority of Congress to act independently on budget questions.

We concur with the Tax Foundation's position that the time has now come for Congress to impose and abide by tighter spending ceilings, match spending to income and give the Appropriations Committee full authority to curb "mandatory spending," if there is to be any curb of deficit federal spending.

Concern is widespread that unless some effective mechanisms are developed to control the upward trends in federal spending, this nation will face the need of either new federal tax increases or the prospect of renewed inflation.

The Tax Foundation said "the federal government has already committed taxpayers to financing specified levels of revenue sharing, postal operations, military retirement payments, agricultural price supports, social security interest on the public debt, veterans benefits, welfare and government operations."

Again, Congress must be urged to take the necessary steps that would stem the tide of federal spending, much of it considered wasteful, in order to prevent economic reversals or slumps and additional tax boosts the nation might have to experience.

GILMAN CALLS FOR SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will be introducing a resolution providing for the appointment of a special prosecutor empowered to investigate and prosecute any offense against the United States arising out of unauthorized entry into Democratic National Committee Headquarters at the Watergate and any campaign with respect to the election in 1972 for the office of President.

With so many critical issues confronting our Nation, it is paramount that we restore the faith of the American people in our system of Government by pursuing as thorough and independent an investigation of the Watergate affair as possible, bringing it to a speedy and just resolution.

For this reason, I am introducing this resolution calling for the selection of three nominees for the office of special prosecutor to be submitted to the President by a committee comprised of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the president of the American Bar Associa-

tion, and the Attorney General of the United States.

In order to encourage a broad participation in the selection process, this resolution calls for reaching out to our Nation's leading bar associations in providing the three-man committee with nominees for the position of special prosecutor.

It is important to note that this bill insulates against the possibility of any arbitrary dismissal of the special prosecutor by limiting removal from office to "gross impropriety, gross misconduct, gross dereliction of duty, or for violation of this act."

The American people demand and deserve the continuation of a vigorous and independent investigation of the Watergate affair. Shaken faith in our coequal system of government, precipitated by the events of the past few weeks, mandate congressional action providing for an exhaustive, unfettered investigation of any illegal activity, bringing to justice all of the guilty.

In the interests of the Nation's welfare, it is incumbent upon Congress to respond to those we represent, seeking the means for bringing about a just resolution to this corrosive affair which has plagued our country for too many months.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution providing the legislative authority for the office of special prosecutor.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the text of the resolution follow my remarks in this portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H.J. RES. —

To provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor to investigate and prosecute any offense arising out of campaign activities with respect to the election in 1972 for the office of President

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the President shall, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a special prosecutor of the United States (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "special prosecutor") from a list of not more than three individuals nominated for such appointment by a committee comprised of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the President of the American Bar Association, and the Attorney General of the United States of America.

(b) The American Bar Association, the American Trial Lawyers Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the National District Attorneys Association and the National Bar Association shall submit a list of not more than three nominees to the committee not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) This committee, upon receiving the lists from those organizations specified in Section 1, subsection (b) of this Act, will select and nominate three individuals for the position of special prosecutor and submit their nominations to the President within twenty-five days following the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The special prosecutor shall have primary authority to prosecute any offense against the United States: (1) arising out of the unauthorized entry into Democratic National Committee Headquarters at the Watergate; (2) arising out of any campaign with respect to the election in 1972 for the office of President.

(b) Upon request of the special prosecutor, the head of any Federal agency shall: (1) detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency; and (2) provide any relevant information or materials, to the special prosecutor to assist him in carrying out his duties under this Act.

Sec. 3. All materials, tapes, documents, files, work in process, information and all other property of whatever kind and description relevant to the duties enumerated in Section 2 hereof, tangible or intangible, collected by, developed by, or in the possession of the former Special Prosecutor or his staff established pursuant to regulation by the Attorney General (28 C.F.R. O. 37, rescinded October 24, 1973), shall be delivered into possession of the Special Prosecutor appointed under this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) The special prosecutor shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 11 of the Executive Schedule under Section 5313 of Title 5, United States Code.

(b) The special prosecutor may appoint and fix the salaries of such staff as he deems necessary to assist him in performing his duties under this Act.

Sec. 6. The special prosecutor may be removed from office by the Attorney General of the United States for gross impropriety, gross misconduct, gross dereliction of duty, or for violation of this Act, but for no other cause, or by the Congress pursuant to Article 11, section 4 of the Constitution. The Attorney General shall give 30 days notice in writing to the Congress of his intention to remove the special prosecutor, setting forth in detail the grounds for such removal. Upon giving of such notice the Attorney General may suspend the special prosecutor and dismissal shall be finally effective 30 days thereafter.

LEHMAN COLLEGE: A CULTURAL AND CIVIC CREDIT TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Herbert H. Lehman College in my district is one of the fine institutions that make up the City University of New York—CUNY. Lehman College has embarked on a program to bring lectures, special events, and concerts to the campus for the benefit of the student population and the general public. A special aspect of the Lehman cultural arts program is its involvement of the public with the school's intellectual community—faculty and students.

This program is described in the following article appearing in the CUNY Courier on November 1:

LEHMAN'S CULTURAL PROGRAMS REACH OUT TO COMMUNITY

Take it from Mrs. Fanny Kaplan of the Bronx, there's an intellectual Olympics going on at Herbert H. Lehman College in the form of lectures, special events, and concerts for the benefit of the public as well as registered students.

Mrs. Kaplan, a retired schoolteacher, is one of several hundred citizens from the Lehman environs who stroll onto the campus several days a week to attend what are generally called Lehman's cultural events. They are an enthusiastic and appreciative crowd.

"Let's face it," says Mrs. Kaplan, "We're a little like the GI's who returned to school after World War II—we're highly motivated."

NO CONDESCENSION

The Lehman program, in terms of content, may not be much different from those provided the community by other CUNY units. But it is unique in one important respect: it casually brings neighborhood people, many of the retired, onto the campus to participate with undergraduates and faculty at regularly scheduled intellectual events. In short, this is one community cultural affairs program free of any taint of condescension.

And what are these cultural events? One day it may be an all-Beethoven concert by the Gramercy String Quartet, the college's resident ensemble composed of members of the New York Philharmonic. The next day it may be a talk by scientist-author Rene Dubos, or a discourse on acting by Vivec Lindfors, or a meeting with any one of the scores of visiting lecturers brought onto the campus throughout the academic year by the college's departments.

The program started modestly five years ago, shortly after Lehman separated from Hunter, when the Department of Classical and Oriental Languages introduced its "Classics of the Western World" series featuring noted visiting scholars.

VISITORS LIMITED

The series, offering discussions of the classics of antiquity by such academic all-stars as Bernard M. W. Knox of Harvard, George Luck of Johns Hopkins, and Robert T. Fortna of Vassar, initially permitted a limited number of visitors from neighboring schools and colleges to audit the lectures.

Three years ago, The New York Times sent a reporter to the college to scout the series. The result was a feature story of the "Gosh-Gee-Whiz-Culture-Is-Alive-in-the-Bronx (of all places)" type."

That was the starting whistle for a leisure-citizen stampede of the campus. Calls and letters came from all over the metropolitan area—Junior Leaguers from Greenwich, Conn., grey-haired men and women from the Amalgamated Union's Housing Co-op, Riverdallians, promenaders from the Grand Concourse, and residents of Washington Heights. There was even an elderly Wall Streeter, for a time, who commuted to the college by chauffeured limousine.

PATRONS INFORMED

The public's clamor for an opportunity to participate in Lehman's intellectual life led to the compilation of a cultural-events mailing list of nearly 1,000 individuals and organizations who are periodically informed of upcoming campus events.

The popularity and success of the classics series led to a sequel, "From the Renaissance On," with lecturers from Lehman's Departments of English, Germanic and Slavic Languages, and Romance Languages. It, too, is a hit with regular campus visitors. In fact, recently when Dr. Leonard Lief, president of the college and a professor of English, delivered the lecture on Shakespeare's "Henry IV," he spoke to a packed hall of 70 students and almost as many people from the neighborhood. Latecomers were forced to sit in the aisles—and they did.

NOT PASSIVE OR UNCRITICAL

The audiences are not passive. One elderly gentleman predictably pops up at the end of every string quartet concert and shouts, "Bravo." They're not uncritical, either. One woman at the end of each academic year writes a thank-you letter that includes marks for the speaker—"fair," "good," "excellent," and "superb." Another visitor asked that one speaker not get another invitation because "he dragged in too much sex."

But, in general, these members of the audience appreciate what they are getting for free. And no wonder. In the past year they've had a chance to hear novelist Katherine Anne Porter read from her own works, Eubie Blake give his ragtime lecture-concert, Anthony Burgess talk about how Americans

are killing English (the language, that is), Barbara Ward discuss the plight of the underdeveloped nations, Israeli poet T. Carmi discuss modern Hebrew literature. Others who were heard were lexicographer Clarence L. Barnhart, Spanish novelist Juan Goytisolo, pianist Beveridge Webster, not to mention dozens of other topical or cultural presentations.

GENERATION GAP NARROWED

The relationship between the community visitors and regular Lehman undergraduates can best be described as respectful. Most of the visitors come to the college dressed in tailored suits. Most Lehman students do not. Yet, when speakers call for questions or comments from the floor, students listen attentively to the viewpoints of their elders—and vice versa. When a black Vietnam veteran spoke of his war experiences at a session with CUNY Distinguished Professors Eric Wolf and Hans J. Morgenthau, he was applauded by the senior citizens.

If anything, the members of the community seem to have gained new respect for the students. For instance, one woman discovered she had forgotten her purse in a lecture hall. When she went to the college's lost and found, she was amazed to discover that a student had turned it in—cash, credit cards, and cosmetics intact. Not only did she write of her delight at this proof that today's students are honest, but she donated \$100 to the college's scholarship fund.

OFFSETS BAD IMPRESSIONS

But, from the college's point of view, the best dividend has been the goodwill that has been built up in the community. These people appreciate what Lehman College is offering them—and its students. And their praise goes a long way to offset the rumors about today's colleges, students, and standards.

As one woman, a member of the Hunter College class of 1939, put it: "When I went to college there was nothing as stimulating as this going on."

She may be right. But, then again back in '39 she may have been too young to appreciate it.

SUPREME COURT'S ABORTION DECISION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Msgr. McHugh, director of the Family Life Division of the U.S. Catholic Conference, who recently said that a number of recent events have "magnified the tragic error" of the Supreme Court's abortion decision last January.

Urging enactment of a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision, Msgr. James T. McHugh said:

The tragic decisions of life and death that are being made by medical technocrats are attributable to and permissible under the absurd reasonings of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is imperative that the American people understand that the Court's opinions rival in destructiveness our storehouse of weapons and that the philosophic concept of many physicians is a far greater danger than Watergate.

For the information of our colleagues, the following is the text of his statement:

STATEMENT

"Events of recent weeks have magnified the tragic error of the Supreme Court's abortion opinions of January 22, 1973.

"In California, an obstetrician is charged with solicitation to commit murder because he ordered that oxygen be withheld from an infant that survived abortion. The infant is alive today because the nurse refused to obey the doctor's order. In the court, the doctor's lawyer argued that the doctor is not guilty because he complied with the California abortion law which allows abortions up till 22 weeks. However, the child was 32 or 33 weeks along—eight months—when the abortion was performed. The doctor also defends himself by pleading that no one told him the child was born normal.

"The reasons that a doctor can claim legal innocence for destroying a living child can be found in Justice Blackmun's abortion opinion (*Doe v. Bolton*): 'the medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors . . . relevant to the well-being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health. This allows the attending physician the room he needs to make his best medical judgment. And it is room that operates for the benefit, not the disadvantage, of the pregnant woman.' Presumably the disadvantage to the child—death—is not a compelling factor for Mr. Blackmun.

"In Buffalo, New York, a physician has been sentenced for the death of a woman on whom he performed an abortion. The doctor's lawyer claims that the abortion was legal, and the death is the result of 'an error in medical judgment.' Yet, in the Supreme Court abortion opinion Mr. Blackmun argues against legal restrictions so that the doctor 'may range farther afield whenever his medical judgment . . . dictates and directs him.'

