

business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of morning business, if there is no legislative business to be transacted, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. GERALD R. FORD for the office of Vice President of the United States.

If there is legislative business that has been cleared for action, then, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of such business.

At the hour of 2 o'clock p.m., on Monday, November 26, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following treaties; Calendar No. 22 and Calendar No. 23, they being Executive N, a protocol amending the 1928 convention concerning international expositions, and Executive Q, a protocol to the International Civil Aviation Convention, respectively.

A yea-and-nay vote will begin at the hour of 2 p.m. That rollcall will extend to the hour of 2:30 p.m., allotting 30 minutes for the one rollcall vote on the two treaties, which ordinarily would require 30 minutes with two rollcall votes;

that is, the one rollcall vote will count for two votes.

At the hour of 2:30 p.m. the Senate will either begin consideration or will resume consideration of the nomination of Mr. FORD, whichever is the case, as dictated by circumstances on Monday. It is not anticipated that there will be any vote on the confirmation of Mr. FORD on Monday. Debate will ensue during the remainder of the afternoon. It is hoped that the vote on the confirmation of Mr. FORD can occur on Tuesday.

That about wraps it up for Monday.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 378, as amended that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 o'clock noon Monday, November 26, 1973, with a happy Thanksgiving to everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

Chair wishes the same to the distinguished majority whip.

The motion was agreed to; and at 11:31 a.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 26, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 21, 1973:

##### UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

Raymond C. Anderson, of Michigan, to be Federal cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

##### IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration nominations beginning Kenneth E. Lilly, Jr., to be lieutenant commander, and ending Contantine E. Mercias, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 15, 1973.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE CASE FOR TWO CHINAS

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last week the People's Republic of China—PRC—purchased the imposing Windsor Park Hotel in Washington, reportedly for an Embassy, at a staggering \$5 to \$6 million. Foreign policy observers say this signals establishment of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Communist China. Currently the 50-man PRC delegation in Washington is strictly unofficial. But the new American obsession with mainland China poses a distressing dilemma for one U.S. ally of a quarter century, the Republic of China—ROC—located on the Island of Taiwan.

Both the PRC and ROC insist there is but one China, each adamantly claiming its capital as the seat of government. Free China knows recognition of Communist China will mean the ouster of its Embassy from the United States, just as seating the PRC in the United Nations meant expulsion for the Republic of China in 1971. When the United States first sought a new relationship with the People's Republic of China, U.S. officials acknowledged the principle of one China, but scrupulously avoided mention of either capital. Our real policy, in fact, has been a juggling act of balancing one China off against the other.

For 25 years, the ROC has enjoyed U.S. recognition and has maintained its Embassy in Washington. But friendship between these two nations has been more than just a diplomatic venture; we hold similar values of individual liberty. To

this day the Republic of China is one of the freest in Asia. Through the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954, the United States has made invasion by Red China across the 90-mile-wide Taiwan Strait unfeasible. America also provided economic assistance to ROC and in 1965 their industriousness made possible a complete phaseout of development aid, one of the few nations to become so self-reliant. In fact, Free China has benefited from an 11-percent growth rate in the gross national product for each of the last 4 years, a phenomenal success for a developing nation. Yet, all this may change if we switch recognition from the Republic of China to Communist China.

U.S. foreign policy has focused recently on accommodating past enemies to reduce past cold war tensions. However, this sudden shift has left traditional allies out in the cold, a policy for which the White House and State Department bear responsibility since Congress has no power over the game of diplomacy. One conceivable result of this policy switch might be a U.S. troop pullout from the Island of Taiwan, leaving it vulnerable to the other China. Another probable one is the recognition of the PRC. While it is wise to better international relationships, it is neither prudent nor expedient to sacrifice a proven ally with similar ideals to a suddenly friendly former adversary. We seem to be banking too heavily on Red Chinese promises of friendship.

In the past, our word has been our bond and allies were assured of a consistent loyalty by the United States. Only demonstrations that the United States is not abandoning free China can maintain American credibility with its friends worldwide. Two convincing shows of American good faith could prove the United States a true ally to the Republic

of China: Continuing military support and sponsoring the seating of both Chinas in the U.N.

Ample precedent has been set in the U.N. for the admission of two Chinas; currently both East and West Germany enjoy membership. South Korea recently made a bid to join the U.N. under a separate flag from her neighbor North Korea, a move backed by the United States. Even North and South Vietnam can see the possibility that both can belong to the General Assembly—so why not China?

#### HON. LES ARENDS TO RETIRE

#### HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, only one Member has served in this House longer than the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS. That man is the dean of the House, my fellow-Texan and friend, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. Only one other Member has served as long as LES ARENDS, and that is another Texan, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON.

LES ARENDS came to Congress in 1935. During his nearly four decades of service here vast changes have occurred in our Nation and in the world. But, one unchanging factor has been the dedication of our friend from Illinois to his country, his responsibilities as a Member of the House, and to his party.

He is a strong party man. For some 30 years he has been an important part of the House Republican organization. But never to my knowledge has he allowed

partisan considerations to interfere with personal friendship. For my own part, I have found him my friend from the time I came to Congress. His knowledge and experience have been enormously helpful to me on many occasions.

When LES ARENDS announced recently that he will retire at the end of his present term, Members on both sides received the news with sorrow and dismay. His wise counsel, his consideration of other Members, his gift for friendship will be sorely missed by all of us. His departure will be a loss of magnitude to this body—and to me personally.

## THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, continuing discussion in the press of the recently enacted war powers resolution prompts me to explain my own position on this extremely significant legislation.

I have long sought a more effective role for Congress in national security decisionmaking. Constituents frequently have expressed to me their conviction that an intensive congressional debate and ye-or-nay vote should precede any significant involvement of American forces in hostilities or in situations likely to become hostile. Accordingly, I supported the war powers legislation when it initially came before the House, as well as the conference report on the measure. However, the context in which the House once again considered the legislation on November 7 was markedly different from that in which it previously had come before the House. On the basis of my personal interpretation of my legislative responsibility, the distinction led me to vote to sustain the President's disapproval.

