

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 31, 1973

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

Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might.—Ephesians 6: 10.

Our Heavenly Father, at the opening of a new day we pause to lift our hearts unto Thee in an endeavor to bring our lives into harmony with Thy great and gracious purposes.

Hear our humble prayer for wisdom, truth, and love that we may be wise, loyal to the truth, and live with love aglow within us. So move in our minds that what we say and what we do may be in accord with Thy will for us and for our Nation.

Keep us strong in Thee and in the power of Thy might that we may promote peace in our world, justice in our Nation, and good will in the hearts of our people. By Thy spirit may we be more than a match for the mood of this moving generation.

Bless our Senate colleague, we pray, with Thy healing grace and restore him to health and strength.

In the spirit of the Master we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 177) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 177

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hays, of Ohio; Mr. Brademas, of Indiana; Mr. Dickinson, of Alabama.

Joint Committee on the Library: Mr. Hays, of Ohio; Mr. Nedzi, of Michigan; Mr. Brademas, of Indiana; Mr. Harvey, of Michigan; Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EGLIN AFB CHAPLAINS RATED BEST IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to report to the Congress and the American people that the chaplains at Eglin Air Force Base in my district were awarded the 1972 Terrence P. Finnegan Award for the best overall religious education program in the Air Force.

This is a high honor for these dedicated chaplains and it reflects credit on the entire base. The award is based on the entire education program for children and adults. The Eglin program reflects the interest of many of the personnel assigned to Eglin in that at least 200 volunteer workers are engaged in the program which includes discussion groups, prayer seminars, Bible studies, hospital programs, and teacher training.

These activities take place in homes, chapels, hospitals, and at the Federal prison camp. The program covers Catholics, Protestants, and members of the Jewish faith.

I am pleased to join the Air Force in recognizing the work of the chaplains; Col. Robert E. Mossey, chief Catholic chaplain, and Lt. Col. Charles H. Glaze, chief Protestant chaplain, and the hundreds of fine people at Eglin who made this award possible.

THE ANTITOBACCO FORCES HAVE STRUCK OUT

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

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the anti-tobacco forces have struck again and this time they have struck out.

Recently those of us in the Congress were recipients of an imaginative appeal for a change in marihuana laws. Delivered to each of our offices was a packet of mysterious looking and strange smelling matter.

The attached letter from the National Organization for the Reform of Marihuana Laws told us in bold letters that "The Enclosed Baggie Does Not Contain Marihuana." It then made the claim that what was in the bag was tobacco which the organization described as "potentially more harmful."

Well, it turns out that what the envelop contains is not tobacco. The laboratory which has analyzed it believes that it is *liatris odoratissima*—wild vanilla. The principal constituent of wild vanilla is coumarin which is widely regarded as rather toxic material.

My concern today is not with the position this organization takes on marihuana laws or with its gross misrepresentation but rather with the attack it has made on the product which it erroneously claimed was in the packet.

Smoking marihuana and smoking tobacco are not the same thing. And lumping hard drugs, alcohol, and tobacco together is as dangerous as it is unfair. We do not have tobacco smoking parties as we do "pot" parties and cocktail parties and people do not smoke tobacco to alter consciousness.

Most Americans believe in controlling drug abuse. Lumping an appeal for new laws on marihuana with an attack on tobacco will not help us find any good answers to the questions about control of drugs.

Altering the facts never produced truth.

Congressman DAVE HENDERSON and I

will give more details in a "Dear Colleague" letter.

REACTION TO PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's 1974 budget is too much; it benefits too few; at the detriment of too many.

First, it is too much.

At a time when we should be getting a "peace dividend" due to our withdrawal from Vietnam, the President is calling for an increase in defense spending of \$4.7 billion—the increase alone is about six times as much as we spend on elementary and secondary education—thus making our defense budget \$81.1 billion or 28.4 percent of the Federal budget.

At a time when we should be ending our foreign entanglements, the President is calling for a 12-percent increase in foreign aid—up to \$3.8 billion.

At a time when grocery prices are out of sight, the President is calling for increased spending for price supports in order to pay the agribusinesses not to grow crops.

Second it benefits too few.

Sure, the agribusinesses will be doing fine, but how about the housewife who has to pay exorbitant prices because of a shortage in supply coupled with a great demand?

Sure, the company president who is building the ABM will continue to reap windfall profits, but how about the working man who simply wants a defense that works and does not really care how many times over we are capable of totally annihilating the enemy.

Sure, the head of some foreign nation will approve of the President's budget, but how about the average taxpayer who must work from January to May merely to pay his taxes.

Third, the President's budget does not benefit those who truly need the services.

While defense spending is up, hospital construction is down.

While farm price supports are up, the emergency employment program—designed to place able-bodied individuals on payrolls, not welfare rolls—is out.

While foreign aid is increased, funds to clean up the pollution in our rivers, harbors and lakes are cut in half.

Finally, the Federal budget serves as a compass to point the direction of the country for the next year. This budget points to more "welfare for the rich"—at the expense of the workingman and his family, who, for too long, have paid more than their fair share of taxes—yet, have not reaped the benefits of their taxes.

CREDIT CRISIS FACES NATION'S FARMERS

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today my bill, H.R. 1975, designed to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue operating the Farmers Home Administration Emergency Loan program. The bill would, also, make other needed amendments in subtitle C of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, which established the emergency loan program.

I am very pleased to have a number of my colleagues join me on this reintroduction today as cosponsors of this proposal. And, I am gratified that other of our colleagues have introduced bills with the same language.

It is my belief that this bill should be handled as emergency legislation because of the credit crisis faced by the Nation's farmers whose ability to continue producing food and fiber crops has been severely damaged by adverse weather conditions during 1972. The emergency loan program was enacted by the Congress to provide aid to farmers under these circumstances.

We in the Congress have a heavy responsibility to take positive action to see that this Nation has a healthy agricultural industry. The emergency loan program was passed as evidence of congressional recognition and commitment to this responsibility.

In December, the Secretary of Agriculture took steps directed at thwarting congressional intent by arbitrarily decided—without consultation with or direction from the Congress—to terminate the emergency loan program. This act was, I believe, unconstitutional.

I urge that the Congress act quickly to adopt my proposal as a renewed commitment to aiding farmers fill the Nation's need for agricultural food and fiber and as a clear indication to the executive branch that the Congress intends to fully discharge its constitutional responsibilities as the National Legislature.

THE ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, well, now we have the budget. And what a budget it is. Nothing tells it better than the headlines in the paper. Monday's Washington Evening Star gave us the first reaction and oftentimes, first reactions are lasting.

Consider the headlines: "Nixon Cuts Programs \$6.5 Billion"; "Impact Aid Slash Faced by Schools"; "Medicare Costs Cut \$893 Million"; "Consumer Affairs Gains Funds, Loses Clout"; "Two Poverty Aid Units Ended in Commerce Department"; and finally, "Defense Hits \$79 Billion," and that is an increase.

Mr. Speaker, it is as if the administration searched out all the programs that help people, and hit them with a meat ax.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is going to go line by line over this budget. And my strong feeling is that we are going to

find that some of these spending cuts are phony and many are intolerable.

And let us tell the American people the truth about this budget. This President is trying to sell himself as a cost-cutter—and he has sent us a budget which is \$12 billion in deficit before we even start.

The President claims that this budget will not require higher taxes; that it will not increase inflation, because he has placed a tight lid on spending by eliminating programs which have outlived their time; and that this new budget will give us an era of domestic progress.

I do not argue with the need to control spending. I do not argue with the need to curtail inflation. But I do take issue with the President's priority of spending for fiscal year 1974. Congress fully recognizes its obligations for fiscal responsibility. But it will not permit the President to tear down the humanitarian and necessary social programs that Presidents Kennedy and Johnson helped to build. In the areas of health care, hospital construction, education, housing and community development, the President has presented to Congress an intolerably austere budget. He has dismantled and destroyed the great social programs advanced by every Democratic President since Roosevelt.

Once again, the President's proposed budget encourages "benign neglect" of our elderly and middle Americans. I question the President's priority of fiscal responsibility when the National Defense budget still requires 30 percent of our Nation's expenditures. The Vietnam war has apparently ended. And yet, the new budget request for defense spending has an increase of over \$2 billion for new nuclear missiles and warheads.

While funding for national defense continues to increase, the President proposes to eliminate all the community development programs which have given new hopes for decent living conditions to low- and middle-income families. The President's budget provides no new funding for model cities, neighborhood facilities, open space land, water and sewer facilities, urban renewal and the 3-percent loan rehabilitation program. What kind of spending priority is this?

Under the budget, no new funds will be available for assisting home programs such as rent supplement, 235 homeowners program, 236 multifamily public housing. Much of the budget request in the housing area reflects the moratorium on all new commitments for housing and community development projects announced January 8th. In Massachusetts and throughout the Nation, housing starts today would not be possible without Federal support. Discontinuing these subsidies will lessen the effect of State funds.

The President is eliminating these programs July 1, 1973. For a replacement, he will submit legislation for urban community development revenue sharing to be effective July 1, 1974. That implies a 1-year hiatus in which a large sector of our Nation's economy will be suspended. I do not challenge the need to reevaluate HUD programs. But to sus-

pend a large element of the housing market while this evaluation goes forward is economically unhealthy. Congress will not tolerate this kind of fiscal irresponsibility.

Let us take a look at the President's budget request for another important domestic sector of our economy—health.

No funds are available in 1974 for hospital construction grants, or for construction of community mental health facilities. Under the President's reform of medicare, as outlined in his budget, a senior citizen will pay more for hospitalization and doctors' care than he has under the present medicare program.

Funds for the training of orthopedic surgeons for children is decreased by nearly \$10 million from the 1973 budget request. Grants for training of nurses, and grants and loans for training of public health personnel have been eliminated. These actions by the Nixon administration present a crisis in development of manpower for medical education and research. The curtailment and elimination of these training grants and fellowship programs of NIH will have disastrous consequences on our ability both to conquer the major diseases and to increase supply of physicians over the next decade. These programs have been the basis for success and viability of Federal health research efforts. Why is the President spending at the lowest possible level for health programs? He is spending \$700 million less than the rate the continuing health resolution of fiscal 1973 authorized. Who is the President, hurting by his austere spending priorities in health programs? It is the elderly of this Nation who will be most adversely affected by cutbacks in medicare coverage and health care delivery, hospital construction, and inadequate supply of medically trained personnel. And our senior citizens are the ones least able in our society to subsist under the President's program for our Nation's health.

In the area of public assistance, the President is already spending \$500 million less than the amount Congress authorized as a ceiling. In the area of education, no funds will be available if President Nixon's budget prevails, for the National Defense Loan, which has enabled millions of young adults to attend the college of their choice, Americans who otherwise could not have afforded any higher education. And Nixon's 1974 budget calls for only \$41.5 million in impact aid to local school systems located near Federal installations. Yet in fiscal year 1973, the Government provided \$415 million in such aid.

No one in this Congress opposes economy in Government. No one in Congress opposes a decrease in Federal spending. No one in this Congress supports bureaucratic waste in Federal Government. But why is this austere budget so biased toward certain groups? Why must middle America, the poor, the young, the elderly, the sick, and the handicapped always have to bear the brunt of spending ceilings, of economy in government?

I believe that Congress has its own mandate from those people most affected by the President's budget. We will not

allow President Nixon to eliminate these essential programs in the areas of adequate housing for middle America, the education of our youth, the health care of our elderly, and the general welfare of our Nation.

MORE ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been very interested in the observations and comments of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL). He deplores the increase to the Department of Defense, but he also knows, I am sure, that those increases were primarily predicated on increased costs for personnel, increases that resulted from legislation passed by the Congress to increase the pay of men in uniform so that we could have an all-volunteer military force.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask, does the gentleman want to do away with that program? Let us just ask the gentleman that question.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, let me state I have always been opposed to an army of that type. I have always been opposed to an all-volunteer military force.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Are you against an all-volunteer Army?

Mr. O'NEILL. I have always been against the all-volunteer Army, and I stand opposed to it today as an individual.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask, does the gentleman favor the extension of Selective Service?

Mr. O'NEILL. I favor it to a degree, yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To what degree? May I ask the gentleman, are you for the existing legislation and its extension?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes, I voted for the extension.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the gentleman will vote for it this term, I assume?

Mr. O'NEILL. And the chances are that I will probably vote for it. I have always been opposed to a volunteer Army and still stand opposed to a volunteer army.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And you will vote to cut the funds even though we will have 1.2 million less men on active duty now than we had 4 years ago?

Mr. O'NEILL. I presume the billions of dollars we have been spending, wasting, on the Vietnam war we will surely not need now that the war has ended, and I hope and pray it has ended.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is no increase in procurement funds for the weapons systems that will help keep peace in the months ahead. Is the gentleman going to vote to cut those programs?

Mr. O'NEILL. My record has been that I have always opposed the war and all amendments concerning the Vietnam war, but I always vote for final passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If we act that way, we will be weakening ourselves and making ourselves vulnerable to enemy attack. The gentleman, in other words, wants to slash the defense budget so that we will be weak and will be inviting aggression?

Mr. O'NEILL. I have always been for a strong standing army. There is no question about it. But I cannot conceive in my mind now, when we have spent billions of dollars in Vietnam and with that behind us, not being able to have a cut in our defense program. It is almost inconceivable to me.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The principal increases in the defense program are related to the increased personnel costs. You do not want a volunteer army, but you are for an extension of a permanent draft with the use of Selective Service. I happen to prefer getting the people for our Defense Department by a voluntary method, and I will vote for the extra money for that purpose.

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue the colloquy between the minority and majority leaders.

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. With regard to that, it is my understanding that the President asked for \$4.7 billion more while the extent of the growth of the army comes to a figure of \$2.1 billion. So there is an added cost of about \$2.5 billion that the President is asking for in his budget. I want to make that point clear.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. May I add calmly in contribution to this colloquy that if the REAP program is to be cut completely and other farm programs of that sort, can the best interests of economy be served by the Ash appointment's conflict of interest on a Navy dispute of \$600 million involving Litton Industries? Is that appropriate? I submit it is not appropriate, gentlemen. Mr. Ash should resign. If we can clean up that type of conflict, I will listen to talk of economy from the President on his social programs and join in trying to halt the inflation that plagues our Nation.

HELP FOR BROADCASTERS

Today I am introducing legislation that would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a 5-year broadcast license period and to provide that an application for renewal shall be granted if past performance shows a good-faith effort to serve the needs and interests of its area.

At the present time broadcasters do not have a reasonable assurance of continuity of ownership. They are finding it difficult to cope with the business needs of today where substantial, long-term

plans and investments are required for labor contracts, employee pension plans, and expensive program buys running up to 7 or 8 years.

A 5-year license period would allow them to plan ahead and to improve performance. Incidentally, the National Association of Broadcasters has determined that a 5-year license period would also reduce the FCC workload an estimated 40 percent, thereby cutting down on Federal expenditures in that area.

A broadcaster is entitled to first rights on a renewal if a broadcaster has done a good job, if he has worked within the law and within FCC rules, and if he has served his public well. Without some degree of confidence that a good effort for the community will reasonably assure license renewal, we are soon going to face a chaotic situation. Already, the past months have witnessed a surge of filings against present licensees at renewal time by competing applicants.

I believe these amendments are mandatory, Mr. Speaker. I am hopeful Congress will once again consider this important matter and that public law will be the result.

CONGRESS DOES NOT SIMPLY PUSH FOR THE "SPECIAL INTERESTS"; WE DISPOSED OF RECOMPUTATION OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY LAST DECEMBER AS UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND TERRIBLY EXPENSIVE; YET THE WHITE HOUSE HAS PUT \$360 MILLION FOR RECOMPUTATION INTO THE BUDGET

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could add a little light instead of heat to this debate with regard to the defense budget.

Most Members of Congress have been disturbed in recent days to see valuable community programs slashed from the President's budget as wasteful. In fact, the budget message implies that only the President is frugal and wise; whereas we in Congress are profligate, wasteful, and easily inclined to spend all sorts of unnecessary dollars in behalf of the so-called special interests.

Thus, I was astounded to discover last night that the new defense budget contains \$360 million for recomputation of military retired pay.

Mr. Speaker, recomputation was proposed by the administration in the last Congress. I had the honor of chairing the subcommittee which conducted a most intensive examination of this proposal and submitted a detailed report at the end of December.

We found that recomputation was not only unnecessary and unjustified but if put into practice in its most extreme form would escalate the cumulative costs of military retired pay by the year 2000 to a staggering one half a trillion dollars.

I believe that as far as Congress is concerned our report successfully killed recomputation, in spite of all the "special interest" pressures brought against

us. Yet here we find the White House ignoring the plain facts and figures and pressing Congress once again to follow it down the profligate path of recomputation.

So, Mr. Speaker, here is \$360 million we can easily cut out of the President's defense budget. Here is \$360 million we can shift instead to higher priorities—schools, new hospitals, and day care centers for children.

WE MUST GET CRIMINALS OFF OUR STREETS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the senseless, cold-blooded shooting down of a distinguished Member of the other body emphasizes once more the need for Congress to pass legislation that will be effective in getting criminals off the streets.

Pick up almost any daily paper and you can read of the arrest of some criminal, and find that he has a record a yard long. Often you read that those arrested for one crime are out on bail and awaiting sentencing for other crimes. Why not? They have nothing to lose when courts levy concurrent sentences, and 10 crimes net little more punishment than one.

It is high time that the Congress enact a mandatory prison sentence for felonies committed with a firearm. I have again introduced such legislation. Let us lock up these predators of the night, these abusers of the privilege of carrying firearms. Let us make it carry a mandatory 5-year prison sentence, with no probation, parole, or other dilution. Too long we have listened to those who blame society for crime. Too long we have seen repeaters caught slapped on the wrist, and turned loose to wreak their crimes on society.

It is tragic that our cities have become cesspools of crime, unsafe, not only at night but anytime. The police have done their best. Now they need help. They cannot go on catching the same criminals over and over and be expected to curb crime. For those who maintain that rehabilitation is the end goal of incarceration, I submit that we must put these criminals into surroundings where rehabilitation is possible. Turning them back onto the streets only strengthens the environment of crime. How much more vicious abuse must our citizens take before this Congress gives the police the legislative backing that is a necessity if hardened criminals are to be removed from the streets of our cities?

WE MUST KEEP PISTOLS OUT OF THE HANDS OF CRIMINALS

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the shocking and senseless shooting of Senator STENNIS last evening is an outrage which calls for vigorous action by the

Congress to keep pistols out of the hands of criminals.

The only way to do that, in my opinion, is to make it impossible for private citizens to own handguns. That is what most civilized countries have done, and their crime figures show the startling results. In the year 1971 there were exactly three killings by handguns in the city of Tokyo, a city of 12 million people, because in Japan it is almost impossible for a private citizen to get hold of a handgun.

I intend shortly to introduce legislation which would not only prohibit the sale to the public of handguns, but would start this country down the long hard road toward effectively prohibiting possession of handguns.

Other measures, such as prohibiting the manufacture and sale of cheap handguns and requiring the licensing and registration of all firearms would be steps in the right direction, but in my judgment none of them will really do the job that is required.

In this battle we are up against one of the most powerful lobbies in the country. The power of that lobby can be upset only if the American public makes its voice heard loud and clear. I am convinced the public wants stiff, effective gun controls, but all too often the public's voice is silent.

E. S. WEBB AND H. M. VONIER HONORED BY QUITMAN PCA

(Mr. MATHIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, late last year while we were in recess, I had the honor of speaking during the annual stockholders meeting of the Quitman Production Credit Association in Quitman, Ga.

Two gentlemen who were founders of this fine association were recipients of special awards in appreciation for their 39 years of outstanding service. Mr. E. S. Webb served as a member of the board since the organization of the association in 1933. He was chairman of the board for the past 20 years.

Mr. H. M. Vonier also has been serving since the organization date of 1933.

Both Mr. Webb and Mr. Vonier have now retired from their active roles with the Quitman Production Credit Association, but they were appointed to the positions of directors Emeritus by official board action. Roy E. Hallman of Boston, Ga. and J. Perry Coggins of Lake Park, Ga. were appointed to the vacant positions on the board.

I was very pleased to have a part in the program honoring Mr. Webb and Vonier who very unselfishly have given of their time to advance agricultural interests of Georgia's Second District.

In closing my remarks of that evening, I used words that were spoken by a former Chaplain of the U.S. Senate which very well could be the expression which has guided men like E. S. Webb and H. M. Vonier who believe in America and who believe in helping their fellowman:

I am only one, but I am one. I can't do everything, but I can do something. And what I can do, that I ought to do. And what I ought to do, by the Grace of God I shall do.

BILL TO PREVENT DECREASE IN VETERANS' PENSIONS

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, when the 20-percent increase in social security benefits went into effect last October, 2.3 million retired veterans could not feel the same degree of elation as their fellow social security recipients. According to present law, veterans' pensions would be reduced as a result of the social security increase. As many veterans saw it, and expressed it to me, the Government is taking away with one hand part of what it had given with the other hand.

I have been advised that 24,000 veterans will lose their veterans' pensions altogether. I am told that the pensions of veterans and widows of veterans will be reduced by an average of \$8.71 a month; that is \$104.52 a year—not a whole lot to a corporation executive, but a very significant amount to anyone who is just squeezing by on a barebones pension, with today's skyhigh food, fuel, and other living costs. Moreover, many veterans who called my Providence office are losing considerably more than \$8.71 a month. I fully agree with their plea that the law should be changed.

The last three times there were general increases in social security benefits, Congress adjusted the law so that veterans' pensions were not decreased. It should be done again.

This afternoon I am introducing legislation to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect recipients of veterans' pensions from having the amount of such pensions reduced because of increases in social security benefits.

According to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, such legislation would have a first-year cost of \$420 million. Objections have been raised on the grounds that Government spending must be restrained. But I am convinced that we can replace some less worthy Federal expenditures to meet the needs of our veterans.

This legislation is retroactive to reimburse any losses beginning in January 1973. The bill would solve the problem for the future by exempting all further social security increases. There is no reason for the Congress to go through this exercise every time there is a change in social security benefits.

In the weeks ahead I will be urging the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to schedule hearings on my bill and similar measures supported by many Members of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MADDEN. 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. 7]

Andrews, N.C.	Hanna	Patten
Ashley	Harrington	Randall
Badillo	Harsha	Reid
Barrett	Harvey	Roncallo, Wyo.
Biaggi	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Blackburn	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Breckinridge	Heckler, Mass.	Ruppe
Burke, Calif.	Jarman	Shipley
Burke, Fla.	Koch	Smith, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Kuykendall	Snyder
Chamberlain	Kyros	Stuckey
Chisholm	Landrum	Symington
Clark	McClary	Teague, Tex.
Clay	McKay	Thompson, N.J.
de la Garza	McKinney	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Melcher	Van Deerlin
Dickinson	Mizell	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Murphy, Ill.	White
Downing	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Dulski	Nedzi	Wolff
Foley	O'Hara	Yatron
Fountain	Obey	Young, S.C.
Frey	Passman	
Green, Oreg.	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 361 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY
HOUSE RULES X AND XI

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 176

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 132) to create a select committee to study the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption or rejection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Committee on Rules had its organizational meeting in an atmosphere of harmony and understanding. Our first order of business is the rule which we are bringing before the House today.

House Resolution 176 provides for 1 hour of general debate on House Resolution 132, a resolution to create a select committee to study the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The effect of this rule is to give the House an additional hour to discuss this

resolution which would otherwise have only 1 hour of debate.

House Resolution 132 is cosponsored by Congressman BOLLING and Congressman MARTIN of the Committee on Rules. This is legislation to improve the Congress as an institution. The select committee will be authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study of the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Rule X sets forth the committees of the House and rule XI governs the powers and duties of committees. The select committee will be empowered to study the committee structure of the House, the number and optimum size of committees, their jurisdiction, the number of subcommittees, committee rules and procedures, media coverage of meetings, staffing, space, equipment, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me before he yields to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 176, which the gentleman from Indiana has brought from the Rules Committee, does not provide for the amendment or amendments to the resolution which the rule makes in order.

I would ask the gentleman, why do we in the first rule offered by his committee get what amounts to a closed rule?

Mr. MADDEN. I would say in answer to the gentleman's question that this rule is a rule that has the support of the leadership on both sides of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the House can be counted in terms of a half dozen people, which leaves some 430 other Members of the House who ought to have some consideration in matters of this kind.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's question deserves a full answer, and the full answer is that the resolution is a very unusual resolution. It is, in fact, here by the initiative of the Speaker, and it has been supported by the minority leader; it is cosponsored by myself and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

If the gentleman will examine this resolution 132—and I am sure he has—he will find it unique. It is put together very carefully to accomplish some very specific purposes, and those purposes relate one to the other.

If with the best of intentions the House decided to change the division of the balance between the two sides or change the division in the amount of money, it might very well destroy the possibility, in the judgment of at least one of the authors of the resolution, of the committee having any success. It is not normal for a committee of the House, select or otherwise, to be completely bipartisan nor is it normal for it to provide that the money to be made available to the committee will be divided in that particular way.

If the gentleman will look at the past, he will find there have been occasions when people on this side and that side have felt very strongly that that should not be done.

The present speaker would not feel that he would want to take this approach and have it imposed on it or be involved in this if it were not as provided in this resolution. It is the only way that we can figure out to protect the resolution from what I would consider to be a perversion.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There is no question but what this is a unique procedure both as to the first rule to come before the House of Representatives and one which is in the nature of a closed rule. Unless the previous question is voted down and this rule amended to provide for amendments to the resolution which it makes in order, it precludes the House from considering the Committee on House Administration as a vehicle for this study or the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations from being considered, or any other presently constituted committee of the House. Yet you want to go ahead and spend \$1.5 million on a brand new committee for this purpose.

Mr. BOLLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to comment on that.

If the gentleman feels that strongly about it—and I regret to say this—there is a ready solution. The decision to draft it in this fashion and to seek to pick a committee was a decision made deliberately. I hope to have an opportunity to discuss those other factors at more length in a more peaceful atmosphere, but the fact is that the intent is to have this kind of committee or for opponents to seek another kind of committee.

This gentleman, who is one of the authors of the resolution, is perfectly conscious of the fact that the House may vote this down and choose another vehicle, and that is surely the right of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. May I say further to the gentleman from Iowa I had experience myself on a joint committee about 7 or 8 years ago. It is a difficult law and a complicated task to make a study of this, and when this committee completes its study it will go back to the Committee on Rules and maybe we can take care of what the gentleman would like to have done when this committee comes to the Committee on Rules and it is reported to the full House with the request that it accept their study.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

(Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 176, as the gentleman from Indiana explained, provides for 1 hour of debate on House Resolu-

tion 132, a resolution to set up a select committee to study rules X and XI of the House. These rules deal with the 21 standing committees and the jurisdiction of these committees.

House Resolution 132 provides for the Speaker to appoint 10 members of the committee, five from the majority and five from the minority, with the chairman to be appointed by the Speaker.

In addition to this the committee is provided money out of the contingency funds of the House, which is a bit unusual—and I will explain why this was set up in this manner—\$1.5 million for the period of this entire Congress, that is, for 2 years and not for 1 year, to conduct these hearings and this investigation.

The resolution provides that the select committee is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study with respect to the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, including committee structure of the House, the number and optimum size of committees, their jurisdiction, the number of subcommittees, committee rules and procedures, media coverage of meetings, staffing, space, equipment, and other committee facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this indepth study which will be conducted by this select committee is very vitally needed in the Congress, and in the House today. It has been over a quarter of a century since the Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed.

At that time, before the 1946 Reorganization Act was passed, we had 48 standing committees in the House. It was felt that in order to streamline and make more efficient the operation of the House these committees should be reduced and consolidated. As a result of the 1946 Reorganization Act, the total number of standing committees was reduced from 48 to 19. Since that time two additional committees have been added.

But what has occurred since 1946? We have had a proliferation, Mr. Speaker, a great proliferation of subcommittees so that today we have 128 subcommittees in the House of Representatives—128 subcommittees.

So we have just retrogressed and gone back to the difficulties and the weaknesses that we encountered before 1946. We have had changing times, we have new problems facing the House such as space, the environment, and many other areas, but yet the jurisdiction of the committees has remained practically the same.

If you carefully examine the work of some of our standing committees you will find that many of them are overworked because they have so many subjects upon which to come up with legislation and on which to make indepth studies of the legislation that is under their jurisdiction, that they cannot do a proper job in studying these fields. Then we have other committees of the House whose jurisdictions have remained the same since 1946, but whose workload has decreased because the problems in their particular areas have decreased over this period of time, and they do not have sufficient work to do.

This will be an indepth study on a bipartisan basis to try to create a more efficient operation of the committees of the House which are the heart and soul of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 132, and urge its adoption.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to speak at greater length in the debate on House Resolution 132 but, from the letters that I have received and the stories that I have heard, it seems wise to make some comments now.

I think it is very important for the Members to understand the concept involved in this resolution. I should say, to preface that, that as a member of the Committee on Rules I have served either as chairman or as an active member of each of the subcommittees that dealt with the problems of first ethics, and then reorganization.

A very small amount of history: We found early on when we began to consider the Reorganization Act that is the product of the joint committee—the Madden-Monroney proposal that has passed the Senate overwhelmingly—that it was virtually impossible to even begin to move on action on that because of the way in which that particular bill was drafted. We decided in that subcommittee of the Committee on Rules—BERNIE SISK and ALLEN SMITH, and the rest of us—that the thing we had to do in order to move that segment of reorganization was to eliminate all the problems over committee jurisdictions, because committee jurisdictions, of course, go to the power of every particular Member, of every Member, and the vested interests of every interest in the United States.

So the only way in which we could handle that part of reorganization was to take that segment of jurisdiction out, and that is the way we did it.

When the reorganization bill came to the floor, and in the process of its being adopted, it was modified by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Hall, that there be established a Joint Committee on Organization, and the Joint Committee on Organization was established with the jurisdiction over everything in the Reorganization Act, but specifically excluded from dealing with this area, the area of committees and their jurisdiction.

The reason, as I understood it at the time, that it was done in that fashion was that this was the terribly difficult, thorny area. No matter how difficult it may have been to establish a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, no matter how difficult it may have been to have a Reorganization Act of 1970, this was the meanest area.

About 5 or 6 weeks ago the Speaker of the House called me and asked me what I thought about an attempt to study this area of organization, of jurisdiction, and we had a series of conversations on that matter. The decisions were made in consultation with the minority leader, not in every detail—I would not want him to have any of the responsibility for the amount of money in-

involved—but on almost every detail. We came to sort of a meeting of the minds of how this might conceivably be done, and that is why I am talking now.

We figured it out that there was only one way of having any hope of succeeding in the end, and that was to have a most unusual committee, a completely bipartisan committee, and in the process we decided that the only way to make that very clear that that was meaningful—although certainly we do not want to have two separate staffs—was to say in the resolution that the money would be available half-and-half, half to the majority and half to the minority. We were eliminating or hoping to eliminate all partisanship at the very outset.

This is an impossible task—with the “impossible” in quotation marks—and we wanted to make it clear that this was being undertaken not to serve any party or any interest. That is the reason the committee is unique in that way.

Furthermore we wanted to be sure that we would be as little influenced as possible by anybody in the institution who might wish to influence us in behalf of his particular jurisdiction. Thus we decided the only way in which we could achieve that would be to bypass the Committee on House Administration. Inevitably, since it is the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee there was no possible way of bypassing that, but to be as free as possible from any undue influence from the inside, we decided to bypass the Committee on House Administration in the expenditure of the money and do it very frankly. I informed the chairman of the committee of the fact and he seemed to feel that it made some sense.

Now with regard to the amount of money, I am well aware that Members on both sides of the aisle are concerned about \$1.5 million, and personally I do not think we are going to spend \$1.5 million if the House decides to let us attempt this “impossible” task. But this was essential to assure that over the actual year and a half—and I will talk more about that later when I have more time—that I hope this committee will be engaged we would not be subjected to any kind of pressure other than the normal pressure we expect to get from the other 425 Members of the House of Representatives, because we expect to involve every Member of the House in the decisions that are made by this committee, but we wanted to avoid pressure. We did not want to have to come back hat in hand to anybody to conclude this study.

I had a form budget made up and it came out to a great deal less than a million and a half, a budget splitting in half a competent staff of about 18 or 20 people, none of them excessively paid, none of them paid any higher than the highest allowed for congressional research employees, but an adequate staff, professional and clerical, and there is extra money in the budget in the case the committee over my opposition—and I can state that categorically—decides that it needs to have a management consultant study.

If anybody has taken the trouble to look at any of the reorganizations of any

of the departments, he will find that monumental sums have been spent in employing experts. I think the only real experts we need are people we will not have to pay except to pay their transportation. I think anybody who will not come in here to help us, except for a core staff, any Member who will not help us is going to be quite surprising. I think everybody recognizes the importance of this.

I think although some Members might think I have voted for social programs which are a little too expensive, I do not think any will find any sign of my ever having been an empire builder, nor can any find that the gentleman from Nebraska, DAVE MARTIN, has ever built any empires. I am one of the relatively rare people around here who have given up the chairmanship of subcommittees.

I would like to say that I hope there will not be on the staff of this select committee, if it comes into being, a single member now presently a member of the staff of a Member. I have a young lady who had worked with me on reorganization for a number of years and she is going to spend nearly full time on this subject but she is going to stay on my payroll. This is not going to be a staff-building operation.

The gentleman from New Hampshire has asked me to yield and I yield to him.

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

I think obviously we all agree on the need for this type of study, but I do not think the gentleman has made it clear in his discussion as to why either an existing committee or a committee of the Rules Committee could not do this job if they had it assigned to them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this clear, because after all the gentlemen on the Rules Committee were the fathers of the Reorganization Act including the Hall amendment. If the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations is not satisfactory or House Administration, why do we not go back to where we were when we started reorganization. We did that with a subcommittee of the Rules Committee following up the work of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Mr. BOLLING. The answer, I thought, was completely clear. Inevitably that study, the studies on standards of official conduct, studies on the reorganization act were made by committees with partisan majorities. They were made using the staff of the Committee on Rules in a way that simply could not possibly be adequate.

The truth of the matter is that most of the members of the Committee on Rules, and I think I am as experienced in this subject as anyone, really were not prepared to put in the kind of time that was intended. I think the minority leader and the Speaker, in considering appointments, have been quite specific that this is going to take a lot of work.

We are going to have a committee of 10 members, all of whom work. I do not think that the members of the Committee on Rules generally, except those who, like myself, are preoccupied with this particular facet, such as Mr. MARTIN, who

is very interested in it—I do not think they are prepared to give the kind of time that is involved.