"In the Yale-New Haven Medical Center, 43 children born with some type of birth defects died because they were deprived of medical treatment. One doctor justified this on the grounds that the children faced lives devoid of 'meaningful humanhood.' This resembles Mr. Blackmun's statement that the state has a legitimate interest in protecting the life of the unborn child only when the child 'has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb.' There are no criteria for 'meaningful humanhood' or 'meaningful life' and thus we certainly ought not to allow the Supreme Court or the medical profession to decide who is to live and who is to die.

"The tragic decisions of life and death that are being made by medical technocrats are attributable to and permissible under the absurd reasonings of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"It is imperative that the American people understand that the Court's opinions rival in destructiveness our storehouse of weapons, and that the philosophic concept of many physicians is a far greater danger than Watergate.

"The passage of a constitutional amendment to reverse the absurd judgments of the Supreme Court and to provide some base for legal protection for children—born and unborn—is an urgent and compelling responsibility facing the American people. Political planning and electoral projections should be strongly influenced by these considerations."

QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS HOW FUEL SHORTAGE HAS AFFECTED WISCONSIN'S INDEPENDENT DEALERS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted a survey of independent oil

jobbers and distributors in the State of Wisconsin.

A total of 452 of the 800 independent dealers of petroleum products returned a questionnaire from my office. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine how recent shortages have affected Wisconsin's independent dealers and ultimately consumers.

Ninety-seven percent of Wisconsin's independent petroleum dealers and distributors have been forced to accept allocations of fuel oil, gasoline, and propane from major oil companies.

The fact that 97 percent of the dealers who responded to the questionnaire have been forced to accept allocations demonstrates the seriousness of the current crunch. Allocations below 100 percent result in the reduction of the total amount of petroleum products that a dealer can supply to his customers.

In addition to the high percentage of dealers who have been forced to accept allocations nearly 49 percent have been forced to accept the reduction in supply of 20 percent or more and 84 percent of the dealers answering the questionnaire said they had had "some difficulty" or a "great deal of difficulty" in obtaining gasoline in the past year. Similarly, 91 percent had trouble obtaining fuel oil and 81 percent encountered varying degrees of difficulty in finding propane supplies.

Seventy-six percent of the dealers who answered the inquiry claimed that they needed at least an extra 50,000 gallons of product to satisfy their customers' demand. A total of 25 percent of the dealers said they could have used 100,000 or more gallons of additional product.

The results of the survey demonstrate that the current shortage threatens the existence of independent dealers and distributors. By putting the squeeze on independent dealers through allocations, the major companies are able to expand their share of the market and eventually drive some independents out of business.

PESTICIDE FIGHTER HONORED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, an old and very dear friend of mine, Mr. David Wintermann, is among 21 Americans receiving this year's Conservation Awards of the American Motors Corp.

On his farm in Eagle Lake, Tex., David Wintermann learned 30 years ago that man can live in harmony with nature without sacrificing his productivity. Today he grows rice and cattle without utilizing pesticides that can linger for years, sometimes destroying an area's delicate ecological balance.

His conservation efforts have helped create a refuge for the many ducks, geese and other migratory birds that spend their winters in the mild climate of the Texas coast.

David and his lovely wife Eula, have been a source of advice and inspiration to me over the years, and I am personally very proud to see him receive this well-deserved reward. I am inserting a Hous-

ton Post article on David Wintermann in today's RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues. It is a clear example of how men and their environment can live together in a peaceful, rewarding symbiosis. The article follows:

[From the Houston Post, Sept. 27, 1973]

PESTICIDE FIGHTER HONORED
(By Harold Scarlett)

EAGLE LAKE.—David Wintermann, who has been growing rice and cattle around Eagle Lake for most of his 62 years, accepts the marvels of modern technology.

The cars and trucks of the Wintermann enterprises—he also runs an irrigation company and an agricultural supply business—are equipped with two-way radios.

Wintermann plants and sells the new fast-maturing strains of seed rice.

He even has a flashy four-seater helicopter for patrolling his domain by air. The copter is used for spotting leaks in irrigation dikes and uneven water distribution, for detecting developing problems that would go unnoticed from the ground.

But on one widely accepted modern development, Wintermann is implacably old-fashioned:

He happens to believe that he can grow good rice and good beef without drenching the countryside with powerful pesticides.

Twenty years or so ago, Wintermann and a partner sprayed a rice field with a new pesticide called Dieldrin that had just come on the market.

Dieldrin, like its chemical relative DDT, is potent and long-lasting.

"It killed everything in that field—fish, turtles, snakes, everything," Wintermann recalls. "So, I decided it couldn't do anything good, and I never used it again."

"Moreover, an adjoining field that wasn't sprayed at all produced just as much rice as the field sprayed with Dieldrin."

Wintermann believes pesticides are useful in some circumstances, but he has long banned the use of so-called hard pesticides on his extensive land holdings around Eagle Lake, on the coastal prairies about 60 miles west of Houston.

For this and other contributions to conservation, Wintermann was one of 21 Americans recently chosen to receive the annual Conservation Awards of the American Motors Corp.

A second Texas winner, also from the Houston area, was Glynn A. Riley of Liberty, a Federal wildlife agent and a champion of the vanishing red wolf.

Of Wintermann, the awards judges said: "The sound conservation programs Mr. Wintermann conducts on his ranch serve as examples for crop producers throughout the Southwest."

Wintermann was particularly cited for his aid to the World Wildlife Fund and the Nature Conservancy in creating a preserve near Eagle Lake for the rare and endangered Att-water prairie chicken.

The citation says Wintermann provided 800 acres of his land for the 3,500-acre refuge "on credit and at a fraction of its real value."

Wintermann modestly maintains that he merely sold the land for what was a "reasonable price" at the time.

Eagle Lake proudly bills itself as the "goose-hunting capital of the world," and Wintermann and his wife, Eula, live in a gracious, spacious lakeshore home that is a year-round hospitality house for wildlife.

On a summer afternoon, a dozen or so squirrels scamper around the oak-canopied lawn sloping down to the lake. Cardinals, chickadees and titmice come in for a snack at the bird feeders.

Every year, 700 or 800 teal ducks take up winter residence on the lake by the house. Wintermann feeds them rice meal, and they return year after year.

On down the lake, Wintermann lands are a haven for the state's largest inland colony

of wading birds—hundreds of egrets and herons, along with some scarce wood ibises and roseate spoonbills. Since the only access is through a Wintermann plant, the birds are protected.

On his agricultural lands, Wintermann has built and maintains six sanctuary ponds for migratory waterfowl.

Wintermann is a keen fisherman and hunter himself, but hunting on his lands is limited to occasional guests.

"We have enough land so that we can relieve the pressure on the ducks and geese, let them rest and feed in peace and keep them from being shot out," Wintermann says.

He says his interest in conservation stemmed from the hunting and fishing—and from the strong support of his wife.

The Wintermanns have been members of the National Audubon Society for almost 40 years, and he is a regional vice-president of Ducks Unlimited.

Mrs. Wintermann first read Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring," a monumental early indictment of DDT and other pesticides, when it first appeared in serial form in the New Yorker magazine.

She was "terribly disturbed" by it and called it to her husband's attention.

Wintermann believes in the judicious use of pesticides, but not if they damage wildlife, or if natural controls are available.

He believes cattle egrets, the white African import often seen around grazing cattle, are a far better grasshopper control than any chemical.

Wintermann sells seed rice to fellow farmers, but he refuses to sell seeds coated with Aldrin for use in the Eagle Lake area.

He knows the pesticide coating repels scavenging blackbirds. But he also knows it kills waterfowl.

"I don't preach to others what to do," Wintermann says. "What they do on their own property is up to them."

But it pleases Wintermann when a friend realizes there are few useless creatures in nature's scheme of things.

One rice farmer told him of spotting blackbirds apparently breaking down his crop and eating it. But when the farmer got closer, he could see the birds were eating insects.

"Of course, blackbirds eat rice too," Wintermann says. "But they aren't all bad."

The grounds of Wintermann's home are guarded by stout chain-link fences. The fences are to keep neighborhood alligators from eating Wintermann's hunting dogs.

One nine-foot gator has a den in a pond a scant 50 feet from the Wintermann's swimming pool. But he is not molested.

Wintermann obviously feels that since the alligators were there first, they have as much right to be there as he does.

His concern for wildlife may be one reason Eagle Lake can call itself the "goose-hunting capital of the world."

**TOM QUINLAN HONORED BY
WEST POINTERS**

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Ms. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend Tom Quinlan has spent a lifetime in service to his community, working his way into the hearts of countless citizens in Bristol, Conn., and its environs.

Over the years Tom's untiring efforts in behalf of his fellow Bristol area residents have brought him many, well deserved awards. One of his latest treasures was bestowed on him by this year's graduating class at West Point.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert the following story from the October 18, 1973, edition of the Bristol Press, telling of Tom's latest achievement in a long and distinguished career:

[From the Bristol Press (Conn.),
Oct. 18, 1973]

TOM QUINLAN HONORED BY WEST POINTERS

Bookends in the form of West Point cadets were recently awarded to Tom Quinlan, of Anderson Avenue in Forestville, by this year's graduating class at the military academy. The gift was in appreciation to Tom for 19 years of faithful service in caring for and beautifying the grounds around the veteran's memorial in Forestville. Tom's dedicated activities were made known to the cadets by Lt. Col. Frederick Manross, a former teacher at West Point and a native of this area.

The bookends were an addition to many gifts and honors extended to Quinlan. The Boy Scouts of America awarded him the Silver Beaver and also Order of the Arrow, its highest honor, as tokens of appreciation for some 30 years service as Cub and Boy Scout leader. He holds the two highest Catholic awards made in scouting and has been cited for his work with the St. Edmundites of Selma, Alabama, in arranging retreats for the boys.

He has been a member of the Explorer's Club, an honorary navy recruiter, named Forestville First Man of the Year and an honorary adult leader of Don Bosco Boys' Club. On several occasions, the well-known Forestville was given the title of "Honorary Mayor of Forestville."

SECRET WRITING PLEASES MANY

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, often we talk about individual responsibility and the power of what one man can do. Recently, Floyce Korsak, a reporter for the Dallas Times-Herald, painted a verbal portrait of what one man is doing, anonymously.

Despite the newspaper account, the Dallas suburban businessman remains anonymous as he pursues his hobby to lighten the lives of people who strike his fancy. I would like to share this account of the man known as Hardy with my colleagues:

SECRET WRITING PLEASES MANY
(By Floyce Korsak)

The reincarnationist might tell you that Hardy once was a monk—a scribe in a monastery along about the 15th Century transcribing on parchment passages of Scriptures and the doings of saints.

Hardy, himself, is puzzled about his lettering talent since he has never studied the ancient art that flows so rapidly from his hands. He uses his talent freely for the pleasure of others.

Both the famous and the obscure have received anonymous gifts of hand-lettered messages from the will-o'-the-wisp Hardy, messages that are carefully selected to be meaningful to the recipient who is always chosen for a special reason.

"To surprise deserving people is a thrill for me," he smiles. "And it's always a challenge to devise ways to get the gift to them so that they never know who sent it."

The exact style of lettering he uses is impossible to describe. It's his own. A native of Germany, he says his lettering would be considered similar to Gothic in that country.

"Over here," he says, "you call it Old English. But it's really not that either."

The frames are his own also. Sometimes wood, sometimes metal, but always rich in gold, bright or burnished.

Among well known people who have received messages from Hardy are Erik Jonsson, former mayor of Dallas, President Richard Nixon, Elizabeth Taylor, Bob Hope, Sammy Davis and Conrad Hilton. There are many others.

Senator John Tower presented Hardy's plaque to President Nixon. It was a Winston Churchill: quote: "Courage is the first of human qualities because it is the quality which guarantees all the others."

Hardy made an exception in the case of Mr. Nixon. He let his identity be known. He got a letter of thanks from the President and on his birthday a card came from Mr. Nixon.