The difference between support of legislation as it first moves through Congress and support of a bill that has been vetoed by the President is comparable to the distinction between jurors responsibilities in a civil case as opposed to a criminal proceeding. A decision is reached in a civil case on a tipping of evidence, while a defendant in a criminal proceeding, given the far more severe consequences which may result, must be proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt; in other words, in a criminal proceeding, the burden of proof is far greater.

My initial support of the War Powers Act reflected my conviction that the evidence of recent years compels Congress to reassert its role in decisions of this nature. My decision to sustain the President's veto, however, arose from a careful reassessment of the legislation in a new context, an examination which seriously undermined my confidence in the soundness of the bill and its capacity to meet my constituents objectives.

First, in the wake of the President's disapproval, concern was increasingly expressed that the bill broadened rather

than narrowed the President's authority to commit U.S. troops to action. A number of prominent congressional Democrats generally associated with a liberal or dovish orientation, such as Missouri's RICHARD BOLLING and Iowa's JOHN CULVER, voted to sustain the President's veto. I decided that I could not support the attempt to override this veto, aware as I was that astute observers feared that the consequences of the measure would be opposite to those intended.

Second, the most potent provision in this legislation is that which enabled Congress by concurrent resolution to compel the withdrawal of troops at any time. Concurrent resolutions, because they do not require Presidential signature, normally do not have the force of law. Yet the concurrent resolution provision in the War Powers Act was intended to have very significant legal effect. Unless the warnings of those Members who thought the bill actually expanded Presidential authority were correct, the concurrent resolution provision appeared to be unconstitutional.

Third, despite the measure's provisions which sought to make a bill or resolution in support of continued U.S. troops involvement matters of priority concern in both Houses, I was deeply concerned that a crucial decision withdrawing forces might result from congressional inaction. This legislation was an invitation to any number of Members to find some procedural obstruction that would block a floor vote in one House of Congress.

We have had too many decisions by congressional inaction; we have no business encouraging others. I concluded that irrespective of its intentions, the war powers resolution did not guarantee the ye-or-nay vote with its accountability of each and every Representative and Senator that my constituents vociferously have sought.

Finally, I had serious misgivings about passage of this legislation over the President's veto at a time of deep American involvement in the critical Middle East situation. To tamper with the structure of military policymaking in the United States in the midst of a grave international crisis seemed to me to be unwise.

In conclusion, these doubts, coupled with Vice-President-designate Ford's assertions to me and to the House at large that the President would cooperate in the development of an effective substitute if the veto were sustained, led me to oppose passage over his disapproval. Certainly the opportunity which the existing legislation presented for Congress to assert itself was significant. But I did not believe that it was a unique opportunity. I was prepared to lend my full support to legislation which would have achieved our common objective and avoided the perils of the existing bill.

The vote to override President Nixon's veto having carried, however, I earnestly hope that the new statute's effect will be as constructive as its most persuasive sponsors have promised. And I hope that an early court test will clarify the uncertain legality of the measure's dubious provisions. A law of such extraordinary significance to our Nation should not become an endless constitutional issue.

## CONGRESSMAN BRADEMÁS INTERVIEWS SENATORS BIRCH BAYH AND LOWELL WEICKER

### HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of an interview I conducted with the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, and the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable LOWELL WEICKER.

The interview will be aired November 22, on WSJV-TV, the ABC affiliate in South Bend-Elkhart, Ind.

The transcript follows:

BAYH-WEICKER: "WASHINGTON INSIGHT"

Mr. BRADEMÁS: Welcome to another edition of Washington Insight.

The relationship of the President to Congress and the place of both—and the courts—in the American Constitutional system is receiving more intense scrutiny today than for many, many years.

Watergate and related events, sweeping assertions of executive privilege, White House impoundments of Congressionally-appropriated funds, and claims to Presidential war-making powers have made the phrase "Constitutional crisis" commonplace in the vocabularies of millions of Americans.

Here to discuss these and other questions with me are two leading United States Senators, both of whom have been deeply engaged in seeking to resolve many of these constitutional problems.

Senator Lowell Weicker of Connecticut is a distinguished, and outspoken, Republican member of the Senate Watergate Committee. Senator Weicker first came to Washington as a Member of the House in 1968. In 1970 he was elected to the Senate.

My distinguished colleague, Senator Birch Bayh, needs little introduction to Hoosiers, whom he has served in the Senate for the past eleven years. Before that, he served in the Indiana House where, at 28, he became the youngest Speaker in history.

Right now, one of Senator Bayh's most important assignments is on the Judiciary Committee, where he chairs its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

Senator Weicker, let's begin the questioning with you, sir. The Watergate Committee's hearings are now just a little over six months old, and before they got underway, the Majority Counsel, Sam Dash, said that the "ultimate goal" of the hearings was to discover the impact of Watergate and related events on the Democratic process. Have you reached that goal?

Senator WEICKER. I think we have. I think that some people tried to give to the Watergate Committee a task it never had, which, specifically was relating its work to the President of the United States. That wasn't our job then. It isn't our job now.

Our job is exactly what Sam Dash said, as to what happened to our Constitution, what happened to the government processes, what happened to the political processes, these broad areas. And in that way I think the work of the Committee has been very, very conclusive.

I mean, how many more examples do you want to realize how far down into the gutter politics was taken?

How many more examples do you need to prove that the legitimate operations of government were used oppressively to stifle dissent and disagreement?

How many more examples do we have to have to show the light regard in which the

Constitution is held by many men in the Executive Branch of government?

So that I think it is important to point out that when Watergate and ITT occurred I was very surprised that I received no communication at all from my constituency in Connecticut.

Even, quite frankly, I would expect the Democrats to write and say, hey, what's wrong with you Republicans. But nothing came.

Now we have gone from that situation—I mean literally five to six letters on either one of these matters, which were pretty horrendous—now we have gone from that point to where I am sitting under an avalanche of twenty thousand letters, most of which come from the State of Connecticut.