The Joint Committee on Organization has a major jurisdiction and it has a continuing jurisdiction and a very important jurisdiction. I think that a standing committee of great utility might very well be destroyed by an attempt to deal with this subject.

That is precisely why we have a Select Committee. Second, it is a joint committee. I am not going to mention the fact that it is a partisan majority committee. I think it is demonstrable that the House of Representatives is fundamentally different from the U.S. Senate in its composition, and perhaps it should be in its organization.

The two attempts to change the Congress made in the history of the United States were those that ended in the Reorganization Act of 1946 and one in 1880. The modern one was clearly a failure. It was partly a failure because of the difficulty of dealing with two different problems in one place. The problem of organizing the Senate is very different from the problem of organizing the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is the gentleman suggesting that we can change all that jurisdiction on this side of the aisle without any reference whatsoever to the Senate—

Mr. BOLLING. I say to my friend from New Hampshire, of course we have to have some consideration, but I do not think there is anything that is demonstrable that would indicate we have to have the exact same structure.

I submit that a body of 435 men, each of them elected by the people and representing a relatively small number of people compared to the average Senator, needs to be organized with some consideration to that fact.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 the Senate did not end up with a Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The House did have one from its inception, so a joint House-Senate committee does not necessarily end up with committees in both bodies with identical jurisdiction.

Mr. BOLLING. Very true, and the real question is, the problem is so thorny, so difficult, why add another dimension to it? It is going to be difficult enough to deal with the problem of how to organize the House. Why take on the added complexity of the other body?

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I remind the gentleman from Missouri that in March of 1971, he stood on this floor and said, and I quote:

I oppose the creation of this Select Committee and still oppose the creation of this Select Committee. I do it as a matter of principle. Except in very rare cases Select Committees produce very little. I prefer to see this work done by a standing committee.

Mr. BOLLING. Absolutely right.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I ask the gentleman from Missouri, who I am sure has thought of this very carefully, is he saying to us the present committee of this House is not capable of dealing with this important issue?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Then I believe the gentleman must outline to us the overwhelming and compelling reasons why we must set up a \$1.5 million "slush fund" for this type of activity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOLLING. I should like to say to the gentleman, I am surprised because he used a word I resent when he described this \$1.5 million as a "slush fund." I should like to tell the gentleman that there will be no "slush," that this will be a lean staff. I tried to make it very clear that we will not be playing that game some select committees play of self-perpetuation.

Perhaps it is a key point. If I have my way—I will be 1 of 10, but if I have my way this select committee will come to the floor with a proposition that we consider viable no later than July 1974, and preferably mid-June of 1974, or I will come to the floor and say that we cannot get the job done and I want us to be abandoned and phased out so that the House may begin afresh in a new Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciated the gentleman's explanation. I do find myself in some disagreement, though the gentleman obviously knows his subject matter, and always is precise and fair.

There is one point that has not been made, which I feel is both important and interesting. Why, in respect to a matter like this, which relates to reform, was there a compelling reason, if it was compelling, for a closed rule? Seriously, I find that hard to understand.

Mr. BOLLING. It is very simple. I referred to that matter earlier.

I understand the gentleman's question, and it is a valid question.

In trying to figure out how to do a responsible job—and I will take the major responsibility for this—I came to the conclusion, and others agreed with me, that we had to do it just that way or it was not worth our trying to do it.

That is the reason why we have a select committee. That is the reason why we have a closed rule.

If any of the significant elements of

the committee were changed I would not be prepared to be involved in it. That is why my answer to the gentleman from Iowa was so blunt. If it is not desired to do it this way, then vote this down and somebody else can come in with a proposition.

It is a very simple thing. This is not a long, complicated bill. The way the House can work its will is to vote it up or vote it down and then proceed to the next step, if it wishes.

The gentleman from Missouri is not going to be desperately unhappy in any event. He believes the job needs to be done. He believes this is the way to do the job. If the House decides otherwise it clearly is not possible for the gentleman from Missouri to play a useful role in getting it done.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I merely say to the gentleman from Missouri that on many occasions in the time I have served here there has been talk about broader participation and preventing a few people from making all important decisions. Here is one area where a very few people are going to make the decisions.

Mr. BOLLING. That is as far from the case as it can possibly be, because the reason why we have agreed, among us, that we need 10 working Members instead of perhaps three or four is that we do not think there is any possibility of succeeding with a product that will be accepted by the institution unless we involve every Member of the institution.

I have made up the list of the people I expect to see and have conversation at length with on this select committee, and it is 100 people.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield further.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Every Member of the institution, except for voting on the rule. In that case the gentleman wants to close it.

Mr. BOLLING. No, sir. The gentleman is perverting what I have said. I have said to vote it up or vote it down, and if the House wants to do something else, to go ahead and do it. This is a proposition which the House can accept or reject very easily. It is not complicated.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I wanted to ask an assurance from the gentleman in the well that when his committee brings back a recommendation it will come back under an open rule.

Mr. BOLLING. I am not going to try to tie a committee down. I am not able to do that. I do not know whether it will or not.

Mr. GIBBONS. Does the gentleman mean to tell me, in asking for \$1.5 million for 10 people, eight of whom we do not know who they will be, that they may come back with a closed rule?

I am telling you I am not the committee; I am on it. I would expect we would come back with an open rule, but I certainly am not the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. May I inquire, Mr.

Speaker, how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule, and I hope at the appropriate time other Members in this Chamber will join with me in voting down the previous question so we can open up the Bolling-Martin resolution to amendment and permit this body to work its will. I think it is only fair to advise my colleagues in this Chamber that this closed rule was written after we had voted in the Rules Committee to send House Resolution 132 to the floor. No mention was made either in the open hearing on this or in executive session that this would be brought to the floor under a closed rule, without opportunity to amend, and I personally wish to dissociate myself from this rule which I am reading for the first time today.

Before I proceed on the matter of this rule, Mr. Speaker, let me make clear that I wholeheartedly endorse the motivating concept behind House Resolution 132, that is the need for a comprehensive study of this body's committee system with a view to overhauling it. Back on January 2 of this year I responded to a letter from the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) on this subject, commending him on his initiative in raising the issue of committee structure reform. I went on to say, and I quote: "I am in full agreement with you that this is a long overdue reform which is necessary if we are to modernize the Congress and restore it as a coequal branch of government." I went on to suggest that such a study could be conducted by a reactivated special subcommittee on legislative reorganization of the House Rules Committee, or by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

On that same day, January 2, I wrote to the chairman to be of the House Rules Committee (Mr. MADDEN) urging that one of our first items of business should be recreating the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Reorganization so that we could begin immediate consideration of various reform proposals in the House.

On January 15, 1973, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), at the request of the Speaker, introduced House Resolution 132 to form a select committee of the House to study committee jurisdiction. On January 23, I offered an alternative approach in House Concurrent Resolution 91 which would mandate the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations to conduct this study of the House committee structure. My resolution was nearly identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on January 18 calling on the joint committee to study the Senate committee structure. Yesterday morning in the Rules Committee I offered my resolution as a substitute for the Bolling-Martin resolution, and my motion was defeated.

Let me simply say in defense of my

alternative approach to have the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations study our committee structure that it is a cheaper and sounder approach. Let me remind my colleagues that the joint committee was established by the 1970 Reorganization Act for the specific purpose, and I quote from the act—

The Joint Committee shall make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States.

Now, my colleague from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) argued in the Rules Committee yesterday that the joint committee is precluded by law from studying committee jurisdictions. I assume he was referring to section 402(d) of the 1970 act which reads:

Nothing in this Part shall be construed to authorize the Joint Committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices or precedents of either House or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

I suppose his argument is that since committee jurisdictions and procedures are part of the House rules, and since the joint committee cannot make recommendations with respect to the rules, it is therefore precluded from making any recommendations with respect to committee jurisdictions and procedures, even though its primary purpose is to study and make recommendations with respect to the organization and operation of Congress.

In response to this argument, let me simply point out to my colleague that the old Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress operated under the same prohibition with respect to the rules, and yet in its final report of July 28, 1966, Senate Report No. 1414, on pages 14 to 18, it made eight recommendations under the heading "Committee Jurisdiction." These included splitting the House Education and Labor Committee into two separate committees, assigning environmental sciences to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, redesignating the House Banking and Currency Committee as the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and creation of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

So, unless my colleague from Missouri would argue that the old joint committee acted contrary to its legal authority, we must conclude that the existing joint committee, which operates under exactly the same strictures, has authority to study and make recommendations on committee jurisdictions.

It would therefore seem logical, Mr. Speaker, to assign this committee structure study to an existing committee which has been established to study and make recommendations on the organization and operations of Congress. We are currently spending some \$360,000 each Congress on this Joint Committee, and yet we are now being asked to spend another \$1.5 million to create a new se-

lect committee to do what the Joint Committee is supposed to be doing.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it makes much more sense to make such a study of our committee structure in conjunction with Senate efforts to study their committee structure, for if we do not, the end results are likely to be so disparate as to weaken rather than strengthen the Congress—confuse rather than clarify committee jurisdictions, and retard rather than reform the operations of the legislative branch.

We hear a lot of talk today about the need for the Congress to reform and reassert itself—to reclaim its constitutional prerogatives and restore itself as a coequal branch of our Government. But let us keep in mind, if we are serious about all this talk, that the Congress consists of the House and Senate together, and unless we work together to reform ourselves, in the words of Ben Franklin, "assuredly we shall all hang separately."

The choice seems clear, gentlemen. We can adopt the narrow, shortsighted and parochial approach of forming a new super select committee of the House at a cost of \$1.5 million, or we can take the less expensive, farsighted and coordinated approach of studying this problem in the existing Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. I hope we will have the wisdom to act with the interests of the Congress, not just the House, in mind.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down the previous question on this rule so that we can open House Resolution 132 to amendments, including the alternative approach I have discussed. I know other Members are interested in offering their own amendments to the select committee proposal. Let me simply point out that the vote on the previous question is not a vote for or against my own pet proposal, but rather is the first test in this body this year on the concept of the closed rule.

I read with interest a New York Times article of January 9, 1973, which contained the following lead sentence:

The new chairman of the House Rules Committee declared today that he would try to assure that tax proposals be subject to amendment on the House floor.

The article goes on to describe the chairman's opposition to closed rules on tax bills and concludes with the following paragraph: Mr. Madden said:

Let the people vote, that's what they're sent in here for.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially ironic that this great reform bill is being sent to the floor today under a closed rule which is a prime target of the reformers—a closed rule which the chairman of the Rules Committee says he would not permit on tax bills. Are we to conclude that opening up this bill to amendment would be more disastrous than opening up the Internal Revenue Code to amendment? I hardly think so.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by advising my colleagues that this is their first opportunity in this Congress to go on record on the issue of closed rules. Make no mistake about it, a vote for

the previous question is a vote for closed rules; a vote against the previous question is a vote against closed rules. In the words of my distinguished chairman, "Let the people vote. That's what they're sent in here for."

Mr. GIBBONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman is a very experienced member of the Committee on Rules, and I very highly value your views.

Let me ask you a question. With regard to this committee we are about to appoint, two of the members of whom we know, can that new committee come back and bring a resolution to this body for a closed rule whereby we cannot amend the proposal but have to vote on it up or down?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Of course, they could. If I understand the resolution—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. May I have 1 additional minute to complete my answer to the gentleman?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It is my understanding, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, that this resolution is written in such a way that the recommendations of this select committee as established would go to the Committee on Rules and they would then actually report to the floor any rules changes or legislation that would be necessary to implement the recommendations of the select committee. Obviously it would be possible under those circumstances for this matter to come before us under a closed rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote yes on the previous question; I intend to vote yes for the rule; and I intend to vote yes on the resolution.

Let me tell you why. We have not had a thorough study of committee jurisdiction and committee assignment of responsibilities for 26 years. It is long overdue. The question is how you do it.

Let me give you some history of how this resolution came into being, at least my understanding of how this effort was generated.

When the Speaker, the majority leader, our whip, and myself sat down to discuss committee ratios early in this session we discussed the possibility of dividing the Committee on Education and Labor. We discussed it. From that discussion grew the resolution that is currently before you or which will be before you.

The thought was, instead of just making a decision involving one committee and perhaps dividing it, there ought to be a thorough review of all of these committee jurisdictions by House Members, not by Members of the other body.

All right. The resolution is before you, or will be shortly. I am speaking very parochially to my Republican friends.

This resolution gives us five Members for five Members on that side of the aisle. If you turn it over to the joint committee, the majority party has three Members on that side and we have two in the other body and the majority party has three Members in this body and we have two. Now, how silly can you be? You do not know what a break you are getting from a Republican point of view.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me finish, and if I have time, I will be very happy to yield.

Let me tell you the names of the people on the other side of the Capitol who may be deciding your committee jurisdiction in this body. Let me read the names of the people who served on that joint committee in the other body in the last Congress. The probability is that they might be reappointed. Let me give you their names. In the U.S. Senate on the majority side, Senator METCALF, Senator GRAVEL, Senator CHILES; on the minority side Senator CASE of New Jersey, Senator SCHWEIKER of Pennsylvania. Do you want those five Senate Members deciding the jurisdiction of House committees?

If you do I really do not believe you have thought that through very thoroughly.

Now let us turn to why the Committee on Rules did not take jurisdiction. I believe there are some persuasive arguments that in an instance where you want to analyze committee jurisdiction over all 20 House committees, should you have representatives on this group from as many of the committees as you can find rather than having a small group of 15 having a parochial interest in the Committee on Rules deciding what the jurisdictional limits ought to be for all House committees?

So we anticipate there will be five from that side, five from this side, and at least the people whom I thought about who might be on the select committee from our side there will not be any duplication of committees; we will try to spread experience and responsibility as broadly as possible rather than having a tightly knit 15-member Committee on Rules make those decisions.

I just do not understand why you want to give exclusive jurisdiction to the Committee on Rules. Do not the rest of you who serve on other committees have some expertise and experience in the field of committee jurisdiction and responsibility? Should you not have an input?

I think this select committee is the best vehicle.

Now, as to the arguments made in the letter from my dear friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) that we ought to turn this responsibility over to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, the inference is that they will not need any more staff, and they will not spend any more money.

Do you know how many staff members they have now? They have 23. I do not know in detail what they do, but they have 23 staff members. I am informed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman please yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

What does this staff of 23 do?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is exactly why I wrote the letter. I think they should do something more and I think this area is where they should be doing it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the frankness of the gentleman, and that is the most heartening thing that has come out of this discussion today. That group of 23 apparently needs more work, so I gather you would like to find some additional work for them.

I think we ought to have a staff that is equally divided between Republicans and Democrats, where you will receive the input of a number of members, because they have all have had different experiences and points of view.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the previous question is approved.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave the impression in this debate that we are not in agreement with the speakers on both sides of the issue that much needs to be done at this point in order to strengthen and improve the Congress.

Nor do I wish to leave the impression that the distinguished minority leader might have left that the Joint Committee on the Operation of the Congress has been totally without assigned tasks. They have worked. They have done some positive good. However, I think that a staff as large as theirs could take care of this new assignment, or do so with relatively little added cost. The House Administration Committee could do it.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) mentioned the fact that we ought to have some consultants to perform a study of the Congress. I am sure that that is one of the things we will get with the million and a half dollars he is asking for. He seems to have forgotten that the Arthur D. Little Co. made a study of the Congress a little while ago. If another study is made I am afraid that it may be too much like that of the Arthur D. Little Co., and gather dust somewhere in the archives of this body.

The distinguished minority leader made one point, and I want to address myself to that. He made quite a point of the fact that in this resolution we are going to vote on that there will be a 50-50 division of the membership, Republicans and Democrats, and that there will be a 50-50 staffing. That is an attractive piece of bait, but for some of the

younger Members here I want to point out 3 years ago a bipartisan committee on the improvement of the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, got together and worked out and passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

As part of a covenant that was written and agreements which were made, the minority party was given at least one-third of investigatory staffing and the bill was passed. The first thing that the Democratic caucus did when they got back in session 2 years ago under their caucus unit rule was to strike that out. They broke the covenant. So when somebody stands on the floor of this House and offers as bait—50-50 staffing—I am reminded of that despicable incident.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I sent a letter to every Member of this House. I think the record should show this fact and the letter, which follows:

YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION PLEASE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1973.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Wednesday, the House will consider H. Res. 132 to set up a Select Committee to conduct a study of rules X and XI, including committee structure of the House, the number and optimum size of committees, their jurisdiction, the number of subcommittees, committee rules and procedures, media coverage of meetings, staffing, space, equipment, and other committee facilities. It authorizes \$1,500,000 for this purpose.

Unfortunately this resolution will be considered under what in effect is a closed rule. It is not only unfortunate but ironic that a Congressional Reform measure concerning our own rules of procedure will be thus considered.

There are a number of objections to the Resolution. A major one is that under the Legislative Reorganization Act, we established a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations which is in being and fully staffed. In the Rules Committee, Congressman John Anderson offered a substitute which would assign the subject matter of H. Res. 132 to the Joint Committee, using its staff and saving the taxpayers the cost of setting up a new and somewhat duplicative committee. If the closed rule is adopted, following one hour of debate on the Resolution, there will be a motion to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is voted down, the Anderson substitute will be offered. It may be of interest to you to know that the Anderson substitute is patterned after a somewhat similar resolution offered in the U.S. Senate by Senator Humphrey. Because of mounting public interest in Congressional reform, I hope you will attend the debate on the rule and H. Res. 132.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, unlike the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) I am going to vote against the previous question to bust this gag rule, and unless the previous question is voted down, I am going to vote against the resolution, which the rule makes in order, and for two reasons.

But first let me say that I am amazed at the lack of confidence in the existing committees of the House of Representatives on the part of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and the

gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN). I refuse to believe that there is no committee, either Standing or Select, already existing in the House of Representatives, that cannot be trusted with this study of the House organization. I do not believe that. If I did, I would be tempted to resign from the House. I simply refuse to believe there is no committee competent or trustworthy to handle this kind of legislation.

I am opposed to the expenditure of \$1,500,000 on a proposition of this kind, and every Member of the House ought to be opposed to it—particularly the Republican Members, if they believe in economy. That is \$75,000 a year to finance this committee—and there are no salaries paid to a single member of the committee. The \$1,500,000 for 2 years or \$750,000 per year is purely for staffing. For God's sake, how much do the proponents want to spend on a brandnew committee? And we cannot change that outrageous figure unless we vote down the previous question and get this open to amendment.

I am surprised that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), the new chairman of the Committee on Rules, would come here with a closed rule on this subject. He is quoted in the Wall Street Journal of January 17, 1973, as being opposed to closed rules. He is purported to have said:

There are 435 members of the House of Representatives and 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee. What this means is that 410 members didn't have a damn thing to say about taxes.

He put himself on record as being against closed rules, particularly with reference to tax legislation, and yet the first crack out of the box in this session he brings in a closed rule on a bill to reform the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. This is an extraordinary piece of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, this is an extraordinary piece of legislation. The gentleman from Missouri calls it unique legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman please allow me to answer his question?

Mr. GROSS. Of course. Go right ahead.

Mr. MADDEN. This legislation, when the study is completed, comes back before the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from Indiana will carry out the statement the gentleman just made. My vote will be for an open rule then.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the rule the gentleman has just presented to the House, I would have great reservations about accepting that statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete and wholehearted support of this resolution—which embodies a major step forward in our efforts to breathe

a new and vigorous life into the organization of the Congress.

I would like first to commend you, Mr. Speaker, for having requested the introduction of this resolution and the creation of the bipartisan select committee which it authorizes. I would like, also, to commend my good friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), as well as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) for the initiative that they have shown in highlighting to all of us our need to have a new and fresh look at the basic structure under which our committee system operates.

Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this body is keenly aware of the need for the Congress to grow stronger and more effective. I am convinced that the people whom we represent are also keenly aware of our weaknesses and our needs for renewed strength.

The ability to grow must carry with it the ability to change—to discard obsolete ways and develop an effective, modern organizational structure. I, for one, have confidence in our ability to bring this, our own House, in order. I believe that the resolution before us will help us to accomplish that objective.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there are many areas in which the present rules defining committee jurisdiction should be carefully reexamined and restructured. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I, for one, could point to a number of problem areas involving my committee which were not foreseen at the time the present rules were enacted in 1946. Let me cite just one example:

In recent years the problem of narcotics and its close connection to crime has developed to a point of critical urgency. Yet in approaching the narcotics problem, the 25-year-old jurisdictional lines of our committees are hazy, overlapping, and cumbersome.

Narcotics matters involving criminal law often go to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, while problems involving medical treatment of addicts often go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Several years ago in the executive branch, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs was in the Department of the Treasury. It is now a part of the Department of Justice. As a result of this change, the oversight responsibilities of the various congressional committees with respect to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs have become blurred.

I would hope, for example, that the select committee would address itself to finding the best organizational structure to deal with the narcotics problem both from the point of view of legislation and of congressional oversight.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of the need for House Resolution 132. I could cite many other examples where important legislative matters are now in danger of falling through the jurisdictional cracks that have developed under a structure that has not been reexamined for almost a quarter of a century. Once the bipartisan select committee is established, all of us will have an opportunity

to bring these jurisdictional cracks to its attention and to assist in the formulation of new approaches—new approaches which will be responsive to the true needs of the people whom we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I note with a deep sense of gratification that House Resolution 132 was reported without objection by the House Committee on Rules and in closing I want especially also to commend the chairman, the ranking minority member and all of the other members of the Rules Committee who have voted to support this resolution. I believe that all my other colleagues in the House of Representatives should do no less than give this resolution their overwhelming unanimous support.

I ask that a letter I wrote January 10 to our colleague, Mr. CULVER, endorsing his proposal for a thorough review of our House committee structure, be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

JANUARY 10, 1973.

HON. JOHN C. CULVER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: With respect to your circular letter of December 29 regarding the structure of the congressional committee system, I agree that the question deserves careful study. Congress must be organized in a rational and effective manner in order to cope with the public policy issues facing us in the 1970s. I am deeply concerned about the decline of public confidence in Congress and the evident need for us to perform our constitutional role effectively vis-a-vis the executive branch. I feel it is particularly incumbent upon us to recapture the power of the purse, for example. Renewed study of the organization and alignment of committees in the House and Senate with respect to dealing with the budgetary process and other public issues undoubtedly would be a crucial element in any serious effort to strengthen the Congress.

As to which committee such a task should be entrusted, I note that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 provides that the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations is not authorized to make any recommendations with respect to the rules of either House. I would therefore be agreeable to the Speaker's appointing, in conjunction with the President of the Senate, a select joint committee for this purpose. I would hope to see reflected in the composition of such a group a healthy mix of senior and junior members to assure that the matter is undertaken with political wisdom and realism. It would also be my hope that the majority members appointed to the task would additionally direct their attention to assuring that any committee reorganization undertaken will strengthen—and not weaken—the ability of the congressional Democratic Party to face the policy issues and political responsibilities of the future.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take the 5 minutes. I hope the previous question will be voted up and that we can proceed to a further discussion.

Frankly I think the best statement which has been made on the subject so far has been made by the minority leader. It seems to me that gets to the essential point.

I am somewhat disturbed by the feeling of my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS), about the closed rule, but if this were a complex, intricate, difficult, multifaceted issue then I would have sympathy with his concern.

I cannot make a commitment as to what kind of rule we are going to have if the committee can produce anything. I know my view on it, but I am not much given to making commitments I cannot live up to. I think unless we had it set up to go through by unanimous consent, I think anybody who wanted to reorganize the committee structure of this institution and brought in a closed rule would be planning to bring in too much of a burden on his back.

If I am a member of the committee and I do not have any intention of telling anybody here that I can assure what kind of rule it is going to be, but I think it would be very silly to expect a committee that had done a job that it was proud of not to expect to give every Member an opportunity to do anything he pleased. But I cannot guarantee anything and I do not propose to start out on this subject doing what I have never done in this House before, and that is trying to mislead anybody.

I think we should proceed, we should vote up the previous question, we should vote the rule, and then we should have a little further discussion and then make a decision as to whether we want this done this way or not.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to present to the Members the legislative situation with which we are confronted at the present time. A request will be made for a vote on the previous question. I urge an "aye" vote on the previous question. That means that we will then adopt the rule, but then we will still have 1 hour of debate on the resolution itself, House Resolution 132.

If the previous question is adopted, then it is thrown completely open on the floor.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Just a moment. The leadership of both the majority and minority parties support this resolution, House Resolution 132. I urge that we have an "aye" vote on the previous question. We will then have another hour of debate on the original resolution.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that with adoption of the rule, the main question will be thrown open on the floor. The gentleman does not mean that. He means that the establishment of still another committee will be open for an hour of debate and that is all. It will then be voted up or down. It cannot be amended in any respect.

We cannot reduce the outlandish \$1,-500,000 in funds for the committee.

The gentleman from Missouri says, "Oh, we will not spend all of that."

If the committee spends \$1,499,999, that will take care of it, will it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I cannot

yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that I believe the gentleman from Iowa does not have a reputation for being a big spender in the Congress, and I think the gentleman who is now speaking also has that same reputation of not being a big spender.

I can assure the gentleman that if I am a member of this select committee, we will get a full 100 cents on each dollar, for every dollar spent.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my dear friend from Iowa—he and I came together—if the previous question is beaten and the gentleman from Illinois offers his intended substitute, would the gentleman vote for that so that we could turn the determination of committee jurisdiction over to Senator CASE of New Jersey and Senator SCHWEIKER of Pennsylvania?

Is that what the gentleman from Iowa wants to vote for?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, that is not the only option we have if we vote down the previous question. Put it in the House Administration Committee. I have some confidence in that committee. Maybe the gentleman from Michigan does not.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is the gentleman for any realignment? Is the gentleman for any realignment of committees?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, if I had my druthers, I would give the House Administration Committee \$50,000. That committee could do the job for a fraction of what is requested to be spent in this deal.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does the gentleman think that that committee is preferable to a group that has members from a number of committees?

Mr. GROSS. I am willing to trust the House Administration Committee. I said that once and I will say it again.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, in closing, that there has been a great deal of talk for many, many years about work along these lines to reorganize and make more efficient the operation of the House.

Here is an opportunity for the Members to take positive action; to stop the talking and to get on with the job of making more efficient our operations.

I urge an "aye" vote on the previous question.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both the form and substance of the proposal now being considered. Here is another matter of great import to every Member, and here is another closed rule.

We discussed way back on January 3 the problem of "gag rule." On that occasion, a large number of distinguished Members in this august body, who had plausibly and ostentatiously signed the John Gardner, loyalty oath, renouncing Satan and the closed rule, could not vote "aye" fast enough on a noxious rule change allowing, more suspensions. That

rule in effect gave the opportunity for more bills to be heard with no amendments, and limited debate.

Today we get more of the same. We are getting it in closed rule form. We cannot amend this wasteful and redundant proposal unless we vote down the previous question. We probably cannot vote down the previous question because so many of our distinguished Members who are against closed rules are not really against closed rules. I suppose they are only against somebody else's closed rules.

It is the last day of January. We have not had an open rule yet. At this rate, it will be the Fourth of July before we vote on an amendment.

The substance of the bill is faulty too. Its intentions are noble, but it creates, at an original cost of \$1½ million, another committee to do something that we already have a \$360,000 joint committee to do. It comes from a committee which could do the same thing itself. If this sort of unicameral redundancy is the best thing we can produce in a full month of effort, the Lord help the taxpayer.

I urge the defeat of the previous question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 167, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—205

Abzug	Culver	Hansen, Wash.
Adams	Daniels	Helstoski
Addabbo	Dominick V.	Henderson
Alexander	Danielson	Hicks
Anderson	Davis, Ga.	Hillis
Annunzio	Delaney	Hinshaw
Arends	Denholm	Hollifield
Armstrong	Diggs	Holt
Aspin	Donohue	Holtzman
Bell	Drinan	Horton
Bergland	Dulski	Hosmer
Bevill	du Pont	Howard
Blatnik	Edwards, Calif.	Hudnut
Boland	Eilberg	Ichord
Bolling	Eshleman	Johnson, Calif.
Brademas	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Colo.
Brasco	Fascell	Johnson, Pa.
Bray	Fish	Jones, Okla.
Breaux	Flood	Jordan
Brinkley	Ford, Gerald R.	Karth
Broomfield	Ford	Kastenmeier
Brotzman	William D.	Kazen
Brown, Calif.	Forsythe	Keating
Brown, Mich.	Fraser	Kluczynski
Brown, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton	Lehman
Broyhill, Va.	Fuqua	Lent
Burke, Calif.	Gaimo	Litton
Burke, Mass.	Ginn	Long, La.
Burlison, Mo.	Gonzalez	Long, Md.
Camp	Grasso	Lujan
Carey, N.Y.	Green, Pa.	McCollister
Carney, Ohio	Griffiths	McCormack
Carter	Gubser	McFall
Cederberg	Gunter	McSpadden
Clark	Guyer	Madden
Clawson, Del.	Hamilton	Madigan
Conyers	Hammer	Mahon
Corman	Schmidt	Mailliard
Cotter	Hanley	Maraziti
	Hansen, Idaho	Martin, Nebr.

Mathias, Calif.	Quie	Steelman
Matsunaga	Quillen	Steiger, Wis.
Mazzoli	Rees	Stephens
Meeds	Reid	Stratton
Metcalfe	Reuss	Stubblefield
Mezvinsky	Riegle	Sullivan
Milford	Rodino	Taylor, N.C.
Mills, Ark.	Roe	Teague, Calif.
Minish	Rogers	Thone
Mitchell, Md.	Roncallo, N.Y.	Thornton
Mizell	Rooney, Pa.	Tierman
Moakley	Rose	Towell, Nev.
Moorhead, Pa.	Rosenthal	Udall
Morgan	Roush	Ullman
Murphy, Ill.	Roy	Vanik
Myers	Sandman	Vigorito
Natcher	Sarbanes	Waldie
Nelsen	Saylor	Ware
Nix	Schneebeli	Widnall
O'Brien	Schroeder	Wiggins
O'Neill	Selberling	Wilson
Owens	Shuster	Charles H., Calif.
Pepper	Sikes	Charles, Tex.
Perkins	Sisk	Wright
Pettis	Smith, Iowa	Wyatt
Peyser	Stanton	Young, Fla.
Pickle	J. William	Young, Ga.
Pike	Stark	Young, Tex.
Preyer	Steed	
Price, Ill.	Steele	

NAYS—167

Abdnor	Flynt	Parris
Anderson, Ill.	Frenzel	Poage
Andrews	Froehlich	Podell
N. Dak.	Gaydos	Powell, Ohio
Archer	Gettys	Price, Tex.
Ashbrook	Gibbons	Pritchard
Bafalis	Gilman	Rallsback
Baker	Goldwater	Rangel
Beard	Goodling	Rarick
Bennett	Gray	Regula
Blester	Gross	Rhodes
Bingham	Grover	Rinaldo
Bowen	Gude	Roberts
Brooks	Haley	Robinson, Va.
Buchanan	Hanrahan	Robison, N.Y.
Burgener	Hawkins	Rousselot
Burleson, Tex.	Hays	Roybal
Burton	Hébert	Runnels
Butler	Hechler, W. Va.	Ruth
Byron	Heckler, Mass.	Ryan
Casey, Tex.	Heinz	Sarasin
Chappell	Hogan	Satterfield
Chisholm	Huber	Scherle
Clancy	Hungate	Schellus
Clausen	Hunt	Shoup
Don H.	Hutchinson	Shriver
Cleveland	Jones, Ala.	Skubitz
Cochran	Jones, N.C.	Slack
Cohen	Jones, Tenn.	Spence
Collier	Kemp	St Germain
Collins	Ketchum	Staggers
Conable	King	Stanton
Conlan	Kuykendall	James V.
Conte	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Coughlin	Leggett	Stokes
Crane	Lott	Studds
Cronin	McCloskey	Symms
Daniel, Robert	McDade	Talcott
W. Jr.	McEwen	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel	Macdonald	Treen
W. C. (Dan)	Mallory	Veysey
Davis, S.C.	Mann	Waggoner
Davis, Wis.	Martin, N.C.	Walsh
Dellenback	Mathis, Ga.	Wampler
Dellums	Mayne	Whalen
Dennis	Michel	Whitehurst
Dent	Miller	Whitten
Devine	Mills, Md.	Williams
Dingell	Mink	Winn
Dorn	Minshall, Ohio	Wylder
Duncan	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wylie
Eckhardt	Mollohan	Wyman
Edwards, Ala.	Montgomery	Yates
Erlenborn	Moorhead,	Young, Ill.
Esch	Calif.	Young, S.C.
Findley	Mosher	Zablocki
Fisher	Moss	Zion
Flowers	Nichols	

NOT VOTING—59

Andrews, N.C.	Dickinson	Jarman
Ashley	Downing	Koch
Badillo	Evins, Tenn.	Kyros
Barrett	Foley	Landrum
Biaggi	Fountain	McClory
Blackburn	Frey	McKay
Breckinridge	Green, Oreg.	McKinney
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	Melcher
Chamberlain	Harrington	Murphy, N.Y.
Clay	Harsha	Nedzi
de la Garza	Harvey	O'Hara
Derwinski	Hastings	Obey

Passman
Patman
Patten
Randall
Roncalio, Wyo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Ruppe

Shipley
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stuckey
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.

Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
White
Wilson, Bob
Wolf
Yatron
Zwach

Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Wright
Wyatt

Wylie
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.

Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—135

Abdnor
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Bafalis
Baker
Beard
Bennett
Bingham
Bowen
Brooks
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton
Butler
Byron
Huber
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cochran
Collier
Collins
Conlan
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.
Daniel,
W. C. (Dan)
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Dennis
Devine
Dorn
Duncan
Erlenborn
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt

Frenzel
Froehlich
Gaydos
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilman
Goldwater
Goodling
Gray
Gross
Grover
Hanrahan
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hinshaw
Hogan
Hosmer
Huber
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Lott
McDade
McEwen
McKinney
Macdonald
Mallory
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Michel
Miller
Mills, Md.
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.

Mosher
Nichols
Parris
Podell
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Rallsback
Rarick
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Rose
Roussellot
Roybal
Runnels
Ruth
Ryan
Satterfield
Scherle
Sebelius
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Treen
Veysey
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Whalen
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Winn
Wylder
Wyman
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Zion

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the
resolution.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on that
I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 238, nays 135,
not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—238

Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Aspin
Bell
Bergland
Bevill
Blester
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
B. ay
Breaux
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Cederberg
Chappell
Clawson, Del.
Cohen
Conable
Conyers
Cornan
Cotter
Culver
Daniels,
Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Fuqua

Gialmo
Ginn
Gonzalez
Grasso
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Gunter
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hechler, W. Va.
Helms
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Holifield
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Hudnut
Hungate
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Okla.
Jordan
Kastner
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kluczyński
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McFall
McSpadden
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Malliard
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mezvisky
Milford
Mills, Ark.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mizell
Moakley
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.