"I don't know how in the world he found out my birthday," Hardy says. "I'd like to know."

To a young Arlington matron, Ruth Proulx, a native of China, Hardy lettered an axiom from Confucius, "Freedom and dignity come after you are warm and fed."

Mrs. Proulx's father, a former general in Chiang Kai-shek's air force, has been a Communist prisoner for 22 years. Hardy read the story of her father and sent her the gift.

A local TV weatherman got this message, "One of the most annoying things about the weather forecasts is that they're not wrong all the time either."

And to his own mother-in-law in Germany, upon the death of her husband, Hardy sent a poem by German poet Theodor Storm: "The sadness comes, the happiness is gone. The happiness comes, the sadness will go. The days will never be the same."

There is a poignant story about the way Hardy got started on his hobby. He arrived in this country a number of years ago to take a job that failed to materialize. He decided to stay anyway.

For some reason he does not fathom, he decided to try his hand at lettering, even though he had studied neither calligraphy nor art. His first attempt was The Lord's Prayer. He made four tries, each time misspelling the word "evil." It kept coming out "evel."

"I've always hated the word 'evil,' he smiles. "I guess I got a mental block and it just wouldn't come out right."

He answered a Times Herald ad for a newspaper layout artist, showing his work with the misspelled word and got the job on the spot. He worked at his newspaper job five years. Today he is a businessman. He and his wife, also a German native, live in an area suburban town. They have one son, age 7.

"I can't tell you how much my hobby means to me," he says. "But I have to be in the mood to sit down and work at it. I cannot force it at all. I have to be inspired by a story or a saying or by somebody."

Hardy was given a scroll himself about two years ago. In recognition of his civic activities, he was made an honorary citizen of Dallas.

"It's my proudest possession," he declares.

THE TIME FOR IMPEACHMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the evening daily newspaper in Minneapolis has called for the impeachment of the Presi-

dent. The editorial, published October 22, 1973, in the Minneapolis Star follows:

THE TIME FOR IMPEACHMENT

President Nixon has left Congress no choice but to move toward his impeachment.

Since the beginning of the Watergate scandal, and the revelations of White House involvement in the affair, The Star has been reluctant to support impeachment proceedings, largely on the grounds they would be divisive and traumatic. We continue to be hesitant, for reasons we will enumerate, but the shattering events that began Friday night have in themselves been so divisive and traumatic that we believe Congress must now begin the impeachment process.

Those weekend events began with the President rejecting the ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals, which upheld a lower court order that he turn over the disputed Watergate tapes to the court. At the same time, the President decided he would not appeal the appellate court ruling to the U.S. Supreme Court. This is defiance of the courts and brings into sharp focus the appeals court opinion which said, "... the President ... does not embody the nation's sovereignty. He is not above the law's demands."

When Nixon ordered Archibald Cox, the special Watergate prosecutor, to give up his fight to get the tapes as evidence in the Watergate grand jury investigation, Cox refused and was fired. Deputy Atty. Gen. William Ruckelshaus, who refused to carry out Nixon's order to fire Cox, was himself fired. And finally Atty. Gen. Elliot Richardson, who had given his pledge at his confirmation hearing that Cox would have complete independence in the Watergate investigation, had no recourse but to resign in the face of Nixon's order.

Thus three highly respected public servants, who were in the process of restoring credibility to the Justice Department and refused to blindly follow the orders of the President because they felt those orders were wrong, have been forced out of office.

We find it highly ironic that the President said he acted "in the spirit of accommodation that has marked American constitutional history." Equally ironic was his reasoning in rejecting the appeals court ruling: to avoid "the possibility of a constitutional confrontation." He has clearly not acted in the spirit of accommodation, and he has precipitated the worst constitutional crisis that has arisen since the Watergate affair.

Our hesitancy over recommending impeachment stems from the critical problems facing the country. There is, first, no vice-president in office to fill a vacancy should Nixon be impeached. Rep. Gerald Ford, the President's designate for the office, faces a difficult time in being confirmed by Congress, and there are growing doubts about his leadership abilities. There is also the continuing problem in the Middle East, even with the cease-fire, and there are such critical domestic problems as inflation and the oil shortage.

Still, we feel the President has gone too far toward assuming a sovereignty that is above the law. We urge Congress to use the tool that is within the law—impeachment proceedings—to restore the presidency to its rightful place in the American political system.

THAT PRESS CONFERENCE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the more astute commentators on public af-

fairs in this country is the editor of the St. Paul Dispatch-Pioneer Press, William Sumner. I am sure many of our colleagues remember him well from his service in the Ridder Publication's Washington Bureau. While he has moved to St. Paul, I can assure our colleagues that his perspective has increased his ability to focus on the essential issues of complex problems.

In the past I have been tempted to bring Mr. Sumner's commentary to the attention of our colleagues. I have resisted that temptation fairly consistently since Mr. Sumner treats public officeholders in the same nondiscriminatory manner as Vince Lombardi treated his football players. The fact of the matter is that I run the risk of being accused of attempting to flatter the press by bringing Mr. Sumner's commentary to the attention of the House.

The importance, however, of Mr. Sumner's remarks on the President's recent press conference cause me to bring his thoughts to our colleagues' attention. At this time I place in the Record William Sumner's column as published in the October 30, 1973, edition of the St. Paul Dispatch, a thought provoking analysis of the President's press conference:

THAT PRESS CONFERENCE: ANGRY? HE JUST DOESN'T HAVE RESPECT

(By William Sumner)

After watching the President's press conference on Friday it seemed necessary to wait a few days before offering comment. It was that distressing.

I am not qualified to make judgments on anybody's health or nervous condition, but it was pathetic when the man told those assembled, and the nation, that he had been forced to learn to be cool while under fire.

Here was a correred man, giving us a couple of flashes of an ominous trick-or-treat Halloween smile, who was sweating, clearly troubled and intemperate, moving about physically like an awkward middleweight.

"... I have never heard or seen such outrageous, vicious, distorted reporting in public life. I am not blaming anybody for that ..."

Aaaaak!

This assumes that the media, particularly the TV folks, were responsible for the Watergate scandal, for the Ellsberg scandal, for the nation having no Attorney General at the moment, for a former Vice President being "former," having had his wrist slapped, and for the rest of the human wreckage.

He was low enough to be self-serving in distorting the truth on one occasion and in offering a disputed version of history on the other to justify his firing of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox.

Nixon said Richardson went along with the so-called "Stennis Proposal" and refused to fire Cox only because of his personal commitment to Cox before the Senate.

Let us see what Richardson said, in part: "I regarded the proposal to rely on Senator Stennis for a verified record for the sake of brevity ... as reasonable, but I do not think it should be tied to the foreclosure of the right of the Special Prosecutor to invoke judicial process in future situations."

And,

"... I, given my role in guaranteeing the independence of the Special Prosecutor, as well as my beliefs in the public interest embodied in that role, felt ... clear that I could not discharge him, so I resigned."

"At stake in the final analysis is the very integrity of the governmental processes. I came to the Department of Justice to help restore. My own single most important com-

mitment to this objective was my commitment to the independence of the special prosecutor."

Nixon's disputed version of history concerns Thomas Jefferson who, he said, prepared a "compromise" summary of subpoenaed material for Chief Justice John Marshall.

There is one obvious difference. The potential defendant then was Aaron Burr. The potential defendant now is Richard Nixon. In any case, Nixon's version of history collides with that which holds that President Jefferson did indeed turn over the subpoenaed material itself, not a summary.

Other than that, it was standard Nixon fare of being persecuted, but not blaming anyone for it, but then it got embarrassing or scary, depending on how one viewed this colling, sweating, grinning man.

You only get angry with those you respect. An embarrassment. Sort of like "sticks and stones . . ." and so forth. Or, the same you four times over. All of this now in third person . . . "The President" rather than "I."

Asked about the effect Watergate may have had on the thinking of Soviet officials during the Mideast mini-confrontation, he said, "I think Mr. Brezhnev probably can't quite understand how the President of the United States wouldn't be able to handle the Watergate problems. He'd be able to handle it all right, if he had them."

This seemed to get the only genuine laugh, not of derision, but I thought at the time that it was misplaced laughter.

There was nothing funny about the remark. It may have displayed a longing.

On Sunday we find the glib Mr. Patrick Buchanan, on TV, advocating legislation to break up the "excessive power" of broadcast networks.

It would be awful if this group had a docile majority at this point in time. It doesn't, for which we may give thanks.

QUESTIONS RAISED BY INCIDENT AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a letter written by Mr. O. R. Strackbein and sent to Mr. Donald R. Larrabee, president of the National Press Club, should be of some interest to Members of Congress and to others. The letter, which is self-explanatory, follows:

OSCAR ROBERT STRACKBEIN,
October 27, 1973.

Mr. DONALD R. LARRABEE,
President, the National Press Club,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. LARRABEE: The purpose of this letter is to acquaint you with an incident that occurred last evening at the National Press Club. I shall relate the facts as best I remember them. Several witnesses were present but they may not have been within range to hear all the words that passed.

To begin with I was with a small party, five in all, including myself. We were guests of a member, and sat in the small waiting lounge having cocktails, awaiting the President's speech, when we went into the main lounge where the televised speech came on.

While we were in the smaller lounge I heard in a conversation within our group about some posters that represented the President and the former Vice President in prisoners' garb, with the usual stripes, and a series of concentric circles after the manner of a rifleman's target surrounding the

heads of these officials. Since there is sometimes cross-conversation in such situations I did not receive all the details, and thought no more of it.

After the President's speech was finished someone suggested that we look at the main hall that had been decorated for Halloween. We went in and only a short distance to the right in what seemed to be a stall or cove, my attention was called to some posters on the wall. It was then that I recalled the earlier conversation. As I went forward to inspect the posters I was appalled at seeing the President's likeness as previously described and also that of the former Vice President.

What I had not fully visualized before struck me now with the force of a shock when I saw the President's head encircled by a series of concentric circles centering on his forehead, approximately between his eyes. The image so greatly disturbed me, reflecting, as I did, that there was a virtual invitation to shoot the President.

The Halloween party was to be attended by youngsters and I thought of the lesson in citizenship they would receive from such a debasing and suggestive representation of the President.

Without further ado I tore down the posters and threw them on the floor. Immediately I was approached by a man, quite large of size, who told me that what I had done was a violation of the rules of the club and that he would have to ask me to leave. I said "Go ahead, ask me" or some similar response.

He asked me if I were a member. I said "no". He repeated that he must ask me to leave. I asked him who he was. He replied that he was the chairman of the Club's Board. I said I had been a member of the Club for some twenty years and was now here as a guest. He asked whose guest I was. I said I did not wish to involve him. He repeated that I must leave.

I responded that I would not leave and that if he wanted me out he would have to call a guard. By this time our host who had been some ten to fifteen feet away, as I judge it, came forward and said I was his guest. I then left the two and joined my group. In a matter of moments we were rejoined by our host who then took us into the dining room where we had dinner.

After the dinner was over our host, a former president of the Club, went back into the big hall and said that the posters had been put back on the wall. We shortly left the Club and did not attend the Halloween party. Therefore I do not know what actual use was made of the posters later. One member of our party said a hand type of gun was lying on the table, presumably a dart gun to be fired at the President's head. I have not verified this as a fact. The stall was indeed in the form of a shooting gallery.

It is, of course, not a question of whether the posters were to be used for this or some other purpose. It is also not merely a question of taste. My outrage, which was not premeditated, was instantaneous.

We have had several most unfortunate assassinations in this country in recent years. I am sure that these assassinations are a blot on our society, to be profoundly regretted. Yet if we insist on propagating hatred on a partisan plane against the heads of our government, those who do so may be regarded, not as reducing the likelihood of repetitions of unregenerate acts of violence, but as the sowers of seeds that can beget the most deplorable consequences.

I bring this complaint not as a former member of the National Press Club, but as a citizen who was so deeply shocked that he gave himself in his outrage to an act of a kind that is in no sense characteristic of him.