So I think the point you made is right on target, namely, an increased awareness of the American people of the Constitution and their form of government. And it was their being asleep at the switch which encouraged others to go ahead and hack around and abuse those concepts.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator Bayh, you have a special vantage point from the Judiciary Committee and a particular interest from your situation as Chairman of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee.

How do you see the answer to that question of the effect of Watergate on the processes of democracy?

Senator BAYH. Well, I think it's had a rather demoralizing effect on a lot of people. The mail I'm getting from Indiana—I don't know what yours is telling you, John—but most of our people are telling me that they wonder whether anybody can really talk straight to them, can tell them really what the problems are, and thus be in a position to stand up and make some of the tough decisions.

We in the Judiciary Committee are trying to keep our eye on the mark of a different responsibility than that which Lowell, Senator Ervin, Senator Baker, and others on the Watergate Committee have.

Theirs is really to awaken the public to the problem of Watergate and thus to prepare the way for enactment of important legislation to keep it from happening again. And I think that because of their work we were able to pass a landmark bill in the Senate dealing with campaign financing, which was really much of the problem of Watergate—the abuse of money in order to get elected.

I hope the House can go along with that bill and that we can put some really strong controls on how we use money to influence elections.

But we in the Judiciary Committee are looking beyond that. Really, we're looking to the normal, ordinary everyday due process questions of what do you do if somebody violates the law.

In South Bend or Elkhart, Indiana, if somebody violates the law, they are tried, convicted or exonerated in the court system. And so we need to keep our eye on the mark: that those who have been uncovered and disclosed as participants, or possible law violators in the Watergate affair still need their day in court, because I think the public is going to demand that justice be done and that can't be done on the television camera. That has to be done where twelve men and women say you are either guilty or innocent.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator Weicker, let me turn to a related matter which has been much under discussion, the question of the celebrated tapes. First, the President refused to surrender them; then, after firing Archibald Cox, he said that he would turn them over to the Federal courts; and then he said that some of them never existed.

What's been the impact of that series of events on the attitudes of the members of your Committee?

Senator WEICKER. You know, I am going to answer your question in a way that I don't think I have done. But I all of a sudden remembered the other day, in my shower, which is where I do most of my thinking, which is that do you realize that we never would have had the revelations of the tapes had it not been for the Committee?

People ask me what functions does that Committee perform? This didn't come out by the nature of any criminal prosecution. It's in the hands of the courts and the prosecutors now, but the fact there was a taping system in existence came out through the Watergate Committee.

So that I think this clearly shows the two areas of responsibility: on the one hand, within the judicial system, the determination of individual guilt or innocence; and on the other hand, the work of a legislative committee to bring out a broad picture of what was going on within government.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask at that point a question on a related matter that's before both the House and Senate right now. That is the question of the new special prosecutor, and what the appropriate role of Congress is in respect to assuring his independence and the appropriate role of the courts? Could each of you comment on that?

Senator WEICKER. Let me defer to Birch on that one, because I think this has been his specialty. Let me just complete the first question that was raised here.

I think the big problem insofar as the tapes are concerned is not going to come in a constitutional confrontation between the Congress and the President. I think the problem is going to come when defendant after defendant after defendant claims his rights under the Fourth Amendment, if you will, to have witnesses if he's the accused, and turns to the President and says, I'd like to have those tapes in order that I might establish my innocence. Or the prosecutor wants to have them to establish guilt. What's the President of the United States going to say then? I think that's where his real problem is.

Senator BAYH. You are so right. When I first heard of the existence of the tapes, the Vesco case was just getting started, and I said that if I were a lawyer for John Mitchell or former Secretary of Commerce Stans, I'd demand those tapes. And as long as the President keeps those tapes, they can't be prosecuted. Nobody can be prosecuted, even on the basis of evidence that's not in the tapes.

I think the average American thinks, well, they want those tapes to convict. And yet there are two men who have been indicted on the basis of evidence that's not in the tapes. Yet they are both going to go scot free unless that court gets those tapes. I think you hit the nail on the head, Lowell.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I think it's a "Catch 22" situation where no justice would appear to be possible unless those tapes are brought forth.

Senator WEICKER. Let me say that for all the great institutions of government, I still think what differentiates our society from every other society is that the individual is important. And he's the one who's important in this controversy, and the two that Birch mentioned, and there are going to be many, many others, I can assure you, many others.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator, what about that special prosecutor and his independence that I asked about a moment ago?

Senator BAYH. Well, John, we've had two special prosecutors, Archibald Cox, and now Leon Jaworski, and without in any way demeaning the integrity and character of those men, I am not satisfied with the authority of a special prosecutor. Special means almost anything. We need an independent prosecutor.

We have seen what happens when you

have men with the character of Cox, Elliot Richardson and Bill Ruckelshaus, three pretty outstanding citizens. Yet, when the President, for reasons that he feels are appropriate, feels they are not doing their duty, he can discharge them. And you can say the same thing now about Mr. Jaworski. If Senator Saxbe becomes Attorney General, you can say the same about him. He is a man of character. But as long as they can be discharged by the President, they're not given the independence necessary to follow Watergate tracks wherever they lead.

And, I think, from two standpoints, it's imperative that we create a truly independent prosecutor, and a prosecutor who can be hired and fired by the President, or for that matter, hired and fired by the Democratically-controlled Congress, I don't feel fills the bill.

And that's why we have about 55 or 56 of us in the Senate who feel we should delegate the appointing and firing authority, and that's all, to a panel of the District Court and let them establish the independence of this man and then let him proceed.

We need that independence because there is no way that we can get around the fact that in the past sequence of events the President can discharge a special prosecutor. This going to a consensus of the Leadership is meaningless. The President made those same pledges on television. He made them to Senator Scott, of course, the Republican Leader in the Senate, and Mr. Richardson was confident that there was a mandate of independence.

So to keep from getting in the kind of situation we were on that very dark Saturday, we have to look ahead and hope, not only hope that won't happen, but create a vehicle of independence where it can't.