Myers
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Neill
Owens
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Quile
Quillen
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reid
Reuss
Riegle
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roy
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shuster
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Ware
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.

Abdnor
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Bafalis
Baker
Beard
Bennett
Bingham
Bowen
Brooks
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton
Butler
Byron
Huber
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cochran
Collier
Collins
Conlan
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.
Daniel,
W. C. (Dan)
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Dennis
Devine
Dorn
Duncan
Erlenborn
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt

Frenzel
Froehlich
Gaydos
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilman
Goldwater
Goodling
Gray
Gross
Grover
Hanrahan
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hinshaw
Hogan
Hosmer
Huber
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Lott
McDade
McEwen
McKinney
Macdonald
Mallory
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Michel
Miller
Mills, Md.
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.

Mosher
Nichols
Parris
Podell
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Rallsback
Rarick
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Rose
Roussellot
Roybal
Runnels
Ruth
Ryan
Satterfield
Scherle
Sebelius
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Treen
Veysey
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Whalen
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Winn
Wylder
Wyman
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Zion

NOT VOTING—58

Andrews, N.C.
Ashley
Badillo
Barrett
Biaggi
Blackburn
Breckinridge
Burke, Fla.
Chamberlain
Clark
Clay
de la Garza
Derwinski
Dickinson
Downing
Evins, Tenn.
Foley
Fountain
Frey
Green, Oreg.

Hanna
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Jarman
Koch
Kyros
Landrum
McClary
McKay
Melcher
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara
Obey
Passman
Patman
Patten

Randall
Roncalio, Wyo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Ruppe
Shipley
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stuckey
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
White
Wilson, Bob
Wolf
Yatron

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the
table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the Presi-
dent of the United States was com-
municated to the House by Mr. Marks,
one of his secretaries, who also informed
the House that on January 26, 1973, the
President approved and signed a joint
resolution of the House of the following
title:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution designating
the week commencing January 28, 1973, as
"International Clergy Week in the United
States," and for other purposes.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY HOUSE RULES X AND XI

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report
House Resolution 132.

The Clerk read the resolution, as fol-
lows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved, That there is hereby created a
select committee to be composed of ten
Members of the House of Representatives
to be appointed by the Speaker; five from
the majority party and five from the minority
party, one of whom he shall designate as
chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the
membership of the committee shall be filled
in the manner in which the original ap-
pointment was made.

The select committee is authorized and
directed to conduct a thorough and com-
plete study with respect to the operation
and implementation of rules X and XI of
the Rules of the House of Representatives,
including committee structure of the House,
the number and optimum size of committees,
their jurisdiction, the number of subcom-
mittees, committee rules and procedures,
media coverage of meetings, staffing, space,
equipment, and other committee facilities.

The select committee is authorized and di-
rected to report to the House by bill, resolu-
tion, or otherwise, with respect to any mat-
ters covered by this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution, the se-
lect committee or any subcommittee there-
of is authorized to sit and act during ses-
sions of the House and during the present
Congress at such times and places whether
or not the House has recessed or adjourned.
The majority of the members of the commit-
tee shall constitute a quorum for the trans-
action of business, except that two or more
shall constitute a quorum for the purpose
of taking evidence.

To assist the select committee in the con-
duct of its study under this resolution, the
committee may employ investigators, at-
torneys, individual consultants or organiza-
tions thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and
other assistants; and all expenses of the se-
lect committee, not to exceed \$1,500,000 to be
available one-half to the majority and one-
half to the minority, shall be paid from the
contingent fund of the House on vouch-
ers signed by the chairman of the select com-
mittee and approved by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from
Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) will be recog-
nized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman
from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) will be recog-
nized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, we had
a pretty good debate on the rule, and I
do not propose to take additional time
unless some Member would like to ask me
a question. I shall be glad to reserve my
time and see if the gentleman from Ne-
braska wishes to take time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gen-
tleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I am glad to yield to
the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The issue was raised as to
the gentleman's position on the estab-
lishment or creation of select committees
as a result of his statement of March 9,
1971, when the gentleman stated that he
was opposed to the creation of select
committees as a matter of principle and
I assume high principle.

Mr. BOLLING. Has the gentleman
read the whole statement?

Mr. GROSS. I read enough of it.

Mr. BOLLING. Has the gentleman
read the part that says except in excep-
tional circumstances? This I consider an
exceptional circumstance.

Mr. GROSS. I see. A unique circum-
stance?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes, sir. I think it is unique.

Mr. GROSS. All right. I just wondered if the gentleman remembered his words or remarks.

Mr. BOLLING. I had enough of a memory of them so I looked them up to be sure what they were. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. And all of these Members to be endowed with \$1.5 million, or \$750,000 a year.

Will this committee travel?

Mr. BOLLING. No, sir; it will not. I hope the gentleman will give us his judgment as to how frugal the committee has been when it reports.

Mr. GROSS. It is not going to London or Paris?

Mr. BOLLING. So far as I am concerned there will be no Member travel whatever.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman in the resolution provides for \$1.5 million. Even though I supported the resolution, it does seem like a rather sizable amount. I wonder if the gentleman could expand a little on that and tell us just why he thinks they need that large a sum?

Mr. BOLLING. I do not really expect that the committee, if it operates as I hope it will, will need anything like that amount, but it was imperative, I thought, to assure that half the money would be available to one side and half to the other, to make sure we were not going to be partisan. I thought the only way to do that was to assure that they could function if they had two staffs. In other words, the committee could function with two separate staffs. I do not expect that to happen. I believe we will use a great deal less money than \$1.5 million, but I would have hated to have gone into a situation where it might have turned out to have an entirely partisan approach and not to have adequate money.

I have been very much opposed to having a management consultant study. I think this is a job that has to be done by 435 Members of the House on the best advice they can get, people who are somewhat familiar with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, my view about the management consultant study has been, although I spent hours working with them on it, I do not think it was successful or that it made any contribution, so I have a prejudice against studying this complicated institution with management consultants.

However, if the committee—and I am only one Member of the committee—if the committee decides I am wrong, I would like to see that the committee has the opportunity to decide. I will be fighting it all the way. That is the reason for the excessive amount of money.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my question was basically to find out if there was any basis upon which the gentleman came to that conclusion.

Mr. BOLLING. Well, there was a basis, and I do not happen to recall exactly, but there were people who worked out a staff

that seemed reasonable of about nine people on each side, five professional, and four clerical.

We investigated the expenditures of other select committees. One thing, for example, that we found rather horrifying was that there were select committees which spent \$750 a day for hearings, and I cannot conceive of doing that. But we set up a budget, taking into account all the expenditures, and we came out to about \$1,200,000 if we took into account this wild business of \$750 a day for hearings.

I do not even comprehend that, and I have been here for some time. In addition to that, we added to it about a quarter of a million dollars to take care of this business of a management consultant study.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot guarantee what the figures are going to be, but the gentlemen heard me do a very risky thing, that of telling my friend from Iowa that when we were all finished, I hoped he would give us a critique of how we had spent our money.

In other words, I am confident we are going to spend our money wisely and frugally and without any committee payroll excesses or the rest of those things that could go on.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, does he anticipate that other areas of the study by this committee will be the present makeup of the minority staff?

Mr. BOLLING. I would think it would be inescapable. My own view on the subject has been made clear in a variety of places, including a couple of books I have written.

Mr. Speaker, the dilemma is that sometimes we get into a conflict where we have a legislative committee as to absolutely how much control the minority is going to have over its staff.

Now, I am for doing two things—and it is extraordinarily difficult to accomplish these things when people will not compromise—I am in favor of the minority having absolute control over a substantial portion of the staff, but I am not in favor of setting up a situation—and this has happened in the past; I saw it happen once in a committee—where the minority purposely sets out to wreck the functioning of a committee and uses its staff for that purpose.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is this reservation: that somehow the majority—and I do not mean the majority party—the majority of the committee should have final control.

Now, it is extremely difficult to do the two things at the same time, but I think we have to achieve it, and clearly that is something that would have to be studied.

Mr. COLLIER. Particularly perhaps in setting up a staff so that the minority staff Members are as near as possible in a position of being in ratio to the Members of the House?

Mr. BOLLING. Well, I think that makes sense, but I frankly am not prepared to commit myself to anything so rigid as that, because I have tried very

hard to prepare myself for this task, if I had a role in it, by opening up my mind and trying to eliminate as many of the prejudices and prejudgments I had.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those unfortunate souls who has written books about the Congress—I do not feel really unfortunate, but it is very easy to quote something I have said. Of course, we all remember the old phrase about "Only my enemy would write a book." But I also would reserve the right to change my mind, and what I would express to the gentleman in my initial response to him is that that is the best I can say.

I mean it in entire good faith.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. My friend from Missouri presently addressing the House once wrote an excellent article, or perhaps it was contained in a book about the lords and dukes in the House of Representatives.

Will this legislation do anything to dispose of these powerful people, the lords and dukes that he wrote about at one time?

Mr. BOLLING. I do not know whether there are any lords or dukes around these days, I will say to my good friend from Iowa.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. On the question by the gentleman from Illinois about the division between the minority and the majority, as I understand it, the Rules Committee discussed the fact that we were going to try to divide it equally.

Mr. BOLLING. The resolution specifies that there will be \$1.5 million allocated, one-half to the majority and one-half to the minority. Frankly, I think we would all hope we would have a combined staff, but that resolution is absolute. If the minority wants to use three-quarters of a million dollars on the operation, it is their right under the resolution, and just so long as they ask for it, I think I have to sign the voucher.

Mr. LATTA. Hopefully we will not have to use that kind of money.

Mr. BOLLING. That is exactly right.

Mr. LATTA. Because this would be the maximum amount and perhaps it could be done for a lot less.

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. We have all heard the President's plan to change somewhat the executive branch of the Government. In case there are some changes made over there, I am wondering as to whether or not any effort would be made in such an organization as yours to try to dovetail it with that and the possibility of doing that. You know, they do affect each other. If the President's plan were to be passed, for example, we would have to consider seriously some changes in the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. It is a question that is

so complicated I have a great deal of difficulty in giving an honest answer. I will try to, though, and I will try to be brief.

I think there is a very serious fundamental question as to whether the House of Representatives, composed of 435 Members elected by a relatively small constituency, should try to organize itself as the executive organizes itself. There you have one elected official who, for all practical purposes, has complete control of the Executive Establishment except as that is modified by law; in other words, in something passed by the Congress and signed or accepted by the President or passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President and then overridden by the Congress.

What I am trying to say is I am not sure. Ordinarily one would think along those lines, and for years I did, but I am not sure the way the House organizes itself should correspond to the executive.

Mr. MAILLIARD. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true, generally speaking—it is not entirely true, but it is partially true. I believe—that the House committees show somewhat a relationship to the Cabinet posts, and if the President is going to change the executive, then there would have to be some corresponding change in the legislative.

Mr. BOLLING. Somewhat, I will have to say.

Mr. MAILLIARD. But would it not be necessary to function right so we would not have all jurisdiction in these committees and if they made a change there we would have to make a change here?

Mr. BOLLING. The whole situation would have to be carefully studied and considered. I want to make it clear I do not know what the end result will be.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. I understand the gentleman to say that this committee will make some studies of staffing of both the majority and minority. I wonder if the gentleman will indicate whether or not they will make a complete survey of the staffs of all of these committees, both overstaffing and understaffing. I am one of those Members who think this needs a lot of looking into, and I hope you will look into it.

Mr. BOLLING. I will say to the distinguished minority whip that this committee is going to try to analyze exactly what is happening now as a basis for trying to find out how we can do it better as a body.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CULVER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that it might be useful at this point in time to repeat—at least, for the purpose of making the legislative history in connection with House Resolution 132—to repeat very

briefly the colloquy I had in the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Missouri on yesterday. I referred at that time, he will recall, to a statement that appeared in the press on the 15th of January, the date of the introduction of the resolution, in which the gentleman indicated that further opening up of committee meetings would be under study by the select committee. I said at that time, and I expressed the hope, that it was not a matter that needed 2 years of study, and that it had been studied quite sufficiently and, indeed, as the author of the antisecrecy legislation I would hope we would get early action in this Congress on that kind of legislation either with the adoption of specific committee rules or a more general bill.

And the gentleman I think indicated yesterday that it was not his purpose in indicating this as a possible subject of discussion that it would necessarily indicate any attempt to delay or frustrate the purpose of those of us who would like to see this matter advanced on the legislative calendar.

Mr. BOLLING. That is certainly so. The Democratic caucus which meets tomorrow is going to have before it a resolution on that very subject of secrecy, and I know of nothing in this select committee that would in anyway inhibit the action of the caucus, the Members of the House, or the committees themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 132, creating a select committee to conduct a thorough and complete study of the committee structure of the House, their jurisdiction, procedure, and staffing, is a major step in the House of Representatives becoming truly a coequal branch of the Federal Government.

Reorganization, the first since 1946, is long overdue. The effectiveness, responsiveness, and implementation of legislative oversight by the House will be greatly enhanced by a recasting of responsibility and jurisdiction of our committee system.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, reform of the committee structure in the House is an issue which should concern each and every one of us, for it is directly connected with the ability of the Congress to remain responsive to the current needs of the American people. Certainly, it is proving more and more difficult to deal effectively with the problems of an America of the 1970's when the House is still using a committee structure based on the priorities of the 1940's. I hope that this legislation will prove the beginning of a long, hard look at the current workings of the Congress with an eye to making it work better.

There is one point, however, to which I would particularly like to address myself. This is the relationship between House Resolution 132 and other meaningful reform proposals before this Congress. This legislation must not be used as an excuse for denying or delaying other measures clearly needed to effec-

tively deal with problems of the utmost urgency. I have particular reference to my proposal, cosponsored by over 200 Members last year, to create a standing Committee on the Environment.

We must remember that House Resolution 132 will not bear fruit for at least another 2 years. The problems of which I speak will not wait that long. We are at a critical juncture in the war to protect our environment. Further delay will certainly mean added devastation for man's physical surroundings.

I would therefore urge the chairman of the Rules Committee to push forward with hearings on the proposal to establish a standing Committee on the Environment as expeditiously as possible. We must change the present system of referring environmental legislation to nearly two dozen separate legislative panels in the House if we are to responsibly protect the expressed interests of the American people in preserving a quality environment.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I wrote my colleagues suggesting that the Congress adopt a resolution reflecting the need to modernize the jurisdiction of our committees. I am therefore extremely happy today to rise in support House Resolution 132, which would create a select committee to study the operation of our committee system.

More than 25 years have elapsed since there last was a full reorganization and realignment of congressional committees. There have been a few accretions such as the science and space committees and a plethora of select, temporary, and special committees which attempt to catch up with new issues such as crime, hunger, and the elderly. During the past year several proposals for special committees have sought adoption in the House such as on energy and the environment. And there has just been organized—as a result of the fiscal crisis in the last Congress—a long overdue study committee to examine means of better equipping Congress in its budget and spending responsibilities.

It is my conviction, however, that a restructuring and reorientation of House committees is an essential task which needs to be undertaken now just as much as executive reorganization. And if one rejects large segments of contemplated executive departmental reorganization, even if one is skeptical of its philosophical underpinnings, the case for congressional committee reorganization on its own merits is compelling.

There is too much obsolescence, too much structural decay, too many cross jurisdictions and overlaps, too much erosion by time in our own committees. The past 25 years have seen a revolution in areas of public policy and concern and have added dimensions to congressional responsibilities which were not—and, in many instances, could not—be foreseen in 1946.

Though it is possible, of course, better to mesh the executive and legislative orbits of responsibility, it will at all events be impossible to achieve a perfect match between them. Surely we should do what we can to minimize excessive, redundant, or trivial appearances by ex-

ecutive and other witnesses. But, our first obligation is to see that there is a coherent, realistic, and contemporary setting for the consideration of all legislation and to be sure that the most commanding and imminent issues of public policy are mirrored and realized within the organizational structure of Congress.

It is clear that today both the House and the Senate fall wide of this mark. Some of our committees are already catch basins for miscellaneous or tenuously related subjects; others have acquired an unmanageable breadth of subject matter greater even than those which would be incorporated in each of the new executive departments proposed by the President; still other standing committees have jurisdictions too archaic or too narrowly conceived when viewed against modern public policy issues. And there are other policies—legislative and investigative—such as urban affairs, health services, the environment, economic conversion, energy, national population distribution and growth which fit at best uncomfortably and sometimes not at all into the committee structure within which we now operate.

This is not just a matter of convenience or incidental importance. It strikes to the core of our ability to fulfill meaningful and effective democratic assessment and control and to fulfill our appropriate constitutional role in a system of separated powers. If we are to be an accountable body, if we are to be more than a subordinate or dependent unit of government, then the reform of committees rises to the very top of any agenda of government reorganization. Tinkering, grafting, casual or periodic improvisation will no longer suffice. Nor will technology and computer resources alone—vital as these are also—compensate for or substitute for a close and vigorous review of the inner fabric of our legislative process—the committees.

I do not underestimate the complexity and difficulty of the task. However, it raises in an immediate and testing way our own ability to make Congress both a more effective and responsive branch of Government.

I believe this resolution furnishes a proper framework within which we can work toward a judicious treatment of committee structuring and jurisdiction. I am pleased that this resolution has bipartisan endorsement and that it provides for equal participation by both parties. This is essential to achieving enduring solutions which earn the confidence of the membership and of the public.

Therefore, I urge a favorable vote on House Resolution 132.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before the House to create a select committee to recommend reforms of the committee structure of the House, and I intend to vote for it. I voted against the rule in view of my general opposition to closed rules, which preclude amendments to bills and resolutions on the floor. My "nay" vote on the rule, however, should not be mistaken for opposition to the substance of this resolution.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to commend my

friend and colleague, Mr. BOLLING, for his leadership in developing this proposal and bringing it to the floor. I also want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) for his considerable contribution to the dialog and debate about the need for reform of the House committee structure. I refer specifically to a recent letter which Mr. CULVER sent to many Members of the House which eloquently described the nature and significance of outmoded committee jurisdictional boundaries in the House. That letter, in my judgment, more than any other single factor, moved the House to the action we are now taking to do something about this most important problem.

The most flagrant example, Mr. Chairman, of the need for reform of the committee structure is in the area of transportation. At least five major committees in the House have jurisdiction over one aspect or another of transportation. Public Works has jurisdiction over highways, Interstate and Foreign Commerce over airlines and intercity railroads, Banking and Currency over mass transit, Merchant Marine and Fisheries over most aspects of waterway transportation, and Ways and Means over trust funds and other special fiscal devices under which certain transportation programs are funded.

A legislative proposal to permit funds from the highway trust fund to be expended for mass transit has recently attracted considerable attention and support, and only narrowly missed being enacted by the last Congress. Consideration of that proposal in the House, however, has been greatly impeded by the deplorable fragmentation of Committee jurisdiction in the transportation field. The legislation, which I first introduced in 1965 with then-Senator Joseph Tydings, was referred to the Public Works Committee, which took the position that it did not have authority to act on it. What Committee had jurisdiction over the legislation was further confused and complicated by the fact that attempts to enact it as an amendment to legislation on the floor to a Highway Act and to an Urban Mass Transit Act were both ruled out of order as nongermane.

In response to this jurisdictional problem, Mr. Speaker, I introduced in 1970 a resolution (H. Res. 942) providing for creation of a Select Committee on Transportation charged with, among other things, recommending how we might change current machinery and procedures in the Congress to deal in a more efficient and unified manner with transportation proposals.

That resolution, which I reintroduced in the 92d Congress, has not been acted upon. But I hope and trust that the select committee created by House Resolution 132 will look very carefully at the structure of the committees with regard to transportation issues, and that it will give most serious consideration to establishing a permanent standing Committee on Transportation in the House with jurisdiction over all transportation programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is faced with one of the most serious challenges of its

history. Reform of the standing committees of the House to enable them to deal efficiently with current legislative issues will play a major part in reviving the Congress. If that reform is not forthcoming, the Congress will have little choice but to continue to be preempted and ignored by the executive branch. I look forward eagerly to the recommendations of the select committee to be created by House Resolution 132, and to the early implementation of its recommendations so that this Congress may better meet its responsibilities in the transportation field, and in every field of public policy.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONTE. 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 282, nays 91, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—282

Abzug	Cronin	Hamilton
Adams	Culver	Hammer-
Addabbo	Daniels, N.J.	schmidt
Alexander	Danielson	Hanley
Anderson,	Davis, Ga.	Hanrahan
Calif.	Delaney	Hansen, Idaho
Anderson, Ill.	Dellenback	Hansen, Wash.
Andrews,	Dellums	Hays
N. Dak.	Denholm	Hechler, W. Va.
Annunzio	Dennis	Heckler, Mass.
Archer	Dent	Heinz
Arends	Diggs	Helstoski
Armstrong	Dingell	Henderson
Aspin	Donohue	Hicks
Bafalis	Drinan	Hillis
Bell	Dulski	Hinshaw
Bergland	du Pont	Holifield
Bevill	Eckhardt	Holtzman
Blester	Edwards, Ala.	Horton
Bingham	Edwards, Calif.	Howard
Blatnik	Eilberg	Hudnut
Boland	Erlenborn	Hungate
Bolling	Esch	Hutchinson
Brademas	Eshleman	Ichord
Brasco	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Calif.
Bray	Evins, Tenn.	Johnson, Colo.
Breaux	Fascell	Johnson, Pa.
Brinkley	Findley	Jones, Ala.
Broomfield	Fish	Jones, Okla.
Brotzman	Flood	Jordan
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Karth
Brown, Mich.	Ford, Gerald R.	Kastenmeier
Brown, Ohio	Ford,	Kazen
Broyhill, N.C.	William D.	Keating
Broyhill, Va.	Forsythe	Kemp
Buchanan	Fraser	Ketchum
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	Kluczyński
Burlison, Mo.	Frenzel	Latta
Carey, N.Y.	Froehlich	Leggett
Carney, Ohio	Fulton	Lehman
Carter	Fuqua	Lent
Chappell	Giaino	Litton
Clark	Ginn	Long, La.
Clausen,	Gonzalez	Long, Md.
Don H.	Grasso	McCloskey
Clawson, Del	Gray	McCollister
Cleveland	Green, Oreg.	McCormack
Cohen	Green, Pa.	McDade
Collier	Griffiths	McFall
Conable	Grover	McKinney
Conte	Gubser	McSpadden
Conyers	Gude	Madden
Corman	Gunter	Madigan
Cotter	Guyer	Mahon
Coughlin	Haley	Mailliard

Mallory	Rees	Stratton
Mann	Regula	Stubblefield
Maraziti	Reid	Studds
Martin, Nebr.	Reuss	Sullivan
Mathias, Calif.	Riegle	Symington
Matsunaga	Rinaldo	Talcott
Mazzoli	Roberts	Taylor, Mo.
Meeds	Robison, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Metcalfe	Rodino	Teague, Calif.
Mezvisinsky	Roe	Thone
Milford	Rogers	Thornon
Miller	Roncallo, Wyo.	Tierman
Minish	Roncallo, N.Y.	Towell, Nev.
Mink	Rooney, Pa.	Treen
Minshall, Ohio	Rosenthal	Udall
Mitchell, Md.	Roush	Ullman
Mizell	Roy	Vanik
Moakley	Roybal	Veysey
Mollohan	St Germain	Vigorito
Moorhead, Calif.	Sandman	Waldie
Moorhead, Pa.	Sarasin	Ware
Morgan	Sarbanes	Whalen
Mosher	Saylor	Widnall
Moss	Schneebeli	Wiggins
Murphy, Ill.	Schroeder	Williams
Myers	Seiberling	Wilson,
Natcher	Shuster	Charles H.,
Nelsen	Sikes	Calif.
O'Neill	Sisk	Wilson,
Owens	Slack	Charles, Tex.
Pepper	Smith, Iowa	Wright
Perkins	Staggers	Wyatt
Pettis	Stanton,	Wylder
Peyser	J. William	Wyllie
Pickle	Stanton,	Yates
Pike	James V.	Young, Fla.
Poage	Stark	Young, Ga.
Preyer	Steed	Young, Ill.
Price, Ill.	Steele	Young, Tex.
Pritchard	Steelman	Zablocki
Quile	Steiger, Wis.	Zwack
Quillen	Stephens	
Rallsback	Stokes	

NAYS—91

Abdnor	Flynt	O'Brien
Ashbrook	Gaydos	O'Hara
Baker	Gettys	Parris
Beard	Gibbons	Podell
Bennett	Gilman	Powell, Ohio
Bowen	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Brooks	Goodling	Rarick
Burgener	Gross	Rhodes
Burke, Calif.	Hawkins	Robinson, Va.
Burleson, Tex.	Hogan	Rose
Burton	Holt	Rousselot
Butler	Hosmer	Runnels
Byron	Huber	Ruth
Camp	Hunt	Satterfield
Casey, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Chisholm	Jones, Tenn.	Sebelius
Clancy	King	Shoup
Cochran	Kuykendall	Shriver
Collins	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Conlan	Lott	Spence
Crane	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Robert	McEwen	Symms
W., Jr.	Macdonald	Waggonner
Daniel,	Martin, N.C.	Walsh
W. C. (Dan)	Mathis, Ga.	Wampler
Davis, S.C.	Mayne	Whitehurst
Davis, Wis.	Michel	Whitten
Devine	Mills, Md.	Winn
Dorn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wyman
Duncan	Montgomery	Young, S.C.
Fisher	Nichols	Zion

NOT VOTING—58

Andrews, N.C.	Harsha	Rangel
Ashley	Harvey	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Hastings	Rostenkowski
Barrett	Hébert	Ruppe
Biaggi	Jarman	Ryan
Blackburn	Koch	Shipley
Breckinridge	Kyros	Smith, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Landrum	Snyder
Cederberg	McClory	Stuckey
Chamberlain	McKay	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Melcher	Thompson, N.J.
de la Garza	Mills, Ark.	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Dickinson	Nedzi	Vander Jagt
Downing	Nix	White
Flowers	Obey	Wilson, Bob
Fountain	Passman	Wolff
Frey	Patman	Yatron
Hanna	Patten	
Harrington	Randall	

To the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the pro-

visions of House Resolution 132, 93d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the select committee to study the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives the following members of the House:

Mr. BOLLING, chairman; Mr. STEPHENS; Mr. CULVER; Mr. MEEDS; Mr. SARBANES; Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN; Mr. WIGGINS; Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 176 and House Resolution 132.

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

There was no objection.

MEETING OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that if at all possible, I hope the members of the committee just appointed will meet in the Committee on Rules at 3:30 p.m., today, room H313, for a very brief meeting.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain why the House should meet on Friday next? What business is there to transact?

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am glad to say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is a Democratic Caucus tomorrow and that there is no business for tomorrow, nor is there business for Friday.

Mr. GROSS. There will be business Friday if the House is called into session.

Mr. BRADEMAs. As the gentleman from Iowa, who is a great expert on the rules of the House, knows, it is not possible to adjourn over.

Mr. GROSS. Not possible to do what?

Mr. BRADEMAs. It is not possible to adjourn under the Constitution for more than 3 days.

Mr. GROSS. I assumed the House would adjourn from tomorrow until Monday next, in the absence of business on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. The Democrats go into caucus tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman has yielded to me.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I happen to have the time, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sorry.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sorry; I thought the gentleman from Indiana had the time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is the desire of the majority of the House, in view of that fact that we are having a caucus tomorrow, to have an all-day caucus. We have a long agenda.

There is no business scheduled for the remainder of the week. In view of this fact, we have asked that the session which would normally be scheduled for tomorrow, merely a perfunctory session, go over until Friday. We did not anticipate there would be objection by any Member.

Mr. GROSS. Do the Democrats who attend the caucus plan to eat no lunch tomorrow? Are they going to starve themselves in an all-day session?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is very interesting when one gets into a Democratic caucus.

Mr. GROSS. We can all agree on that.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am glad we are in agreement.

Mr. GROSS. I just do not like the idea of a session on Friday when there is absolutely no business. I had other plans made for Friday.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that there will be no legislative business on Friday. I am sure he has complete faith and trust in the leadership.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could say it was complete in matters of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-28)

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 Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

As predicted, 1972 was a very good year for the American economy.

From the end of 1971 to the end of 1972, total output rose by about 7½ percent. This is one of the largest 1-year increases in the past 25 years. This growth took place in a largely peacetime economy; it was not achieved by a war-fed, inflationary boom. In fact, real defense spending declined 5 percent during the year. More important is the fact that the big increase of production in the year just ended was accompanied by a reduced rate of inflation. Consumer prices increased a little more than 3 percent from 1971 to 1972—a far cry from the runaway inflation rate of 6 percent that confronted us in 1969.

A year ago, looking ahead to 1972, I said that the great problem was to get the unemployment rate down from the 6-percent level where it was in 1971. During 1972 the rate was reduced to a little over 5 percent. We should get this down further, and expect to do so, but what was accomplished was gratifying.

It is especially significant that the total number of people at work rose by 2.3 million from 1971 to 1972, the largest 1-year increase in 25 years.

Everything was not ideal in 1972—in the economy any more than in other aspects of our national life. Rising food prices were a major concern. The U.S. balance of trade with other countries did not improve as we had hoped. But all-in-all it was a very good year.

The economic performance of 1972 owed much to sound and forceful Government policy. The history of this policy goes back before 1972, and back before the dramatic moves taken on August 15, 1971. It goes back to the decision made in 1969 to bring to an end the dangerous inflation that had started in the mid-sixties. The decision was carried out by slowing down the rise of Federal spending and continuing the temporary tax increase that had been enacted in 1968 and by tightening monetary conditions. As a result, much of the cause of the inflation was removed and the rise in the cost of living was moderated. Without these steps, the subsequent success of price and wage controls would have been impossible.

Curbing inflation and cutting back on defense production necessarily involved a downturn in the economy and a rise of unemployment. To keep this from going too far, fiscal and monetary policy shifted in an expansive direction in 1970. And to speed up both the decline of inflation and the recovery of the economy, I announced the New Economic Policy on August 15, 1971. Temporary controls were imposed on prices, rents, and wages. Taxes were reduced. A little later we moved to stimulate the economy further by boosting Government expenditures in the first half of 1972, mainly by bringing forward expenditures that would have been made later.

The policies that began in 1969 contributed to the economic progress so visible in 1972. But Government policies alone did not do the job. Credit goes largely to a strong private economy and to the private citizens who cooperated in raising productivity, maintaining industrial peace, and conforming to the standards of the control system. The Government helped to create conditions in which private people could adapt to a growing economy that was far less defense-oriented and much less inflationary. But it was the individual American who made the adaptations.

The immediate economic goals for the domestic economy in 1973 are clear. Output and incomes should expand. Both the unemployment rate and the rate of inflation should be reduced further, and realistic confidence must be created that neither need rise again.

The prospects for achieving these goals in 1973 are bright—if we behave with reasonable prudence and foresight. By all signs a vigorous economic expansion is underway and will continue during the year. This will raise output and employment and reduce unemployment. The problem, as far as can now be foreseen, will be to prevent this expansion from becoming an inflationary boom.

That is why I put restraining Federal

expenditures at the top of the list of economic policies for 1973. Nothing is easier or more pleasant, at least for a bureaucracy, than to spend money. But beyond some point, which our budget plans already reach, everything that the Government gives out with one hand it must take back with the other, in higher taxes or more inflation or both. Spending proposals must be looked at in this way, by asking whether they are worth either of these costs. Much Government spending fails this test.

I am proposing a budget with expenditures of \$250 billion in the current fiscal year—an increase of \$18 billion from last year. I am proposing a \$19 billion increase for next year, to \$269 billion. Although those are large totals and large increases, they reflect a sense of responsibility and discipline. I urgently seek the cooperation of the country and the Congress in staying within my budget proposals.

Only by holding the line on Federal spending will we be able to reduce the inflation rate further in 1973. Productivity should still be rising strongly. Inflationary expectations have been subdued. Workers have been experiencing large gains in their real incomes and so the pressure to catch up will be less than it was earlier. Anti-inflationary forces are at work, but it will be necessary to keep our healthy expansion from becoming an overheated boom.

The system of wage and price controls in effect during 1972 helped bring about a combination of less inflation and more production. But it is not the best system for 1973. After intensive consultation with all parts of the American society we have concluded that controls should be substantially modified. There are several problem areas—food, construction, and medical care costs—where special efforts at restraint are needed, in some cases more intense than last year.

In the economy at large there is need to establish more firmly a pattern of behavior consistent with reasonable price stability. At the same time our own experience and the experience of other countries demonstrate that as controls continue, unless they are suitably modified, red tape multiplies, inequities increase, interferences with production and productivity become more severe, and the possibility is enhanced that prices will explode when controls are lifted. Therefore, we are modifying the control system in several ways.

We are setting forth standards of reasonable price and wage behavior to which we ask business and labor to conform. Private economic units will be able to determine by themselves whether price or wage increases are within the standards or not. They will not require advance approval from the Government. However, the Government will maintain the legal authority, the practical capacity, and the will to intervene where necessary to stop action that is unreasonably inconsistent with the standards. I am asking Congress to extend the Economic Stabilization Act for 1 year, to April 30, 1974, to continue the authority. There should be no doubt about the fact that the authority will be used where needed.

An essential part of our anti-inflation program must be an increase of food supplies to restrain increases of food prices and bring about reductions where possible. The combination of natural occurrences holding down food production in the United States and abroad with rising consumers' incomes at home caused a sharp increase in food prices last year. These same forces will be at work in the early part of this year. But we have taken steps to increase food supplies. Quotas which previously limited the import of meat have been suspended. Restrictions on the acreage planted to major field crops have been relaxed. An increased amount of dried milk is being allowed into the country. Subsidies on agricultural exports have been eliminated. Grazing of cattle is being permitted on acreage diverted from crop production. We have established new machinery in the Federal Government to assure that high priority is given to holding down food prices.

Restraint in budget policy, the new system of cooperative price and wage controls and special efforts to increase food supplies, coupled with the productivity and vigor of the private economy, should make 1973 another year in which inflation and unemployment decline and output rises. But what is at stake in the policies of 1973 is more than economic performance in 1973. What is at stake is whether we can make 1973 the prelude to a sustained period of growth and stability in a free economy. Since 1968 the Government and the economy have been largely absorbed in the negative task of correcting the destabilizing consequences of the financing of the Vietnam war. That period is almost over. Now we can stop putting out fires and turn to building a better economic order.