Any action that you may wish to take is, of course, in your discretion. I did believe that you should be apprised of the incident,

its cause and the degree of provocation. I feel that the roots of anarchistic violence or the violence of persons mentally or emotionally deranged will be found in incitations of the kind that the posters represented, and embodied as a most reprehensible example.

You will appreciate that I greatly regret being the bearer of such an unpleasant message; but I see no alternative.

Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN.

DEDICATION OF THE NEW RESEARCH AND EDUCATION BUILDING

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on November 2 of this year, the Honorable Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, was the guest of honor at the dedication of the new research and education building of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Kansas City, Mo.

All too often, the accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration are taken for granted and do not receive the space in the news media that they deserve.

So that my colleagues may share in the enlightening remarks delivered by Mr. Johnson, I offer them now for their perusal:

REMARKS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON

It is always a privilege and a pleasure for me to participate in the dedication of an addition to the Veterans Administration's hospital system—the Nation's finest as well as largest hospital system, I am proud to say.

But I especially appreciate this morning's ceremony because it focuses needed and deserved attention on VA medical research and VA medical training which, with patient care, give us VA health care's three-fold mission of care, research, and education.

Mr. Webster tells us that "dedication" means devotion to some work or cause.

No work is more important, and no cause more unselfish than quality health care—including medical research and education which contribute so importantly to such care, for ill and disabled and aging veterans.

It is to this work and this cause that we dedicate not only this magnificent addition to our Kansas City VA Hospital but also ourselves today.

In doing so, we are accepting the challenge to be worthy of the trust which the American people have placed in the Veterans Administration.

Our fellow citizens have said to us, to you and me, to the 165,000 skilled, dedicated men and women who are the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery, indeed, to all who share our responsibility and privilege of serving those who served:

"We want our veterans to have the best care in the world . . . and we are confident that VA medicine can provide such care."

This confidence is justified—never more so than today.

Do not misunderstand.

There has never been—and never will be—a time when the most visible of all VA benefits and services, our hospital and medical care program, could not be improved. But I think that the following facts—comparisons, if you will—evidence the growth and progress and accomplishments of VA medicine during the past four years. They also warrant my

very strong personal conviction that VA medicine will know an even more dynamic, rewarding, and exciting future.

I cite the past four years because of my official responsibility for, as well as my personal familiarity with the state of VA medicine during this period.

1. This year the VA health care system will provide inpatient care for a record 1.1 million veterans, compared with 776,000 four years ago. More than 9,000 of these patients will be cared for here at our Kansas City Hospital.

2. This year VA will handle 12 million outpatient visits—an all-time high—compared with 7.1 million four years ago.

More than 84,000 of these visits will be here at this hospital.

3. This year VA will spend a record \$78 million for medical and prosthetics research (compared with \$58 million four years ago), including more than \$1.5 million at our Kansas City Hospital.

4. This year VA will train 67,000 doctors, dentists, nurses, and other health care personnel in VA's hospitals—over 700 of these at our Kansas City Hospital—compared with 49,000 four years ago.

5. This year VA will spend 12 times the amount budgeted for hospital constructions four years ago.

6. This year VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery will be staffed by 25,000 more full-time employees than were on duty four years ago.

7. And this year VA will have a record high budget of \$2.7 billion for its health care system to accomplish the above essential goals, compared with \$1.4 billion four years ago.

This very day some form of VA patient care or support will be provided to upwards of 167,000 veterans.

We can agree, I think, that VA health care today is in the mainstream of modern medicine. More importantly we can be confident that VA health care will keep abreast of future medical progress, and the changing needs of the millions of veteran patients in the years ahead. Indeed the VA will help lead this medical progress through its research and education programs.

I would direct your attention to the \$5.2 million addition to our Kansas City VA Hospital which we are dedicating this morning, and suggest that its existence emphasizes far more effectively than any words of mine a fact which we should always keep in mind.

The VA hospital and medical care program is structured on the foundation of *research and education* as well as *patient care*. Patient care has always been, and will always be, the primary purpose—priority mission, if you will—of VA medicine.

But a moment ago I noted that VA will spend more than \$78 million this year for medical and prosthetics research. This translates into the involvement of VA medical investigators in nearly 6,000 research projects.

You are familiar with many of VA's medical research accomplishments and shared triumphs such as the virtual elimination of tuberculosis as a killer disease; the perfection of kidney transplants; development of the laser cane for the blind; portable hemodialysis units for home use; motorized wheelchairs for quadriplegics operated through nudge control or voice control or even breath control; and the heart pacemaker—the implanting of the first atomic powered pacemakers in the Western Hemisphere; and clinical proof that the early treatment of hypertension will lessen the incidence of death or crippling strokes from vascular disease.

And you know that the results of VA medical research are quickly made available to all of our citizens.

The point I want to emphasize is VA's unique capability for conducting wide-scale

cooperative research projects in clinical settings; our ability to conduct simultaneously the same research effort in many hospitals.

I submit that this research technique proves that the VA hospital system offers great potential for reducing the time required to test new medical treatments or theories.

Further, my VA associates and I believe that we can apply the same approach successfully in establishing, and demonstrating, new models or patterns of health care delivery—particularly with the appropriate utilization of allied medical personnel, such as the Physician's Assistant and the Clinical Nurse Practitioner.

To illustrate the national importance of VA's medical education and training, which cover some 60 professional and technical categories and which will be given ever greater emphasis and more effective support with this addition to our Kansas City Hospital, permit me to point out the following facts:

Nearly one-third of all physicians now practicing in the United States, and approximately one-half of those entering practice each year, have received a portion of their medical training in VA hospitals.

In addition, VA contributes directly to the education each year of over 1,000 dental students, over 20,000 basic nursing students, nearly one-fourth of all social work graduates, one-third of all dietetic interns, one-fifth of all Ph. D. candidates in clinical psychology, and one-fourth of all pharmacy interns and residents.

In light of these facts, I think it can be fairly said that the VA health care system has greatly assisted in increasing America's vital medical resources. It will continue to do so.

Now, let's take a close look at this Research and Education building addition to our Kansas City VA hospital.

This look should reveal two important truths.

First, this addition is not a separate entity that exists—and will operate independently of the hospital. On the contrary, it is a vital, integral part of the hospital.

Second, our Kansas City Veterans Administration Hospital, including the new Research-Education addition, is more than a single hospital, and more than just one of 170 hospitals in our total hospital system.

It is part—a vital part, to be sure—of the VA's nationwide health care system.

And when I say "system", I mean exactly that.

In addition to its hospitals, the VA health care system consists of domiciliary homes, restoration centers, nursing care units, and outpatient clinics operated directly by VA.

Furthermore, the VA health care system utilizes—and will continue to do so—non-VA facilities, such as other Federal, state and private hospitals, community and state nursing homes, state domiciliaries for veterans, and a variety of other extended care arrangements.

And, as many members of the Show Me State's medical community know from personal experience, VA's health care system also relies heavily on "home town"—or fee-basis physicians and dentists.

But to return to the Research and Education addition, each of you is cordially invited to take a studied, personal look at this facility. I sincerely hope that you will be able to make this tour so that you can see for yourselves how the VA carries out your wish—a nationwide wish—that veterans receive the fullest and finest VA health care possible, including medical research and education.

By way of a preliminary tour guide, let me mention some of the specialized programs and equipment that may not be apparent.

Our Kansas City VA Hospital is headquarters for the National Cooperative Urology Research group which is studying carcinoma of

the prostate. This program, which involves 26 other participating VA hospitals, has made substantial progress in evaluating and comparing treatment of cancer of the prostate.

Our Kansas City Hospital—and by now I am sure you realize that I consider the hospital and this new addition one and indistinguishable—has also been named the headquarters hospital and center laboratory site for the National VA Cooperative Study on Aspirin Therapy and Unstable Angina. This program will test whether aspirin can prevent serious complications in heart attacks.

Researchers at this hospital will have some of the most modern, sophisticated equipment for studies in cell processes and cell biochemistry.

In terms of specialized equipment, I would cite three examples:

To aid in this hospital's Clinical Pharmacology program, there is a highly sophisticated instrument that can identify even complex chemical compounds which will soon be purchased and installed.

In the hospital's Calcium Research Laboratory, the role of peptides from the parathyroid gland is being studied with regard to body calcium controls. Unique items of equipment permit researchers to build such biologically active peptides. Since loss of bone substance affects everyone over the age of forty, with no known way to reverse the process, great importance is attached to this type of investigation.

In another area, the use of computers will permit data equivalent to a full day's work to be collected and analyzed in a few thousandths of one second.

I am sure that you will leave here today properly impressed by the design and construction of this Research and Education addition, and by its furnishings and equipment.

But I know that you will also leave here fully aware of the fact that this facility and our Kansas City Veterans Administration Hospital, above all, means people. *It means:* The 9,000 patients who will be cared for at this hospital this year—and, of course, their families.

The tens of thousands of veterans who will be the beneficiaries of 84,000 outpatient examinations and treatments this year.

The 1,000 skilled and dedicated men and women who staff this hospital, including its new research and education addition.

The hundreds of unselfish volunteers who are so concerned enough about the welfare of our patients that they give thousands of hours each year to provide the companionship, comfort and care which no amount of money can buy.

The officers, faculty and students of the Kansas University Medical Center and the University of Missouri Dental School with which our VA hospital is privileged and proud to be affiliated.

And, of course, the officials and you good citizens of Kansas City whom my VA associates here are fortunate enough to be able to look to for friendship, neighborliness, professional, business and commercial services, fire and police protection, and other necessities and comforts of community life.

In just three more years, this Kansas City Veterans Administration Hospital will celebrate its Silver Anniversary. That observance, coinciding as it will with our Nation's bicentennial, will be a memorable one I am sure.

But I would also point out that this hospital's 25th Anniversary observance will also find World War I to be 58 years in the past, the average World War II veteran to have been out of uniform 30 years, and Korean Conflict veterans to have been back in civilian life nearly a quarter-of-a-century.

The few remaining Spanish-American War veterans will have celebrated, or getting ready to celebrate, their centennial birthdays; while the youngest of our Vietnam war

veterans will be in their early or mid-twenties.

But all of these veterans will have one thing in common.

A present or future need for VA hospital and medical care.

I can assure you today that the Veterans Administration health care system, including its Medical Research and Education programs, will be around, ready and able to provide that care.

Thank you again for joining my VA associates and me in this dedication ceremony.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY CALLAWAY SPEAKS BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 and 1966, I served in the House of Representatives with the Honorable HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, of Georgia. "Bo" is a West Point graduate and a lawyer. He is a man of unquestioned honor and unusual ability. The United States of America is indeed fortunate to have a man of his training and devotion to duty as Secretary of the Army. I submit for the record his speech of October 15, 1973, before the Association of the U.S. Army:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY
Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished guests:

I'm delighted to have this opportunity to be with you this afternoon. We in the Army are aware of your long-standing support for a strong National defense and we feel that the Nation owes you a debt of gratitude.

It is an exciting time for me to be Secretary of the Army. We are entering a historic time, a time of basic change, as we try to do what has never been done before. The Army has set out to provide security for this great country, to keep our global commitments, to stand ready to face an aggressor on a moment's notice—and to do all this with an Army of volunteers. No nation in history has tried to meet such massive and complex commitments without compelling people to serve, through one form of conscription or another. It is a challenge—a great challenge, one which I assure you we are doing our utmost to meet. Today I want to address this question with you—this question of meeting the need for an Army with a volunteer force.

Unfortunately, discussions of the volunteer Army are usually accompanied by emotional considerations about the value of the draft or of Universal Military Training. There are many, both in the military and out, who genuinely feel that the maintenance of a draft is important to our country, and so the debate continues. But the debate is on the wrong subject.

Those who continue to hold out the false hope that the Army can or ought to simply dodge the problems of the volunteer environment by quick return to the draft are not facing up to today's realities. The country doesn't want a draft today. The Congress doesn't want a draft today. The alternative then is a successful volunteer Army or failure for the Army. The US Army has never failed this country. It has always turned the hard challenges of history into success. So today, the challenge for all of us who support the Army is clear. We must set our minds to making the volunteer Army work.