And the second point is, you know that a lot of our people out there are so cynical, I think with good cause, about what we're doing up here. They have seen impossible, what I have felt would be impossible, things happen. And I don't want to put them in a situation where they have another impossible thing happen. If this prosecutor thinks somebody's innocent, I want that person out there to feel that he's independent enough to declare him innocent.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator Weicker, let me turn to another area of Presidential-Congressional confrontation, the so-called War Powers issue. Congress has just overridden the President's veto of that bill, and you argued very forcefully for it. Can you tell us what it is and why you were for it?

Senator WEICKER. Well, I might add, just as importantly, the American people were for it. The polls that came out since the override, the polls that were taken before Congress voted for the override, showed that some 80 percent of the American people felt there should be some check on the President in this area.

Basically, this is not a problem of Richard Nixon. It's a problem of American presidents within my lifetime, from Roosevelt through Nixon, where in effect in the foreign affairs field, in the military field, more and more power has been given up by the Congress, placed into the hands of one man. How badly that type of a system operates is illustrated, I suppose, by Vietnam. That's really the lesson.

So in this particular piece of legislation, what we have done is not to deny the President the capability of acting and acting immediately without any check from the Congress, but, rather, we have provided that any such action is subject to Congressional review within a matter of sixty days.

So to those who like to raise the scare tactic that in a nuclear age you're tying the hands of the President behind his back, the answer is nuts. It's just not doing that. To the extent that he does have to check in with the elected representatives of the people in the

House and the Senate, yes, he does. And there's not one of us that wouldn't agree that we would never have gotten into the terrible dissension over Vietnam if, in fact, that decision again had been arrived at by the American people. But it wasn't. It was basically a decision made by a few men.

So all we've done is to put things in their original perspective. This isn't anything revolutionary or new. All we are doing is harking back to the original principles of the Constitution insofar as Congress being involved in any commitment of American troops and of declaring war.

The waging of war isn't the job of Congress. That is the job of one man. But before American lives are going to be lost, I think the American people should be consulted. Mr. BRADEMAs. Birch, do you have any comments on the War Powers Bill?

Senator BAYH. Well, I think it's long overdue. It either means what it says in the Constitution, or it doesn't, John, and I don't think the American people want one man to make a determination as to whether hundreds of thousands of our young men are going to have to suffer and our nation is going to have to suffer the costs of war, and the tragedy of war.

And I think, as Lowell pointed out, we have not tied the hands of our policymakers, our President, and those around him, so that they cannot defend us. This is some of the rebuttal that was used against us.

But the President can respond; he can do anything in the event of attack; and we've given him that time . . .

Mr. BRADEMAs. Sixty days within which to commit U.S. troops to combat, but after that he has to come back to Congress if he wants to keep them there, isn't that part of the Act?

Senator BAYH. Yes, and that's a long enough period of time for the Congress to act. You can argue all you want to about Vietnam. That's over. To try to rehash the pluses and minuses of that, I don't think means much, but we're really foolish if we don't learn so we don't have another Vietnam.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me put another question to both of you Senators, and that's on another subject where the President and Congress have been at loggerheads, and that's the issue of executive privilege. Senator Weicker, just what is executive privilege and how far do you think it ought to be extended?

Senator WEICKER. Well, it's a lot of nonsense as advocated by President Nixon.

I believe there is a valid area of executive privilege. I would say it certainly would involve conversations between the President and his staff on matters of security. Aside from that, I don't allow for the theory. His business is the public's business, just as mine is.

And it certainly does not cover illegal type conversations or conversations that related to possible illegal activities by persons. I don't think it should involve anything except valid national security discussions. At least, that's my concept of executive privilege.

Otherwise, I think everything the President of the United States and everything that Senator Bayh and myself say quite frankly ought to be public.

Now we've just gone through this business in the Senate of opening up Senate hearings, not just the public hearings, but the executive sessions. We've placed upon ourselves the limitations of national security, of proprietary information—trade secrets—and one more area, of personal references to character, those to be held private. But, otherwise anything else to be discussed ought to be in the public domain. This isn't our government; it isn't our committee; it belongs to the American people.

I feel the same way insofar as discussions

of the President are concerned, recognizing there could be a valid national security area—not, again, the very broad one that's been thrown around the place—where the President's conversations should be privileged between himself and the staff, but none of that executive privilege business for staff member discussing national issues.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator Bayh, what do you think about this issue?

Senator BAYH. Well, you know, there's nothing in the Constitution about executive privilege. The philosophy of executive privilege, a very narrowly defined one as Lowell accurately describes it, is sort of a doctrine that's developed to let the President conduct his business so that staff people can come in and be very candid with him. "Mr. President, last night you were terrible in that speech", or "You made this mistake", or "I recommend thus and so", without having that get out in public. And it's necessary to have that kind of candor.

But the President isn't above the law. No member of the President's staff ought to be permitted to use this kind of thing to cloak mischievous activity and the size of it has been so blown out of proportion that I could hardly believe my eyes and ears when I watched President Nixon on that press conference the Friday night after everybody had been discharged down at the Justice Department there that day, when he talked about the Thomas Jefferson experience with the Aaron Burr letter and Chief Justice Marshall, and that this was precedent for his not letting any of this information be made available.

The facts of that situation were that, if Jefferson were the one who defined executive privilege as of that moment and this moment, he let the letter be made not only available to a judge who would watch it, as the Watergate tapes were going to be held by the court. He gave the letter to the prosecuting attorney involved, the U.S. district attorney, and even said he was willing to be interrogated himself.

So it is not a matter of the President's having a curtain around him which can't be penetrated. We don't want government in a smoke-filled room or in the privacy of our office or of the Oval Office at the White House.

Mr. BRADEMAs. There does seem, speaking of the Oval Office in the White House, to be some dissension going on right now in respect of what the President and General Haig are saying about what former Attorney General Richardson said about the firing of Archibald Cox. Senator Weicker, do you think that General Haig will be brought up before the appropriate Senate committee to testify on that subject?