We must develop more reliable and responsible attitudes and methods for dealing with the Federal budget, so that it is not perpetually on the margin of an inflationary explosion. We must prepare for the end of wage and price controls, and be willing to show the same courage in taking them off as was shown in imposing them. We must weed out the restrictive effects of the large number of other economic controls exercised by the Federal Government, most of them having their origins decades ago, and many of them interfering with productivity and production. And we must strengthen the forces of competition in a vigorous free-enterprise economy.

Nowhere is the need to make 1973 a year of economic reform more apparent than in our international relations. Our actions of August 15, 1971, put the world on the path of negotiation for improvement of the international economy. Last year we made proposals for the reform of the international financial system, and these proposals are now the subject of discussion by high-level officials of the member countries of the International Monetary Fund. This year we expect to enter negotiations on the subject of trade.

We want the American people to be able to buy those foreign goods and services that are better, cheaper, or more interesting than our own. That raises

the American standard of living. We want our people to be able to invest abroad when that is the most profitable thing to do. But we also want the American people to be able to pay for these purchases and investments in the way that is best for us. That means, first, that we must be able to pay by selling abroad the things that we produce best, and selling them on the best terms that we can freely obtain. Second, it means that we must be able to pay in a way that is sustainable so that we are not confronted with the need for sudden and possibly painful adjustments.

Existing arrangements are not favorable to us in either respect. We have been buying from abroad in rapidly increasing amounts, and that has helped the American people. But our exports, with which we seek to pay for these imports, have been subject to high barriers, particularly in the case of our agricultural products. We have not been able to sell enough to pay for our overseas expenditures, and so we have had to pay by incurring more and more short-term debts abroad. This is not a situation that can go on indefinitely; its sudden ending could be disruptive. Therefore we want to bring about those reforms that will permit us to earn our way.

Our proposals have been, and will be, put forth in the U.S. national interest. But this is not contrary to the interest of other countries. International competition is shifting from the military and political arenas to the economic. This is a great advantage, because in economic competition every participant can win—there need be no losers. The effort of each nation to produce and sell what it can do most efficiently will benefit others. This is the fundamental belief underlying our proposals for reform and the fundamental reason for thinking that a satisfactory agreement will be reached.

The general prediction is that 1973 will be another very good year for the American economy. I believe that it can be a great year. It can be a year in which we reduce unemployment and inflation further and enter into a sustained period of strong growth, full employment, and price stability. But 1973 will be a great year only if we manage our fiscal affairs prudently and do not exceed the increases in Federal expenditures that I have proposed. This is the practical lesson of the experience from 1965 to 1968, when loose fiscal policy turned a healthy expansion into a feverish boom followed by a recession. I am determined to live by this lesson. And I urgently appeal to the Congress to join me in doing so.

RICHARD NIXON.

JANUARY 31, 1973.

TIME FOR CHANGE IN REA

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial regarding subsidized REA interest rates which

appeared in the January 3, 1973, edition of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.:

TIME FOR CHANGE IN REA

The Nixon administration has a good case for its decision to replace the low-cost credit system of the Rural Electrification Administration with higher-interest loans. The bleak days of the New Deal required emergency measures that are no longer needed.

In the early 1930s, much of rural America was still relying on oil and candles for light. Private utility companies found it unprofitable to extend service to those areas. So Congress set up the REA in 1936. The goal was two-fold: To electrify the countryside, and to help provide a low-cost, dependable source of power that would force private utilities to keep their rates down.

The first goal has largely been met. Rural cooperatives would not have been possible without government backing. But now their major work is expanding and refining service. They should be able to do that with more modest support.

A good parallel is offered by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which also was established to bring power to an area that private industry was unwilling to serve. At first the authority was funded directly from Washington. Now it successfully goes to the open bond market to finance improvements.

The second goal involves much more controversy. The rural and municipal utilities have kept private rates lower than they would have been. In 1967, the respective averages per kilowatt-hour were \$1.49 and \$2.31. But the private industry has been charged with gross overcharging of customers because of the laxity of state regulatory commissions.

The commissions set private rates. A reasonable return on investment in plant and equipment is generally considered to be six per cent. Critics contend, however, that the commissions often accept the word of the utilities about their revenue needs, partly because of understaffing and partly because the private companies with their high-powered attorneys have developed an excessive influence over the politically appointed commissioners.

Senator Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.) has maintained that, on the basis of a six-per-cent return, the utilities overcharged the public 1.4 billion dollars in 1967. He cited two reasons: Some commissions approved rates that gave more than six per cent, and the utilities are permitted to include charitable donations, lobbying and advertising expenses and the cost of preparing rate cases as part of their investment.

The elimination of the two-percent federal loans by the REA is not likely to add to the rate problem. Nor are the new five-per-cent guaranteed loans likely to put the rural cooperatives out of business. The rate issue should be settled by the state commissions, if necessary with investigations by the Federal Power Commission or Congress to make sure that "reasonable" rates are not unreasonably padded. For one thing, the commissions should have skilled lawyers and other staff members qualified to judge utility operations.

PROPOSED OUTLAYS FOR DEFENSE

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed budget is a clear expression of his intention to define Federal responsibility over the next 4 years by shifting the solution for many domestic problems away from Washington. However, the attention to the military side of

the budget appears to be constant and there are items in the budget that will demand the scrutiny and concern of all Members of Congress, if we are to develop an intelligent and effective defense posture for the future.

Today's Washington Post contains an excellent editorial appraisal of the proposed defense outlays, along with some cogent suggestions of areas that merit close congressional attention. I include the text of that editorial:

THE PROPOSED OUTLAYS FOR DEFENSE

Minus funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense portion of Mr. Nixon's proposed outlay for fiscal 1974 comes to around \$79 billion. This figure, as the President and his spokesmen have rightly pointed out, represents a much lower proportion of the overall federal budget and of the GNP than defense spending did when he assumed office. They also observe that in constant 1974 dollars, the total figure represents a lower expenditure for defense than in fiscal year 1964—before the Vietnam build-up.

It is to take nothing away from the administration's understandable satisfaction with these developments to remark that the defense budget is still mighty high. We have no doubt that had the same rigid standards of proven need and proven efficiency been applied to certain weapons procurement programs that were applied to programs in the domestic sector, a number of planes and ships would likely have gone the way of the poverty program or impacted area aid to the schools. And, based on his record over the past couple of years, Chairman Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee (who was reported in serious condition at a late hour last night as a result of gunshot wounds) offered us reasons to expect that between \$1 and \$2 billion worth of excess in proposed expenditures for military procurement and research could be found. There will doubtless be other congressional settings for dispute over these hardware programs.

It is a dispute into which the services will move unequally. The Army, having already lost its proposed gunship helicopter and main battle tank to congressional actions, comes in with very little in the way of big, immediately costly programs beyond the SAM-d missile. And, to its credit, the administration has not asked funds to build the second Safeguard ABM site permitted us under the SALT agreement. The Air Force is, so to speak, at the take-off stage. Both the B-1 strategic bomber and the F-15 fighter do not yet reflect anything like the costs they could in time incur, although this year's budget does include a big purchase of F-15s. (We note that our old friend AWACS, the strategic air defense program about which Secretary Laird once accurately observed that this newspaper had a "thing," is in a state of relative repose. It is reportedly in process of being transformed into a less ambitious and more sensible tactical air defense project.)

It is the Navy that will be incurring the large and visible procurement costs with its various aircraft and ship-building projects and with its progress on the new long range underwater strategic missile system, Trident, and the new CVN 70 nuclear powered aircraft carrier among other major projects. Navy cost overruns, plus the relationship of Mr. Nixon's new budget director, Roy Ash, to the settlement of his old firm's (Litton Industries) claims against the Navy are bound to stir up further controversy on the Hill. And, despite the fact that Congress last year authorized procurement for both the Trident and the CVN 70, so too the pace at which the first project is proceeding and the early initiation of the second are bound to create new conflict. Especially where Trident is concerned, the accelerated rate of the program continues to raise the question of whether our under-

water arsenal is dangerously outpacing our possible knowledge of the anti-submarine warfare techniques it may eventually be pitted against.

Both ultimate outlays of money and the safety and security afforded by the force structure we are creating are at issue in these administration requests, and they are matters on which Chairman Stennis along with others on the Hill have spoken wisely. But Mr. Stennis—unlike some of the liberal Democrats in Congress—also has no illusions about where the big financial outlay is going. It is going into manpower costs which have risen to 56% of the defense budget. As Caspar Weinberger, Mr. Nixon's outgoing budget director has aptly said, until the Congress granted substantial military pay increases in the mid-sixties, the nation was in effect taxing draftees to pay our national military bill. Now the public has assumed the cost. Compared to 1968, we are now spending approximately \$7 billion dollars a year more on military pay and personnel costs, even though military forces have been reduced by 1.3 million men. If we were paying this smaller force at the old rate, we would be saving close to \$20 billion a year. With the creation of an all-volunteer army and with the need to create new incentives to bolster the strength and effectiveness of the Reserves and National Guard, these costs cannot be expected to wither away. Moreover, the pressure for an unwarranted increase in military retirement benefits "recomputation" could put the whole thing out of sight.

All this suggests two things to us. One is that the Pentagon, for all the modest progress in these matters it has claimed, is obliged to take much more comprehensive and effective measures to reduce the excessive ratio of support-to-combat troops in the services, to cut back on the overblown general officer class, to close unneeded bases and to take similar steps such as creating a smaller but more efficient Reserve that will result in holding the line on personnel-related costs. The other is that those legislators who have preferred to address the defense budget solely in terms of glamorous, visible and highly costly individual weapons systems, should bend their attention to the manpower cost issue. Last summer, Chairman Stennis could only get three votes beside his own against a bill for "recomputation" of retirement benefits; and this year the administration has requested a "recomputation" bill that would cost around \$360 million for the coming fiscal year. The point is that the administration bill would also incur a retirement benefit obligation to those it covered coming, over time, to more than \$10 billion.

Recomputation, like other payroll issues, lacks much of the drama of the weapons systems battles. But that is where sensible congressional attention should now be turned. We would cite Mr. Weinberger again in support of the need to keep our military outlays under control: "The defense budget . . . must be seen not only in terms of what we must defend ourselves against but what we have to defend. The more we take from the commonwealth for its defense, the smaller it becomes."

THE CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the recent riots and disturbances at Attica, Rahway, and other correctional institutions stand as vivid testimony to the failure of America's prison system. Soaring crime rates contribute

further evidence. Many believe that recidivism constitutes the hard core of this country's crime problem. An estimated 40 to 75 percent of our supposedly "rehabilitated" offenders commit additional and often more serious crimes upon release. Four out of five felonies are committed by alumni of our correctional institutions. It seems that our prisons are not correctional at all but rather colleges of crime that graduate men and women more deviant, disturbed, and expert in criminal methods than when they were first admitted.

Although rehabilitation has been the espoused goal of prisons for over a century, more attention has been given to punishment than positive action. We have paid sorely for this negligence—with the lives of prisoners, of correctional officers, and of ordinary citizens, who are increasingly the victims of a growing crime rate.

Today I am introducing a bill which is designed to close the gap between rhetoric and the reality of true reform. I am pleased to announce that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch), the ranking minority member of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, is a cosponsor. Only with bipartisan support can we expect to combat effectively the grave problems facing penal institutions. This is not another research or study effort. The Correctional Manpower and Employment Act of 1973 is an action proposal with a two-fold purpose: To create training and employment programs for offenders in order to increase their chances of getting and keeping a constructive job upon release, and to improve the effectiveness of correctional staff through better programs of recruitment, training, and personnel management.

The goal of our correctional process should be to prepare an offender to re-enter the community so that he can lead a productive and crime-free life. Employment is absolutely essential. Studies have shown conclusively that the ability of a released offender to stay out of trouble is tied directly to his ability to get and hold a job. Teaching offenders skills and enabling them to find decent jobs ought to be the most important aim of the correctional process.

But the unemployment rate for ex-offenders is three times the national average. Why? Surprisingly, the ex-offender's prison record is not the most significant barrier to his employment; it is his lack of marketable vocational skills. Fewer than 85 percent of all Federal prisoners have marketable job skills, and prisoners leaving our State institutions are even less prepared to face the job market of today.

Prison training programs today are limited in range and content and bear little relevance to outside employment needs. They are not geared to the inmate's interests or capabilities but rather to the institution's needs. For example, prisoners in New York State institutions are trained to become barbers, only to find upon release that the State of New York refuses to grant barbers' licenses to ex-offenders. As Chief Justice Burger so aptly put it:

It is no help to prisoners to learn to be

pants pressers if pants pressers are a glut in the labor market or bricklayers or plumbers if they will not be admitted into a union.

The thrust of my bill is to link job training with existing opportunities for employment. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make grants to correctional agencies and to public or private agencies for the training and employment of offenders, giving priority to programs in which public or private employers actually find jobs for participants.

The bill aims at creating job training and employment opportunities for offenders during all stages of the criminal justice system—before trial and during and after incarceration. For example, financial assistance will be given to pretrial or other intervention programs, thereby, offering an opportunity to offenders to participate prior to consideration of their cases. Following the program, a recommendation is made to the court on the behavior of the individual charged. If his performance is favorable, charges could be dropped. Such a program not only reduces court congestion and long delays between arrest and trial, but also prevents stigmatization of young first offenders.

To help offenders during the time of their incarceration, my bill provides grants to prisons, jails, and other agencies to increase and expand their job training and employment opportunities. Let me briefly describe a few of the programs included. First, it is important to know the offender's skills, aptitudes, and interests before selecting his rehabilitative program. So diagnostic tests and interviews are available.

Another hindrance facing offenders is simply their ignorance of the process of finding a job. We must instruct them in job interviewing and proper work habits.

In addition, we need to make prison work more relevant to outside job vacancies. My bill would upgrade work in correctional institutions so that skills developed by offenders, such as institutional cooking or laundering could be applied effectively to outside employment opportunities.

In cooperation with various labor unions, my bill supports apprentice training programs in skills that will be in demand upon release. Training time spent within the correctional institution would be counted toward the required union apprenticeship period.

The bill also provides grants to public or private agencies to establish training and employment programs for offenders after their release. It supports work-release programs that allow the offender to gain realistic on-the-job training in a community. The participant could learn not only vocational skills, but also how to adjust to work-a-day community living.

Another program eligible for funding is a training program for important people in the offenders' lives—their families, parole officers, and other appropriate citizens—to sensitize them to the special employment problems of ex-offenders and their key role in the rehabilitative process.

A role is given to both the public and private sectors. The cooperation of the

private sector in particular is paramount to the success of our job-oriented rehabilitative efforts. Unless the offender can feel part of the larger community again—as demonstrated by his ability to obtain a job—he cannot be expected to commit himself to a law-abiding life within it. My bill provides for a tax credit to employers of ex-offenders, after the offender has worked for 1 year, and it is agreed he will be kept on for another year.

Another section of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to conduct various types of model programs specifically designed to increase the employment opportunities of offenders.

One is a probation subsidy experiment, under which the Secretary would make grants to certain States that agreed not to incarcerate offenders. Instead the States would keep offenders in the community and provide them with intensive counseling, vocational training, and other supportive services using the funds that otherwise would have been spent on incarceration.

Another model program is an ex-offender-oriented employment service. The bill would fund special units established in State agencies of the U.S. Employment Service, composed of specialized personnel responsible for placement activities. They would interview prisoners while in the institutions and give them special assistance in finding jobs upon release.

A third program is a project to aid selected States in shifting their juvenile offenders from reform schools to smaller community-based facilities or programs. Reform schools have proven just as ineffective and harmful as our adult correctional institutions, if not more so. Recidivism rates for the under-20 age group are higher than for any other age category—typically as high as 80 percent. This bill authorizes grants to selected States so they can close down their youth prisons, using their resources instead to place young offenders in halfway houses, group shelters, foster homes, and other community-based facilities. There the juveniles would be provided with special counseling services, education and vocational training, employment opportunities, and other supportive services designed to give them a true opportunity for rehabilitation. For the dangerously disturbed few, who must remain confined for safety's sake, grants are available to States to provide them with special psychiatric care.

The bill also includes two model programs which are designed to increase communication between inmates and correctional officials.

One is a project to determine the value of establishing ombudsmen in correctional institutions to help resolve prisoner grievances, which while sometimes petty, nonetheless have led to riot and disturbance. The bill authorizes grants to selected States for establishing prison ombudsmen, who would be responsible for dealing with inmate grievances on a day-by-day basis. Particular attention would be given to solving those problems involving prisoner work assignments, vocational training, and employment opportunities.

Should communication between prisoner and official break down, and a riot occur, however, we need an effective means to negotiate prisoner grievances without the bloodshed of violent confrontation. The bill thus authorizes funding for a project to evaluate the use of third-party professional mediators to resolve conflicts between inmates and officials during such critical times. Under this program, grants are authorized to establish mobile "crisis teams" who would be trained to negotiate agreements during prison riots or other disturbances. These teams would be comprised of professional negotiators from business, industry, and other appropriate fields. Grants available under this program would also cover any workshop sessions and training programs established to adapt arbitration skills to the specific area of prison conflict.

In addition to the above-mentioned programs, the Secretary may conduct other projects designed to improve inmate training and employment opportunities and the effectiveness of correctional personnel. It is important that the Federal Government support innovative programs that could have possible nationwide application and bring insight into new correctional techniques.

Federal, State, and local laws pose another significant barrier to an ex-offender's employment, since they often deny him access to certain positions because of his past record. In some States ex-offenders cannot obtain driver's licenses, work in establishments handling alcoholic beverages, or serve as beauty operators. I fail to see the necessity or value of such laws. They harm the offender's chances for rehabilitation, and threaten the community by increasing the likelihood that the offender will be forced back into crime. My bill authorizes the study of State laws that are statutory impediments to employment, so that we can best determine how to change them.

In order to bring about the reform so desperately needed in our corrections system, we need not only the right programs but also the right people to administer them. Without this key ingredient, it will be difficult if not impossible to implement our proposals.

The second purpose of this measure is to improve the effectiveness of correctional personnel. We need more aggressive programs of recruitment, training, and personnel management to fulfill a vital need in the overall correctional process.

Many correctional personnel are older than most inmates and have other differences that act as barriers to understanding and communication. Recruitment of correctional staffworkers is further hampered by restrictive physical requirements which are unrelated to any work that must be performed, and result in turning away many otherwise qualified applicants.

Training programs are also inadequate. Many guards qualify for their demanding, difficult jobs by simply passing a civil service examination and a physical. Most have a low level of general education—16 percent have not even completed high school. Yet, inservice

training programs for correctional staff are extremely limited.

A national survey of correctional personnel conducted by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training found that inservice training programs were available to only 7 percent of all administrators, 9 percent of all supervisors, 10 percent of all functional specialists and 14 percent of institutional lineworkers.

My bill attempts to overcome this deficit by giving funds to correctional agencies to expand their recruitment and training programs. Emphasis is on opening up the correctional field to a greater number of young people, women, and minority group members. Grants are also available to recruit volunteers and legal, medical, and other professional and paraprofessional personnel to assist in the area of corrections. Priority will be given to those programs that contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and advancement of correctional personnel so that tightly scheduled written examinations or unrelated physical requirements are removed as impediments to a correctional career.

Training programs will be extended to present correctional personnel as well as to the new recruits, which will include seminars, courses, and sabbatical leaves for educational purposes. Funds are also available for the development of courses and curriculum in cooperation with institutions of higher education to raise the general level of education of corrections staff and to inform them of new ideas in their field. Financial assistance will also be available for persons attending school to advance in a corrections career.

The Correctional Manpower and Employment Act also creates a National Corrections Manpower Center under the supervision of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons that will focus on a long-term manpower development plan to meet the overall needs of the correctional system. The center will also arrange regional training programs as well as give technical assistance to correctional institutions.

I am making available to the Members of the House a section-by-section analysis of the bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1973

SEC. 2. Statement of Purpose.

This section declares it to be the policy of the United States to improve the correctional process by providing comprehensive manpower training and employment programs for offenders, and by improving the effectiveness of correctional personnel through better programs of recruitment, training, and personnel management.

SEC. 101. Grants to Correctional Agencies for the Training and Employment of Offenders and the Improvement of Correctional Personnel.

Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make grants to any correctional agency for programs to improve training and employment opportunities of offenders and to improve the effectiveness of correctional personnel.

Manpower programs for offenders, eligible for assistance, include: training and employment programs in correctional institutions (including on-site and off-site work experience projects); research programs, training and employment programs in model commu-

nity training and employment centers for juvenile offenders; diagnostic tests and interviews of offenders; training for offenders in finding employment; pre-release furloughs for offenders seeking employment; halfway houses for work-releasees; and methods of upgrading work in correctional institutions.

Programs to improve correctional personnel include recruiting and training programs, with priority given to those programs that help eliminate artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. These programs include attracting paraprofessionals through in-service training which would provide upward mobility into a corrections career; attracting young people, women, minority group members, volunteers, and legal, medical, and other professionals to assist in the area of corrections. Training programs eligible for assistance provide for use of private industry's resources; programs to retrain present corrections personnel; provision of sabbatical leaves; development of courses and curricula in cooperation with institutions of higher education; and financial assistance to persons attending educational institutions to advance in a corrections career.

Provision is also made for flexible work schedules, improved working conditions, promotional opportunities and health insurance for correctional personnel.

Sec. 201. Grants to Public or Private Agencies for the Training and Employment of Offenders and Ex-Offenders.

Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make grants to any public or non-profit private department, agency, or organization to establish training and employment programs for offenders and ex-offenders, and programs to improve the effectiveness of correctional personnel. Provides that the Secretary may also make contracts with any profit-making organization for the employment of offenders, including related training programs and supportive services.

These programs include pretrial and other intervention programs which provide an opportunity to individuals who have been charged with an offense to participate in training and employment programs, prior to final disposition of their cases; programs offering a full range of public employment and advancement opportunities; training programs, established by Joint Apprenticeship Committees, with priority given for programs in which training time spent within the correctional institution is counted toward period of apprenticeship of offenders completing training; work-release programs, including programs in the area of environmental protection; professional and paraprofessional training programs; training programs for ex-offenders in the process of finding employment; and training programs for prospective employers, parole officers, family members of ex-offenders, and others to sensitize them to the ex-offender's special employment problems.

Sec. 301. Federal Programs for the Training and Employment of Offenders and Ex-Offenders and the Improvement of Correctional Personnel.

Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to conduct model or demonstration programs designed to facilitate the training and employment of offenders and their reintegration into the community, and to improve the effectiveness of correctional personnel.

Requires the Secretary to establish these programs on the basis of their potential effectiveness, and in areas having the most need.

These programs include the following: (1) a Probation Services project, under which the Secretary shall make grants to selected States of one-half the amount it costs to incarcerate an offender, if the States agree to keep certain offenders in the community and use an amount equal to the cost of their incarceration to provide them with intensive probation services, emphasizing vocational training

and employment, (2) a State Employment Service project, which establishes in State agencies of the U.S. Employment Service special units composed of specialized personnel responsible for the job placement of ex-offenders, (3) an Ex-Offender Placement project, to assist in the placing of qualified ex-offenders who are denied employment for reasons other than their ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonding, (4) a project for the employment of offenders in Federal assistance programs, (5) projects to determine the efficacy of closing down State reform schools, providing instead community-based treatment for juvenile offenders, (6) projects to determine the value of using professional mediators to resolve conflicts between inmates and correctional officials during prison riots and disturbances, and (7) projects to determine the value of establishing ombudsmen in correctional institutions to deal with prisoner grievances, especially those relating to vocational training programs and assignments and employment opportunities before and after release.

Sec. 401. Conditions for Assistance for All Applicants.

Requires any correctional agency or public or private agency desiring financial assistance to submit an application to the Secretary of Labor. Each application shall include assurances that the applicant will make use of the best available resources in developing their programs; appropriate evidence of community understanding and cooperation in the development or operation of offender training and employment programs in the community; provision for the involvement of industry, labor and employment personnel from the private sector of the economy, as well as educational and vocational education personnel; provision for utilization of trained professionals and paraprofessionals; and provisions meeting other administrative requirements.

Sec. 402. Conditions for Assistance for Correctional Agencies.

Provides that each application submitted by a correctional agency shall include certain additional provisions, including assurances that offenders participating in training and employment programs are selected on an objective basis; assurances that supportive services are provided along with training and employment; provision for the maximum utilization of work-release and the use of up-to-date training equipment; and assurances that prior arrangements have been made for release of participants upon satisfactory completion of training.

Sec. 403. Conditions for Assistance for Public or Private Agencies.

Provides that each application submitted by a public or private agency shall include certain additional provisions, including evidence of cooperation from the appropriate State department of corrections or correctional agency; and, in the case of a profit-making agency, assurances that employment will be provided for each offender who participates in a training program.

Sec. 411. Allocation of Funds—Equitable Distribution.

Requires the Secretary to establish criteria assuring equitable distribution of assistance by State, taking into account, among other factors, the ratio of the number of prisoners under 25 in each State to the total number in the country; the ratio of the number of prisoners in each State to the total population of the State; the ratio of the number of persons in the care of correctional agencies within each State to the total number in the country; the needs of the correctional agencies within each State in proportion to the needs in the Nation as a whole.

The aggregate assistance to the agencies and entities within any one State shall not exceed 15% of the funds appropriated.

Sec. 412. Allocation of Funds—Priority in Funding.

Provides priority in funding for programs assisted under this Act to be given to those most likely to be effective in meeting their goals. With respect to training and employment programs for offenders, priority shall be given to those in which arrangements are made with public or private employers for the employment of individuals participating in these programs.

Sec. 413. Allocation of Funds—Priority in Refunding.

Provides priority in continuing funding for programs assisted under this Act to be given to those applicants who show a high placement rate, taking into account either the relation of their placement rate to the gross national placement rate for all offenders or to the national rate for offenders having similar placement problems.

Sec. 414. Allocation of Funds—Installment Payments.

This section permits the Secretary of Labor to make installment payments to any grantees under this Act.

Sec. 421. Coordination and Program Linkages—Agencies Involved.

Requires the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to enter into agreements to avoid program duplication and to assure the combining of resources, maximum coordination, and joint planning between programs conducted under this Act and other programs administered by these officers.

Sec. 422. Coordination and Program Linkages—Education for Offenders and Correctional Personnel.

Requires the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to enter into agreements pursuant to which the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare will provide education for offenders and ex-offenders and correctional personnel participating in programs under this Act, and will establish linkages between programs under this Act and education, vocational rehabilitation, and other similar programs.

Sec. 423. Coordination and Program Linkages—Volunteer Recruitment.

Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make arrangements with the Director of Action for the use of volunteers recruited by the Director to assist in the operation of programs under this Act.

Sec. 424. Coordination and Program Linkages within Each State.

Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into such arrangements as are necessary to ensure maximum coordination and joint planning between programs conducted under this Act within each State.

Sec. 431. Definitions.

This section defines the terms "correctional agency", "offender", and "State".

"Correctional agency" means, in addition to any Federal, State, or local jail or prison, any Federal, State, or local correctional department or agency, any community-based correctional facilities, such as half-way houses, prerelease and postjudiciary referral centers, juvenile homes and detention facilities, and other appropriate facilities.

"Offender" means any person charged with or convicted of an offense, including juveniles against whom proceedings have been brought.

"State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Sec. 501. Additional Incentive for Employment of Offenders and Ex-Offenders.

This section provides for a tax credit for employers who place offenders or ex-offenders, certified by the Secretary as having successfully completed training under this Act, in employment or on-the-job training. Such employers may claim an income tax credit equal to 20% of the wages paid such em-

ployees in the first 12 months of employment, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of work incentive program expenses. (The amount of the tax credit for any one employer is limited to no more than the greater of \$25,000 or 50% of his total tax liability in any taxable year, but amounts in excess of these limits may be applied to other taxable years under carry-back and carryover provisions. Tax credits would be recaptured if the employer discharges the employee during the first 12 months of employment or within a year after the first 12 months of employment unless the employee leaves voluntarily or because of disability or is discharged for misconduct. The employee must be paid wages comparable to those paid to other employees of such employer who perform comparable services.)

SEC. 601. National Corrections Manpower Center.

This section establishes a National Corrections Manpower Center under the supervision of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The purpose of the Center is to develop a long-term manpower development plan and program to meet the overall needs of the correctional system; provide technical assistance to correctional institutions in the development of correctional manpower; develop and provide both training programs and experts for the improvement of corrections personnel; and arrange regional training programs.

SEC. 701. Studies and Reports—Program Effectiveness.

Requires the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to conduct a continuing evaluation of programs under this Act to measure their effectiveness, particularly with respect to participants' recidivism rates. The Secretary is also required to submit to the President and Congress annually a detailed report of his findings.

SEC. 702. Studies and Reports—Statutory Impediments to Offender Employment.

Requires the Secretary of Labor to conduct a nationwide study of State laws resulting in statutory impediments to employment of offenders, in order to measure their effect upon the ability of ex-offenders to find jobs, and their resultant effect on recidivism rates. Requires the Secretary of Labor, through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to compile other relevant information regarding offender employment opportunities, and to publish the results.

SEC. 703. Studies and Reports—Civil Service Commission.

Requires the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, to report to the President and Congress, no later than one year from the date of enactment of this Act, on the extent to which employment opportunities for offenders may be increased in the Federal service.

SEC. 801. Appropriations.

This section authorizes appropriations of \$150 million for fiscal year 1974, \$200 million for fiscal year 1975, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the next three fiscal years.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH AUDIOVISUAL INDUSTRY

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, judging from numerous news stories in the past few months as well as the com-

mentary that has taken place in the Congress in the new session, there is no doubt that big government will be the subject of lengthy debate in the years ahead. Statistics prove that the Federal Government has grown at an unprecedented rate in the last decade, and no one in the Congress needs to be reminded that Federal programs, bureaus, agencies, and departments touch virtually every facet of our lives.

A manifestation of the growth of the Federal Government is seen in the ever-increasing tendency to create in-house goods and services. There are over 18,000 in-house operations in Government, many that could and should be contracted to the private sector.

Together with my colleagues, Mr. BELL and Mr. CORMAN, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 2675) The Federal Audio-Visual Act of 1973, that would take steps to eliminate unnecessary Government competition with private industry in one of these areas, audio-visual material.

More than \$300 million is spent annually by the Federal Government on audio-visual production. This makes the Federal Government the Nation's single largest producer of audio-visual material.

The Defense Department is one of the biggest offenders. In 1971 and 1972 they produced 12 films on one subject: "How To Brush Your Teeth." Venereal disease got almost as much attention; 10 films were manufactured on the subject.

Not only is there duplication of products within each Department, but there is also needless duplication of personnel and equipment between all agencies. Last fall I released a 66-page report on Federal involvement in audio-visual production based on a comprehensive study of the problem and specific inquiries to agencies to determine their role in this production. To my original inquiries 13 Government agencies declared they had a total of \$15 million worth of audio-visual equipment. Investigation showed, however, that the Defense Department alone has more than \$289 million worth of AV equipment. Six of the seven major agencies comprising the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare possess individual facilities, equipment, and personnel.

There was great discrepancy in the original Agriculture Department report and a subsequent report that was given to my investigatory team. It was to the tune of \$310,000 in 1969.

The Defense Department made even more blatant errors. They reported to the Library of Congress that \$9.7 million had been spent for AV activities. A report later issued by the General Accounting Office upped that figure more than \$50 million—to \$60.2 million.

The waste of taxpayers' money through duplication and mismanagement is just one portion of the inequities and inefficiencies created by Government competition with the private sector. There are hundreds of millions of dollars in radio/television/film production facilities sitting idle and there are thousands of fine professional performing and technical personnel who are jobless. At any given

time union members of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists—AFTRA—and the Screen Actors Guild—SAG—are suffering 50 percent to 80 percent unemployment.

I discovered in my investigation that the Departments of Agriculture, Transportation, Labor, Interior, and Defense pay performers about one-sixth of the union pay scale.

The Federal Government must be induced to discontinue this direct competition with the private sector and to contract more productions to private audio-visual firms. This practice would result in a higher quality product and less duplication.

Of course, Government competition with the private sector is present in many other Government operations, and broadened investigation of Government in-house industrial and commercial functions is urgently needed.

The Federal Audio-Visual Act of 1973 is an attempt to end needless Government in-house audio-visual production; I hope that its purpose will trigger similar investigations in other areas. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2675

A bill to establish the Federal Audio-Visual Coordination Board, regulate production by Federal agencies of audio-visual materials, and provide certain labor standards in connection therewith

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Audio-Visual Act of 1973".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to provide regulation and coordination of the use and production of audio-visual material by Federal agencies.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. Where used in this Act—
 (1) the term "audiovisual materials" means motion pictures, television video tapes, radio tapes, slide films, filmstrips, photographs, phonograph records, and transcriptions;
 (2) the term "audiovisual supplies and equipment" means unexposed, unprocessed, or unrecorded films, tapes, and recording discs, and cameras, projectors, sound recording devices, and related equipment, but does not include any equipment or supplies which are primarily used for the reproduction (by photograph or otherwise) of documents, correspondence, and other paperwork;
 (3) the term "employees" means actors, announcers, newsmen, singers, musicians, dancers, phonograph recording artists, laborers, mechanics, craftsmen, technicians, and any other supporting personnel engaged in the production of audiovisual materials;
 (4) the term "production", when used in conjunction with audiovisual materials, means creating, preparing, editing, reediting, or reproducing such materials;
 (5) the term "Board" means the Federal Audio-Visual Coordination Board established by this Act; and
 (6) The term "Federal agency" means any department, independent establishment, commission, board, bureau, division, office, or subdivision thereof, and any corporation wholly owned by the United States, but does not include the Congress, the courts of the United States, the governments of the territories or possessions of the United States, or the government of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL AUDIOVISUAL COORDINATION BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board to be known as the Federal Audio-Visual Coordination Board.

(b) DUTIES.—The Board shall—

(1) work to achieve a coordinated and cooperative relationship between Federal agencies and the audio-visual industry of the United States;

(2) undertake systematic appraisals of Federal agency procurement, utilization, and production of audio-visual supplies and equipment; and promulgate standards to create uniformity and interchangeability, and increase economies;

(3) organize and supervise the administration of section 5, and prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

(1) the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(2) five members appointed by the President from persons who represent the audio-visual units of Federal agencies;

(3) five members appointed by the President who represent the private audiovisual production industry (two or more of such persons shall represent the organized labor sector of such industry).