And the volunteer Army is working! It is working because there are still young men and women in America who want to serve their country—this is "an idea whose time remains" for all Americans, young and old, of every race, color, and creed. And it is working because the Army offers to young men and women a satisfying life and solid benefits in conjunction with their service. There are those who feel we are trying to buy an Army. This is not the case. We are giving young men and women who serve in the Army a standard of living that is roughly comparable to the standard of living they might get in the civilian community for doing a similar job. This means higher pay; paid annual leave; complete, superb medical and dental care; life in much improved barracks, and more.

All of these measures are necessary. I support them wholeheartedly. But let me emphasize that we are not trying to buy an Army! We will get the Army that the Nation needs only by appeal to sacrifice and service.

And this brings me to the second most important way that we are making the volunteer Army work, by insuring that service to the country is a meaningful part of the young man or woman's life. We are making Army service a step forward in their lives, not an interruption. And to do this we are putting a great emphasis on education and training, and on insuring that our soldiers' jobs are important and useful.

We are doing this by making each soldier's job relate to the Army's mission, because this makes Army service mean something. Our young people want value from their lives. They want a job that matters and we've got that job. We are also working to eliminate unnecessary irritants. We think this will make the Army more attractive, and our surveys have borne this out.

We have developed a very attractive package of education and training. To the high school dropout who has the ability and motivation, we offer work toward a high school diploma, as an adjunct to training. To the high school graduate, an opportunity for college training, part of which may be as an adjunct to training. To junior college and college students, the possibility of further training, and even this may be as an adjunct to training. And to all of them, the Army offers vocational training that will be useful when the soldier returns to civilian life.

With a meaningful job, a decent standard of living, and real opportunities for continued education and training, young men and women can look upon a period of service to the country as a genuine step forward in their lives. And when they leave the Service, they will realize other very important advantages. For one thing, under the GI Bill, they are entitled to more education, provided by the government to its veterans. And they're more mature. The Army has trained them, given them each a mission, and then held them responsible for professional results. This responsibility develops maturity. Thus, both the education and experience of military service prepare them for better jobs when they leave the Army for civilian careers.

All of these benefits are pointed toward the first term volunteer. For those who choose to reenlist for the volunteer Army, however, more opportunities for education, maturity, and service accrue.

We have, today, the finest noncommissioned officer leadership training we have ever had, with progressive career steps going from the recruit right on through our top command sergeant major. Our men and women enjoy the benefits of our new Noncommissioned Officer Education System, a system which offers to the noncommissioned officer a progressive, professional military education roughly comparable to the superb system of schooling we have always offered to our officers. The system trains, educates, and

motivates our NCO leaders for the progressive challenges of an Army career.

Some of our strongest supporters don't fully understand today's Army. They think the Army lost something important when we initiated, for example, the idea of hiring civilian help—KPs—to work in the kitchens and dining rooms. They think that eliminating such irritants as KP has made the Army soft. But the Army's mission is not to peel potatoes; its mission is to fight. Peeling potatoes does not improve discipline or combat efficiency. So changes to some things held traditional in the past are in the wind, but if you look at them, you will see that each turns harder than ever on mission. We are not retreating from the Army's real business. The volunteer Army is ready to fight.

We do not have and we shall not have a permissive Army. We have and we shall have a disciplined Army, responsive to authority, and able to perform its mission in the service of the country. You expect it; the country deserves it; and I'm going to do my level best to see that it happens!

In brief, that's the program we have undertaken to attract young people, to encourage them to enter the Army. And once they're in, I know that many of them will choose to stay beyond their initial commitment, because they will see that the Army has a very fine career progression system.

I believe Americans will agree, then, that we have a package that is appealing to today's young people, appealing not only in terms of benefits, but in the opportunity for service to country. And the beauty of this is that it appeals to everyone in America. Service to country appeals equally to rich and poor, Northerner and Southerner, educated and uneducated. Pride in America and willingness to sacrifice for her is an ideal which knows no cultural or economic boundaries. In this fact lies the very strength of the Nation. I count on this appeal to give us an Army which mirrors America. It's not going to be a mercenary Army, it's going to be an all-American Army.

This then is our plan. It is not only our plan for the future, it is also a description of today's Army. For practical purposes, the draft ended for us on December 29, 1972, when the last draftee entered the Army. (Although a few deferred draftees entered later.) So we have had about 10 months' experience now in a volunteer environment, and I think it is appropriate that we review some of the results.

Because each month we openly discuss our goals and quotas, many have a distorted picture of our progress. They feel we are hopelessly short of recruiting goals, trying to make up the gap by lowering quality, and as a consequence, ending up with nothing worthwhile whatever. It is true that we have missed our goals during the past 10 months. But it is important to remember that our goals are akin to the salesman's goals—realistic, but difficult to meet.

What are the facts? During these past months, we have recruited into the volunteer Army some 124,000 young men and women; further, over 34,000 men and women have reenlisted during this period. In fact we have been running about 84 percent of our recruiting objective ever since December 29, 1972, when we abandoned the draft. And those who have come into the Army are of high quality. We have had a higher percentage of high school graduates entering the Army since the draft ended—about 10 percent higher—than we had in the 6 months before the end of the draft. As a result, we now have an Active Army of over 794,000 and this is 97 percent of our programmed strength. Total accessions, then, have fallen somewhat short of our goals, but we are still filled far above any level of concern, and quality is high.

And we have many encouraging signs. Last

year we decided to reactivate the 9th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Washington, but the manpower was not at hand. So we told the commander, General Fulton, that if he wanted a division, to take his cadre, the Division colors, and go out and recruit a division. General Fulton and his recruiters did just that. They began a vigorous recruiting campaign and today that Division stands at 102 percent strength, essentially filled with enlisted volunteer soldiers. Now, this is a real success story, a living example which illustrates concretely that the volunteer Army program is not an impossible dream, but a workable idea, and it is typical of many other units with similar successes.

We do not minimize our recruiting problems; we spend our time and energy working on them. We are trying many new approaches to recruiting, which stress quality together with quantity—such as increasing the number of recruiters, expanding our unit-of-choice and station-of-choice options, screening out poor soldiers in our reenlistments, administering new entrance tests, and even weeding out misfits in basic training. These efforts will continue.

Some also have expressed concern that the volunteer Army was doomed to failure because it would bring a decline in discipline. That has not been the case. If we compare discipline trends for FY 72 with FY 73, a period which includes both draft and volunteer Army experience, we find that rates for AWOL, desertion, crimes of violence, crimes against property, courts-martial, and separations under less than honorable conditions, are down.

Virtually every major indicator of discipline except drug offenses has, in fact, remained or turned positive in the volunteer Army. Whatever factors contribute to this picture, it is clear that today's volunteer soldier is not causing an increase in disciplinary problems.

Many also had expected the volunteer Army to herald the demise of our National Guard and Army Reserve as viable outfits. No such demise is in sight, although we do face problems here. We have seen modest reductions in the strengths of both our Reserve Components from the December 1972 levels, a trend in fact dating from mid-1971. But current indications give us some encouragement that we may be able to restrain this decline. We have in the past several months, for example, been successful in recruiting trained, experienced, prior-service personnel into our Reserve Components to offset some of our shortfall. As you know, Reserve Component strength remains critically important, so we are very much concerned that it continue to receive close attention. Under the total force policy any future emergency buildup will have to rely upon the National Guard and Reserve rather than a draft for initial and primary augmentation of our Active forces. I expect the improving image of the volunteer Army to have the positive effect on the health of our Reserve Component recruitment that is needed.

Finally, combat readiness, which is the heart of our business, has shown significant improvement. When the draft ended, we had 13 divisions on the books, but only 10 fully formed. Of the 13 divisions, only 4 met the Army's stringent readiness standards and were considered ready for combat. By contrast, we now have 13 divisions fully operational and 10 ready for combat. Thus, our divisions today, judged by the stringent standards reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, much more nearly meet their goals in terms of authorized strength, personnel job qualification, unit training, equipment on hand, and equipment serviceability than they did at the end of the draft. Six months to a year from now, I believe our readiness posture will be even better.

These simple facts and figures point to one conclusion—The Army is better today than

it was at the end of the draft. But the figures are not nearly so meaningful as the subjective feel of those in the Army. I certainly don't pretend to be an expert on this, but by the end of this month I will have visited all 13 of the Army's active divisions, as well as many other posts and stations. During every visit I have talked with new soldiers, with senior noncommissioned officers, with junior officers, with senior officers and commanders. I can tell you that without any question, today's Army is a far better Army, far more prepared for combat than it was at the end of the draft. I can just feel it everywhere I go. It's in the air. Discipline is better, morale is better, training is better, and equipment is better. The Army's future is indeed now.

And, what is more important, all of our vital trends, with the possible exception of drug abuse (and we are working hard and effectively on that one), are in the right direction today. Let me emphasize—your Army is good now, ready to fight, and getting better with the passage of time. I foresee no doom ahead. Six months from today we will be better, and after that, better still.

This picture that I give you of today's Army is enthusiastic and optimistic, and purposely so. I am extremely proud of today's Army and what has been done to make it work in the volunteer atmosphere. But I recognize our challenges. Benjamin Franklin once said, "the man who expects nothing . . . shall never be disappointed." I believe he would share my belief that men who do expect something worthwhile and are willing to work hard for it, are apt to achieve it, even if the task is difficult and unfamiliar.

We are dally working on new, innovative, and exciting ideas to insure that we get the right number of qualified men and women to man our Army. It will not be easy. It will perhaps be the toughest job that the U.S. Army has ever been called upon to do, but I am certain that today's Army will be equal to the challenge.

We in the Army have always needed the active support of the American people. Today, we need it even more than ever before. Even our strongest critics have recognized that the one vital element necessary for the success of the volunteer Army lies beyond the Army itself. I'm talking about public support. We need your help as we plow new ground, as we steer an uncharted course to give the country the best Army it has ever had. Without your help, we cannot succeed; with it, we cannot fail. Together, we can meet the challenges and prove worthy of the Nation's trust.

Thank you.

A LEGAL COUP D'ETAT?

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Congress continues to be inundated with communications and suggestions concerning the future of this great Nation, and the actions that we, as Members, should be taking. It is especially important that we should retain our perspective, and our long-range vision of what we feel will be good for the Nation as a whole. In aid of this balance, I want to offer for my colleagues' information an editorial from the Sarasota (Fla.) Herald-Tribune:

[From the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, Oct. 23, 1973]

A LEGAL COUP D'ETAT?

The orchestration and choreography have been impeccable. The greedy motivation, disguised by skillful media manipulation, could not be faulted by Machiavelli. The stakes are the highest—nothing less than control of the Government of the United States.

"Across the nation calls for impeachment mingled with cries of amazement in an emotional outpouring reaction from America." So read the AP's lead story on Monday afternoon after an extraordinary weekend during which, on the home front, President Nixon forced out of his administration three high-ranking members of the Justice Department, while, on the world diplomatic front, he and his Secretary of State negotiated with Russia an end to the Middle East war and a consequent withdrawal of humanity from the nuclear brink.

Impeach the man who ended the disastrous Vietnam war—the fourth war in this century initiated under the leadership of the Democratic Party? Impeach the man who has achieved the impossible in bringing the real hope of peace between the Arabs and the Jews? The very idea will be viewed by history as grotesque!

But it has now become clear that nothing less than capturing control of our government is and has been the objective of those who cynically have exploited the scandal called "Watergate" to arouse the American people and in this process, incidentally, have shaken the confidence of our foreign allies in the American system, contributed to devaluing the dollar in world trade and endangering the detente achieved by President Nixon with the two Communist superpowers.

A coup d'etat has never been carried out in American history. But skillful manipulation of the constitutional process has now brought us perilously close to a coup—not through violence and military overthrow but through devious political manipulation of the unhappy events of the last year.