Senator WEICKER. I'm going to let Birch address himself to that question because he's on the Judiciary Committee, where the comments were made, but I'm just going to say one thing.

I made a comment, I think it was when Mr. Haldeman was on the witness stand, that everything those people touched, they corroded. Mr. Haldeman took very great exception to that comment. The fact is I haven't seen one person walk in and out of that mess who doesn't come out bespattered or dead or anything in between. And I mean that.

You know, you see men like Ruckelshaus, you see an Elliot Richardson and Archibald Cox, and you realize how far that's gone. These men don't tell lies. They make mistakes, I suppose, like we all can, but they don't tell lies.

But apparently everybody in Washington, in other words, has lied at one time or another, has been disloyal. I'll tell you it's a grim picture that has been painted, and for all of those who said, well, how did Pat Gray not understand what was afoot when he walked into the White House in June of 1972? How could he know that what was being pre-

sented to him wasn't wrong, may I point out that at that time there was no knowledge of anything having gone wrong with the exception of one small story about a break-in at Democratic headquarters.

Even to this day, honorable men like Senators Baker and Ervin walked down to the White House, and before they come out, they are something less than when they walked in. I've had it with that group down there insofar as the reverence in which they hold the concepts of honesty, integrity and the reverence in which they hold the position of the Presidency of the United States. It's a rough show, and I'll believe the version of, as I say, those who have walked in and out and have been hurt and hurt badly, rather than the version of those still there.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Well, speaking of the Presidency of the United States, we have a problem now with the Vice Presidency, and you in the Senate will be shortly voting, and we in the House, on the nomination of Jerry Ford for Vice President. Senator Bayh, you were the author of the 25th Amendment that makes possible the present procedure. Is the procedure working the way you thought it would?

Mr. BAYH. About as well as could be anticipated.

Could I just add one comment to Lowell's remarks, because this week we had considered the matter of whether we should find out who's telling the truth when the President says Elliot Richardson is lying.

I don't know what it is, Lowell, about this city that for some reason or another, it goes beyond just smattering the institution of the Presidency, but public office as a whole. Apparently people no longer feel that when they make a mistake, they can admit it.

It seems to me that when you make a mistake, the best way to extricate yourself from it is to say, all right, I made a mistake. I don't think people expect any of us to be perfect, but they darn well don't expect us to lie and to have to look for straw men on whom to have to shift blame for the responsibilities of a public official. That doesn't make good politics and it certainly isn't honest and ethical.

I don't think Elliot Richardson lied. He was before our committee, I worked carefully with him in my office to try to iron out the negotiations on which Archie Cox could move on out and get this Watergate behind us, get it out of the politics so we could get on with other business. I don't think Elliot Richardson lied, but I'm willing to listen to anybody.

On the 25th Amendment, as I look back now, my hindsight is better than my foresight.

We could foresee then that you might have a Congress of one party and a President of the other, and that it would not be good for the institution of the Presidency, the Executive Branch, to have a Democrat in there now taking pot shots at the President, nor would it have been the case when President Eisenhower was there to have a Republican.

We need a unified executive, and so we wanted the President to nominate someone that was of his party that he would feel confident in so that he could delegate Presidential duties and thus share the awesome burdens of that office.

We didn't want that to be an anointment of the heir apparent because history has shown that Vice Presidents have a great probability of becoming President. So we wanted the Congress to serve as an electoral body, and I hope that's the function we're performing right now.

We ought to be looking for one thing, and that's to find a man who's qualified to serve as President. That was the underlying authority given in the 25th Amendment to the Constitution.

Senator WEICKER. I think it's only fair to say as far as Birch is concerned that his foresight was pretty good, and I think it is testimony to what can be done with some creative thinking, and he had it. It wasn't a hindsight operation at all.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We only have a couple of minutes left, so I'd like to ask each of you to speak for just a minute on how you see the future of American democracy in the light of Watergate and all we have been experiencing. Are you optimistic or pessimistic, Senator Bayh?

Senator BAYH. Well, I have some short term pessimism about some critical problems that are going to confront our country as a result of the black eye the democratic process has received because of all the things Senator Weicker and others have been involved in letting us know about what happened.

But because they have let us know, I think I have long-range optimism that no system anywhere else in the world could have uncovered this malfunctioning of the situation and thus be able to purge itself of those men and those malfunctions of the system so we can keep it from happening again. I think the system is going to survive.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Senator Weicker, how do you feel?

Senator WEICKER. Very good. I think quite frankly we've got a tremendous future ahead of us just because of what's happened. We've been running around the town to figure what we ought to do for our 200th anniversary, what monument or building ought to be raised up, at the cost of millions of bucks.

I think the fact that we've once again decided to return to our original concepts, those concepts that made America great, is enormously important. In other words, we are not willing to accept a little decadence, a little corruption, as the price of government. If we'd done that I would have said it would have been a pretty bleak future. But with what has been unearthed, . . . a year and a half ago, a guy stood outside a supermarket in Florida with a copy of the Bill of Rights, and 75 percent of the people who came out said, "I'm not going to sign that Communist document". They wouldn't do that today. They now understand what it means.

**SPEECH DELIVERED TO THE VETERANS MEMORIAL COURT OF HONOR IN RED OAK, IOWA, ON NOVEMBER 12, BY REAR ADM. D. V. COX, U.S. NAVY**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the following speech by Rear Adm. D. V. Cox, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, who recently delivered the address to the Veterans Memorial Court of Honor in Red Oak, Iowa. I feel that the remarks by Admiral Cox, who has served this country for more than 30 years in the Navy, are an excellent tribute to our veterans and also provide us with a good look at today's Navy. The speech follows:

**SPEECH BY REAR ADM. D. V. COX**

I am honored, but above all pleased, to be here today to join you in observing Veterans Day of 1973. For as long as I can remember, Armistice Day, from which Veterans Day

evolved, was important to me. My dad, Ralph Cox of Farragut, was a volunteer in the American Expeditionary Force in World War I and I was early taught that the moment of silence at 11 a.m. on 11 November was sacred to the memory of those who had given their lives for our country and for the peace of the world. The war to end wars had been fought and won, and our thoughts in those days of the 30's were occupied with overcoming depression and drought. We paid little heed to the warlike preparations of a man named Hitler. But a few lines of a poem, repeated at every Armistice Day ceremony, impressed me in a way I can never forget.