(d) TERMS.—Members shall be appointed for terms of three years. A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman of the Board shall be the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(f) PAY AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) members of the Board shall each be entitled to receive \$25 for each day (including travel-time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Board.

(2) Members of the Board who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Board.

(3) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Board, all members of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(g) DIRECTOR AND STAFF.—The Board shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of a Director and a staff of not more than five persons without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapters III and IV of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Director shall be paid compensation at a rate not to exceed the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, and any staff appointed shall be paid compensation at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-11 of the General Schedule.

(h) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Board may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(i) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Board the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Board to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(j) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Board on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Board may request.

(k) MAILS.—The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon

the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(1) GOVERNMENT AGENCY COOPERATION.—All Federal agencies are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Board, and shall furnish to the Board, upon its request, any information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act.

AUDIOVISUAL PRODUCTION

SEC. 5. (a) GENERAL RULE.—No Government agency, except as provided in subsection (b), shall produce any audiovisual materials. All such materials shall be obtained from private sources.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Any Government agency may produce up to 25 per centum of the audiovisual materials which are solely for the internal consumption of such agency. Such 25 per centum shall be based upon the monetary value of the materials produced.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO STANDARD.—In these instances where the Board finds that a measure which is based entirely upon monetary value is either inequitable or unworkable, it is authorized to require such adjustments, or apply such other types of measure, as it finds necessary.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 6. Every employee under a contract entered into by a Federal agency pursuant to section 5(a) or any subcontract thereunder, shall be compensated at rates not less than those prevailing for similar employees as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Service Contract Act of 1965. Every contract, without regard to the monetary value thereof, made pursuant to section 5(a) of this Act shall be subject to the requirements and provisions of the Service Contract Act of 1965, notwithstanding the exclusions contained in sections 7 (1), (2), (5), and (6) of such Act.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. This Act shall not apply—

(1) where the audiovisual materials or production involved include information classified, or likely to be classified, pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 10501 (Safeguarding Official Information);

(2) where the audiovisual materials are used or produced by a Federal agency for the purposes of scientific research, testing, or development; or as part of official surveillance for crime investigation, administration of law enforcement activities, or collecting and compiling intelligence regarding national security;

(3) to restrict a Federal employee or member of the Armed Forces from appearing in any audiovisual material in which he is portrayed in a role which is contained in his job classification, but only if he is regularly employed by the Federal agency for which the audiovisual material is being produced and regularly functions in such role; or

(4) where the Board, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, has found it in the interests of the United States to provide an exemption.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect sixty days after the date of its enactment.

TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

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

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a shield bill to give absolute and unqualified protection to journalists, authors, and news media from compul-

sory disclosure of or testimony about any information or its sources, obtained in their capacity as a journalist, before the Congress, any Federal court, grand jury, agency, or other body.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the press today is under the most serious attack in its history. What is at stake is the first amendment.

The actions of this administration in subpoenaing reporters' notes pursuant to offensive Justice Department guidelines, in using the courts to prohibit newspapers from publishing through prior restraint, and in making charges of "ideological plugola" against the broadcast networks and seeking to influence program content through abuse of the broadcast licensing process, do grave damage to the fundamental principles of free press and free speech embodied in the first amendment.

In its most raw and repugnant form, the assault on our free press has in recent months included the actual throwing of news reporters into jail, some for indefinite periods.

Within the past year our heritage of a free press has been stigmatized by the jailings of: Edwin A. Goodman of WBAI, in an action in the New York courts in which the District Attorney's office sought production of tapes broadcast on WBAI; Peter Bridge, the New Jersey journalist, who spent 20 days in jail for refusing to answer certain questions put to him by a grand jury relating to his confidential communications with news source; William Farr, of the Los Angeles Times, who was jailed for refusing to disclose which lawyer in the Manson case gave him certain confidential and—by court order—secret documents; and John Lawrence, Washington Bureau Chief of the Los Angeles Times, in a matter relating to the Watergate case now proceeding in Washington.

These actions should be abhorrent to all Americans. They do fundamental violence to the most cherished of our constitutional values and freedoms. The jailing of newsmen is something we hastily deplore when perpetrated by foreign, less democratic countries. We must not tolerate it in our own free society.

Out of these considerations, I have concluded that the only effective guarantee against abuse of the press by overzealous grand juries, courts, and investigatory agencies is an absolute statutory protection of newsmen and authors against compulsory disclosure of any kind of information, whether published or unpublished, or sources of information, whether human, documentary, recorded, or otherwise.

The essential features of my bill are: An absolute and totally unqualified privilege against compulsory disclosure of information or sources of information obtained or received by a person or organization while acting in the capacity of journalist or news medium;

Conferral of this privilege with respect to both published and unpublished information, including the person's mental knowledge, notes, film, recordings, photographs, outtakes and information in any other form whatsoever;

Comprehensive definition of "journal-

ist" as including any employee or agent of a newspaper, magazine, radio or television station or network, or wire or news service, or book—including an author; and

Comprehensive definition of "news medium" as including any newspaper, magazine or other periodical, radio or television station or network, book or pamphlet, or wire or news service and any employee, operator, publisher, or agent thereof.

This extremely broad and comprehensive protection represents a departure from the qualified privilege bill which I introduced in the last Congress. The principal reason for this departure is the recent tendency of several courts, in construing state "shield" statutes, to place extraordinarily narrow interpretations on the privilege against compulsory disclosure and to rule the privilege not applicable in important cases.

Thus, in the Farr case in Los Angeles, a judge held the California privilege statute inapplicable, in part, because Farr was no longer a reporter even though he was at the time he received the confidential communications. Whatever else may be said of this opinion, it is logically impossible to defend the proposition that such statutes could do any good if reporters who once leave the profession are then required to testify as to confidences obtained during the course of their work as journalists.

Another aspect of the Farr case is the suggestion by the Court that since it had barred communication between all lawyers and the press, no statute—however broadly phrased—could limit the Court from requiring the reporter to testify as to the nature of any violation of his order. In this fashion, the California statute was turned on its head and the reporter, instead of being protected against forced testimony as to his source, was held required to testify precisely because the judge wanted to know who the source was.

Another example is that in the Village Voice case in New York in which the broad New York statute which contains no reference to confidentiality as a precondition for applicability, was held to require a confidential relationship between the reporter and his source. Absent such relationship, the Court held, the statute gave the reporter no protection.

Still again, in the Bridge case in New Jersey, the New Jersey statute was held not to apply on the ground that the paper for which Bridge worked—the Newark Evening News—was out of business at the time he was called to testify.

All these decisions reflect an unwillingness by the judiciary to give any but the most grudging interpretations to such statutes. When one adds to this the likelihood that the current administration will argue most broadly for any definition of "national security" or the like contained in any exception to a bill, one is led to the conclusion that the best solution is an absolute bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give the most serious consideration to this approach. In my judgment, anything short of this approach will fail to guar-

antee a free and unfettered press—a press accountable only to the American people it serves and not to Government authorities. We must not allow the press to be used as an unwilling investigating arm of the Government or the courts, and therefore we must not enact loopholes in our law which would allow this.

In its opinion in the Caldwell case last year, the Supreme Court invited Congress to enact "shield" legislation, stating:

Congress has freedom to determine whether a statutory newsman's privilege is necessary and desirable and to fashion standards and rules as narrow or as broad as deemed necessary to address the evil discerned.

Justice Potter Stewart, in his dissenting opinion in the same case, criticized the Court for showing "a disturbing insensitivity to the critical role of an independent press in our society." Let the Congress not be equally insensitive.

I hope the Congress will treat this matter with urgency. Every encroachment on a free press besmirches our constitutional heritage. We have witnessed far too many such encroachments already. Let us act promptly and decisively to close this sad chapter of our recent history.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill and a section-by-section analysis be included in the RECORD at this point.

FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

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 "First Amendment Protection Act of 1973."

SECTION 2. Congress declares that:

(1) The values embodied in the First Amendment to the Constitution are currently under sustained and most dangerous siege.

(2) A well-informed public is essential to the survival of democratic government and it is thus of the highest priority that a free and unfettered flow of information be made available to the public.

(3) Such information cannot be provided the public unless journalists are free to gather, prepare, edit, analyze, comment on, write and broadcast news without fear of governmental restraint or sanction.

(4) Such information cannot be provided the public unless individuals with information can confide in journalists and rely upon them to protect their identities and their confidences and not to serve as governmental agents.

(5) Compelling journalists to disclose information gathered by them or the sources thereof inhibits and impedes the newsgathering process and the free flow of information to the public and thus violates the essence of the First Amendment.

(6) Journalists, in quickly and dangerously increasing numbers, have been compelled to disclose information gathered by them and/or sources thereof and have been ordered jailed for failure to make such disclosure.

(7) It is now urgently necessary for Congress to protect the values embodied in the First Amendment of the Constitution by providing protection for journalists and thus for the public as a whole so as to insure that the free and unfettered flow of information to the public is not limited.

SECTION 3. No journalist or news medium shall be required by any judicial, executive, legislative or administrative body of the United States or of any Commonwealth, Territory, Possession, or Trusteeship thereof, including, but not limited to, any court, grand jury, agency, department or commission, or

by either House of Congress or any committee thereof, to disclose any information received or obtained while acting as a journalist or news medium.

SECTION 4. No journalist or news medium shall be required by any judicial, executive, legislative or administrative body of the United States or of any Commonwealth, Territory, Possession, or Trusteeship thereof, including, but not limited to, any court, grand jury, agency, department or commission, or by either House of Congress or any committee thereof, to disclose the source of any information received or obtained while acting as a journalist or news medium.

SECTION 5. As used in this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) "Information" shall mean any written, oral or pictorial news or other material of whatever sort, whether or not published, including, without limitation, notes of journalists relating thereto, outtakes, tapes, recordings, films, photographs, and any and all other such materials in whatever form they may take.

(2) "Newspaper" shall mean any paper that is published and distributed periodically that contains information.

(3) "Magazine or other periodical" shall mean any publication which is published and distributed periodically that contains information.

(4) "Book or pamphlet" shall mean any book or pamphlet that contains information.

(5) "Radio or television station" shall mean any station, network, group or affiliation of stations, equipped to engage in the transmission by radio or television signals of writings, signs, signals, pictures, sounds and information of all kind, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding and delivering of communications) incidental to such transmission, intended to be received by the public, directly or by the intermediary of relay stations.

(6) "Wire or news service" shall mean any group or affiliation of newspapers and/or radio and television stations engaging in gathering, transmitting and supplying information to its members.

(7) "News medium" shall mean any newspaper, magazine or other periodical, radio station, television station, book or pamphlet, or wire or news service, any employee or agent thereof, and any individual, partnership, corporation, or other legal entity owning, publishing or operating the same.

(8) "Journalist" shall mean anyone who is or has engaged in gathering, preparing, editing, analyzing, commenting on, writing, broadcasting or processing information for a newspaper, magazine, radio station, television station, book or wire or news service, and any employee or agent thereof.

(9) "Source" shall mean any person, document, record or animate or inanimate supplier of information.

FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1973 SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SEC. 1. Entitles act the "First Amendment Protection Act of 1973," to emphasize the need for legislation to preserve and protect the principles of freedom of the press and the public's right to know embodied in the First Amendment.

SEC. 2. Declaration of findings that a well-informed public is essential to the survival of a democracy, and that protection of confidential relationships between newsmen and their sources is necessary to assure a free and unfettered flow of information to the public.

SEC. 3. Totally exempts any journalist—(defined as) reporter, editor, commentator, analyst, writer, news gatherer, photographer, cameraman, announcer, broadcaster, author, or any other employee or agent of a newspaper, magazine, radio or television station,

wire or news service, or book—and any news medium—(defined as) newspaper, magazine or other periodical, radio or television station, book or pamphlet, or wire or news service and any employee, agent, operator, or publisher thereof—from compulsory disclosure before Congress or any Federal body of any information, (including reporters' notes, film clips, outtakes, recordings, photographs and all other materials in any form), whether or not published, obtained or received while acting as a journalist or news medium.

Sec. 4. Applies the identical exemption as in section 3 with respect to sources of information (whether human, documentary, recorded, animate or inanimate).

Sec. 5. Definitions (see above and text of bill).

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE OLIVER PAYNE BOLTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say goodbye to good and close friends, and especially so today as we join to pay tribute to our former colleague, the late Oliver Bolton, whose death December 13, has left a poignant vacancy in the lives of all who knew him.

Oliver Bolton served three terms in the House of Representatives, in the 83d and 84th Congresses and again in the 88th, adding his own luster to the distinguished public service rendered by both his father, the late Chester C. Bolton, a Congressman from 1929 until his death in 1939, and his mother, Frances Payne Bolton, Congresswoman from 1940 until 1969.

For a span of almost 40 years, this remarkable family gave their districts and the Nation the benefits of their unexcelled leadership and wisdom. Oliver never stood in the shadow of his magnificent mother, even during the periods in which they served together in the House, and this was a point of pride to both of them. As Ollie said, when he first came to Congress, he and his mother might not always vote alike, but "if we do, it will be coincidence and not much more than that. We will have arrived at our conclusions independently by individual processes." His mother agreed, adding with her characteristic candor:

"I don't know how he will vote on the big issues, although we have discussed many of them. The working of Oliver's mind always has fascinated me, for his thinking has taken many unexpected turns. I can never predict it."

While major votes did occasionally find them voting in opposition to one another, their basic philosophy of government was similar and they were leaders in many important legislative battles.

Oliver Bolton commanded through the strength of his own personality, convictions, wisdom and wit, the affection and respect of all who served with him. To those of us who had the privilege of knowing him well as a friend, he was an incomparable companion with a ready sense of humor.

It was with sorrow that we watched Ollie's career shadowed by his heart condition. But he made it more triumph than

tragedy in his personal life. As he once explained in a newsletter to his constituents, following a heart attack, his illness had given him the ability to reexamine his convictions, shoring some up and discarding others. He wrote:

"Life cannot be lived in a state of constant tension, but rather should be lived rationally and calmly with interest in all things, with concern for some and worry for none."

Ollie has left us now. We will miss him sorely, but with the thought always of his indomitable spirit, his joyous zest for living, his courage in the face of physical adversity, and his unconquerable faith in our great Nation's ability to achieve the greatest good.

To his beloved mother, Mrs. Bolton, to his charming wife, Adelaide, and his two fine sons and daughter, Mrs. Minshall and I extend our deepest, most sincere condolences.

I include an article from the Washington Post of December 15, 1972, at this point:

OLIVER P. BOLTON, Ex-OHIO CONGRESSMAN, DIES

(By Jean R. Halley)

Former Rep. Oliver P. Bolton, a Republican from Ohio, who with his mother, former Rep. Frances P. Bolton, also a Republican from Ohio, became the first mother-son team in the history of Congress, died Wednesday in Palm Beach, Fla.

Oliver Bolton, who was 55, served three terms in the House of Representatives. He first represented Ohio's 11th District from 1952 to 1956, when he decided not to seek re-election after suffering a heart attack.

His health later improved enough so that he ran again in the same district and was re-elected to a third term in 1962. He was defeated two years later when he ran for representative-at-large from Ohio.

His mother, who now lives in Mentor, Ohio, represented the 22d District of that state for 14 consecutive terms in Congress until her defeat in 1968. She succeeded his father, Chester C. Bolton, who was serving his fifth term in Congress when he died in 1939.

Oliver Bolton, who was born in Cleveland on Washington's Birthday, attended St. Alban's School here and later graduated from Harvard College. He also held a bachelor of law degree from Western Reserve University in Cleveland.

During World War II, he served with the intelligence section of the 5th Marine Amphibious Corps in the Pacific.

He soon became involved in Republican politics in Ohio, although years earlier, while he was a student at Harvard, he had ventured that he would never follow in his father's footsteps.

He recalled later that he changed his mind, after he served as chauffeur for his father during a campaign.

"I learned a lot about politics, and I've changed my mind about a lot of things," he said after he was first elected to Congress. "I first started then to see the workings of practical politics and some of the fallacies of textbook politics."

During his first two terms in the House, Rep. Bolton supported flexible farm price supports, foreign aid assistance, reciprocal trade agreements and civil rights. He served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Administration Committee.

Although there were strong bonds of affection between Rep. Bolton and his mother, he insisted that there were no apron strings when it came to making decisions on national legislation.

"I want to make one thing clear," he said. "Mother and I may vote alike on some of the questions that come up in Congress. If we do, it will be coincidence and not much more than that. We will have arrived at our conclusions independently by individual processes."

His mother agreed on his independence. "I don't know how he will vote on the big issues, although we have discussed many of them. The working of Oliver's mind always has fascinated me, for his thinking has taken many unexpected turns. I can never predict it," she said, without elaborating.

Oliver Bolton was stricken with a heart attack at the early age of 38 but returned to work in Congress in 1955 after months of enforced rest. In a news letter to his constituents, he explained that he had a new philosophy:

"You re-examine your philosophy, shore up some of your earlier convictions, discard others and—with the wider vision of one who has looked into the valley—you adopt broader ones . . ."

"The weeks in the hospital have made you realize that life cannot be lived in a state of constant tension, but rather should be lived rationally and calmly with interest in all things, with concern for some and worry for none."

After he decided to retire, Rep. Bolton continued to be active in state politics. He served briefly as Ohio director of commerce.

Most of his time, however, was devoted to the investment business and to the Dover Daily Reporter and the Willoughby News Herald, which he published from 1952 to 1963.

During his third term, Rep. Bolton won a battle to put on public record the spending of congressional committees and the Capitol architect.

He attacked the U.S. Food and Peace Program's aid to Egypt and also spoke against a proposed wheat deal with the Soviet Union, charging it would bring "fantastic profits" to foreign ship owners such as Aristotle Onassis.

He further took off on Onassis when he publicly questioned the propriety of a cruise taken by the then Mrs. John F. Kennedy on Onassis' yacht in the Aegean Sea in 1963.

After his defeat in 1964, Rep. Bolton retired from politics.

In addition to his mother, he is survived by his wife, Adelaide; two sons, Charles P. and William B.; a daughter, Mrs. Jerome Grapry, and two brothers, Charles B. and Kenyon C. Bolton.

[From the Washington Star and News, Dec. 15, 1972]

OLIVER P. BOLTON, 55, SERVED IN CONGRESS WITH MOTHER

Oliver P. Bolton, 55, a former Republican congressman from Ohio, died Wednesday in a Palm Beach hospital of complications from the latest of several heart attacks. He lived in Mentor, Ohio, and spent winters in Florida.

Mr. Bolton and his mother, former Rep. Frances P. Bolton, also an Ohio Republican, were the first mother and son team to serve in Congress.

He was elected in 1952 and 1954, but did not seek reelection following a heart attack. He recovered and was elected to another term from Ohio's 11th District in 1962, but was defeated in the 1964 election for an at-large seat.

His mother, who was defeated in 1968, came to Congress in 1940, the year after the death of her husband, Rep. Chester C. Bolton, who had served in Congress since 1929. Her grandfather was Sen. Henry B. Payne, D-Ohio.

Mr. Bolton, while a student at Harvard University in 1936, told his father, he did not believe politics was an honorable calling. His father countered by inviting him to be

his chauffeur for the rest of the campaign that fall.

"I learned a lot about politics," Mr. Bolton said, "and I've changed my mind about a lot of things since then. I first started to see the workings of practical politics and some of the fallacies of textbook politics."

When Mr. Bolton came to Congress he warned that he and his mother might not always vote alike. "If we do, it will be a coincidence and not much more than that. We will have arrived at our conclusions independently by individual processes."

Between 1952 and 1963, he was publisher of two Ohio newspapers, the Willoughby News Herald and the Dover Daily Reporter. After his second term in Congress he was appointed Ohio's director of commerce.

Mr. Bolton served on the House Administration and Banking and Currency committees. He supported civil rights legislation, flexible farm price supports and reciprocal trade agreements, but opposed a plan to sell wheat to the Soviet Union.

He was born in Lyndhurst, Ohio. After graduating from Harvard he served in the Army during World War II and returned to school at then-Western Reserve University in Cleveland, where he received a law degree.

Besides his mother, he leaves his wife, the former Adelaide Brownlee, and two sons, Charles P. and William B., of Mentor, Ohio; a daughter, Mrs. Jerome Grapy of Paris, Ohio, and two brothers, Charles B., of Lyndhurst and Kenyon C., of Shaker Heights, Ohio.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to yield to Congressman BILL STANTON from the 11th District of Ohio, who succeeded Ollie and since he has been here has done a magnificent job as a Member of Congress from the great State of Ohio.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal sadness that I arise at this time to pay tribute to the late Oliver P. Bolton for I have had the privilege of being his Congressman these past 8 years.

All who served with Ollie Bolton would agree on one point: If you knew Ollie, you liked him. He had a personality unmatched by anyone I have ever met. He was able to bring out the best qualities in everyone he knew.

My personal knowledge of Oliver Bolton extends to a period immediately following World War II. First active in his mother's campaign for Congress, he decided in 1952 to run for the House from the newly created 11th Congressional District. It was my pleasure to work closely with him at that time and to share with him the thrill of victory on election night.

Mr. Speaker, only failing health kept Oliver Bolton from a brilliant political career. He was a man of great courage and ability: a man who had few peers as a public speaker, a man who called a spade a spade, and gained new friends and allies wherever he went.

When his heart would no longer take the heat of the political arena, he voluntarily retired in 1956 from Congress. In 1962, he answered an appeal from the leaders of our congressional district to return to Congress. However, his health did not improve and for a period of 15 years, it handicapped him far greater than most people ever realized.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in Oliver Bolton's hometown paper, the News-Herald, which he once owned, said it better than I can:

It would not be out of line to call him a great American. He was a man you couldn't help but love, a man you couldn't help respect; he was in every way a tremendous person.

I will miss him and so will everyone else who knew him.

To his wife, Adie, his mother, our beloved former colleague Frances, and the other members of his family I extend my sincere condolences.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague who serves with me on the same committee, and I rise only to welcome this opportunity to join with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON) who has just spoken, and with the other gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) in expressing my condolences and in joining at this moment concerning the fact that this very fine Ohioan and fine American has passed on.

Mr. Speaker, I was in my first year, and, in fact, had not gotten very far into that year in the Congress, when I met Representative Bolton. For a while we were neighbors. My first office assignment was on the seventh floor, room 1741, of the Longworth Building, and as a result I discovered soon that in this new constellation of faces Oliver Bolton was friendly. And we became fairly good friends considering the fact that he remained only for that one Congress after my first venture on this scene.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly share in the assessments that have been made of Oliver Bolton. He had a unique personality, and was warmhearted, friendly, down-to-earth. He was very much a human being; and he did not let the office go to his head. I sincerely regret that he has passed on. I cannot help but feel that he is still very, very useful. You could not know Mr. Bolton without feeling that you were talking to a very fine young man.

Again I thank the gentleman for allowing me to express my condolences at this moment.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), for his kind words.

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

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I think that Ollie Bolton held a rather unique position in this House as the famous son of a famous father, and a famous mother, both of whom served here in the Congress. Of course, his father, Chester, was here long before I ever served in the Congress, but his mother, Frances P. Bolton, Congresswoman Bolton—we called her "Congresslady"—was perhaps one of the most unique persons who ever

served in this body. She was highly respected in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and highly respected on both sides of the aisle.

Oliver came to the Congress and served in a different district from that of his mother, but they served together at the same time. I cannot think of another family in the annals of the history of the Congress as a unique as theirs, with a father, mother, and son who served in the Congress.

Oliver Bolton served in this body, and he served honorably, efficiently, and well. Oliver was quite active in our political party, taking an extremely active part in it even though he did suffer from ill health. He was a friend of mine. I know we are all thankful for the contributions that he made, not only to the Congress of the United States, but to the Bolton family name.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and again I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), for taking this special order.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret that I learned of the death of our former colleague, Oliver P. Bolton, on December 13.

I have especially fond recollections of Mr. Bolton because we came to the House of Representatives at about the same time, we are essentially the same age, we are both from Ohio and we served together for a time on the same committee.

Oliver came naturally by his commitment to public service. The Bolton family is one of the most distinguished in Ohio and each of his parents served many years in the Congress with real dedication and distinction. But Oliver was much more than a thoughtful, intelligent Representative. He was a warm and gracious human being, with courage and resilience to overcome adversity and personal loss.

To the Bolton family I extend my deepest sympathy upon the loss of this splendid and outstanding gentleman. He served his community and Nation proudly and well, and many of us share the sense of loss which is felt so keenly by his family and close friends.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we have had brothers and fathers and sons serving simultaneously in the House and the Senate—the Mortons, the Symingtons, and the Goldwaters, for instance—but the Boltons were the only mother and son to serve simultaneously in the House. Former Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton served here with such great distinction for so long and is so loved by all of us who have had the privilege of knowing her that when her son Oliver was elected from a different district of Ohio and came into the House where his mother was then a political star his role was a difficult one. Their views and votes on legislation were often different, and Congressman Oliver P. Bolton was often admonished in a good-natured way by other Members that "mother knows best."

During his service here, Mr. Bolton had the courage of his convictions and fought resolutely for what he believed in and earned the respect of all of his colleagues. During our second terms in the House, we

served together on the Committee on Banking and Currency. He was an able and effective advocate of the legislative positions he favored and he contributed much to our deliberations. He was a popular Member of the House and his death has saddened all who knew him.

I express my deepest sympathy to his remarkable mother and to the other members of his family.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to those familiar with the personal and political achievements of the Honorable Oliver P. Bolton, formerly a member of the Ohio delegation, news of his passing has been received in a spirit of deep remorse. Throughout his lifetime he stood as a symbol of political integrity in the eyes of thousands, and his independence, innate honesty and unquestionable courage endeared him to the many fortunate enough to know him, both in his native Ohio and here in Washington.

Oliver Bolton was a graduate of Harvard College, class of 1939, and served his country for 5 years during World War II. Upon returning to civilian life, he studied law at Western Reserve University and entered politics with considerable enthusiasm. He was chairman of the Ohio Young Republicans in 1948 and 1949, and Young Republican's National Committeeman from Ohio in 1950 and 1951. He was nominated for Congress by his party in 1952 and elected.

As a Congressman, Oliver Bolton served on the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on House Administration, performing with distinction. His knowledge of finance and his deep concern for fiscal responsibility made him a leader in committee and on the House floor.

As a member of the Ohio State Senate during the period of his service in Congress, I had occasion to meet with Oliver Bolton on numerous occasions, to discuss the problems confronting our State and our respective districts.

In all my dealings with him, I was impressed by the deep sincerity of his opinions and his intense desire to work for what he regarded as the benefit of his district, his State, and his country.

We were from different parties, he and I, and on many issues we were in total disagreement. But on many others we could, in fact, agree, and work together productively in friendship and harmony.

Oliver Bolton was an outstanding Representative during his time in Congress, and I wish now to commend his performance and praise the memory of a leader who will be missed by all who served with him.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, no one who served with him here in the House of Representatives could be less than deeply moved by the announcement of the death of our former colleague, Oliver Bolton.

I served with Ollie Bolton on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I came to know him, not only as a fine and distinguished member of that committee, who knew the work of the committee well and who used that knowledge to serve his constituency and his Nation; I knew him also as one of the most charming, one of the most friendly, one of the

most delightful men I could ever come to know.

There was an enthusiasm about everything he did that was infectious. He was a friend to everyone, and he had the complete respect of all.

He served here in the Congress with his mother. They represented the great State of Ohio here in Washington, and they represented it well.

To his family who mourn his passing I extend my deepest sympathy. He was a fine man, a distinguished man, a warm friend, and an outstanding public servant.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in extending sympathy to the family of our late colleague, the Honorable Oliver P. Bolton, who served the State of Ohio as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Ollie Bolton was a member of one of Ohio's distinguished families, a family which established a long tradition of public service, particularly in the House of Representatives. His father, Chester C. Bolton, served in the House from the 71st through 76th Congresses, and his mother, Frances P. Bolton, was a Member of the House for 14 consecutive terms.

Among Ollie's major contributions to our Nation's progress was his farsighted interest in making more congressional records available to the public. He played an instrumental role in opening for public scrutiny congressional financial information, particularly with respect to committees. In an era when the public's "right to know" is of vital importance, we, as Members of the House and as citizens of the United States, appreciate Ollie's foresight.

His friendliness, integrity, and perception attracted me to him during our brief association in the late 1950's. It was these same qualities which, through the years, earned him the respect and friendship of those constituents and congressional colleagues who were privileged to know him.

Mrs. Whalen joins me in extending to former Congresswoman Bolton and to Ollie's family our sincere condolences.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I speak of the passing of our former beloved colleague Oliver Bolton. I remember with great pleasure how we worked together on a number of projects—one in particular was to have a patriotic and inspirational content in our postage stamps, a thing which is now a well-established policy. Like his mother, our former beloved colleague, Frances Bolton, he brought to Congress high ideals and warmth and humanity which will long be remembered together with the substantial contributions of both of the Boltons as major legislators. My family and I extend our deepest sympathy to his widow and family and to his mother and her family as well. We will long miss Oliver and remember him not only for his good work in Congress but for the warm personal friendship which he generously gave to all of us.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of our former colleague, Representative Oliver P. Bolton.

He was a fine man and a distinguished American.

It is especially sad since he was still in the prime of life. But during his life he served his country well, and no man can ask for more.

Although I was not privileged to serve with him, I grew to know and admire his mother, our colleague Mrs. Frances Bolton. Oliver and his mother were the only mother and son team ever to serve in the House of Representatives. They were quite a team, and the people of Ohio were served well by their diligent endeavors.

My deepest sympathies are extended to Mrs. Bolton. I know that she was her son's greatest source of support and inspiration. As she will miss him, so shall we all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound feeling of sadness that I address my comments to the death some weeks ago of our former colleague and long-time friend Oliver P. Bolton.

The Bolton family has enjoyed a record of public service to the State of Ohio and to the Nation almost unparalleled in our Nation's history. Ollie Bolton's great contributions to that tradition were both well known and respected by the voters of Ohio and his colleagues on the Hill.

My personal relationship with the Bolton family extends back to childhood when my father and Ollie's late father, Chester C. Bolton, served together in the House. When the senior Mr. Bolton died, he was succeeded by his widow, Frances Payne Bolton who served until 1968. During that time, young Ollie undertook his own separate political career and eventually served with his mother and my father in the House during the 83d, 84th, and 88th Congresses. And then in 1965 it was my privilege to come here to serve with Mrs. Bolton for a short time. But Ollie's service in the House preceded mine and so I never had the opportunity to serve personally with him.

Ollie had early been identified as one of the rising young political stars in Ohio, and following his three terms representing Ohio's Third Congressional District, he ran for the State's Congressman-at-large seat in 1964. Unfortunately, that year was not a good one for Republicans and he was defeated. Such a loss can be tolerated as one of the transitory fortunes of politics. The real loss came when coronary disease obliged Ollie, for the sake of his family and himself, to give up the strenuous life of politics. The loss was not so much his as it was a loss to the people of Ohio and the Nation because he had on him the mark of greatness and within him the capacities of character, commonsense and persuasive leadership to give his State, his party and his Nation many years of devoted and capable service.

Ollie had the necessary dedication, too. The Boltons never participated in politics as a means of paying the family bills. They considered public service one of the obligations, like their many philanthropies, which came with wealth. But Ollie could not have worked harder had he been poor than he did in the pragmatic business of campaigning or in the philosophic business of espousing his view-

point on legislative matters. And he always did it with an articulate deftness and an appealing humor that won the friendship of his adversaries, if not their votes. He was a great guy as well as great politician.

The Browns have felt the deepest ties of affection for the Bolton family, and we now extend our sympathies in the passing of one of its members.

The death of Oliver Bolton represents the loss of a dear friend to those of us who knew him and the loss of a true public servant to the citizens of Ohio and the Nation. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), and the other Members here today, in paying respect to our former colleague, the Honorable Oliver P. Bolton.

Our colleague, Mr. Bolton, was a member of one of Ohio's—and the Nation's—most remarkable political families. He himself served three terms in the House of Representatives and was active in civic and community activities throughout his life. He was former secretary of commerce for the State of Ohio, a major newspaper publisher, and a member of the Kent State University board of trustees.

During his service with us here in the House, he had the distinction of having as a colleague his mother, the Honorable Francis P. Bolton. Together, his mother and father—the late Chester C. Bolton—served in the House for a remarkable total of 40 years.

We who served with "Ollie" will miss his presence and the warm association of his company. We all extend our deepest condolences and sympathy to his mother, to his wife and children, and to his brother. I hope that this family will be strengthened in the widespread appreciation of his devotion and dedication to the public service.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that our former colleague, Oliver P. Bolton, has broken from the ranks. A comparatively young man, it seemed that he had many useful years of service ahead of him.

Oliver Bolton served his Nation well, first as a soldier during World War II, when he acquitted himself bravely, and later in the political arena, where he performed with great distinction. He found time also to make a name for himself in the fields of law and journalism.

While I mourn his untimely passing, I am grateful that his paths and mine crossed frequently during the years. My deepest sympathies are extended to the members of his family. May God comfort and sustain them in the days ahead.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Oliver P. Bolton the United States loses one of its ablest and most intelligent citizens. Mrs. Rhodes and I lose one of our closest and dearest personal friends.

Oliver Bolton and I came to Congress together in 1953. He was one of the original members of the S.O.S. group, and had much to do with the 83d Club and its activities. Ollie was probably the most popular member of the 83d Club. He never said or did anything which was

unkind or demeaning to any person, and always had a jovial word and a slap on the back for his colleagues. Being around him made you feel that the day was just a little bit better than it had been before he came on to the scene.

Oliver Bolton was a fine Congressman. He represented his district and the people in it conscientiously and well. His voice was only raised in the interests of his country, his State and his district as he saw them. His opinions were sought after and heeded.

Ollie was a great citizen of this country, but he was also a devoted father, husband and son. Knowing the Bolton family has enriched the lives of many of us. Certainly, the mother-son combination of Frances P. Bolton and Oliver P. Bolton represented a great team working for our country and its people.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Adie Bolton and her family upon this loss, which we share.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of my good friend and former colleague Oliver Bolton came as a real shock. Ollie served in this body with great distinction. It was my privilege to have known him not only as a colleague but as a warm personal friend. We both came here in the 83d Congress. Those who served with him know what a warm and jovial personality he was. After he retired from Congress several years ago he still maintained an active concern for the affairs of Government and he never forgot the friendships he made here. Peg and I had the privilege recently of visiting Ollie and Adie at their home in Palm Beach. Even in adversities of health his warm and congenial personality never changed.