The resignation of Vice President Agnew has set House Speaker Carl Albert, a Democrat, in line for succession if President Nixon should die, be assassinated or removed by impeachment. His elevation to the Presidency would not mean merely a change in the man holding that office, but a complete change of the party in control, and of the Cabinet, and of all the apparatus of the Executive Department.

Senator Ted Kennedy's call for holding up senatorial consent to the appointment of Representative Gerald Ford as Vice President was the keynote speech in the campaign to obtain for the left wing Democrats what was denied them by the overwhelming vote of the people in the 1972 election.

Regardless of the rights or wrongs of the Watergate scandals, regardless of the legalistic question of whether or not privacy of presidential papers extends to presidential tapes, regardless of the multitude of petty controversies that befog the scene, the hard fact remains that the American people are entitled to a Vice President appointed and confirmed promptly under the provisions of the 25th Amendment of the Constitution.

Many sincere Democrats and Republicans have been stampeded into losing sight of what it would mean in division of our nation, turmoil in our government, temptations to rashness by our enemies, and peril to the foundations of our 200-year-old Republic should the President be hounded out of office. But the Ted Kennedys, the Tip O'Neils, the George Meany and the Bella Abzug who lead the pack baying for Nixon's blood know exactly what they are doing.

The basic tenet of this newspaper has always been that the American people, given all the facts and time to analyze them, will ultimately come to the right decision. We

have not lost that faith. We believe that unless fate or events move so rapidly that discussion and analysis are stifled, the judgment of the American people will be to reject and condemn the insidious campaign to steal the presidency from the man and the philosophy on whom it was bestowed one year ago by the majesty of the elective process.

**BALTIMORE CITY HOSPITALS'
BICENTENNIAL**

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, for the Government and the people of the United States, these are troubled times. As we Americans approach the Bicentennial of our Nation, we have an opportunity and obligation to look back upon the struggles and accomplishments of our forefathers, and upon the spirit of determination which guided their actions. Looking back in time we can find sources of a renewal of determination, faith in our future and accord among our citizens that we so desperately need.

This month marks the 200th anniversary of a venerable medical institution, Baltimore City Hospitals. The occasion reminds us that we have always been a society that helps those who cannot help themselves. We have come to the aid of the victims of misfortune through our churches, through philanthropy large and small, and through the donation of our time as volunteers. But we have also done so through our institutions of government.

In November 1773, the Maryland Legislature appropriated funds to purchase land for the purpose of establishing an alms house in Baltimore. That was very much an act of charity by the body politic, for in those days, before the modern era of medicine, hospitals were chiefly for the poor and destitute.

The Alms House quickly outgrew its original role as a shelter for the infirm and aged and soon was playing an important part in the development of medical services and education in Baltimore. Medical students began clinical instruction at the Alms House as early as 1812. In 1840, under the direction of the distinguished Baltimore physician, Dr. William Power, the institution began the modern scientific practice of keeping accurate medical histories and progress reports. The system of medical instruction and consultation was greatly expanded toward the end of the last century in cooperation with the existing Baltimore medical schools, helping to develop the brilliant medical tradition that has so distinguished Baltimore.

Today Baltimore City Hospitals, descendant of the old Alms House, carries on that fine tradition and has greatly expanded its capacity to serve the Baltimore community. It has grown to a modern complex of medical facilities on a 240-acre site overlooking Chesapeake Bay. It provides every kind of health treatment, with services ranging from

dentistry to psychiatry, surgery to chronic care. Last year Baltimore City Hospitals cared for nearly 55,000 emergency cases, delivered more than 3,000 babies and treated more than 90,000 outpatients.

This 200-year tradition of service and innovation are clearly evident in City Hospitals' present-day treatment programs, many of which are unique in Maryland and the object of national interest and acclaim. The Highlandtown Kiwanis Burn Unit provides specialized intensive care to burn victims, employing the most advanced techniques to ensure physical and psychological recovery. The Coronary Care Center, recognizing that the majority of deaths from heart attack occur before the victim reaches the hospital, has developed with fire department cooperation a program for radioing cardiograms to the hospital from rescue ambulances. Rapid, accurate diagnosis enables trained ambulance crews to begin treatment while the patient is still en route to the emergency room.

Baltimore City Hospitals also play a central role in Maryland's statewide effort to care for critically ill infants. Newborn babies are brought in by State police helicopters for treatment of lung disease, respiratory tract deformities, and heart defects. Once at the hospital the child is assured of treatment by a specially trained expert staff utilizing the most modern facilities.

In addition to medical care and instruction, nationally important research programs are an integral and essential part of the activities carried on at Baltimore City Hospitals. Specialists there are engaged in a challenging approach to the treatment of cancer through the use of chemotherapy. The U.S. Gernotology Research Center was established at Baltimore City Hospitals in 1940 by the National Institute of Health. It carries on enormously significant studies in the physiological, biological, psychological, and social factors of aging and recently opened a new \$11 million facility.

As it embarks upon its third century of service, Baltimore City Hospitals continues to expand and improve its programs for the community. Not only are its door open to the critically ill in need of specialized personnel and facilities, but it has undertaken to establish and maintain special care and treatment centers in adjacent neighborhoods. These Affiliated Community Health Centers will offer outpatient and preventive medicine programs, often to persons who now have little access to quality medical care.

This newest effort, reflecting an important trend in our thinking on the goals and means of health care delivery, is yet further testimony to Baltimore City Hospitals' tradition of community service and medical achievement. It is also proof of what the cooperation of a skilled and dedicated staff, concerned government officials, and private groups and individuals can achieve. On the occasion of its bicentennial I am pleased to join in this tribute to one of the Nation's outstanding medical institutions. Baltimore City Hospitals can be proud of its continuing tradition of community

service, and Baltimore's citizens can be proud of the great medical institution their support has helped to build.

A BETTER ARMY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the heart of the volunteer Army program has been an effort to strengthen the Army as an institution—to make it a better Army. Increased professionalism has been seen as the best way to strengthen the Army. And reducing the sources of dissatisfaction was recognized as key to the goal of improving Army life.

Much has been done toward furthering these goals in this transitional period to a volunteer Army. Efforts have been made to improve recruiting, barracks life, family living, post care, military pay, and health care for the soldier and his or her dependents.

An article in the August issue of *Soldier* magazine discussed what has been and is being done to make the Army a better institution. The first half of that article follows:

A BETTER ARMY

July 1973 has passed.

How did the Army tackle its problems?

What progress has it made toward becoming an all-volunteer force? How's it working so far?

For starters, planners had to ask certain basic questions:

What type of Army was wanted?

What type of volunteer should it actively seek?

What changes would the Army have to make to attract and retain enough volunteers?

How could a changed public image of an all-volunteer force be projected?

Drawing on the resources of research agencies, special boards and experts eminent in behavioral science, sociology and psychology the Army began to get answers. Patterns and profiles emerged.

The All-Volunteer Army would have to be a better Army with strengthened professionalism providing positive incentives to military service—with Army life improved by eliminating or reducing most of the sources of dissatisfaction.

To reach the prototype volunteer—an 18-year-old high school graduate or holder of the GED Equivalency Certificate who could meet the quality mental, physical and moral standards for military service—a modernized recruiting and entrance system would have to be established.

As a first step toward these goals, the Modern Volunteer Army (MVA) Program was born in January 1971 with Project VOLAR.

VOLAR served as a test-bed for experimenting, evaluating and refining a number of new approaches under conditions of limited application before they were adopted Army-wide. Initially it was conducted at four stateside installations—Fort Ord, CA, Fort Benning, GA, Fort Carson, CO, and Fort Bragg, NC—and at two U.S. Army Europe installations.

By the time VOLAR ended in June 1972 it had been expanded to nine additional CONUS installations, Alaska and Hawaii, at an approximate cost of \$10 million.

Reaching the Recruit. As changes were

made within the Army to attract qualified volunteers the recruiting force was changing, too.

Project VOLAR worked on the image from within. The recruiting force carried the message to the prospective volunteer on the outside.

The heart of the MVA/Project VOLAR Program was an effort to strengthen the Army as an institution—to make it a better Army.

Professionalism was seen as the best way to strengthen the Army while reducing the sources of dissatisfaction would improve Army life.

Emphasis was placed on improving professional competence plus building a strong sense of accomplishment and achievement among Army men and women of all ranks. This meant:

Getting back to the basics of soldiering. Where possible, the soldier is freed from non-military chores such as KP, guard duty, grass-cutting and other housekeeping chores. This concept recognizes that what soldiers do on their military jobs is the critical element. Within VOLAR's budgetary limitations, civilians were hired to perform KP and other housekeeping chores. Additional labor-saving devices such as power mowers and other equipment were purchased to increase efficiency in those tasks.

Providing exciting, meaningful training. Under decentralized training procedures the unit commander is made responsible for planning, managing and executing training programs which challenge the individual soldier to demonstrate his ability against high standards and measure his accomplishments by testing actual performance. "Hands-On" training gets the soldier working on his weapon or equipment early. Adventure training offers an added attraction. The soldier is placed in an environment requiring him to employ initiative in accomplishing given tasks. Men in small units develop self-reliance moral and physical courage and mutual confidence by participating in mountain climbing, boating, survival and endurance feats and exploring.

Encouraging educational development. Under MVA/VOLAR vocational and general education opportunities were expanded through accredited civilian contract schools. The program is aimed at standardization of curriculum offerings, admission and residency requirements through a worldwide association of civilian contract schools.

Another significant goal of the program provides careerists with the opportunity to advance their skills training and general education level during normal duty hours. Each Soldier who has not graduated from high school can receive on-duty professional instruction while earning a high school diploma. Soldiers who completed high school can pursue vocational training and baccalaureate education during normal duty hours. The program permits a logical educational progression during the soldier's entire career.

Fostering professional leadership. This program is designed to develop outstanding leaders, officers and NCO's, and allow them to properly exercise that leadership. Action was taken on several levels: Establishment of an NCO Educational System (NCOES); stabilized tours for commanders; and an improved Officer Personnel Management System (OPMS) and an Enlisted Qualitative Management Program (QMP).

The NCO Education System (NCOES) involves a three-level program of professional training and educational development for career NCOs. Careerists return to school periodically for training in individual career fields. The program consists of three progressive levels: Basic, Advanced and Senior. In Basic level courses selected E-4s and E-5s are prepared for duty and increased responsibilities as E-6s and E-7s. Advanced level courses prepare selected E-6s and E-7s for

duties as E-8s and E-9s. Senior level courses for selected E-8s are offered at the Sergeants Major Academy at Fort Bliss, Tex.

Stabilized Tours for Commanders—an impossibility during the Vietnam war—would be established. Under the MVA/VOLAR concept brigade and battalion command tours were established at 18 months minimum and company command tours at 12 months minimum.

Setting Up a New Officer Professional Management System provides officers with proper skills to meet basic Army requirements. The program's four basic objectives are: improve professionalism; put the most qualified commanders in command of troops; increase specialization; and improve officer motivation and career satisfaction. Under OPMS the promotion system was revised and officers are now required to develop dual skills.

The Enlisted Qualitative Management Program (QMP) was initiated in February 1971. Under QMP, reenlistment is denied to persons who are not promoted or recommended for promotion within designated periods of time. Through qualitative screening reenlistment is also denied to persons who are considered to have low potential for advancement to higher grades.

Improving Army life means removing, where possible, the irritants and inadequacies which detract from the environment in which the military man and his family live. This means improving the soldier's total environment: barracks life, family housing, post services and pay.

Barracks Life. Lack of privacy was found to be one of the most widely voiced complaints. Some progress had been made prior to the Vietnam build-up but the twin pressures of wide-ranging commitments and budgetary limitations made the going slow. Progress increased noticeably under MVA/VOLAR.

MVA funds were made available in late 1971 to determine what effect barracks privacy would have on service attractiveness. Large platoon bays were partitioned into two- and four-man living spaces, each furnished with a rug, desk, chair and lamp. Soldiers were permitted to individualize their quarters. Congress appropriated \$55.5 million to expand the barracks privacy program in Fiscal Year 1972, with funds going mostly for modernization of permanent barracks. The Fiscal Year 1973 budget contained \$238 million for construction of new barracks including some \$16,000 new spaces, plus modernization of \$53,000 existing barracks spaces.