In Flanders fields the poppies grow  
Between the crosses row on row.

We are the dead, short days ago  
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,  
Loved and were loved, and now we lie  
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe  
To you from failing hands we throw  
The torch; be yours to hold it high  
If ye break faith with us who die  
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow  
In Flanders fields.

To me this never meant 1916 in war torn France; it never meant that Germans were the foe.

It meant that young men had given their lives for an ideal; and their last wish, as I imagine it has always been from the Biblical wars through Vietnam and the Mid-East conflict, was that their mortal contribution would count toward a better life for those left and those yet to be born, a better world.

Not all heroes give their lives in war. Most survive their trials and live a full life still striving for a better world. So today is a tribute to the living as well as the dead. It is a day when all stand in ranks again to receive the honor of our nation.

Attainment of freedom and peace, of a better world, extracts a price. Veterans of yesterday and of today have paid that price. Those who paid the full price desired to live as much as does any American; those who were disabled desired peace and health instead of injury and illness; those who watched their loved ones march off to war prayed for their safe return and the security of the country they love. Through constant efforts to preserve our freedom, this country has lived by sacrifice and service. It is stronger for it, the world is better for it.

Having said a few humble words to honor the past let me now talk to the future. Glorious histories have been written by those whose flags we dedicate today. The inspiration their memory gives us is for the future, not the past. Our duty to them cannot be fulfilled by one day a year of glorious memory. It can be filled by living in the future by the standards for which they died.

Today we see new young faces in the ranks of our Army, Navy and Marines, and Air Force. Our future safety is in their hands. They guard this future just as those we honor today guarded our past. I am proud of them and proud to be an old-timer serving with them. I trust them and you must. We now have a volunteer force, for the first time since before World War II. Think what that means, and especially think what it means today. Since Pre-World War II days the only choice a young man has had was which service to choose. He knew that he had to serve. Now the choice is—if to serve. If he serves, he volunteers with the knowledge that there will be no flags waving as he marches off—and none as he marches home. He may feel that his accomplishments will not be of interest, only his failures. He may have an awareness that he will not read of any triumphs of his superiors, military or civilian, only of their inadequacies. If he reads his newspaper well and watches TV

devotedly he might wonder whom he can trust. He could easily be convinced that no one will trust him. Yet his Nation expects him to volunteer under these conditions. And he does. He is deserving of very special faith and respect for that reason alone.

In times of peace and prosperity or following a conflict such as Vietnam these national attitudes can be expected. Historically, this has always been the case in all lands. Remember what Rudyard Kipling wrote about a 'tween-wars England:

"For it's Tommy this, an Tommy that, an' chuck him out, the brute!"  
But it's 'Savior of 'is country' when the guns begin to shoot;  
And it's Tommy this, an Tommy that, an anything you please;  
An' Tommy aint a bloomin fool—you bet that Tommy sees!"

When I entered the service, in 1940, such was the case. A great many people really believed that there was no reason for us, here in America, to worry about Germany and Japan. A few short months later, thousands of American lives were sacrificed to that complacency.

What is the situation today? We read and hear a great deal about defense—but it's all about its atrocious expense. We read of a new era of "detente" and hopes for lasting peace. Of course, at the same time we do read of war in the Middle East. Many seem to wonder why—now that we're no longer at war anywhere in the world—why we still need to spend so much for defense.

I am going to limit my remarks on this matter to the Navy, your Navy, with which I am most familiar. Believe me, our whole purpose is to protect the United States and the future. We can't do this without your support, economic and political, and we can't do it without public confidence.

Now let us examine what the Russian Navy is doing.

We have excellent authority for our analysis.

I can pass on to you some of the things Admiral Gorshkov, who had headed the Soviet Navy for the past 20 years, has told us about his navy's potential. "The Soviet Navy will no longer be confined to its home waters, but will exploit the freedom of the seas and through its global presence in peacetime will spread Communist influence outside the borders of the USSR."

The value of a Navy was really emphasized to the Soviets when they didn't have one to stand up to us in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, although for years they had smarted under our ability to sail in full control of the Mediterranean and to carry the stars and stripes to all the ports of the free world. They have spent the past ten years building a Navy. Because of the national emphasis and resources they have been willing to put into the effort, they have had phenomenal success.

First they created a naval deterrent to counter-balance the US ballistic missile submarine force. Their leader Admiral Gorshkov has said: "Our Navy is now a modern ocean-going fleet outfitted with the latest equipment. It is armed with nuclear missile-carrying submarines that have long-range ballistic missiles. Submarines armed with ballistic missiles are capable of destroying ships at distances of hundreds of kilometers, and of delivering blows from beneath the water against strategic targets at great distances." Their first version of our Polaris submarine—the Yankee—made its operational appearance in 1968. The Soviet Yankee submarines, each with sixteen 1300-mile range ballistic missiles, commenced regular patrols in the Atlantic in 1969. Today the Soviets maintain several Yankees on station off the East Coast at all times. There are 31 Yankees in the Soviet inventory, most

of them in the Northern Fleet with direct access to the Atlantic.

Now, while we debated on whether to build the Trident submarine or not—they have built a similar new class, the Delta, with 12 missiles capable of a range of 4000 miles. With these they can target most of Europe and the entire US (including Iowa) from as far away as the Norwegian Sea. They have 16 of these under construction.

They have also built quantities of fast attack submarines which we know are aimed at US and NATO supply lines and naval forces. The "Charlie" model carries 8 cruise missiles by which it can launch submerged.

Their surface combatants, new cruisers and destroyers, are fine ships with superb missile systems. They have built helicopter carriers, the Moskva and Leningrad. Now we learn that the first Soviet aircraft carrier has been launched, and that more are on the way. We expect to see this ship go to sea with a combination of helicopters and vertical takeoff aircraft. As James Fighting Ships states "This will give them a worldwide capability—able to provide antisubmarine and air striking power at any point where the Soviets consider intervention necessary."