Peg and I extend our deepest sympathy to his lovely wife Adie and family and to his mother Mrs. Bolton with whom we also served for many years. May the memory that he was a wonderful husband, father and son who served his country with such dedication sustain them in their time of bereavement.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I mournfully commend to my colleagues' attention the passing and death of former Congressman Oliver Payne Bolton, a member of one of Ohio's most honorable and prestigious political families.

Oliver Bolton served in the 83d, 84th, and 88th U.S. Congresses. Both of his parents were Members of Congress as was his maternal great grandfather. His father was Chester Castle Bolton who had a distinguished record of military service during World War I and served in Congress from March 4, 1929, to January 3, 1937, and for 10 months in the 76th Congress until his death.

Mrs. Frances Payne Bolton succeeded her husband, was reelected to 14 succeeding Congresses and to the 91st U.S. Congress. She was a granddaughter of Henry B. Payne who served in the 44th Congress and was a U.S. Senator from Ohio from March 4, 1885, to March 3, 1891.

Treading in ancestral footsteps, Oliver Bolton was 24 years old when America entered World War II and he served 5

years in the military, including a tour with the 5th Amphibious Corps in the South Pacific. After discharge, he completed his legal education and was admitted to the bar in 1947.

Subsequently, he was elected chairman of the Ohio Young Republicans for 2 years, was national committeeman to the Young Republicans 2 more years, publisher of two newspapers from 1952 to 1963, Ohio State Director of Commerce and, finally, an investment banker in Mentor, Ohio.

Oliver Payne Bolton was only 55 when he died last December 13. He had made himself always available for consultation on matters of public service. We, who knew him and came to admire and respect him down through the years, shall miss his sage advice and willing counsel.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in the House to pay special tribute to my good friend and valuable public servant, the late Oliver P. Bolton of Ohio. Ollie was always one of my favorites because of his warmth and friendliness. I first became associated with Ollie when I was in the Young Republican National Federation in the middle fifties. At that time he was one of the most energetic young Members of Congress.

When I first came to Congress in 1961, I was able to know Oliver P. Bolton in a different capacity, as a colleague and fellow candidate. My previous high regard for him was multiplied many times by my good fortune in working closely with him in the House of Representatives during the 88th Congress and on the campaign trails.

Ollie Bolton generated a warmth and a concern and was one of our most popular statewide candidates. Unfortunately, 1964 was not a good year for Republicans and Ollie's brilliant career, already partially hindered by problems of health, came to a close. Even after that, Oliver Bolton was active and interested in politics and the Republican party and it was my good fortune to have our paths cross often.

I extend to his family my sincere regrets at his untimely passing. I know their loss is somewhat diminished by the knowledge that he was truly loved and respected by his friends and colleagues in Congress and thousands of people throughout his congressional district in the State of Ohio. Ollie Bolton set very high standards and was an inspiration to us all.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our late colleague, Oliver Bolton, was an outstanding Member of this body during the period when he served as a Member of the House from Ohio. I join my colleagues this afternoon in paying respect to his memory.

He was a very effective Member, respected by those of us who were honored to serve with him, for his knowledge of legislative procedures, his skill in debate, and the great devotion with which he fulfilled his assignment as a representative of the public. He was a respected and effective Republican political leader in Ohio as well and, in his legislative and

political activities, he set an example which shows the best in American public service. Oliver was also a very friendly and congenial companion, a true friend, and one of the finest individuals with whom I have had the opportunity to serve.

We also recognize that he served in the best traditions of the great service that his family has given to public office, serving as he did in the same body in which his father and mother served as Representatives.

Mrs. Derwinski and I send our condolences to his wife, Adelaide.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include among the tributes being paid to Oliver Bolton today the warm words of affection spoken for him by another former colleague of ours, William H. Ayres.

TRIBUTE TO OLIVER BOLTON

Ollie Bolton was unique amongst men, unique amongst Congressmen, unique amongst friends.

I doubt if Ollie Bolton had an enemy. If he did they never made such an admission. Mary Helen joins me in saying "Mrs. Bolton, your late son, Ollie, died too young. Fortunately, his sons will carry on the heritage. What they have been left shall never die."

My deepest sympathy to Ollie's widow, Adie. Her strength is too great to ever weaken.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that we take note of the passing of our friend and former colleague, the late Oliver P. Bolton.

Following in the footsteps of both his father and mother, Oliver Bolton served as a member of this body with honor and distinction. He will long be remembered as one of our outstanding Congressmen—one who brought to his office a wisdom and judgment that distinguished his service in the House of Representatives.

To his family, friends, and associates I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep regret that I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of Oliver Payne Bolton, our former colleague from Ohio. He was a man sincerely concerned with the preservation of democracy in our great Nation. He was a champion of freedom, for not only this country, but for all countries who were threatened or oppressed by outside forces.

He distinguished himself with a rich and varied career as soldier, newspaper publisher, Congressman, public servant, and banker.

When America went to war in 1941, Mr. Bolton, as a member of the 107th Cavalry of the Ohio National Guard, entered active duty and served his country for 5 years, until 1946.

His first political experience was gained with the Ohio Young Republicans, an organization which he served as chairman in 1948 and 1949, and as the Young Republicans national committeeman from Ohio in 1950 and 1951.

Bolton also distinguished himself in the field of journalism as publisher of the Lake County News Herald, Willoughby, Ohio, and the Daily Reporter, Dover, Ohio, during the fifties and early sixties.

He was first elected to Congress in 1952, capably representing his district during the 83d and 84th Congresses. After a tenure as director of commerce for Ohio, he returned to the House of Representatives for the 88th Congress.

During his final years, he was a partner of Prescott, Merrill, Turben & Co., investment bankers. He will be remembered by his many friends both in public service and in the private sector.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this chance to join in paying tribute to our late colleague, Oliver P. Bolton, who died on December 13.

We all know—it was amply played up throughout his career and again in his obituary notices—that Oliver Bolton was "part of the first mother-son team to serve in the House."

But it would be unfair and unfortunate if this "first," impressive though it may be, became his prime lasting identification.

Oliver Bolton deserves to be remembered not simply for family relationships, but as a concerned and conscientious Congressman in his own right.

The tragedy of a heart attack suffered when he was just 38 years old interrupted a promising congressional career after two terms in 1956.

Months of enforced idleness gave him a chance to hone his own philosophy: he decided that "life cannot be lived in a state of constant tension, but rather should be lived rationally and calmly with interest in all things, with concern for some and worry for none."

Sufficiently recovered to take on his House duties again in 1962, he won reelection and returned to exhibit his interest and concern anew.

Serving with him on the House Banking and Currency Committee, I found him to be both a legislator who did his homework on matters before the committee, and a true gentleman at all times. He cared about people, and he showed it.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his mother, former Representative Frances P. Bolton; his wife, Adelaide, and his family.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to the beautiful eulogies for our departed colleague, Oliver Bolton, of Ohio.

Ollie was one of my best friends, having arrived in Washington as a newly elected Congressman the same day I did. Ollie had many outstanding attributes, one of the most important of which, in my opinion, was his boundless enthusiasm for life. He was a man of tremendous energy and yet he always took the time to be courteous and kind to those with whom he dealt.

As one member of the unique team of mother-son legislators, Ollie showed great respect and admiration for his mother, Representative Frances Bolton, and yet he at times showed his independence by voting differently than she.

I extend my sincere condolences to his wife, Adie, and their children and especially to his mother who made such a remarkable name for herself while serving in this body.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of our former colleague in the House of Representatives, Oliver P. Bolton. Although Ollie had not served in the Congress since 1965, I know that he is fondly remembered by many Members here.

Ollie Bolton came from a distinguished and politically active Ohio family with a tradition of Government service. First elected to the 83d Congress, he served in the House of Representatives from 1953 to 1957. After dropping out of public life for a short period, Ollie was reelected to the 88th Congress in 1962. This was the year I was first elected to the House, and Ollie and I became close friends at that time.

I greatly respected him for his grasp of national problems and his legislative abilities. It was a privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives and an honor to have been his friend. I would like to extend to his family my sincere condolences on their loss.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, when one of our former associates in this body dies the whole Congress seems touched with a sense of sadness and humility. We say to ourselves, in due time there go I, and we reflect on what, if anything, we have done, or will do, worthy to be remembered in the short span we are privileged to walk and work in this House.

Oliver Bolton was my friend. We were not close—did not serve on the same committees—were not of the same party; but, as a fellow representative of the people we each, in our own way, worked in this Hall to hammer out on the anvil of controversy and compromise, the legislation of our day.

His service here was short. Plagued by ill health he served two terms—from 1953 to 1957—and then in 1963 returned for another term. Born on George Washington's Birthday in 1917, he died at the early age of 55 years.

Who can say what Oliver Bolton, son of a distinguished father and mother who both served long and ably in this House, might have done had not Providence decreed for him a short and interrupted service in this body?

The concern of all of us, I hope, will be of comfort to his mother and his loved ones. I consider it a privilege to participate in paying tribute to him and to his service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Americans of the Territory of Guam and myself, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying our respects to the memory of the late Congressman Oliver P. Bolton, who unfortunately passed away this past December.

Congressman Bolton was truly a credit to his country and his absence will be undoubtedly felt by his friends and former colleagues. During the late Congressman's service in the House, he was an active supporter of legislation which was beneficial to his fellow Americans on Guam. Men such as Congressman Bolton have done much to maintain the high

standards of this legislative body, and he will be sorely missed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the life, character and public service of the late Oliver Payne Bolton.

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

There was no objection.

THE TRUE STATE OF THE UNION OVERVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in March 1971, the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Nixon in the White House. At that meeting, we presented 60 recommendations to the President and we told him that—

Our people are no longer asking for equality as a rhetorical promise. They are demanding from the National Administration and from elected officials with regard to party affiliation, the only kind of equality that ultimately has any real meaning—equality of results.

The President's reply to our document came to us 2 days after the deadline date which we had set for his response. His document consisted of 115 pages—took 2 months to prepare—and according to his own admission, was compiled by 200 people. The man-hour cost of 200 people working 60 days on this document was well over a million dollars.

Yet the document said nothing. It amounted to a recodification of his administration's policies and goals, which were after all, the reason we went to see him in the first place. And yet, it had been the President himself who, at our meeting said to us:

I appreciate the candor with which you gentlemen have spoken here this afternoon. If I were in your shoes—if I were seated in your places at this table, I would speak with the same deep commitment and concern with which you have spoken.

And then, unsolicited, the President added:

Your people have not gotten a fair shake in this country. . . .

Unfortunately, the President's printed document did not reflect his spoken sentiments. In addition, subsequent statements and programs have shown us that the President carries an extremely low

and distorted estimate of the real needs of minority, poor, and disadvantaged Americans.

On January 20, 1973, in a perverted twist on the message of John F. Kennedy, President Nixon callously exhorted the American people:

In our own lives, let each of us ask—not just what will government do for me, but what can I do for myself?

The question is a dangerous one in an era when people's ability to help themselves is dwindling and when a Federal commitment to humanity is needed more than ever before.

People are helpless when they are uneducated; or poor; or sick; when they are at the mercy of drug addicts and pushers; when they are out of work; when living costs spiral upward beyond their reach; when they live in unsanitary and indecent housing, when they are a minority in a racist nation; and when they are victims of a foreign policy that few believe in. The number of people who lack the tools to become self-reliant is on the rise in the United States today. The fact that this administration intends to keep those necessary tools locked away—and will award the key only to the privileged and the powerful—was signaled to us in both the inaugural address and the 1974 budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus does not intend to sit idly on the sidelines while corporate and vested interests take bread from the mouths of the poor. Over the past 4 years we have learned that self-reliance is a virtue which is demanded only from minorities, the poor and the disadvantaged; no one told Lockheed and Penn Central to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. That is the central fallacy in Mr. Nixon's exhortation. It is one which the Congressional Black Caucus intends to expose and to combat—with legislative programs and congressional action.

We, too, would like to believe in self-reliance, but we see it as a goal. It is not, as Mr. Nixon would have us believe, a means. The means to the end of self-reliance lie in a Federal commitment to the fulfillment of human and social needs. The legislative package which we intend to produce would meet the needs of minority, poor and disadvantaged Americans. It would give people the tools they need to lift themselves out of the quagmire of despair and of helplessness.

AN ALTERNATIVE

Today, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus stand together in this Chamber to present an alternative to what the President has to offer. The President perceives our society and the solutions to our problems in one way; we have a different perception. We are not afraid to see inequality and injustice—problems that are crying out for solutions. We do not shy away from the challenge of completing a task. We believe that this Congress can, at any time, reassert its powers on behalf of the American people and we intend to help lead this body out of its lethargy.

Today, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus present a report on the true state of the Union. Each section

of this document discusses the past record and offers alternatives for the future.

DOMESTIC NEEDS

We begin from the premise that, in this richest and most advanced technological Nation, poverty is a shameful anachronism. The Federal Government has the power to eradicate poverty. In the absence of jobs, the welfare system must be revised to provide an adequate income for every American citizen. At the same time, the Government must institute a program of full employment. It should evolve new and more effective manpower training techniques and create millions of jobs in both the public and private sectors. We will oppose the budget's proposed \$600 million cut in manpower programs and its termination of the Job Corps program. The Congressional Black Caucus will work toward full employment. In the meantime, we will promote legislation which assists employable persons during the transition period and permanently provides for the disabled and the disadvantaged.

We do not believe that inflation should or can be fought with unemployment. The proper means of combating inflation is an effective stabilization program. Phase II should have been succeeded by an improved and strengthened stabilization effort—it should not have been scrapped.

We will watch the implementation of the revenue-sharing program with close attention. We are aware of lapses and inequities in the present law and we intend to fill an oversight function which the administration appears to have abdicated. Special attention will be paid to civil rights compliance within the revenue-sharing program. We will fight against proposed special revenue sharing in the areas of manpower, education, and community development.

Recent years have witnessed a great disparity between promise and performance in education, health, and housing. It is to the everlasting discredit of this President that he has vetoed an unprecedented number of education, health, and housing bills. Where the veto has failed, impoundment has succeeded. The Congressional Black Caucus will take part in what we hope will be a massive action by this Congress to prohibit the impoundment of appropriated funds.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, with its block grant approach to funding, was billed as a comprehensive solution to the problems of our criminal justice system. Black people and poor people suffer most from the ravages of crime, because they live in areas where crime rates are highest. They also suffer from racial discrimination by the police, in the courts, and in the corrections system. LEAA has failed to provide the innovative leadership necessary for real reform in the administration of criminal justice. Instead, it continues to devote huge sums to the purchase of weapons and hardware for local law enforcement agencies. The rhetoric of "law and order" must be replaced by creative, constructive efforts to deal with the causes of crime and retribution must be replaced by rehabilitation.

A spirit of innovation is desperately

needed to solve the growing problem of narcotics addiction and drug-related crime. Our Government must attack this scourge at its source, by taking retaliatory action against those countries which grow and process the heroin being sold on our city streets and in our schools. We need treatment and rehabilitation facilities and we need drug education programs. Addiction must be treated as a sickness and not a crime. The Government must be willing to take on the forces of organized crime if it is to win our national battle against narcotics addiction.

Innovation must also be applied to the rooting out of racism in the military. Our own research and recent events have proven beyond doubt that our Armed Forces have institutionalized the practice of racism. We believe that the justice which we demand in all walks of daily life must be extended to our armed services.

The difficulties that disadvantaged Americans face nationally are especially acute in the District of Columbia, where nearly a million Americans are denied adequate representation. The Black Caucus will provide the congressional leadership to rectify this situation.

FOREIGN POLICY

Just as our concerns do not stop at the boundaries of our congressional districts, they do not cease at our national borders. We are concerned about oppressed peoples in other lands, particularly on the African Continent and in Southeast Asia. We advocate a complete reassessment of our Nation's foreign commitments. We deplore this Government's sympathy with the white minority in Africa and we intend to resist all Presidential and congressional efforts to aid the Portuguese, the Rhodesians, and the South Africans in their practices and their wars of oppression. This is essential in light of our belief that, unless immediate steps are taken to fulfill our stated commitment to majority rule at home and abroad, Southern Africa might well become our next Vietnam.

We are unalterably opposed to this country's dual practice of colonialism and imperialism, and we have seen the disastrous effects of those policies in Indochina. We will participate in congressional action to make future Vietnams—future unauthorized and unconstitutional wars—impossible.

We watched as, over the years, officials attempted to justify this country's military presence in Southeast Asia on the grounds that we could not abandon our allies. Billions of dollars and millions of lives were wasted because our Government did not ask the same self-reliance from the South Vietnamese as it did from minority poor and disadvantaged Americans. We demand that the American people be afforded the same advantages and the same assistance that our Government poured into a land halfway around the globe.

COMPLEX PROBLEMS NEED COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTIONS

The President has inflamed racism by exploiting the issues of busing, quotas, and law and order. We will persist in exposing his inflammatory and simplis-

tic rhetoric for what it is—while advocating programs which provide comprehensive solutions to problems that we recognize as highly complex. In an era when civil rights and liberties are under attack on every front, we will seek to expand those rights.

With each new veto and each new revelation of impounded money, minority, poor, and disadvantaged people have been put on the defensive. It is wrong that when the number of poor Americans is increasing, when new and better Federal programs are desperately needed, the poor are being made to retrench and to defend programs which were insufficient to begin with.

The American public has been asked to believe that the inadequacies in past programs—such as OEO, title I, 235 housing or Hill-Burton—make the goals of those programs unrealistic. We disagree. The goals of the poverty program, of equality in education, housing, and health care remain goals to work toward. We would expand past programs which worked and replace those which did not. In this spirit, we will work for the continued existence of programs which are threatened by the 1974 budget. Some of these are OEO; legal services; regional medical planning; comprehensive health service grants; maternal and child health project grants; NIH research; emergency school assistance; elementary education development grants; Project Followthrough; funding for titles III and V of ESEA; drug abuse education; Model Cities; urban renewal; and new communities. These are only some of the major cuts. Taken as a whole, the budget presents a clear view of the distorted and perverted priorities of this administration.

EMBARKING ON A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

This, then, is the true state of the Union as we see it. After over a year of hearings in which we collected data that had never been assembled before, we now embark on a legislative program in this Congress. We believe that a strong Congress is absolutely essential to thwart the repressive and inhumane impulses of this administration.

We sense growing support in this Chamber for our positions on many issues. We will cultivate that support and work to make this body an equal partner in our tripartite system of government.

While inequality and injustice are facts of life for millions of Americans, we maintain that they are perversions of life. We seek equal opportunity and equal justice for all Americans. The true state of the Union tells us that these remain goals to be sought.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for an extremely perceptive opening statement. I believe it clearly outlines the tremendous amount of thought that has gone into the presentation of this special order, "The True State of the Union."

The Congressional Black Caucus today

pledges itself to the launching of a comprehensive legislative attack upon several of the most pernicious and unjust aspects of the so-called "criminal justice system." The stark reality we face is the fact that in its most direct contact with crime, in terms of prevention, detection, apprehension, conviction, and incarceration, the criminal justice system fails miserably to do anything about its reduction.

For the President to brag in his "Special Analysis of the 1974 Budget" that the FBI crime index increased only 1 percent during the first 3 quarters of 1972, supposedly the "lowest rate of growth since 1960," represents a crude attempt on the part of the Nixon administration to dupe the American public into believing that his "law and order" approach to crime has effectively resulted in the reduction of crime.

The fact of the matter is that crime increased massively last year across the country, and in every year that Mr. Nixon has been in office. No amount of statistics juggling can hide the fact that the criminal justice system has broken down at every conceivable stage. That system is a source of anything but justice, and is in itself "criminal" in nature, given the manner in which it victimizes both the public at large and the hundreds of thousands whom it apprehends, tries in its courts, and condemns to the prisons which are nothing more than schools of crime and recidivism.

In the portion of our "State of the Union" message dealing with the massive failure of the criminal justice system, the full text of which I now submit for inclusion in the RECORD at the conclusion of these brief remarks, I have outlined in detail the injustice, inequities and ineffectiveness of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the "no-knock" and "preventive detention" provisions of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Procedure Act of 1970, and the obvious defects of the American system of prisons, courts and police law enforcement.

Included in my analysis are concrete recommendations; 13 dealing with the prisons and the "correction" system, 16 dealing with the court system, and seven dealing with police and law enforcement officers; all of which will be followed up by specific legislative proposals.

These recommendations are far from all inclusive, but their tenor suggests the types of changes which are needed if the notion of "Equal Justice Under Law" is to be anything but an empty phrase.

In addition, it is vital to note that for the last 25 years, the Congress has failed to examine the Federal Criminal Code as a body of law. Efforts have now been made by Senator McCLELLAN and the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws—established by Congress in Public Law 89-801—to revise our national criminal laws. Hearings have begun in the Senate with regard to Senate bill No. 1, designed to revise the entire title 18 of the United States Code, introduced by the senior Senator from Arkansas. S. 1 is frightening in its length, if not in the serious legal implications

of some of the changes in the criminal code which it seeks to implement.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is 538 pages long, and it is the largest bill in history ever presented to the Congress. It is even longer than another famous bit of injustice—this time economic—the infamous Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The Judiciary Committee in this body is undertaking a similar study of the criminal code, and I am very happy to note that three members of the Congressional Black Caucus serve on the Judiciary Committee and will be working diligently on this long-overdue overhaul of title 18.

Mr. Speaker, this administration and the 93d Congress must take our recommendations for criminal justice reform very seriously.

President Nixon's simplistic response to the so-called crime problem can be summarized in three words: "Spend! Spend! Spend!"

This year we are once again pumping \$800 million in assistance to State and local governments to be allocated through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the law enforcement revenue-sharing program.

The new Nixon budget reveals that LEAA will continue to devote a disproportionate percentage of its funds to the purchase of weaponry and hardware for local law enforcement agencies, a policy which totally defies any rational approach to the long-range control of crime and injustice on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the new Nixon budget is disturbing, as our chairman of the caucus has mentioned, in several other respects as well. With regard to the criminal justice system, why, for instance, is the LEAA going to fund the U.S. Air Force, of all people, for translating police equipment needs into practical hardware systems for police departments?

Why is LEAA about to pay the U.S. Army Missile and Munitions Center a substantial amount of money to conduct project studies on civil disorders?

Why is the projected Federal outlay for inmate education and training being reduced significantly at a time when our prisons are failing to carry out their rehabilitative role?

Why are LEAA action grants to the States going to be increased by \$35.7 million in fiscal year 1974, despite the fact that LEAA has conducted virtually no evaluation on how effective such blanket expenditures have been in the past?

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that LEAA spends a mere 1 percent of its budget on evaluation. If there is anything good that can be said about the Defense Department, it is that it at least spends about 15 percent of its budget on evaluation of its myriad programs.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency—NCCD—has recommended that at least 12 to 14 percent of the funds for each LEAA program be set aside for evaluation so that we can find out where this nearly \$1 billion a year in Federal moneys is going and how effectively it is being spent by LEAA vis-a-vis the reduction of crime and the rehabilitation of offenders.

Why does the Department of Justice continue in its failure to issue minimum standards in the form of enforceable regulations and guidelines with respect to police, courts, and corrections; opting instead for "National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals" recommendations with absolutely no enforcement provisions attendant thereto?

We are going to examine these questions in the Black Caucus and hopefully in the Congress.

Yes, the failure of the Nixon administration to deal in any substantive way with criminal justice reform can perhaps best be seen in the poor performance of LEAA. But it can also be seen in the administration's and this Congress continued failure to recognize the social and economic root causes of crime. How can we make it understood to this Nation's leaders that crime predominates in the same place where infant mortality is four times greater than in the city as a whole; where the death rate is 25 percent higher; where life expectancy is 10 years shorter; where common communicable diseases with the potential of physical and mental damage are six and eight times more frequent; where education is the poorest; where alcoholism and drug addiction are prevalent to a degree far transcending that of the rest of the city; where, in short, dehumanization, alienation, and exploitation hold the black and the poor in a relentless grip? How can the President seriously expect us to believe him when he says that he is determined to reduce crime on the one hand, while with the other he tries to wipe out the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the health, and education and manpower programs which are the only truly remedial and responsive solution to the so-called crime problem?

Yes, any realistic look at the current state of the Union dictates our recognition that the failure of every aspect of the criminal justice system raises questions which go even deeper than the mere failure to reduce crime serious as that is. For it raises other questions which go to the very heart and nature of our racist society. The community outside the prison walls must never separate itself from the community inside the jailhouse, and the corrective measures against crime must be at least partially administered in the community. The essential problem is not that of an "improper" individual behind bars; for most of us sense intuitively that the problem basically is that of an improper society outside the prison gates. It is a society which is rampant with inherent contradictions, which we as a caucus and which we as a legislative body are charged with trying to resolve and untangle.

So it is in this context that I join with my fellow members of this distinguished caucus to recognize that unless we simultaneously address ourselves to these larger questions, attempts at correcting the criminal justice system will take place in a vacuum.

America's criminal justice system is a source of anything but justice, and is in itself "criminal" in nature given the manner in which it victimizes both the public at large and the luckless thousands

whom it apprehends, tries in its courts, and condemns to schools of crime and recidivism. In its most direct contact with crime—prevention, detection, apprehension, conviction, and correction—the system of criminal justice fails miserably to do anything about its reduction.

If it is to succeed, the criminal justice system must be viewed as a process, all components of which must unfold toward the same goal, namely, the prevention and control of crime and the rehabilitation of offenders. To succeed, this system must flow humanely, efficiently, and with justice from police to prosecutor to judge to jailer. The success of each function depends upon the effectiveness of all. The failure of any one component insures the failure of the entire system. Yet, as it exists today, the criminal justice system has broken down at every conceivable stage.

An overwhelmingly disproportionate number of victims of the criminal justice system spring from the black, poor, exploited, and alienated sectors of American society. Despite the capture of the crime issue through "law and order" rhetoric, black men and women fall victim to crime and are subject to arrest entirely out of proportion to their numbers in the general population. Twenty-seven percent of all individuals arrested nationwide are black, even though blacks comprise only 11 percent of the total population. Selective enforcement of the law has become the rule of the day. It has been estimated that the total cost to the American public resulting from corporation price-fixing alone is at least equal to all costs resulting from crimes against property. Yet blacks are arrested and subjected to police brutality out of proportion to their numbers, while white-collar crime and "crime in the suites" continue to be politely tolerated by law enforcement officials. More blacks than whites have been executed in the United States, and this does not include lynching, so-called self-defense, or police killings.

Two-thirds of the arrests take place among about 2 percent of the population. And where does that 2 percent reside in every city? It is in the same place where infant mortality is four times greater than in the city as a whole; where the death rate is 25 percent higher; where life expectancy is 10 years shorter; where common communicable diseases with the potential of physical and mental damage are six and eight times more frequent; where education is the poorest; where alcoholism and drug addiction are prevalent to a degree far transcending that of the rest of the city; where, in short, dehumanization, alienation, and exploitation hold the lives of the poor in a relentless grip.

The failure of the Nixon administration to deal in any substantive way with criminal justice reform can best be seen in the virtual nonperformance of the heavily funded Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA. On March 25, 1971, the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Nixon and included in its 60 specific recommendations for governmental action several concisely worded criticisms of the LEAA performance. The President's reply to

those criticisms was, for the most part, totally inadequate:

LEAA continues to devote a disproportionate percentage of its funds to the excessive purchase of weapons and hardware for local law enforcement agencies, a policy which totally defies any rational approach to the long-range reduction of crime and injustice by the Federal Government. For the President to reply that "LEAA has fostered the broadest program of criminal justice reforms and improvements in the Nation's history" is grossly misleading, since LEAA is, in fact, the only "comprehensive" crime control program. The President's reply says nothing regarding the quality of that program, referring only quantitatively to the millions of LEAA dollars spent in various ways.

The LEAA block grant program remains essentially a fiscal relief program devoted to beefing up criminal justice system components as they presently exist, and doing precious little in an innovative vein. In fiscal year 1971, 42 percent of all LEAA block funds went for police, primarily police equipment, reflecting a distorted vision of which component of the system is in most dire need of funds at this time. The only innovation that ever takes place occurs when an occasional isolated local official decides to use LEAA money to effect criminal justice reform. LEAA itself has failed to provide leadership to the States for criminal justice reform.

Although LEAA now does require some degree of title VI compliance with regard to grantees, title VI enforcement remains, on the whole, totally inadequate. For example, LEAA has never considered the degree to which saturation policing grants and other programs which result from its funding lead to discriminatory practices.

Meanwhile, to this day, virtually no internal research, planning, or evaluation of LEAA programs are conducted by LEAA itself. According to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency—NCCD—whereas less than 1 percent of LEAA funds are now devoted to evaluation, no less than 12 percent of funds provided by LEAA for each program should be devoted to this purpose. LEAA has no idea what the specific impact of its block or discretionary grants has been, and with few exceptions no States carry out substantive evaluation of expenditures of LEAA funds.

The President's reply to our demand that LEAA insure adequate minority and community representation on planning agencies at all levels was also grossly inadequate. A content analysis of 35 of the 55 State planning agencies and their respective review commissions conducted in 1971 shows that private citizen representation on such agencies remained at only 14 percent, and was, where it existed, totally unrepresentative of the public at large. This figure compared with 20 percent police representation, 16.8 percent elected Government official representation, and 10 percent prosecutor representation.

Increased accountability and evaluation of all LEAA programs must occur immediately. The failure of LEAA to

address the true nature and underlying causes of crime can no longer be tolerated by the American public.

The administration has done nothing to dispel our concern that although the "no-knock" and "preventive detention" provisions of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 clearly impinge on the constitutional rights of suspects and defendants, it continues to be advertised by this administration as a model for the Nation. Other laws with similar constitutionally odious provisions are the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 and the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. None of these acts ought to be advertised as models, and we strongly urge that the administration support legislation to repeal such sections of those acts as inimical to the interests of a free society.

We pledge ourselves to the launching of a comprehensive legislative attack upon several of the most pernicious and unjust aspects of the American criminal justice system, and we implore the administration and the 93d Congress to consider seriously the following tentative list of recommendations. These recommendations are far from all-inclusive, but their tenor suggests the type of changes which are required if the notion of "Equal Justice Under Law" is to be anything but an empty promise:

CORRECTIONS

The first black prisoners in this country were Africans brought here in chains in 1619. Our African ancestors were the victims of the political, economic, and social oppression of white America, and let it always be remembered and understood that the majority of present-day black offenses in the context of the criminal justice system have their roots in the political, economic, and social deprivations of blacks by Anglo-America. Slave camps, leg irons, handcuffs, reservations, and concentration camps; Sing Sing, Jackson, Attica, Soledad. These are the real monuments of this country, more so than Monticello or the Statue of Liberty.

The handwriting is on the wall for the American system of "corrections." It is scrawled with the pen of intolerance and corruption, and written in the blood and human anguish of its victims. Our prisons are scenes of physical, verbal, and psychological brutality, inadequate medical care, arbitrary and capricious rendering of disciplinary decisions without regard to an inmate's constitutional rights, and total dehumanization and human destruction. Involuntary subjection of primarily black inmates to various forms of medical, drug, and psychological experimentation has reached alarming proportions, as the uncovering of the Tuskegee studies and investigations of such atrocities as the experimental use of thorazine and prolixin on "unruly" prisoners graphically indicate.

When the dehumanization and non-record of rehabilitation by correctional agencies are considered, the failure of the criminal justice system is compounded and assured. Rehabilitation is the major chance of the criminal justice system to reduce crime, yet here, it fails

perhaps worst of all. Recidivism rates for released prisoners are generally constant for various parts of the country despite variations in the outmoded correctional practices currently employed everywhere. There is no difference in the recidivism ratios between inmates who had received "rehabilitative training" as it is presently being conducted within the confines of prisons and those who had not. Government officials have yet to face the fact that community based treatment is cheaper than building more and more gigantic prisons. It would cost less per year to send an offender to college than it does to incarcerate him. Probation costs only one-sixth as much as institutional care, and parole only one-fourteenth as much.

One study shows that 93 percent of the juvenile court jurisdictions in the country lack detention facilities other than city jails or police lockups. The majority of the offenders held in the corrections system are between 15 and 30. In jails across the country, juveniles, and adults are mixed, with untried detainees and convicted felons placed in the same cell so that misdemeanants can sit at the feet of seasoned offenders.

There is a total absence of strictly enforced minimum standards for the treatment of prisoners. Existing procedures for the review of prisoner complaints are inadequate. Policy makers have forgotten that the central constitutional principle underlying all rules, regulations, procedures, and practices relating to persons imprisoned in accordance with Federal law is that such persons must retain all rights—such as the guarantee of free expression and association—except those expressly removed by title 18 of the United States Code. Instead, cruel and unusual punishment abounds.

If the Federal Government generally and LEAA specifically are serious about wishing to lower crime rates—which they have failed to do thus far—they are going to have to raise the priority of corrections significantly. After all, 85 percent of the crimes in this country are committed by repeaters, and 98 percent of all inmates eventually return to the community. Yet the corrections system is underfinanced and overtaxed. Federal, State, and local governments together spend less than one-fifth of their criminal justice budgets on corrections. They spend more than three-fifths on police.

We recommend the following:

First. A ban on the building of any new correctional institutions for juveniles or place of community based rehabilitation programs and other alternatives to incarceration.

Second. The establishment of small, State and local community-based correctional treatment centers—including diagnostic services, halfway houses, and other supervisory programs for preadjudication and postadjudication referral of delinquents, youthful offenders, first offenders, and all inmates—so as to afford a reasonable opportunity for participation in innovative work-release, school release, and various treatment programs.

Third. Community-oriented programs for the supervision of parolees and inte-

gration of inmates into the community upon parole or release through vocational training, job placement, and on-the-job counseling.

Fourth. A ban on all laws which do not allow professional licenses to be granted to former inmates.

Fifth. The establishment and enforcement of prisoner treatment standards and the creation of an agency within the framework of a national enforcement mechanism to hear complaints arising from alleged infractions of such standards.

Sixth. The establishment of parole decisionmaking bodies for adult and juvenile offenders which are independent of correctional institutions, the establishment of an independent and regionalized Board of Parole, the provision of fair and equitable Federal parole procedures, and the provision of assistance to the States for the operation of fair and adequately staffed parole systems.

Seventh. The establishment of alternatives to the detention of persons awaiting trial.

Eighth. The entitlement of prisoners to furloughs for family and social visitation.

Ninth. The establishment of a "Bill of Rights for Prisoners," of procedures to insure the right of offenders to be free from personal abuse, and of formalized and enforced grievance procedures for inmates.

Tenth. The banning of all psychiatric, drug, and other medical testing and experimentation in prisons.

Eleventh. Attorney rights for all prisoners in preparing their parole applications, habeas corpus briefs, et cetera.