To further upgrade the soldier's environment contracts totaling \$63 million were recently awarded for construction of newly designed barracks at Fort Hood, TX, Fort Carson, CO, and Fort Sill, OK. The new buildings will offer increased privacy in three-man living areas.

Improving Family Living has generally meant building more units and extending family housing eligibility to all married personnel except trainees.

Improving Post Services includes construction and modernization of chapels, schools, commissaries and recreational facilities. Commissary and Post Exchange operating hours can be extended and a larger selection of merchandise provided for the soldier and his family.

Central In-Out processing centers are being established at all posts, with special emphasis given to providing friendly, courteous service.

The long-established policy of providing sponsors for families on Permanent Change of Station to overseas commands has been extended stateside, with the gaining units required to appoint a sponsor for the soldier and his family on CONUS PCS.

Health Care for the Soldier and his Dependents is also being improved. Quality of service is being upgraded with clinical operations expanded to provide a full range of

services during hours convenient to the patients.

Improving the Soldier's Pay has long been goal of Army planners. The gains made during the 1960s benefited career soldiers but were of little assistance to the first-term soldier.

MVA/VOLAR studies showed that if the Army was to become all-volunteer and still meet its overall manpower requirements, it would have to achieve and maintain a rate of pay comparable to civilians of equivalent ages, skills and education.

Recognizing that the first term soldier suffered the most severe pay inadequacies the military pay boost approved by the Congress effective November 1971 provided for roughly doubling the pay of a private. An E-2 received a base pay of \$85.80 in 1964. By mid-1973 his base pay totalled \$342.30.

Smaller increases went to those in higher grades and with longer time in service. An increase in basic quarters allowance was enacted.

Recruiting Retooled. As these people-oriented changes came in rapid succession, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command began getting the word out to the public.

"We had to learn to communicate with today's youth in a manner they understand," said Major General John Q. Henion, Commander of the Recruiting Command.

"We could no longer sit in the recruiting stations and wait for the volunteer to come to us. But at the same time we had to remember that with the reduction in the size of the Army it would become increasingly important that the volunteer we enlisted would meet the high standards that had been established.

"For example, judges and probation officers used to offer young offenders an alternative—join the Army or go to jail or on probation. We have spent a lot of time and energy getting this policy quashed across the country. Recruiters know this is strictly forbidden and judges are getting the message.

"We have also found that men and women who score poorly on the Armed Forces Qualification Test are less likely to succeed. We have a ceiling on the number who can be accepted in that category (IV). You can always find exceptions but the percentages are against them.

"From the numbers standpoint, you measure a recruiter's performance by how well he meets his assigned objective. But this isn't always the whole thing. We know he has to make himself known and respected in the community in which he works. This requires that a considerable amount of time be spent on public and community relations projects. He has to make and keep a variety of contacts because today's contacts mean tomorrow's enlistments. He has a full-time job and it certainly isn't an easy one.

"Once we began to get the quality volunteer's attention with our advertising we had to offer something he was interested in. Enlistment is just the first step in building an All-Volunteer Army. We had to look beyond basic training and AIT and offer the new soldier a meaningful, worthwhile job in his unit.

"Our enlistment options were expanded to include train and travel, unit of choice enlistments, station of choice and guaranteed school options.

"A Delayed Entry Program which permitted young men to enlist in the reserves and come on active duty up to 6 months later was established and proved quite successful. This enabled the young man to complete high school or tie up any loose ends prior to his entry on active duty. We later extended the program to Women's Army Corps enlistees."

To reach the quality volunteer, an additional \$10.6 million was funded for advertising in FY 1971. "Today's Army Wants to Join You" was the theme of a 3-month test on radio and TV. Commercials were keyed to the people-oriented changes. Young men and

women were invited to call a toll-free number indicating which enlistment option they were interested in and a recruiter would be in touch within 24 hours.

How successful was the paid advertising? Recruiting Command officials considered it highly successful. In the Los Angeles recruiting main station alone, an average of 50 additional calls were received each day during the test period.

By the end of Fiscal Year 1972 the number of true volunteers (those not motivated by the draft) increased by 41 percent over FY 71—from 76,000 to 107,000. Draft calls decreased from 152,000 to 25,000 during that period.

WETIP PROGRAM SERVING COMMUNITIES WITHOUT CHARGE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, I sent the following letter, along with a copy of H.R. 10602, to Mr. Thomas M. Jones, president of radio station KBON in San Bernardino, Calif.:

DEAR TOM: Congressman John Conyers (whose district includes much of the area served by your former Detroit sister station) and a handful of other Members of Congress, including myself, have just introduced a bill which might interest you. Entitled the "Community Anticrime Assistance Act of 1973," this legislation would benefit such programs as the WETIP program you have promoted so extensively.

Keep in mind that legislation such as this generally takes quite a while to pass, if it passes at all; I wouldn't want you to get your hopes up too high. But I thought you would want to know that I am thinking of you.

Best regards,

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Member of Congress.

On October 17, I received a reply from Mr. Jones, thanking me for my letter and adding that the bill "certainly has many merits" and hoping that it will be passed by the Congress. Then Mr. Jones continued:

The WETIP program, however, is a "grass roots organization" (pardon the pun) that is strictly volunteer except for several paid members. Under no circumstances does WETIP want any grants or aides (sic) from government whether they be local, state or federal. Our experiences find that any time government gets involved, we have problems.

And 12 days later I received the following letter from Mr. Bill Brownell, the State director of the WETIP program:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: This date I received a copy of your letter to Tom Jones of Radio Station KBON, and his reply to you which I also would like the liberty of answering, because of the reference to We T.I.P. Inc.

The drug and resulting crime problem is a matter which gravely concerns every thinking American, and must be combatted on a wide front.

We T.I.P. Inc. is composed of service and fraternal organizations which wish to fill an obvious gap between law enforcement agencies, and rehabilitation programs.

The bill which you introduced has obvious merit, but the spirit found among We T.I.P. Inc. volunteers is now, and has always been quite firm in a policy of "GRASS ROOTS EFFORTS" upon which we were founded.

This program has spread statewide on a very simple premise of citizen involvement or doing work for a common good on a free enterprise system. Thanks to such organizations as the Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, Elks, Optimists, Jr. Womans clubs and Womans clubs the spirit of service to man kind is alive and well.

We T.I.P. is willing and able to serve the State of California in the battle against the drug menace without one cent cost to the tax payer and we have hopes of spreading nation-wide.

Should We T.I.P. be called upon by congress to reveal the success pattern now established, and operating in California we shall do so with pride, but we must also respectfully decline federal and state funding as in the past.

I shall be delighted to receive word on any bills intended to reduce crime in the streets, keep up the fight.

Very sincerely yours,

BILL BROWNELL.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a rare and pleasant surprise to have people engaged in such work tell us that they not only are not seeking Government financial assistance, but actually would decline such assistance if it were offered. I am sure that our colleagues will also be interested in such a remarkable program, and I will, therefore, insert in the RECORD at this point an article on the subject which appeared in the September 1973 issue of Reader's Digest:

JOIN THE WAR AGAINST CRIME AND DRUG PUSHERS

(By Trevor Armbrister)

Community-action programs that encourage citizens to help police have proved remarkably successful. Here's how they work, and how you can get involved

A husky young man was watching television at the Randavoo Lounge in Amarillo, Texas, on October 26, 1971. Suddenly, he grabbed a leaded pool cue and crashed it over the head of waitress Dora Ward. Then, pulling out a gun, he fired a warning shot, scooped up the money in the cash register and fled into the street.

Waitress Ward told police that she had never seen her assailant before, and no one else had been in the lounge at the time. Fingerprints were too smudged to be of use. The case seemed headed for the list of unsolved crimes.

However, Jim Pratt, news director of Amarillo's television station KVII, remembered having read an article about a Detroit News feature called "Secret Witness," which offered rewards for information leading to arrests and convictions in cases that baffled police. In four years, Secret Witness had helped to solve 17 murders and numerous other crimes in the Detroit area. Maybe, Pratt thought, KVII-TV could follow suit.

Amarillo police officials responded enthusiastically, and listed eight unsolved cases for Pratt to feature, one per evening, in a 90-second spot on the 10 p.m. news. Kicking off his Secret Witness program on January 18, 1972, Pratt described the Randavoo robbery, offered a \$500 reward, and asked potential informants to call a special number. That very evening, he received a call naming Joe Walter Neves as the culprit. Neves' photograph was slipped into a collection and shown to waitress Ward. She identified Neves as her assailant, and he was soon tried and sentenced to a five-year prison term. (An appeal is pending.)

For the past several years, radio station WBBR in Buffalo, N.Y., has maintained a special "Crime Line" to solicit information

*See "Secret Witness—New Weapon Against Crime," The Reader's Digest, November, '71.

about criminals. Early in 1972, station president Bill McKibben heard about a Tampa, Fla., program called "TIP" (Turn-In-a-Pusher),** which encouraged residents to identify anyone they suspected of selling drugs. The effort had been quite successful, and on May 3 WBBR instituted its on TIP line.

Less than two weeks later, an anonymous informant told WBBR that Paul J. Smith was peddling narcotics from his home on Buffalo's Grant Street. The information was relayed to the Erie County sheriff's office, and on May 22 an undercover agent purchased 427 grams of heroin from Smith, who was arrested and convicted for sale and possession of drugs.

The number of such community-action programs is rising dramatically. At least a dozen newspapers and radio or TV stations have now initiated a Secret Witness feature, and TIP is functioning in 79 communities. Says John E. Ingersoll, former director of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, "People are just itching to take action against criminals and pushers in the streets." The efforts vary in sponsorship, scope and success. Some are the creation of newspapers, chambers of commerce or local service organizations such as Lions, Kiwanis and Elks. Some restrict their focus to hard drugs, while others encompass marijuana and miscellaneous crimes, even purse-snatching. Most guarantee the anonymity of the informant and pay rewards, usually after a conviction has been obtained.

No one claims, of course, that such supplements to traditional police activity will or can stop crime completely or put drug pushers out of business. Yet they have contributed to hundreds of arrests, and resulted in a significant number of convictions. Even more important they have proved that there is something citizens can do to help combat the nation's skyrocketing crime rate—up 187 percent in the last decade.

As Philadelphia Daily News managing editor David Lawrence, Jr., says of that paper's Secret Witness, "The cases that we get are the toughest ones, those the police can't solve." He tells of March 20, 1971, when six Philadelphia youths set out to visit friends in another part of the city. En route, one of them attempted to steal a car in a gas station. When station operator William Pas-trana, armed with a tire iron, tried to thwart the theft, he was fatally shot by one of the youths.

Police had no clues. The case seemed tailor-made for Secret Witness, and the Daily News offered a \$4000 reward for information. In February 1972, a Secret Witness tip led to the arrest of 19-year-old Robert Lee Jones, who subsequently confessed to the shooting.

On December 26, 1970, two men held up a sporting-goods store in Long Beach, Calif., stole \$1000 and approximately 20 guns, then executed the father-son proprietors, Cyril and James Ball. Robbery Detectives Don Murray and Y. D. Carter interviewed scores of area residents and spent between 700 and 1000 hours searching for leads. "We didn't have a thing to go on," Carter recalls. In desperation, police appealed for help to the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram Secret Witness feature, and last October 27 an anonymous caller identified two ex-convicts who were back in a Louisiana state prison for armed robbery. They have since been arraigned and charged with the murders.

Secret Witness programs are achieving equally encouraging results elsewhere. Since its inception in July 1970, the Houston Post "Public Protector" series has helped police solve eight homicides and three armed robberies. Thus far, the newspaper has paid rewards totaling \$22,500. In the past 18 months, the Sacramento Bee's Secret Witness feature has contributed to the solution of 93 crimes. In Pontiac, Mich., the North Oakland Chamber of Commerce "Silent Ob-

**See "TIP" Is Turning In Pushers," The Reader's Digest, October '72.

server" program has led police to four murderers and has helped to prevent a planned assassination.