The Soviets have a real "Blue Water" Navy, and in the past few years they have learned to use it. The Mediterranean is now full of Soviet ships. Their level in the Atlantic has increased by 50 per cent. They keep ships, combat ships, in the Indian Ocean, off the coast of Africa and in the Caribbean.

This year in August and September, a Soviet cruiser, destroyer and submarine visited in Cuba and exercised in the Gulf of Mexico.

On the 13th of August the Russian cruiser and destroyer were 200 miles off Corpus Christi. The next day they were 100 miles east of the mouth of the Rio Grande and on the 15th they were 300 miles South of New Orleans. They have now gone home, but others will return. This is a regular deployment for them.

It is patently clear that the Soviets already have a Navy of far greater strength than would be needed for purely defensive purposes, and they methodically continue to build with no sign of tapering off.

Why in an era of "detente" has Russia placed this emphasis on offensive naval forces? This question needs answering far more than that heard in this country of—"Why must we continue to spend money on defense?" Russia, unlike the US, is a land power, self sufficient in all critical material resources, not at all dependent on maritime trade. Why, then this Soviet emphasis on an offensive Navy? In the military, we know the Soviets' capabilities, and we are concerned about them. We reject and resent allusions to a lack of sincerity on our leadership's part when these capabilities are described. I assure you the Soviet capability is not a fantasy, dreamed up to pry your tax dollars loose. The Soviet Bear's capability at sea, on any sea, is real, formidable and awe-inspiring.

We know defense must share priority with domestic needs. We know funds are limited. We in the services pay taxes too. We recognize that defense must be efficient. I firmly believe there is no large company in the world that works harder, or is more effective at running an efficient business than the military services. And we are spending less, not more on defense. Measured in "real" dollars, with inflationary effects removed, this year's budget request is 8 billion below the last pre-Vietnam budget in 1964—35 billion below the Vietnam peak year of 1968.

Because we are economizing, your country's active duty military strength is at its lowest level since the Korean War. Your Navy has 40 percent fewer ships than it had in 1968. In the Atlantic Fleet, as the Soviets build, we have less than 200 combatant ships.

The Soviets have almost that many submarines in their Northern Fleet.

In spite of what I've said, I still feel we have a slight edge. We are building a more modern, if smaller, Navy. Manned with real professionals from our volunteer force, we'll do our utmost to give this country of ours the best defense we can. But we need your help. We need, first of all, your help in finding more young men and women to volunteer for your Navy. You grow the best crop of these in the world, right here in Iowa.

Next, we need your understanding that a defense is necessary, that history has proved we can never have peace through weakness, that defense will cost money, that lack of defense may cost lives.

But most importantly in these days we need your confidence and trust. We can't negotiate with the Soviets or Chinese, or stand up to them if need be, without this. We can't buy the weapons we need for defense if you don't believe us, and so turn down our requests. We can't lead your fine young men and women as they should be led unless your confidence passes on to them.

This is a day of inspiring memory, for those whose flags we honor and for all veterans. Let us also make it a day when we examine, in the light of the patriotism, dedication and responsibility they showed so well—the future of our nation. I think this wonderful country is worth defending—and defending well.

#### THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA WANT DISMANTLING OF COLC

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the October 1973, CWA News, Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, appraises the Cost of Living Council:

#### DISMANTLE THE IMPOTENT GIANT

(By Joseph A. Beirne, president, CWA)

The one-armed giant known as the Cost of Living Council should be dismantled and its members sent packing. The Council should go out of business at once because it was never really in business—not in the business for which it was intended.

It never really was operative, except in the mind's eye of those who advise President Nixon on economics.

Price controls are a joke—a nasty joke on workers whose wages were shrunk by freezes and then shredded by bloated prices and inflated interest rates.

This economic monstrosity with only one enforcement arm used to squeeze workers and consumers and a mouth that chews up workers' paychecks while waving businessmen and financiers ahead in their race for bigger profits must be disbanded now.

It is quite evident that the Cost of Living Council is doing nothing about the fact that the present inflation is pilfering 45 percent more out of workers' paychecks for food than was taken six years ago.

It appears helpless to cope with inflation that is costing the average workers 60 percent more than in 1968 for meat, fish and poultry. These figures come from the U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture.

When trying to deal with anything involving prices whether it is beef on the hoof or gasoline to get you to work, the Council decrees by its inaction that we live in an

economy half-free and half-slave. No state, Abraham Lincoln told us, can live that way.

This economy can no longer tolerate the abuse of economic slavery for workers and the simultaneous unbounded license for profiteers.

Economists forecast that the Cost of Living Council will grant most if not all of hundreds of pending price increase requests. And even Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers expresses little confidence in the Cost of Living Council. He predicts that food prices will rise for the next six months at an annual rate of ten percent.

As the business-oriented U.S. News and World Report notes in its October 15 issue: "Even before Mr. Stein's forecast, people around the country had been bracing themselves for still more unpleasant price news."

No forecaster is predicting wage increases to parallel the boost in prices, however. If only one-half of the economic picture is controlled, how far can we be from the corporate state where every segment of society and every individual is in complete bondage?

#### A RELATED MATTER

I would like to share with you some information on another, but related, matter.

Oftentimes critics contend that leaders are unaware of what members think and believe on various subjects. This Union is blessed with so many levels of contact that we in CWA do not lack knowing; if there is a lack, it is of time to digest what CWA men and women at various levels are saying.

As you know, a number of times during the year CWA has conducted random polls of the members.

Such a poll was taken a few months ago and five major issues of concern with their order of importance resulted from that poll.

CWA members told us the five issues about which they were most concerned in this order were:

1. Economy (this category included cost of living, inflation and wage and price controls);
2. high taxes;
3. honesty in government (including Watergate and related matters such as "dirty tricks" in politics);
4. ecology (including air and water pollution and energy crisis);
5. pension.