Twelfth. An end to parole regulations placing undue restrictions on parolees regardless of the merits of individual cases.

Thirteenth. The prohibition of the arbitrary dissemination of arrest records to prospective employers of ex-inmates.

COURTS

The overwhelming majority of the adjudicated cases occur in the State and local courts, and State and local judicial systems suffer from a number of serious administrative, structural, and fiscal problems. Court systems in most States are highly fragmented, lack central administrative direction, exhibit disparate rules of practice and procedure, have cumbersome procedures for judicial selection, discipline, removal, and retirement, and are often faced with critical shortages of funding. All of this leads to a disorganized, inefficient, and unjust judicial system.

Overwhelming caseloads, overlapping jurisdictions, widely varying procedures for trying similar types of offenses, and wide disparities in sentencing practices and the quality of judicial personnel pose a severe threat to the rights of the accused and to the equitable functioning of the judiciary. Although the right of the poor to a defense attorney at all stages of any Federal or State criminal proceeding has been established by the Supreme Court, implementation of this right lags seriously behind the case law.

Those supposedly "presumed to be innocent" are packed into courts with overcrowded dockets and often provided with inadequate legal counsel after being held in jail for inordinate lengths of time awaiting trial. Fifty-two percent of the American jail population at any given moment has not been convicted of anything. For those individuals who are arrested, it is bail for the rich and jail for the poor. One's ability to post bond is almost entirely a function of his socioeconomic status, relegating the entire bail system to the depths of class discrimination. The practice of "plea-bargaining" is regularly abused by prosecutors and inept defense attorneys alike. Defendants often plead guilty to crimes they did not commit after being induced and/or coerced to do so.

With regard to "preventive detention," studies show that the factors which a court could use in determining who should be preventively detained have never been empirically established, thus compounding the danger of total arbitrariness in its application. On the other hand, statistics show that if all arrested persons could be brought to trial within 2 months after arrest, well over 50 percent of crime committed by those on bail could be eliminated. Even a 1970 pilot study authorized by the Department of Justice to support preventive detention theories indicated that the possibility of predicting pretrial crime is negligible, while most pretrial crime occurs after 60 days have passed between the time of arrest and the time of trial.

The fact that State and Federal judges of courts on all levels are appointed and not elected prejudices a fair trial in many cases, and precludes black representation in most cases, since there is not a single black official in this Nation who has the power to appoint a judge. Despite President Nixon's feeble attempt to answer our 1971 demand that he appoint equitable numbers of black Federal judges and other legal officials, including U.S. attorneys, U.S. marshals, Federal correctional officials, and other high-ranking Justice Department employees in every region of the country, black representation in all of these areas does not even begin to approach parity with the black population level in this Nation.

We recommend the following:

First. A drastic increase in the percentage of LEAA and other funds spent on the judicial system.

Second. Speedier trials, with a maximum of 60 days' wait for felonies and 30 days for misdemeanors. These limits should be flexible enough to allow for continuances requested by defense attorneys, pretrial discovery by both prosecution and defense, and so forth.

Third. The immediate appointment by the President of equitable numbers of black Federal judges and other judicial officials, including U.S. attorneys, U.S. marshals, Federal correctional officials, and other high-ranking Justice Department employees in every region of the country.

Fourth. Improvements in court administration and organization on all levels.

Fifth. The removal of traffic cases

from the purview of the judiciary and their placement under the jurisdiction of administrative boards.

Sixth. A tightening of sentencing laws to make them more consistent and punishment less disparate.

Seventh. Elimination of sentences which call for the payment of a fine, or, in the alternative, incarceration for those who cannot pay fines.

Eighth. The decriminalization of "victimless crimes."

Ninth. The cessation of selective use of grand juries to habitually indict individuals for clearly political reasons.

Tenth. The establishment of strictly enforced standards for the provision of legal services to individuals involved in every stage of the criminal justice system, including habeas corpus and parole application preparation.

Eleventh. The prohibition of prosecutorial coercive inducements to entering a plea of guilty and the banning of any plea negotiations being conducted without the presence of defense counsel.

Twelfth. The improvement of pretrial release programs, including, in appropriate cases, increased diversion of offenders out of the criminal justice system and into community-based rehabilitative programs prior to trial or conviction, the establishment of procedures for the issuance of a summons in lieu of arrest, and wider use of citation release systems, station house release, and third-party custody for all but the most serious alleged crimes.

Thirteenth. The upgrading of the quality and standards of judges and judicial conduct through more stringent selection processes which are based solely on merit and which involve representatives of the lay public as well as those thoroughly schooled and experienced in the law and the judicial process.

Fourteenth. Substantive reform of the bail system.

Fifteenth. The creation of pretrial discovery provisions which place definite obligations on both prosecution and defense.

Sixteenth. The wider use of "screening"—the discretionary decision to stop, prior to trial or plea, all formal proceedings against a person who has been arrested—based not only upon insufficiency of evidence but also upon such factors as the financial hardship or family disruption of the accused, the value of further proceedings in preventing future offenses by the accused, and improper motives of the complainant.

POLICE

Police brutality and the abuses which American citizens must endure daily at the hands of the police have been widely exposed and discussed, yet nothing substantive has been done to curb the wanton disrespect so often shown by law enforcement officers with regard to individuals' constitutional and civil rights. The 1968 rioting of policemen in Chicago should not be mistaken as an isolated occurrence for the residents of ghettos and barrios are constantly confronted with the reality of perpetual police abuse.

One need only critically examine the difference between the way policemen

generally return white, middle-class juvenile offenders to their mother's doorstep with a slap on the wrist and perhaps a verbal tongue lashing while black delinquents are almost invariably thrust into the cruel criminal justice system upon committing their first offense, to grasp the inherently discriminatory nature of present-day enforcement. It has been empirically determined that, in addition to the courts, arresting police officers exercise a considerable amount of discretion in making the decision to divert certain alleged offenders from the criminal justice system. Yet, police diversion practices are terribly inconsistent. A study of 48 police agencies in Los Angeles County revealed diversion rates ranging from a high of 82 percent to a low of 2 percent. The police, like the courts, have often failed to realize that certain types of conduct, such as that manifested by the mentally ill, alcoholics, and juveniles, can best be dealt with by diversion from the criminal or juvenile justice systems.

Police selection, recruitment, and training continue to take place in the absence of strictly observed minimum government standards. While about two-thirds of the States have established councils on police standards, myriad abuses still occur. As the Police Task Force of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice put it:

Existing selection requirements and procedures in the majority of departments . . . do not screen out the unfit. Hence, it is not surprising that far too many of those charged with protecting life and property and rationally enforcing our laws are not respected by their fellow officers, and are incompetent, corrupt, or abusive.

A study by the International Association of Chiefs of Police showed that of 162 major law enforcement agencies across the country, only 41 administer psychological tests to applicants. Six of these agencies did not even conduct personal interviews. Educational requirements for policemen are minimal, with many departments not even requiring a high school education. Courses in the sociology and psychology of poverty and ghetto life are virtually nonexistent in the police academies. Even the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia noted that recruits who were not deemed qualified to write citations were nonetheless immediately issued guns and ammunition.

We recommend the following:

First. The immediate upgrading of standards for police selection, training, and recruitment.

Second. The amendment of title 18, United States Code, section 242, so that it becomes a more effective legal tool in prosecuting those policemen who deprive citizens of their constitutional rights under color of law while making an arrest.

Third. The encouragement of lateral recruitment of lawyers, medical professionals, college graduates, and others into the ranks of police forces, and the modification of restrictive civil service regulations that prohibit lateral recruitment.

Fourth. The creation of citizens' review boards empowered to monitor police practices and handle citizen complaints outside the framework of police agencies.

Fifth. An end to discriminatory policies of police recruitment, selection and promotion, and the proportionate employment of ethnic minorities on police forces.

Sixth. The formalization of all police diversion decisions with regard to juvenile offenders. Such decisions must be made by highly trained juvenile specialists. There must be a corresponding increase in monetary support for community-based programs geared for providing assistance and counseling to referred juveniles.

Seventh. The provision of comprehensive Government tort liability insurance for police employees. This would enable the public to collect for damages to person and property that arise from the misuse of police discretionary powers. Furthermore, if the Government is paying for insurance, it will be more likely to see to it that police discretion is kept within legitimate bounds.

The hard logic of practical American politics dictates that a hesitant administration and Congress, all too carried away with the current "law-and-order" ethic, will only be compelled to encourage legislation aimed at an amelioration of the failures of the criminal justice system if they are pressured to do so by an aroused citizenry which holds out its power at the ballot box and which demands change in a constructive, collective, and organized fashion.

Any realistic look at the current state of the Union dictates our recognition that the failure of every aspect of the so-called system of legal justice raises questions which go even deeper than the failure to reduce crime; for it raises other questions which go to the heart and very nature of our society. The community outside the prison walls must never separate itself from the community inside the jailhouse. And the corrective measures against crime must be at least partially administered in the community. The essential problem is not that of an "improper" individual behind the bars; for most of us sense intuitively that the problem basically is that of an improper society outside the prison gates. It is a society which is rampant with inherent contradictions. It is in this context that the Congressional Black Caucus recognizes at the outset that unless we simultaneously address ourselves to this larger question, all talk of correcting the criminal justice system takes place in a vacuum.

Mr. STOKES, Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), for his observations in this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the State of California (Mrs. BURKE).

Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The subject that I shall address myself to is the question of poverty in the United States, and in particular the Office of

Economic Opportunity. It is a tragic coincidence that both President Lyndon Johnson and one of his most forward-looking and important creations are dying within weeks of each other for, just as our former President has passed away, so the Nixon administration is killing the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Two years ago the Congressional Black Caucus specifically urged the President not to destroy OEO and, although I was not a member of the Black Caucus and not a Member of this body at that time I, along with the entire nation of concerned citizens, and in particular the black population of this country, applauded as the Black Caucus made this sincere attempt to maintain OEO.

In response to the caucus the administration implied that there would be a continuing role for the agency. That response noted that "as OEO tests and proves new ideas, and as those programs mature and become more a matter of management than innovation, they should be spun off to the line departments which have primary responsibility for administering social programs. This would free OEO to continue its primary mission as innovator and advocate for the poor. It would also make increasingly aware to the line departments the special needs of the poor, and as proven programs and experienced personnel transfer to those departments would have the benefit of their experience. This would give the poor not only a spokesman in OEO, but an enhanced awareness and sensitivity to their needs in the line departments where ongoing programs which affect the poor would be administered."

Now that commitment by the administration has been abandoned, and those words are revealed as hollow rhetoric. Once again the Nixon administration's total lack of concern for the rights and equities of millions of poor and minority Americans becomes evident.

From its inception in the Johnson administration OEO was created as a challenge to existing bureaucracies as a means of showing that new ways of meeting the real needs of the poor could be demonstrated. OEO set out to bring about conditions at the local level to advance institutional change, and to affect the decision and policymaking processes to encompass and involve the needs of the poor and the disenfranchised.

OEO was established because the line departments—the very same agencies to which OEO programs now are being scattered—were both unwilling and unable to deal with low income and minority citizens. And, despite the serious constraints imposed on OEO over the past 4 years by the Nixon administration—constraints which limited the ability to seek any new directions or programs—we believe that OEO was becoming a success and that it was making a positive effort to involve the poor in the decision-making which affected their everyday lives.

Even before the recent announcement of OEO's final dismantling, as a result of Nixon's policies, it was but a mere shadow of its initial intent and hopes.

Starting with an immediate freeze on any new program directions made in the first days of the Nixon term, OEO has been bludgeoned and beaten back until it hardly can be called an effective agency for change and growth.

Yet we strongly believe that with proper control and funding OEO can be revived and become a strong advocate for the poor. And it must be Congress taking the lead in this area, because the Nixon administration has given only lip service to the needs and programs established by and for OEO.

Despite the rhetorical claims of support for OEO, here is the reality of the Nixon job that has been done on the poverty program:

The Job Corps has been gutted and removed from OEO and switched to the Department of Labor.

Headstart and day care have been cut back and transferred to HEW.

Legal services—those lawyers now can be utilized for only routine casework, and the important right to fight instances of explicit governmental lawlessness has been placed in jeopardy.

Probably one of the reasons legal services has been cut back was because it was doing such an effective job.

Comprehensive health programs—those funds have been cut by 10 percent.

Community development—funds have been slashed 30 percent.

Family planning—funds have been lowered 37 percent.

Emergency food and medical services—funds have been virtually eliminated.

The Office of Program Development has been abolished outright.

VISTA, Foster Grandparents, alcoholism programs—have all been transferred.

Today approximately 30,000 people may be unemployed as a result of the dismembering of OEO. At the same time Community Action, Legal Services, and migrant programs increasingly have been subjected to partisan political considerations. Contracts have been awarded to firms on the basis of how much they contributed to the Republican Party, not by any standard of how much they may help the needy and the poor.

In sum, the net effect of President Nixon's 1971 commitment to OEO as "innovator and advocate for the poor" has been instead, dismemberment of the agency, emasculation of antipoverty programs, and abandonment of this Nation's poor.

Finally, I should like to make this comment. The President's budget for the 1974 fiscal year proposes to transfer responsibilities for programs now funded through the OEO to other agencies of the Government, and some of these programs will receive a reduced level of funding.

To dismantle OEO without presenting a reorganization plan to Congress is grossly illegal. Under the Executive Reorganization Act, as amended, the President must submit his proposed plan to Congress before it may take effect. Specifically, title 5, U.S.C. section 905(b) states, and I quote:

A provision contained in a reorganization plan may take effect only if the plan is transmitted to Congress before April 1, 1973.

We have heard of no plan to submit such a plan for the reorganization of OEO. Indeed, last week Mr. Roy Ash, the President's selection to head the Office of Management and Budget, announced that three executive offices would be reorganized and plans sent to Congress. These included the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Office of Science and Technology, and the National Aeronautics and Space Council. No mention was made to send up a plan regarding the reorganization of OEO to Congress for review, as required by law.

Under the law either House has 60 days in which to pass a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the reorganization plan—and this is under section 906(a).

It bothers me that the President apparently feels he can violate the law when it is to his choosing, but crusades for law and order. I think we should ask the President: "Are you going to send up an executive reorganization plan for OEO so that Congress can exercise its legal authority to review the plan?"

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding this time, and I yield back any time remaining.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for her contribution in this area.

I would now like to recognize the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM) in the area of welfare reform.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

No issue was more cleverly exploited during the first 4 years of the Nixon administration than was the issue of welfare reform. And yet, no issue is more worthy of our attention than the survival of the 14 million persons—mostly mothers and children, the aged, the blind, and the totally disabled of all ages and ethnic groups—who are not able to completely take care of themselves.

While repeatedly stating its desire to help welfare recipients become more self-sufficient, the administration's words have been only that—rhetoric without action. Recommendations made to President Nixon in 1971 by the Congressional Black Caucus included the need for:

A guaranteed income maintenance plan;

Standardization of eligibility requirements;

Establishment of adequate payment standards;

Elimination of degrading treatment of recipients;

Provision of suitable work opportunities which maximize individual freedom of choice and self-respect; and

Improvement of food assistance delivery systems.

Now, in 1973, we must report to the Nation that none of these recommendations was translated into reality. Let us take them point by point.

First. The administration supported a family assistance plan that set a maximum guaranteed income of \$2,400 a year for a family of four, well under the caucus recommendation of \$6,500. However, that \$2,400 was actually less aid than 45 of the 50 States were already providing families and would have made recipients ineligible for food stamps.

Second. The administration agreed with the caucus that eligibility requirements, adequate payment standards, elimination of abuse to recipients, and provision of work opportunities were necessary aspects of reform. It also said its proposed program would provide 200,000 public service jobs at no less than the minimum wage, would include additional training and child care and would entail "required acceptance of suitable work or training."

But what happened?

First, the 203,000 jobs provided through the public employment program passed by Congress in 1971 have boiled down to a present 148,000 persons still employed and a directive has gone out from the Department of Labor ordering an end to any new hiring. In addition, the program was designed to reach no more than 3 percent of the unemployed from its inception.

Even more drastic has been the administration's decision—not publicly revealed until very recently—to put a freeze on most manpower training and job development programs.

Second, we all know that President Nixon vetoed last session a comprehensive child care bill which would have authorized Federal support for a child development program for dependents of working parents.

And third, the "required acceptance of suitable work" clause was translated into a repressive "workfare" concept in a bill introduced in the Senate which one dissenting Senator termed a "slavefare" concept.

Under workfare, recipients—except mothers with children under 6—would be required to register for employment with public or private employers for a fee equal to the prevailing—not minimum—wage in their locality. They would not be protected by any State or Federal laws regulating hours of work, rates of pay, or other conditions of employment except for social security if a private employee in that position were so protected.

Training for job placements for mothers on workfare would have included "cleaning up and beautifying their apartments" and "providing a pleasing home atmosphere with child-centered activities" certainly an absurd and irrelevant preparation for a job outside the home.

As for child care promised by the administration—this bill proposed that afterschool care, if needed, would be the responsibility of any member of the family, whether a minor or an adult, who would be found "capable" of providing supervision.

The workfare approach also established a "parent-locator service" to track down and obtain support from absent fathers, utilizing the services of the U.S. Attorney General, legal service attorneys and regional blood-typing laboratories to determine paternity. Mothers would lose their benefits if they failed to cooperate, even though it is well known that matching blood types of a man and an infant can disprove paternity but cannot prove that the man is, in fact, the father.

We need not wait until 1984 to decry such police state tactics.

The workfare bill also included elimi-

nation of the declaration methods for determining eligibility, elimination of food stamps and a restriction of fair hearing rights and other legal protection of recipients.

Meanwhile, when State and local governments compared the proposed 5-year package of \$15.8 billion in welfare fiscal relief that Congress offered with the \$29.8 billion which would be provided in the same period under the general revenue-sharing plan being discussed at the same time, they shifted their support from welfare reform to revenue sharing. Not only was the fiscal relief provided under revenue sharing greater than that under welfare reform the money could be used for virtually anything and therefore was seen as politically more beneficial to a greater number of constituencies.

The preoccupation with securing revenue sharing on the part of State and local governments also led to passage of an amendment to the revenue-sharing package imposing a \$2.5 billion ceiling on expenditures for social services which, since 1967, had allowed local governments to finance such services as foster care, orphanages, family planning, health, vocational training and rehabilitation, day care, senior citizens centers, and drug and alcoholic rehabilitation programs.

In other words, the governments were willing to give up both the \$4.6 billion they needed for domestic programs and welfare reform in exchange for a blank check they could spend however they wanted with no strings attached.

It was just as well that the welfare reform bills most favored by the administration were killed during the 92d Congress since they were more repressive than progressive in many ways.

However, Congress may find itself deliberating similar legislation again this year, legislation whose intent will be to make life even more miserable for our Nation's poor than it is now, legislation that would contain inadequate—if any—provisions for meaningful child care and job training and development.

In spite of this discouraging state of affairs, most thoughtful observers still agree on the urgency of improving—if genuine reform is impossible—the patchwork quilt of welfare programs presently being administered by States and the Federal Government.

Many feel that improvement is needed to make the system more humane as well as more efficient. But President Nixon's emphasis is on punishing those forced to accept aid in a society that denies them all other choices. Throughout his first administration, the President used "welfare" as a code word to conjure up in the minds of his so-called silent majority visions of a woman having another child to increase her dole or a man living off the taxpayers rather than finding a job he could surely have "if he really wanted it."

Although his inaugural speech repeated the word "new" 17 times, according to one commentator, his thesis that "the Government should take less from the people so they can do more for themselves" included the same old phrase "work instead of welfare." Once again, the President is waving the red flag by

equating those on welfare as being those who do not or will not work for a living. Once again; he is castigating welfare recipients while simultaneously impounding funds for or eliminating entire job training and development programs designed to provide precisely those same persons with an opportunity to escape the hated relief rolls.

In the face of an overall 5.2-percent rate of unemployment—and a disgraceful 10 percent among blacks—the President is willing to live with this rate of joblessness, claiming it is a curb on inflation. In effect, the poor shall be sacrificed to the interests of the middle class.

Clearly, the prospects for meaningful welfare reform are as dim now as they have been for the last 4 years. The Nixon administration still seems bent on penalizing those unlucky enough to be poor in our society.

Nevertheless, we insist that reform is one of the priority issues facing us and our constituents throughout the Nation. If the President would have the people "do more for themselves," he will have to help provide them with a chance to reach that admirable goal.

At the very least, those citizens who are desperately trying to survive—with or without aid—should have the following protections:

Extension of minimum wage coverage to those workers—mostly minority group—who are concentrated in the lowest paying and least secure jobs.

Elimination of a subminimum wage clause from any welfare reform bill on grounds that almost all Americans will support the concept of a fair day's pay for an honest day's work.

Increased support for job development and public service employment instead of impoundments and freezes on such programs, with the added assurance that welfare recipients and the chronically poor be represented in fair proportion to their numbers.

Provision of child care programs that would include educational and nutritional components rather than being custodial warehousing of the precious children of working mothers.

This administration's overriding philosophy has been a harkening back to those mythical good old days when every man, woman, and child was tied to the work ethic and when jobs in a developing nation were available to every person who needed to make a living except those who, because of race and class discrimination, were denied this basic means of survival.

The inheritors of that caste system are with us today and are still being denied the right to earn a living with dignity and self-respect. They want that right. They need that right. They must have that right with all the privileges that go with it.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for an excellent and very articulate statement on behalf of this Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, education in America has suffered many setbacks during the first 4 years of the Nixon administration, with the years ahead looking leaner still as the budget trimmers recklessly perform their "fat trimming" op-

erations, cutting into the very fiber of our educational system, and threatening the goal of quality education for all our citizens.

In October 1968, candidate Nixon promised:

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—either federal, state or local—the one area we can't shortchange is education.

This was indeed a laudable and promising beginning. How unfortunate then that these words were not given meaning through Presidential actions in the first term of the Nixon administration, how incredible that these sentiments should now be labelled, "the sacred cow" of Congress.

In March of 1971, the Congressional Black Caucus presented the President with a list of recommendations for action in the area of education. We began by recommending the initiation of a program of comprehensive child development services to be provided as a right to every American child. This was a commitment which the President himself had publicly articulated in 1969, but which he emphatically reversed by vetoing the OEO and Child Care Amendments in December 1971.

We called for the strengthening of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, urging the full and advanced funding of this act, and stating our opposition to the proposed system of block grants to supplant title I and various other categorical programs. The administration's response has been one of all-out support for educational revenue sharing, a proposal which threatens to dilute the funds presently going to title I, and diffuse the impact of compensatory education by subjecting such programs to the machinations of State and local politics.

Recognizing the extensive power of the Office of the President, we called upon Mr. Nixon to exert national leadership to meet the constitutional commitment of equal opportunity for all men. The response to his rhetoric has been sorely contradicted by the clear expression of his actions supporting two major legislative assaults on these rights, through the successful inclusion of a busing moratorium in the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 and the prohibitions of busing fundamental to the Equal Educational Opportunity Act.

Finally, we recommended an increase in Federal aid to higher education in the form of increased student assistance and aid to black colleges and universities. Congressional passage of the Higher Education Amendments implemented several of our suggestions for helping students finance their educations, but the President's present spending level and new budget for these amendments substantially obstructs their full implementation.

Since coming to office in 1969, this administration has vetoed six major pieces of legislation in the area of education alone, including four bills to provide badly needed funds for the current school year.

The President vetoed the 1971 child development bill; fought passage of the Drug Education Act to help schools teach

children the dangers of drug abuse; and opposed passage of the Environmental Education Act to support school ecology programs.

Even when the President has not vetoed vital education measures, he has often refused to spend the amounts of money appropriated by Congress. Examples of these lower spending levels include: zero spending for title III of the National Defense Education Act, this despite congressional appropriations of \$50 million for the acquisition of education equipment; nor are funds being spent for title 5C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides aid to State departments of education for planning and evaluation; nor for the career education program.

Most prominent among these programs is title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has long been an object of Presidential scorn, and which has never been fully funded to the \$7 or \$8 billion level authorized. Even the present spending level of \$1.5 billion was achieved only through strong and persistent congressional pressure. Congress last year added about \$200 million in title I funds, which are presently embargoed due to the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations.

Federal expenditures for title I have actually been shrinking relative to the total budget and the impact of inflation. Since 1965, title I appropriations have increased by some \$638 million, but the percentage of title I funds in the total budget has dropped from 0.7 to 0.6 percent. When this is added to a cumulative rate of inflation of nearly 20 percent, the decline of effort becomes quite considerable and most disconcerting in light of the fact that only about one-third of the eligible children are presently being reached.

The President's proposed education revenue sharing would further dilute the impact of title I by combining title I funds with emergency school aid funds, with little likelihood of significant increase in funds for either, and the potential threat that existing funds may be diverted, or functional programs terminated.

Over the past few years, there has been considerable controversy over the effectiveness of compensatory education. We must closely examine the real facts concerning the operation and intensity of focus of existing compensatory education programs. In so doing, we will probably find that funds and resources are being diffused to such an extent as to make their impact negligible. Let us look at the record of the Kansas City and Philadelphia public school programs where ghetto kindergarten students are successfully learning to read, a skill their more affluent white counterparts will not be formally taught until the first grade. This suggests that the cycle of failure for ghetto children can probably be terminated at the source if resources and efforts are concentrated on the real problem.

In 1972, Congress enacted an administration proposal amending the Higher Education Act to prohibit the implementation of court orders calling for the busing of schoolchildren, pending the ex-

haustion of judicial appeals. Several months later, the House enacted an administration measure which sought to provide equal educational opportunity by prohibiting busing beyond the next closest school and permitting the reopening of prior court desegregation orders. Fortunately, the vigilance of the Senate prevented its enactment into law.

These measures represent a complete retreat from responsibility, and a tragic failure of moral and political leadership. They claim to advance the cause of equal education, while blatantly denying these opportunities to millions of poor and minority children. They propose to consign untold numbers to separate and unequal educations, with little regard for the tragic social and educational consequences.

The issue of busing has nothing to do with the fundamental quality of education—rather, it has long been recognized as the most immediately feasible tool to provide children access to the best available educational opportunities. We must continue to utilize it, while seeking out more satisfying and permanent solutions.

If this administration and the Nation are truly concerned about equal education, they will move beyond the sham of busing to the more fundamental issue of the financing of education. Recent court decisions in this area have established that a basic inequity exists in the present reliance upon property tax for the financing of education. Moreover, the use of local property taxes to finance schools violates the 14th amendment by making educational opportunity a function of local wealth.

If we are to guarantee equal education, we must implement the recommendations of the President's Commission on School Finance that "each State assume responsibility for raising and allocating educational resources," and for increasing the present 7 percent Federal share of total educational expenditures, so as to more nearly equalize resources among the states.

A final area of concern must be the financing of higher education. In 1971, the Caucus called for a 70-percent increase in Federal aid to higher education in the form of increased student assistance and aid to black colleges and universities. While congressional passage of the 1972 Higher Education Amendments implemented several of our suggestions, the financial crisis being faced in higher education is increasingly acute, particularly for black institutions and black college students.

Approximately 85 black institutions of higher education provide 80 percent of the total black graduates annually. Black institutions are also principal educators of the poor, educating some 17 percent of the college enrollment from low-income families. A full two-thirds of the graduates from black institutions come from families with an income of \$5200 or less—a remarkable achievement in light of a national figure of less than 10 percent of the population from that income level ever receiving a college degree.

In 1970, Federal funding to these institutions totalled \$125 million, or 3.4 per-

cent of the total Federal budget for higher education. A full 45 percent of this aid goes into student financial aid, as opposed to the average of 21 percent in other institutions.

Most of the Federal aid received by these institutions is from the basic education programs of HEW. Black institutions receive only 0.3 percent of all the funds allocated for research and development—a fact which severely limits the growth of these institutions and their students in the critical areas of physical sciences and medical and nuclear research.

If these institutions are to continue to provide the training and education necessary for poor and minority students to take an active role in the society, the sources of revenues available to them must be greatly expanded. The Federal effort both in terms of direct aid to institutions, and more importantly, in the providing of financial aid to students, must be substantially increased.

At every level the American educational system is being challenged to provide quality educational opportunities for all our citizens. The President's record, and recent budget statement, however, give little hope for an increasing Federal role to meet this challenge.

The Members of Congress must, therefore, assume the responsibility and exert the necessary leadership to fulfill this commitment. We, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, reaffirm our support for legislative action to provide comprehensive child development services, as a right to all American children.

We deplore the decrease in effort for title I which has occurred under this administration, and again call for the full and advanced funding of this program.

We call for the reinstatement of vital sources of financial aid to students available under the direct loan and educational opportunity grant programs, programs which Congress deliberately maintained in the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

Finally, we urge Mr. Nixon, to recall his 1968 commitment, and call upon him to fulfill that promise not to shortchange America in the field of education.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. STOKES.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from the State of California (Mr. DELLUMS), on military and foreign policy.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with extraordinary pride that I rise this afternoon to join with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, and my other friends and colleagues who make up the composition of

the Congressional Black Caucus, to attempt from the floor of this body to address the American people on what is in fact the real state of the Union.

In the moments I have allotted to me I will address myself to two issues; first, the question of racism in the military and, second, the general issue of foreign policy.

First, on the question of racism in the military:

I

Mr. Speaker, the history of racism within the military dates back as far as there have been minority members of the Armed Forces. Yet, it was only 23 years ago—in 1948—that President Truman officially abolished segregation in the military. It took another 15 years—until 1963—for the Defense Department to issue an initial directive opposing racial discrimination and calling for equal opportunity programs for minority servicemen and their families. Three years ago, Secretary Laird issued yet another directive condemning discrimination. Only after that directive did the military services move to implement programs and directives of their own dealing with internal racism.

Following the 1971 Congressional Black Caucus meeting with President Nixon, the Defense Department responded by setting up the Task Force on the Administration of Military Justice in the Armed Services and by promoting four blacks to the rank of General. However, we cannot accept these actions as anything but minimal first steps. Certainly they have no real impact on the day-to-day practices which affect each minority serviceman; the arbitrary decisions, unfairness and blatant administrative and judicial practices which render stated policy meaningless. Complaints received daily in Congressional Black Caucus offices from minority servicemen indicate that existing Defense Department policies are negated continually by lower grade commanding officers and NCO's.

The very existence of these directives has led many minority servicemen to expect equal participation in every level of the military. This has not been the case. For example, although the total proportion of officers to enlisted men has risen significantly over the past 3 years, minority officers are still drastically underrepresented; out of a total enlisted strength of 1.6 million, blacks now comprise 249 thousand or over 13 percent; but only 7,900 men or 2.3 percent are officers. And minority servicemen continue to receive the least desirable job classifications and opportunities for advancement.

For black servicemen, justice in the military is usually a travesty.

Minority servicemen receive a vastly disproportionate percentage of article 15 punishments, of pretrial confinements, and of less than honorable discharges; thus making it more difficult for black servicemen to obtain jobs and training on return to civilian life. According to the Pentagon's own recent Task Force on the Administration of Military Justice:

Black servicemen receive Article 15 punishment in greater numbers than their proportionate number within the armed services.

Over one-fifth of those men in pretrial confinement were black—with the average length of such confinement 34 days, over 5 days longer than the average confinement of whites. With only 1 percent of the military attorneys available to defend them being blacks, civilian groups have been forced to organize to see that the minority servicemen receive the counseling and legal help they require.

In November 1971, the Congressional Black Caucus held specific hearings on racism in the military. These hearings brought out that racism has become institutionalized at all levels of the military. We saw that this racism takes many of the same forms as in civilian life; slow advancement; over-literal interpretations of the regulations; punishment disproportionately borne by the minority; the difficulty or even impossibility of obtaining fringe benefits; subtle and not-so subtle harassments, and many others. This situation is worse in the military since civil rights are so difficult to protest in this closed society and there is so little publicity of the violations.

What we in the Congressional Black Caucus heard about—and warned both the Congress and the Pentagon about—in 1971 exploded last year. Minority servicemen clearly indicated they would no longer passively accept the racism which confronted them in the military. They were well aware of the directives which had been issued; they expected that commanding officers would heed these directives; time after time they brought these problems to the attention of their superiors. And yet, after investigations were completed, the replies they received were invariably similar: "You are not being discriminated against," they were told.

Whenever violence occurs, the reaction of the military has been to focus attention on acts of violence and not on circumstances which produced this response. The minority serviceman found himself punished for his reactions to racism—while no attention was given to the causes of his discontent.

Yet, the unique feature of the military which offers the hope of real change is its authoritarian reward-punishment mechanism which conditions the survival and the chances for advancement of members of the military. The Black Caucus accepts these black servicemen as their constituents and insists that compliance with equal opportunity policies become an effective part of the reward-punishment system, even to the extent of making racial discrimination punishable by court-martial.

The Congressional Black Caucus believes that racism in the military must be eliminated—not only because of its debilitating effect on racial minorities, but also because racism in the military poses a serious threat to our national security. Certainly this Nation cannot be secure as long as the Armed Forces are more concerned with protecting themselves against their fellow servicemen than with defending against an external enemy. The increasing polarization of blacks and whites in our Armed Forces is rapidly approaching the point

where the overall effectiveness of the military as a fighting force will be seriously hampered, if not completely stalemated, by its inability to eliminate this internal racial strife. Therefore, it is obvious that drastic and far-reaching changes must be initiated immediately to insure that racism and discrimination toward all minority groups in the military is finally eliminated.

Realizing that we can depend less and less on an insensitive administration for solutions to these very serious problems, the Caucus recommends that legislation be enacted by Congress in the following areas:

First. Promotion of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Employment to Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Employment, so that he will be able to report directly to the Secretary of Defense.

Second. Amending the UCMJ—Uniform Code of Military Justice—to make racial discrimination a court-martial offense.

Third. Amending the UCMJ to remove all civilian crimes and offenses from military control and returning them to the civilian courts.

Fourth. Allow nonmilitary personnel to be represented on court-martial boards and have selection-at-random from the entire base population.

Fifth. Establish more explicit conditions which would allow for release of those held in pretrial confinement.

Sixth. Guarantee that persons charged under article 15 would have the right to confer with legal counsel before accepting or rejecting the article.

Seventh. Elimination of all punitive discharges and establishment of certificates of service.

II

Mr. Speaker, in 1969 and again in 1973, President Nixon talked about a "generation of peace" and a new era in our relations with the other countries of the world. To achieve these goals would require a complete reorientation across the entire range of American foreign policy. Yet, not only has the Nixon administration failed to begin this massive effort, but it has intensified reliance on power politics and the brutal use of force to achieve ends.