TIP programs are proving equally effective. In Ontario, Calif., for example, 39-year-old Bill Brownell, a former deputy sheriff of Los Angeles County, discovered that drugs were being sold at his son's junior high school. "They were backing up station wagons in front of the local junior high schools and selling the stuff openly," he says. When Brownell read about Tampa's TIP success, he sought and got help from local service clubs—Lions, Kiwanis, Elks, Junior Women's Club—and on January 5, 1972, incorporated We TIP as a nonprofit organization. He designed a long form to screen out crank calls, hired a TIP operator and worked with the local postmaster to set up a "drop" location system for the payment of rewards.

In its first year of operation, We TIP received 1859 calls—leading to 117 arrests and 21 convictions to date. Among them: a 12-man heroin ring in Pomona; a LaHabra couple with a pound of heroin, 8000 phenobarbital pills and 4500 amphetamines in their possession; a high-school student peddling amphetamines to his classmates; and a San Diego man smuggling in cocaine from Mexico. We TIP has grown into a statewide network; one toll-free call can now relay information to local authorities in 65 California communities.

"In the past," Brownell explains, "a citizen might call police and say that 'Joe Jones' was selling heroin. He'd have to go to court to testify. Joe would receive a light sentence, and the citizen would live in fear of reprisal."

Now, before beginning operations in a new city, Brownell promotes "we tip week." The script is always the same. The mayor issues a proclamation, and we tip bumper stickers appear on police cars. Next day, service-club members place posters on each merchant's door. Other service-club members address high-school students and teachers alike, and the media carry announcements. "By the end of that week," Brownell says, "the city knows the program. Its citizens act as one, and there's no recrimination. The pusher can't intimidate everyone."

The New York Daily News launched "Program Pusher" last February, offering no rewards but stressing that the anonymity of informants would be maintained. In the first four months of operation, more than 3900 tips poured in, enabling police to make 102 drug arrests.

These programs offer a solution to the growing need for more citizen involvement in the fight against crime. In the belief that more and more Americans will want to take part in them, The Reader's Digest has produced a special booklet entitled "How You Can Join the War Against Crime and Drug Pushers." It cites instances where Secret Witness and tip have helped police nab criminals, then lists specific instructions as to how to set up similar programs in your community. Individual copies are available free to any reader. Chambers of commerce, service clubs, civic groups and law-enforcement officials who wish to distribute the booklet may obtain large quantities if they will describe their specific needs. Address requests to Reprint Editor, The Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Bill Brownell, Tom Jones, and the many other public-spirited citizens who are working so hard to do something about one of America's most critical and difficult problems. There are many things that the Federal, State and local governments can do—and should be doing—to reduce crime, but in the long run we must all fail without the help of concerned, committed private citizens who are willing to do more than their share for the benefit of us all.

OIL COMPANIES PROSPER DURING THE "OIL SHORTAGE"

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the third quarter figures for net income by the major oil companies were published by U.S. Oil Week in its issue of October 29, 1973. As the publication expressed it, "Predictions of a leveling off in the oil companies' profits went out the window" as initial earnings reports came in. Every company made significant gains, and, among the majors, Gulf, Exxon, and Mobil reported gains of 91 percent, 80 percent, and 64.1 percent respectively.

We have listened for years to the complaints and warnings of the major oil companies that profits must go higher or the industry would not have enough incentive and capital to explore for and develop new reserves. Recently, the "oil shortage" has been invoked by the major oil companies as the rationale for a massive advertising campaign extolling their civic virtue, urging the deregulation of natural gas, contending that environmental safeguards have made the development of additional energy reserves unworkably expensive, and otherwise painting a picture of inadequate profitability for the industry. These income figures, however, tell a different story.

What is to be done? The Nation faces a national energy crisis, one which threatens the quality of life at home and the integrity of our policies overseas. Price controls have been imposed, but they are notably lenient for the oil industry, containing as they do "production incentives" for the major companies. It is an appalling situation; a crisis is at hand, but oil companies are making record profits, under price controls.

The truth is that the major oil companies have amassed so much power and influence that they can prosper at the expense of the American public and the American economy. While the small independents in the petroleum field have been going out of business, the majors have been growing fat. They have a virtual monopoly on the most vital energy resources of the country and, like the trusts of the late 19th century, they will continue to hold their monopoly until they are required to surrender it.

It seems to me that in this critical area, where social, political, and economic factors come uniquely together, it is essential that there be a greater degree of public accountability. It may be time for Congress to consider the creation of a U.S. Fuels Corporation, similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority, to develop our domestic energy resources.

It is certainly time, in my view, to break up the major oil companies through antitrust action into smaller, more competitive units. Besides reducing pressure on prices by bringing profits within reasonable limits, this antitrust action would reduce the concentrated power now in the major oil companies' hands. Free market conditions could be

restored to the industry, with benefit to the entire country.

The profits of the major oil companies for the first 9 months of 1973 are as follows:

OIL PROFITS STAY SKY HIGH

Predictions of a leveling off in oil company profits during the third quarter of 1973 went out the window last week as initial earnings reports came in. Every company reported significant gains, topped by Occidental's 7.153% increase over 1972. Among the majors, Gulf, Exxon and Mobil reported gains of 91%, 80% and 64.1% respectively during the third quarter. Ten major oil companies showed average per-company earnings up 52.1%. Major-company market experts who blew the third quarter predictions are crying doom again, now saying uncertainties in the Middle East will result in lower earnings during the fourth quarter.

	Net income 3d quarter (in millions)	Percent gain	Net income first 9 months (in millions)	Percent gain
Amerasia Petrofina	\$9,200		\$20,222	58.0
Ashland	24,400	17.0	85,200	25.0
Cilgo	28,600	61.0	104,800	24.8
Clark	9,154	284.0	22,413	349.6
Commonwealth	9,200	3,965.0		
Continental	54,200	38.0	153,400	24.1
Exxon	638,000	80.0	1,660,000	59.0
Getty	33,700	57.5	50,100	22.9
Gulf	210,000	91.0	570,000	60.0
Imperial			111,000	39.6
Marathon	30,700	36.0	82,500	49.0
Mobil	231,200	64.1	571,200	38.4
Occidental			55,400	7,153.0
Phillips	53,850	43.0	143,700	30.0
Shell	83,600	23.0	253,300	41.0
Skelly			27,200	9.5
Sohio	18,000	14.0	62,500	55.0
Standard of Ind.	147,300	37.0	399,800	32.0
Tenneco	53,300	20.0	149,300	12.9
Union	50,700	61.0	129,100	44.0

1 4th fiscal quarter.

IMPEACHMENT MAIL

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received over 1,200 telegrams and letters from both constituents and individuals throughout the country calling for either the resignation or impeachment of the President. I would like to insert a sampling of some of the letters I have received for the interest of those who read the RECORD:

Mr. MORRIS, MICH., October 24, 1973.

DEAR MR. RIEGLE: Please add our voices to those that are demanding that President Nixon be impeached.

We feel he has gone too far, too often in ignoring the laws of our land. If the President himself sets such a shameful example, who then can the American people look to?

Sincerely yours,

MARY LOU EARNS,
STANLEY A. EARNS.

FLINT, MICH., October 23, 1973.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RIEGLE: As your constituent, I want to register my request for you to take every action you can to secure the impeachment and removal from office of President Richard M. Nixon.

Over a number of months my concern has grown as to whether he really believed in the U.S. Constitution or whether he was fit to hold the office of President. He has surrounded himself with people like Ehrlichman,

Haldeman, Mitchell, Stans, Dean, Colson, Krogh, Agnew, Chotiner, Rebozo and Abplanalp and others who, though not all convicted criminals, have lent the suspicion of corruption to this administration.

His recent actions have indicated increasing isolation from the American people and from democratic principles.

His decision to abolish the office of Special Prosecutor, held by Archibald Cox, seems to me to represent a certain step toward totalitarian rule, and I believe that no time can be lost in removing Pres. Nixon from office before we have absolute dictatorship.

Although tonight's radio news reports that he has agreed to make the "White House Tapes" available, I feel that this no longer resolves America's concerns about a possibly paranoid and dictatorial ruler who ignores solemn oaths, commitments and responsibilities to the legislative and judicial branches of our government and to the American people.

I therefore ask you to accept this as my request that you work for immediate impeachment and removal from office of President Richard M. Nixon.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. CHASE.

FLINT, MICH., October 22, 1973.

Representative DONALD RIEGLE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RIEGLE: "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long-established, should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to

throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

How poignant recent events have made Thomas Jefferson's eloquent words, for it is doubtful if our nation's founders ever conceived that the American people would again someday have their rights and liberties endangered by their own government. Fortunately, though, they did consider the improbable and embodied in the Constitution a means of removing a tyrant from office short of revolution. Richard M. Nixon has shown himself to be in contempt not only of the courts, but of the American people. He has demonstrated his bad faith by doing everything in his power to obstruct justice in regard to Watergate. How grievous it is to say, but the only recourse of the American people, through their representatives, is impeachment. Hopefully you too have had the courage to admit this.

Yours truly,

LOIS LIVESAY.

BAY CITY, MICH., October 25, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RIEGLE: I hope you are still one Congressman with the interest of our country in mind. The chain of events that has taken place since the firing of Mr. Cox is staggering. I shouldn't say just since the firing of Mr. Cox, because any half-wit who reads the paper; listens to the news; or reads any news magazine, could have seen this tragic misconduct of handling our government and its policies. I truly believe Mr. Nixon to be man trying to cover all his misdeeds and mistakes, but who can run that fast?

Please back any proposal that will have the firing of Cox investigated, and what leads he had uncovered before he was fired. Nixon cannot judge himself, any more than I would be allowed to if I were thought guilty of a crime.

I surely hope you are aware some of us do not think it would be better to let the President continue in office even if some

of these allegations are true. We cannot tell our children how to be good citizens; loyal Americans; and honest, when the President can do anything, and not be held accountable for it. Man I wouldn't get to first base if I were to try breaking the law in so many ways.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAULINE RIVARD.

ORTONVILLE, MICH., October 22, 1973.
Representative DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RIEGLE: I'm writing out of my concern for the unfortunate and incredible circumstances of the Watergate investigations. Although I've never been a supporter of the President's, up until the past few weeks I've wanted to believe he wasn't involved in the Watergate scandal. But now, that position cannot withstand the President's recent actions: refusal to release the White House tapes; dismissal of special prosecutor Archibald Cox and disavowment of that office; the subsequent resignation of Attorney General Richardson; and the dismissal of Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus.

When the most powerful public office in this country is held by an individual who by all indications believes himself to be above the law, then I think impeachment proceedings should be initiated. I fear that the longer we let the present scandal-ridden Administration govern, the greater the irreparable damage that will be done to the faith we Americans have in our public servants and perhaps more tragically, in this country itself.

I have confidence that Congress will meet this challenge by taking action in the form of impeachment proceedings and that you will support such a measure in an effort to restore government to the people.

Sincerely,

GEORGIA GROVESTEEN.

SENATE—Wednesday, November 7, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

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

O God of this day and of all history, be with us in this place that we fall Thee not. Impart to us the humble spirit which is taught by Thee. Give us discerning minds to know Thy will and obedient hearts to do it. Work with us and through us for this Nation and the world. In times of turbulence, fraught with anxiety and surprises without end, grant us here the strength and courage of those whose minds are stayed on Thee. When men are unsure about so much, keep us sure of Thee and of Thy purposes. Guide this Nation through the perils and perplexities of this era to a new age of goodness and grace in the fulfillment of a divine destiny. When our work is done grant us Thy peace.

Through Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were commu-

CXIX—2273—Part 28

nicated to the Senate by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 3, 1973, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2016) to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes.

DISCONTINUANCE OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR A FEDERAL-INTERSTATE COMPACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The message is as follows:

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, November 6, 1973.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nomination of Joseph S. Farland, of West Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Fiji, to Western Samoa, and to the Kingdom of Tonga, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)