These findings may or may not coincide with what you individually believe. They do represent the concerns of a large sampling who took the time to complete the poll.

Since the poll was taken, elected officials of both major political parties who made their own assessments during the summer recess of Congress have come alive and recognized the (to them) startling fact that economic worries were right on the top of the list.

Whether our nation's leaders act upon this new found knowledge remains to be seen. Thus far there is no sign that they are translating their awareness into activity.

The CWA poll results are striking, too, in that for the first time in many, many years "world peace" is absent from the list. The poll, of course, was taken before the present Mideast crisis which again focuses attention on the problem of "world peace."

This may also be attributed to the withdrawal from Vietnam or because of the President's negotiations with Peking and Moscow, and the use of the word "detente" as a catchall to cover the world situation today.

One can only hope and pray that this euphoric use of the word "detente" will not entice this nation and its citizens into a false sense of security. This whole issue of foreign affairs and our quest for world peace certainly merits a great deal of consideration by all.

In the struggle for world peace, with all its diplomatic subtleties and nuances, there should be a sense of caution; for the problems of Southeast Asia have not evaporated and are still with us, not in the dramatic

way that the Middle East now is, but there, nevertheless.

On world matters, we are not dealing with children, but with skilled negotiators, eager to press every advantage. If anyone doubts that, he or she should take another look at the wheat deal.

No one who has stepped inside a food market recently or applied at a bank for a home mortgage would quarrel with the fact that economy is a number one issue. But it is just as disquieting to consider that the same folks who brought us this economic mess are also managing our international relations.

#### A LETTER FROM A FARMER'S DAUGHTER

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from my constituent, Teri Benson of Jefferson, Iowa. As a farmer, I know that few peo-

ple realize what our life and profession is like. Teri has asked me "to set the people of this country straight." I can think of no better way than by sharing her letter with my colleagues:

JEFFERSON, IOWA,  
November 6, 1973.

Hon. WILLIAM SCHERLE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHERLE: For many years there has been great dissension toward farmers. For some reason, people in this country are quite narrow minded. They seem to think that farmers are rich and have it easy. I'm the only daughter of a farmer here in Jefferson, Iowa, and I know from experience that it is not true. Of course, there are always some in every profession that this might apply to, but if you took a survey of all of Iowa farmers, you would find that a large percentage are having quite a few struggles to make ends meet or to compete with modern big farmers.

Take the price of cattle and hogs. First, the farmer must buy replacements for his herds, then buy feed and modern equipment to get the biggest gain on his animals. This amounts to a lot of money! Then, when

prices are frozen, the poor, small farmer can't get much profit, if any, from his cattle or hogs.

Then consider the risks a small farmer, or any farmer, takes with his crops, such as corn and beans, which are the major crops raised here in Iowa. First, in the spring, my father has to worry about getting the crops in and making a decent seedbed. Of course, he also has to worry about getting fertilizers, chemicals, and the brand and hybrid of seeds he needs. Considering the very wet and disagreeable weather we've had the last few years it's been a hectic and often discouraging race against time and fate.

In the fall he has to worry about whether or not he'll get his crops out. Sometimes, like last year, he was still working clear up till after Thanksgiving. What a headache!

I think something should be done about this. People blame the farmer for food inflation. That's not right! If it weren't for the farmer in this country, there would be no country! I think we should set the people of this country straight! Let them know of the plight of the small farmer, and do something about it before it's too late and there are no more small farmers!

Sincerely,

TERI BENSON.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, November 26, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Watch ye, stand firm in your faith, be courageous, be strong. Let all that you do be done in love.—I Corinthians 16: 13, 14.*

Almighty God, again we assemble in this Chamber after a brief recess and first of all we lift our hearts unto Thee in prayer. Facing the days of this week and the tasks of these hours, grant unto us a vivid sense of Thy presence that in our minds there may be understanding, in our hearts peace, and in all relationships—good will.

Keep us unwavering in our loyalty to the best interests of our country, unflinching in our courage as we seek solutions to the perplexing problems which confront us, and unalterably just and kind in all our dealings with one another.

Kindle in our hearts and in the hearts of all people a desire to cultivate the fine art of living together in good will, with justice and for peace in our world.

In the spirit of Christ we offer this our morning prayer. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 9575. An act to provide for the enlistment and commissioning of women in the Coast Guard Reserve, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 1284. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees;

H.R. 2533. An act for the relief of Raphael Johnson;

H.R. 3334. An act for the relief of Maria Lourdes Rios;

H.R. 3758. An act for the relief of Isabel Eugenia Serrano Macias Ferrier;

H.R. 8528. An act to provide for increasing the amount of interest paid on the permanent fund of the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home;

H.R. 9256. An act to increase the contribution of the Government to the costs of health benefits for Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10511. An act to amend section 164 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 relating to financial assistance agreements; and

H.R. 11459. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11459) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANON, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 97. An act for the relief of Jose A. Seradilla;

S. 663. An act to improve judicial machinery by amending title 28, United States Code, with respect to judicial review of decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 928. An act to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes;

S. 1038. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances to certain members of the uniformed services in connection with leave;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Concepcion Velasquez Rivas;

S. 1398. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines funds for making payments on certain pre-1934 bonds of the Philippines, and for other purposes;

S. 1418. An act to recognize the 50 years of extraordinary and selfless public service of Herbert Hoover, including his many great humanitarian endeavors, his chairmanship of two Commissions on the Organization of the Executive Branch, and his service as 31st President of the United States, and in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of his birth on August 10, 1974, by providing grants to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace;

S. 1673. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zosima Telebanco Van Zanten;

S. 2112. An act for the relief of Vo Thi Suong (Nini Anne Hoyt);

S. 2267. An act to amend section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein, and for other purposes;

S. 2299. An act to provide authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for operation of those projects, and for other purposes;

S. 2551. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes;

S. 2589. An act to declare by congressional action a nationwide energy emergency; to authorize the President to immediately undertake specific actions to conserve scarce fuels and increase supply; to invite the de-