A real "generation of peace" cannot begin until America realizes the heritage of unfairness and oppression found in the history of its foreign policy. Ever since America became a world power, foreign policy has been based on callous disregard of the rights and aspirations—many times even the lives—of non-Western peoples. Just as America's nonwhite minorities have refused any longer to accept an inferior status within America, we refuse to accept a foreign policy based on the implicit inequality between whites and the Third World.

Nowhere is this underlying racism more clear than in Southeast Asia, and in the ability of President Nixon to continue for so long acts of senseless destruction and devastation without either effective protest or control at any time by Congress. We do not believe any President would have been allowed to perpetrate this insane policy against any white

nation. We do not believe that any number of POW's would justify a policy of terror directed against an entire nation—if that nation were European. We do not believe the costs of the war would have been tolerated if the administration were not adept at shifting them to the backs of black and poor people.

Every one of us is aware of the President's failure to make good his promise of a speedy withdrawal from Indochina. Yet the full dimensions of the costs of the war have been difficult to grasp. The plain fact of the matter is that our adventurism in Southeast Asia still continues to cripple the efforts of black and poor Americans to bring about desperately needed reforms in the community and the Nation. The President has felt compelled to cut deeply, not only into reform efforts, but also into basic domestic services. Even as this war ends, misdirection of financial resources will cost us dearly now and in years to come.

No matter what we are told by administration and Pentagon spokesmen about alleged dwindling defense budgets and economic problems that stem from whatever minimal cutbacks in domestic military spending have occurred, in reality this country still allocates \$10 to \$20 billion too much each year for defense. By making military decisions primary and domestic decisions only secondary, this administration shows a basic misunderstanding of the real sources of American strength.

Material costs of the war have been high, but spiritual costs have been even higher, for we have been asked to exchange the true pride that comes from the commitment to our national ideals on equality and self-determination for the false pride based on belligerence and abuse of power.

The Government began this undeclared war not in reaction to any real threat to the Nation but on the basis of a foreign-policy calculation that the United States could contain the Russian and Chinese superpowers through the small country of Vietnam. Now the Nixon administration tries to reach over the heads of the Vietnamese and settle the war on the basis of an understanding between the great powers. This kind of diplomacy may bring peace to the United States, but let no one imagine it has brought peace to Vietnam, that it has succeeded in leaving Vietnam anything but a legacy of continuing violence. The Vietnamese will not be at peace until a stable solution is found by the Vietnamese themselves, not by any outsiders, whether they be Russian, Chinese, or American.

Even more disheartening, Nixon's entire foreign policy seems based on the ease with which the United States takes more from the Third World than it ever intends to give back. Economic aid and trade investment policies build up economic structures useful only to this Nation's establishment and not the host population. America's power over markets is used to monopolize raw materials without paying a truly fair price. Although many people are under the impression that U.S. foreign aid is helping to equalize world income, the truth is

that the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations continues to increase. The rate of economic growth of the poor countries is in a losing race with the rate of population increase, while America's swollen economy takes more and more of the raw materials and energy sources needed to attain our standards of living. No one can expect this situation to continue without bringing about confrontation on a global scale. There is no evidence that the present administration has any realization of the magnitude of this crisis.

The Nixon administration still ties national prestige and power to dictatorial regimes that have to rely on American support to maintain themselves against their own people. Nowhere was this more true than in the shocking tragedy of Bangladesh where power politics took precedence over human decency. As in the case of Chile, the administration still shows blind hostility to any government—no matter how democratic or nationalist—that threatens any U.S. business interest. Black Caucus members have introduced legislation to end our military aid to the Brazilian generals, to maintain economic sanctions against the Rhodesian minority government, to end U.S. involvement in the South African forced-labor economy, and to reorient foreign aid efforts with a massive increase in truly helpful economic aid. But these efforts met with little success.

The Black Caucus hopes that the truce signing really mean a final end to the insanity of using America's wealth to make life miserable for people who never did us any harm. We hope that pressures for continuation of hostilities are successfully withstood.

But we also intend to do much more than hope. We call on Congress to assert the responsibility it has evaded so long. Congress must insure that withdrawal signifies more than an empty phrase—and that the Pentagon and its friends understand it. Congress must no longer allow secret wars to be fought anywhere. And if Mr. Nixon characteristically tries to reverse course, Congress must refuse all funds for any further terror diplomacy.

The Congressional Black Caucus is in the process of making an analysis of the President's budget message and will make a more detailed statement to the Nation at a later date.

However, the caucus has serious concern over some of the premises underlying the budget cuts and suggests they be carefully scrutinized by the Congress.

The budget begins with the premise that defense spending cannot be cut. While we understand that rising manpower costs and costs for a volunteer army contribute to much of this increase, there is much waste in the military, particularly in many of the weapon systems which are of questionable value in the country's defense. In addition, use of U.S. military in European countries must be reevaluated in relation to critical domestic needs. A \$4.6 billion increase in defense in the face of a \$1.3 billion decrease in military manpower raises serious questions regarding our national priorities.

The state of this Union will continue sick and distrustful, unready for the challenges that lay ahead, until the blight of the war and all it represents is finally lifted from the country and from the black and poor communities. It is time to begin; to face our responsibilities to the rest of the world; to cease killing and maiming and to start working toward solutions to our common problems recognizing our common humanity, and common need to live in peace, freedom, dignity, and justice.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) for his statement on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, also chairman of the African Affairs Committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, who will state the position of the Black Caucus on Africa.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, while the Congressional Black Caucus and President Nixon agree that the "two awesome problems" still facing Africa are the quest for modernization and the attainment of majority rule in southern Africa, our views on the means of resolving those problems are diametrically opposed.

The caucus finds that the President's concept of "progress" in this area, as in many others, is far from realistic.

President Nixon has failed to act positively on our recommendations of May 1971. Africa has not been given priority in foreign affairs. Far less than 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product has been allocated to foreign assistance in the developing countries. A special representative task force to provide a comprehensive review of U.S. policy has not been created. The White House rejected our recommendation to withdraw South Africa's sugar quota. This Government has not joined the Council of Namibia. While we welcome the appointment of a black Foreign Service officer to the American Embassy in South Africa, and note the administration's intention to encourage private enterprise in sub-Saharan Africa, we remind the administration that its interest in supporting the majority-ruled states of southern Africa must include Zambia as well as Lesotho, Botswana, and Swaziland.

Since the May 1971 Black Caucus report to the Nation, there has been a definite trend in U.S. policy toward more support of repressive minority governments in southern Africa and the intensification of economic policies that create hardships for the economies of black African nations.

Despite a United Nations' decision that the least developed countries—and Africa contains 16 of the 25 least developed nations—should be given priority in foreign assistance, the Nixon administration has decreased the proportion of foreign aid to developing countries since 1971. American aid to Africa declined from 8.4 percent of its total foreign assistance to

less-developed countries in 1971, to 7.9 percent in 1972 and will probably amount to 6.8 percent in 1973.

Recent revaluation of major currencies, one result of President Nixon's new economic programs, crippled foreign trade, and monetary reserves and increased external debts of African and other developing states.

The Nixon administration has refused to endorse an international commodity agreement for cocoa sought by primarily African countries and is threatening not to renew the international coffee trade agreement to which a number of African nations are a party.

The United States lags behind the more progressive policy of the European Economic Community in granting general trade preferences to African and other developing countries.

The Nixon administration has withheld its support from a proposal to further link international finance and credit mechanisms to development needs. Such a link would immeasurably assist African and other developing countries to better handle trade fluctuations caused by price changes in industrial countries. This approach would also help to halt the deterioration in terms of trade for critical items.

As President Nixon designs new trade and international monetary policies, proper consideration should be given to the internal economic needs of less-developed countries. We must avoid at all costs the entrenchment of a world stratification system which consists of a few rich white nations and a massive majority of poor nations of nonwhite peoples.

If the Nixon administration's economic policy toward Africa and the rest of the developing world has been deplorable, its posture toward southern Africa has been nothing short of criminal.

In dealing with Portuguese administered territories:

The satanic assassination of Amilcar Cabral in Conakry last Saturday serves only to dramatize the gravity of the situation in the Portuguese administered territories of Africa. This leader of the PAIGC, slain like Patrice Lumumba and Eduardo Mondlane in a struggle against European colonial domination, was about to proclaim the independence of Guinea Bissau and Cape Verde.

In Mozambique, the effectiveness of the Frelimo forces has been so successful in the Tete Province of that country, that Rhodesia and South Africa have felt constrained to assist Portugal's defense of Mozambique.

The President bypassed the Senate to sign an executive agreement on the Azores military base in December 1971. By adding a nearly \$434 million aid package, he markedly improved Portugal's capacity to wage war.

The President has failed to control the sale of defoliants to Portugal. These chemicals are being used to denude the land in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau.

The administration has relaxed the embargo on arms and military equipment to Portugal, allowing certain aircraft,

such as helicopters and troop transports, to be exported to the Lisbon regime.

The Nixon administration voted against a resolution in the last U.N. General Assembly session which declared that liberation movements in territories in Africa under Portuguese administration were authentic representatives of the people there.

Concerning Rhodesia:

As early as September 1970 the Nixon administration ignored international economic sanctions to permit importation of 150,000 tons of Rhodesian chrome. A year later the White House failed to exert the necessary pressure to block the passage of the Byrd amendment which permits importation of strategic materials from the Rhodesian rebel colony in violation of United Nations Charter obligations. Even after the African people of Rhodesia dramatically demonstrated their opposition last January to the Heath-Smith accord, the President did virtually nothing to encourage rescinding the Byrd amendment. We now see that Rhodesia has imposed economic sanctions against Zambia, causing a new threat to international peace and security.

The Nixon administration appeared to give its approval to this action. Only 2 months before, the former chairman of the Committee to Re-elect the President, predicted over Rhodesian television on November 27, a "change" in U.S. policy "sooner than anyone realized."

Since the passage of the Byrd amendment, over 25 ships carrying Rhodesian contraband—particularly chromium ore, ferrochrome, nickel, and nickel cathodes—have entered the United States.

The President continues to permit the Rhodesian Information Office, which tends to function as an unofficial Embassy, to operate in Washington, D.C. In contrast, the Rhodesian Information Office located in Australia was ordered closed recently by Prime Minister Whitlam.

Turning to South Africa:

While there has been a total failure of the "dialog with South Africa" policy among African states, the Nixon administration still pursues a policy of communication and increased contact with the Pretoria regime.

The White House supported renewal of the South African sugar quota.

In dealing with Namibia:

The Nixon administration still allows tax credits to U.S. corporations doing business in Namibia for taxes paid to the illegal South African administering authority. Further, it has taken no concrete action to implement its oral decision in 1967 to discourage new U.S. investment in Namibia.

The Nixon administration continues to protect American business in Namibia vis-a-vis the illegal administering authority.

We specifically urge the Nixon administration to:

Take concerted action to improve hiring policies to insure that blacks are represented in the foreign service, world wide at all levels, in all career specialties.

Enforce arms embargoes against

South Africa and Portugal especially for aircraft and other military transport equipment and weapons.

Adopt a policy of majority rule for South Africa and disavow the "separate development" policy.

End nuclear cooperation with South Africa.

Terminate all military aid to Portugal under NATO until it grants self-determination to its African territories.

Cancel the executive agreement with Portugal on the Azores military base.

Vigorously support U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and end all dealing with the illegal Smith regime.

Join the United Nations Council on Namibia and seek ways to implement U.N. resolutions and the World Court opinion concerning South African withdrawal from Namibia.

Provide substantial bilateral aid to Zambia consistent with U.S. stated support for majority ruled countries of Southern Africa.

Render all necessary assistance to Zambia following Rhodesia's closing of their mutual border to assure importation and exportation of products required to maintain economic stability.

Grant priority to African countries in the allocation of U.S. foreign economic assistance.

Act forcefully to bring about the demonetization of gold.

Support an international commodity agreement for cocoa and renew the international coffee trade agreement when it lapses this September.

Work actively to obtain a multinational accord on increasing the allocation of International Monetary Fund Special Drawing Rights to the developing countries and linking SDR's to development in those countries.

Make a substantial contribution to the special fund of the African Development Bank.

Establish a special task force composed of a broadly representative policy group to provide comprehensive review policies affecting Africa.

Maintain the moratorium on U.S. ship visits and shore leave in South Africa until apartheid is ended.

Reject the application of South African Airways for a new air route to the United States.

Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and distinguished colleague from the State of Michigan (Mr. DICES) for his sensitive perception, his articulate analysis and forceful recommendations.

It is now my pleasure to yield to my distinguished colleague and friend from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

Mr. FAUNTROY, Madam Speaker and Members of this distinguished body, we have just heard a very eloquent and perceptive analysis of our support of colonialism abroad. I rise to talk about colonialism at home, for as this Nation approaches celebration of its bicentennial anniversary, the people of the District of Columbia approach a centennial observance. Tragically, this centennial cannot be called a celebration. Indeed

this centennial, unfortunately, is an infamous one. 1973 marks the 99th anniversary of the District of Columbia's being stripped of its right to govern itself. 1974 is the 100th year of bondage.

Much has happened these past 100 years. In 1874, the Congress removed the right of the District of Columbia to elect its local officials and to have a meaningful voice in local affairs. In a real sense, the District of Columbia was among the first colonies. At the end of the 19th century, this Nation found its "manifest destiny" and reached out for colonies the world over—Hawaii, the Philippines, and Cuba. In the past 100 years, these all were governed in one manner or another as a colony of the United States. History and the pressure of events has caused each to be freed from colonial domination. Only one real colony remains. The District of Columbia is truly the last colony.

People in the District of Columbia have no vote in the Congress. They have no right to elect local officials directly responsible to them.

They pay taxes and pay the overwhelming share of the cost of running local government, but they have no right to determine what those taxes are or determining how their tax money shall be spent. For these 100 years, the Congress of the United States has acted as the city council and the state legislature for the District of Columbia. No man, no matter how good his motivation or strong his ideals, can know what is right for the people of the city unless he is accountable to those people.

While the bicentennial celebration is inevitable. We, in the 93d Congress, and particularly blacks in the 93d Congress, will have an unparalleled opportunity to be certain that the District's infamous centennial does not come to pass. With the District's 71 percent black population, blacks across this country will view congressional action on this question as a test of whether Congress will deal with the problems of blacks generally in a fair and just fashion. We have an opportunity to give the people of the District of Columbia what is justly theirs—their right to govern themselves, thus bringing 99 years of bondage to an end. This is our challenge.

The task is not simple. The path is not free of obstruction. Both Congress and the President have a major role in making this dream come to pass. First, the framework for self-determination must be laid. The Nelsen Commission has made a number of recommendations for the shaping of the present District Government into an efficient machinery for delivery of governmental service. We know that the Committee on the District of Columbia under its new leadership will bring forth an implementation of these recommendations. As the Nelsen Commission itself indicated, however, the implementation of its recommendations cannot serve as a substitute for the granting of self-determination to the people of the District of Columbia. At the same time that the foundation for efficient and responsive government is being set, the Congress must move forward to find a form of self-government that re-

flects the best information and expertise that can be used to fashion self-rule for the people of the District. We are confident that this can be done. This Congress can also give the people of the District of Columbia voting representation in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Congress has its responsibility, and the President also must act. The White House has been strangely silent in the past 18 months about its attitude toward self-rule for the people of the District. It has been unwilling to use its influence to shape a constructive approach to the problem. All we have seen is silence and indifference. Even at the time in the last session of Congress when home rule legislation may have been within grasp, the President did nothing and provided no help.

Self-rule for the District of Columbia is not a Republican issue nor a Democratic issue. It is not even strictly a black issue. The denial of self-determination for the people of the District is an issue of democracy, central to whether this Nation can be perceived to be truly free. As long as the District of Columbia is denied its just rights under a democracy, an indelible stain is spread across the pages of this Nation's political history.

Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from California for allowing me this time, and let us move forward to implement this part of our agenda.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my esteemed and distinguished colleague from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) for his sensitive and articulate presentation.

Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure and my privilege to introduce another friend, my distinguished colleague from the State of California (Mr. HAWKINS) who will speak to us on the subject of employment and the economy.

Mr. HAWKINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

The Nixon administration has greeted recent signs of recovery from its 1970-71 recession as "good news" justifying program retrenchment, widespread cutbacks in Federal spending, and continuation of economic policies that "feed the fat and starve the lean."

While real growth of the 1972 gross national product averaged 6.5 percent, inflation was 3 percent. The growth rate exceeded averages for the post World War II years only because such advance is normal in years of recovery from deep recessions. But figures such as these are not realistic gauges of economic growth.

Administration claims of high employment and a decreasing unemployment rate for 1972 must not be judged by the "official" figures, but by examining the actual situation in which millions of American citizens live: in poverty, with marginal employment, insecurity, and alienation.

The Nixon administration is, in fact, failing, through statistical misrepresentation, to count an estimated 20 million persons who are able and willing to work but who for various reasons are not covered under the Labor Department definition of "jobseekers."

Some, for example, stop looking for jobs that do not exist and are never counted in the BLS work force and unemployment statistics. In addition to these discouraged workers, there are other categories of the uncounted unemployed and underemployed. They include those who are involuntarily working part time; the "hidden unemployed"—housewives, welfare recipients, older persons, et cetera; and those, who, for legitimate but temporary personal reasons, are not seeking work.

Taken together, they reach a true figure of not 4.3 million, but over 20 million uncounted unemployed. Even this number does not include the thousands of underemployed persons who work full time but do not earn enough to support themselves and their families. The current minimum wage, \$1.60 per hour, paid to a person working a 40-hour week amounts to a yearly income of \$3,328.

Because the administration continues to exclude these persons from its statistics, we are presented with the illusion of relative employment prosperity. Moynihan's benign neglect has become malignant disregard of millions of people without jobs. One of the numerous negative results of this underreporting is that it allows the President to cut the funding of some job and job-training programs, and to abolish others entirely.

In addition, the lack of public awareness of the extent of the problem prevents public demand for remedial action. Thus, severe unemployment continues—leading to increased welfare rolls, the dismembering of families, hostility between ethnic groups vying for the same job or programs, and, of course, more crime.

We believe that the Nixon administration must be willing to commit itself to guaranteeing full productivity and full use of our human resources through a vigorous program of public service jobs and sensitive and relevant economic and fiscal policies conducive to the highest levels of employment by private enterprise.

Having failed to acknowledge the true number of unemployed persons and thus to take appropriate measures to see that necessary jobs were available, this administration has cost America billions of dollars in lost tax revenues.

The President's appeal for public support of his merciless and unwarranted abolition of anti-poverty, manpower, education and health programs under the guise of fighting inflation and preventing a tax increase is purely a political hoax.

First. He rules out completely tax revision based on ability to pay as a means of increasing revenues, granting tax relief, and meeting the costs of essential human needs.

Second. He ignores the simple fact that while taxes may be burdensome it is the higher costs of living involved in his policies from which we suffer the most: High interest rates, rents, runaway food prices, increasing medical costs, and inflated utility payments.

Third. He advocates improperly that by reducing expenditures for programs to meet human needs, economy is

achieved and somehow those needs will be met by someone closer to the people or by the people themselves. It would be just as logical to reason that it is economical to save by encouraging school dropouts so fewer would have to be educated or to shorten life expectancy in order to avoid providing old age benefits, or to require each of us to sweep the street in front of our property, empty our own waste, or educate our own children, with a return to the simple frontier days of early America.

Granted, some reduction in spending is desirable. But the point is that increased revenue without additional taxation is possible by reducing unemployment and increasing the economic growth rate. A simple 1-percent reduction in the official unemployment rate would increase revenues by over \$12 billion and at the same time help to achieve the work ethic the President cherishes so dearly. It is also well documented that we lose at least \$7.8 billion of gross national product due to the underutilization of minorities.

Billions can be saved and inflationary pressures relieved by honestly disengaging altogether from Indochina, by reducing the need to make large unemployment insurance payments through implementing full employment, and by cutbacks in huge subsidies to a few giant industrial, agricultural, and financial monopolies. This would be in line with the President's admonition and belief in self-reliance and free competitive enterprise. In addition, we should point out that the military budget is being increased by \$4.7 billion—an increase which is six times what the Government spends on elementary and secondary education.

We refute the cynical theory that lowering the unemployment rate would necessarily lead to inflation. Administration economists claim, if the unemployment rate goes down, inflation necessarily has to go up. And today, it becomes perfectly clear that the administration is more than willing to trade off millions of workers to stop inflation.

In the first place, the economy is entirely too complex for such simplistic reasoning that lower unemployment leads to higher inflation. An administration that wants to control the economy, can battle inflation through other means—such as monetary policies. At this stage of our Nation's economy, it is preposterous to see the gross national product increasing at 6.5 percent in 1 year and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers saying that the "average person" is better off as a result. But we know that the "average person" has not benefited this much and we know that the person who is unemployed is not "average" but does have an inalienable right to participate in that 6.5-percent increase in GNP.

Second, we detect a cynicism in an administration's policies designed to scrap social programs—manpower training, education, day care—under the guise of reducing the role of Government in the economy while at the same time imposing controls on the wages of working people, allowing prices and profits to

rise, and even promoting guaranteed loans to large corporations. Is the land of opportunity really one in which people are permitted to be unemployed while an inefficient "free enterprise" corporation is saved by the Government?

The Congressional Black Caucus, in its statement to the President in 1971 recommended the creation of 1,100,000 public service jobs; a comprehensive manpower planning program that could train the unskilled for those jobs and for others in the private sector; basic changes in Federal recruitment, testing, and promotion policies to make them more equitable; enforcement of the mandate of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance to insure equal employment opportunities for potential and actual employees of companies with Federal contracts; and cease and desist power for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance suffers from the lack of authority to enforce its own guidelines. It has become clear that the current administration has neither the interest nor the desire to see that women and minority workers have a fair chance to get jobs with Federal contractors. On the contrary, the National OFCC Director has been told to go slow on compliance and has had his supervisory relationship with the OFCC field representatives taken away.

In regard to testing, the Civil Service Commission has held that the decision of the Supreme Court in *Duke* against Griggs Power Co. which says tests must be job related does not apply to jobs within the Civil Service Commission itself. And CSC continues to recommend and place potential Federal employees in jobs using the results of tests that are patently non-job-related and furthermore have never been validated.

Finally, of those recommendations to the President here mentioned, the empowering of the EEOC to bring suit against groups not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was accomplished in Congress last March largely through the efforts of Members of this caucus. Thus, 2 years after our statement to the President, we find that only one of the recommendations was carried out—and this one against the bitter opposition of the administration, and in a weakened form.

I suggest that our principal economic troubles and social tensions arise out of the fact that we negate in practice the national goals we assert in principle. Current policies have made shambles out of the Employment Act of 1946 which mandated high employment and production. The Civil Rights Act—implementing the goal of equal opportunities—is becoming obsolete through disuse. The goal of "a decent home for every American" is profaned by arbitrary executive action that cuts off housing programs for low- and moderate-income groups. And the war against poverty has turned into a war against the poor.

These goals were set cooperatively by the Congress and the executive branch—and neither acting alone has the right to repeal them.

Today Members of the Congress are being asked to tax the American people in order to turn funds for programs of national concern over to "local officials" as if Congressmen were not also locally elected by the same constituents.

It is said that too much power resides in Washington. If so, it is on Pennsylvania Avenue—not on Capitol Hill or in the Supreme Court across the street. The Government is referred to by the President as some monstrosity separate from "the people" and not as the instrumentality by which people democratically, efficiently, and economically meet their human needs.

A government "of, by and for the people" is today a delusion. It is a government of vast power, manipulated by a few men, for special interests. Starting here in the Congress—with peoples of diverse interests and identity as allies—we must articulate national hopes and relocate the pathways that lead to achieving national goals.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) for his articulate presentation, and his forceful recommendations.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) and our other colleagues for taking to the well of the House tonight on the true state of the Union, affecting the future of democracy in these United States.

With reference to what is happening to the budget, wherein immeasurable programs critical to the needs of the American people are being slashed—and slashed precipitously—I think what is at stake is whether or not this Congress is going to honor an American commitment to the poor, to early childhood education, to a host of antipoverty and health programs, indeed, to higher education which is in the process of being decimated in many areas. Clearly, the Congress must stand up today and be counted.

It is critically important that we return the power of the purse to the Congress, and that we have checks and balances in our Government.

The House is allegedly the people's representative, the people's body. We must and can regain the power to cut funds when they are being improperly spent by the executive, inconsistent with congressional mandate or statute. At the same time, we must and can direct the executive to spend the funds that have been improperly impounded, or perhaps use the powers of the debt clause of the Constitution to sign the checks ourselves. As a step, we might consider a Comptroller General appointed, not by the President, but by the Congress, through concurrent resolution.

Unless we can get these basic powers and effectively use our power to compel testimony and information of witnesses relative to our congressional and consti-

tutional purposes, this body could become increasingly somewhat irrelevant.

Conversely, it is my conviction that unless the Congress stands up and exercises power thoughtfully and wisely, we will be treated with increasing condescension by the Executive. If we want thoughtful cooperation, we have got to deal from a position of strength in the public interest. Ultimately what is at stake is not just the checks and balances in our system of government, nor is it simply what is going to happen to the American people and the children and the poor throughout our land—the people whose hopes have been dashed; it is a question of survival of freedom itself.

I have seen in many countries of the world the cause of freedom of the press threatened. Today we are seeing this under the most serious attack in our history. We must fight for the viability and strength and integrity of our free institutions. To me this means, among other things, a free and viable press, including radio and TV. It means unfettered courts, free to interpret justice as they see it and, finally, a proper balance between a strong Executive, a judiciary, and Congress. If these institutions can be maintained in the strength of viability and hope and integrity, then I have great hope for the United States, and, above all, for a government that must recognize that it is accountable to the American people.

This is something that I think some in the Executive Office fight today. We are here as servants, and the role of government is to govern, not to divide and conquer.

I think the gentleman in taking the well, and also the entire Black Caucus, today is helping to illustrate, to underline and underscore, the importance of these issues which go to the heart of freedom in this country and, indeed, throughout the world, and to our commitment as free men to serve as servants of the people. It is our duty to see that people are involved in the decisions affecting their lives, and that the commitments of their Government done in their name are honored.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend the Congressional Black Caucus not only for taking time tonight, but also for its valuable contributions to the rights and liberties of all Americans.

Mr. DELLUMS, I thank my friend and distinguished colleague from New York for his comments and his thoughts and his commitment to action, and his sense of idealism. I am certain that if the 92d Congress was any indication of the gentleman's commitment, I am sure that he will be one of the many Members of Congress who will join the Congressional Black Caucus in helping us fight to right the wrongs and redress the human issues and solve the human problems that confront us in this country and throughout the world.

It is now my privilege and my pleasure to introduce one of the new members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from Texas, who will discuss

the issues of civil rights enforcement. I yield now to my colleague and friend, Miss JORDAN, from the State of Texas.

Miss JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me a portion of time to give you an overview of civil rights enforcement.

In the 19 years since the historic decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which outlawed segregated education, the Federal civil rights arsenal has been stocked almost full. Almost every aspect of discrimination has been prohibited by statute, Executive order, or Supreme Court decisions. Much of the administrative machinery has been established to give the Federal Government the means to insure that no citizen is denied the opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution. But in the 1970's, this array of weapons is in danger of becoming like the arsenal in colonial Williamsburg, neatly stored in an isolated blockhouse, noticed only by students and historical scholars. The legacy of two decades of national upheaval is withering away from lack of use, and, in some areas, from active attempts to dismantle the enforcement machinery.

This atrophy is certainly not attributable to a lessening of the need for forceful programs to assure minorities equal access to decent homes, good jobs, effective health care and full participation in the processes of democracy. Despite some dramatic progress in the last two decades, racism continues to flourish across this land, crippling the lives of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Indians and other oppressed minority groups. Black families earn only 61 percent of what white families earn. Black unemployment continues at twice the rate for whites. Nonwhite male infant mortality is increasing while fewer white infants are dying. It is small comfort to a black family struggling to overcome ancient prejudices to know that it is guaranteed equality in legal theory.

Only with national resolve and unflinching enforcement of civil rights laws can this legal theory be translated into fact. Both resolve and enforcement are in dwindling supply in this decade. The buoyancy and optimism of the 1960's, when statutes and orders were won to break down almost every barrier to equality, have given way to dismal perceptions of the demise of "the second reconstruction." Instead of promoting racial conciliation and social change through the active enforcement of civil rights laws, this administration has combined indifferent, lackluster enforcement with blatant backtracking.

These disastrous, regressive policies are apparent throughout the Federal Establishment. The Federal Government itself, the Nation's largest employer with over 3 million employees, has yet to give minorities equal employment prospects, especially in the higher levels of the civil service system where decisionmaking power and influence rest. Twenty-seven percent of the civil service employees in

grades 1 to 4 are black, but only 4 percent of those in grades 12 to 18 are black. Despite improving efforts by the Civil Service Commission to increase recruitment of blacks and other minorities in all levels, these proportions have scarcely changed.

The private employment picture is far worse. The Federal Government has a wide array of powers designed to open up industries and unions to minorities which have been systematically excluded from well-paid employment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which has responsibility for title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting discrimination in private employment, has had little impact on the pervasive racism it is directed to attack. Long vacancies in key positions, limited and time-consuming powers, continuing lack of sufficient staff and funds and negligible coordination with other key agencies have relegated the Commission to piecemeal reactions to individual complaints. It has made relatively few initiatives to attack the broad patterns of discrimination in employment and promotion possibilities which abound throughout the private sector. Those complaints which it does handle take from 16 months to 2 years to process. Attempts in the 92d Congress to give the Commission the power to issue cease and desist orders to employers or unions found guilty of discrimination were opposed by the administration and defeated.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance in the Department of Labor has shown even less effectiveness in making Government contractors follow nondiscrimination in their employment practices. Its principal sanction—termination of Government contracts—has been used so rarely that it is no longer a credible weapon. The Philadelphia Plan and other "hometown" efforts to open up construction unions to minorities are widely recognized as charades which result in little real improvement in the employment prospects for black construction workers. The principal tool available to these agencies and many others in the Federal Establishment, affirmative action plans for increasing minority employment, have come under increasing attack as the undemocratic imposition of forced quotas.

Setting reasonable goals for minority employment, with accompanying timetable and carefully laid out plans for approaching those goals, are the essential mechanisms for gaining access for minorities to employment in the economic mainstream. The administration's vehement opposition to quotas, which is a perversion of the goals required by affirmative action plans, has given the cloak of respectability to the opposition to this principal means for securing equal employment opportunity. These spurious attacks seek to characterize affirmative action plans as the establishment of mechanical selection procedures which ignore merit and concentrate only on skin color, ethnicity or sex. Instead, affirmative action must be seen as a remedy when an employer or union is shown

to have discriminated against minorities, for without explicit plans and targets that discrimination will continue to exist. The Nation must be made to realize that the time has come to pay the moral dues for the centuries of discrimination and neglect which have cut off millions of black and brown citizens from enjoying the fruits of our society.

The Department of Justice's Division of Civil Rights, which should be the focal point of the Federal civil rights effort, plays an almost invisible role. Its minimal staff prevents it from exercising the coordination required, with the result that its attorneys concentrate on minor and lengthy litigation. Instead of imaginative and aggressive enforcement of the laws, pressing other Federal, State, and local agencies to generate major civil rights compliance activity, the Civil Rights Division exercises scant leadership in the field. Its principal responsibility for insuring every citizen the right to vote has been all but abandoned. The administration tried in the last Congress to dismantle the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which are virtually needed to enfranchise the 2.5 million still unregistered black voters in the South. The Federal Government shows an alarming willingness to let these disenfranchised blacks fend for themselves, rather than actively seeking to prevent States and political subdivisions from establishing discriminatory voting procedures.

This dreary picture repeats itself throughout the Federal establishment. Title VI offices in almost every Federal agency, charged with insuring that minorities have equal access to and participation in Federal programs, are understaffed, underfunded and inadequately trained. Their efforts are characterized by self-certification of nondiscrimination with little, if any, agency investigation; rare pre-approval of grantees compliance with civil rights statutes; and no enforcement of those statutes if discrimination is found. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the independent watchdog of the Federal civil rights effort, has consistently pointed out the utter inadequacy of existing enforcement programs. No agency has ever been rated as making more than a marginal effort in any civil rights area. Recent personnel decisions by the President give no reason to hope for improvement. A union official who has actively resisted the development of affirmative action plans in the construction industry has been designated the Secretary of Labor. The head of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's Division of Civil Rights, whose enforcement programs have been severely criticized for inactivity and ineffectiveness by a Federal court, has been designated to take charge of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. The Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, whose agency has fought an uphill battle to breathe life into civil rights enforcement, has been forced to resign. The Community Relations Service of the Justice Department, once a forceful advocate of minority

causes in communities across the country, has been decimated by budget cuts.

How did this Nation, which seemed to have rediscovered conscience and concern for the rights and opportunities of others in the last two decades, so quickly find itself in a period of increasing reaction and racial antagonism? Perhaps it is because we all underestimated the complexity of the problems of racism and the deeply rooted attitudes and institutional procedures which sustain it. Certainly the task of rooting out the discrimination which pervades almost every aspect of life in this country cannot be accomplished merely by statutes or court orders. Vigorous enforcement of the law with the leadership of the highest officials in Government is clearly necessary, but so obviously lacking. The sense of urgency about civil rights seemed to melt away when the ghettos stopped burning and the present administration began 4 years of "low profile" numbing Government.

There are only a few hopeful signs of change. Recent agreements arranged by the administration with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Co. in separate cases could have major impact on previous discriminatory practices in those companies and demonstrate the potential impact of large industry actions. Thousands of employees should find new avenues of promotion and advancement opened up to them as a result of these Federal compliance activities. Millions more could benefit from increased Federal actions of this kind.

Another hopeful sign is that the budget request for fiscal year 1974 showed few decreases, other than in the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice, for civil rights enforcement activities, and a number of small increases in agency allotments. These modest increases will not revolutionize civil rights enforcement but they can help retard the backsliding which has become increasingly typical of the Federal effort.

However, the problems remaining to be solved are immense, and the momentum of the 1960's has run out. The 93d Congress will be called upon to defend progress already made rather than undertake new initiatives. The effort to extend the Nation's concept of equality to include all men of all colors cannot yet be abandoned.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas, for her illuminating presentation and pointed recommendations.

It is now my pleasure and my privilege to introduce my colleague from the State of Illinois, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE) who will speak to you on the issue of health.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to express my thanks to my very distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DELLUMS) for yielding to me and affording me the opportunity to participate in this very momentous occasion.

Racism is more than a matter of civil rights.

In a country with a gross national product exceeding \$1 trillion, we are unable to take care of the basic health care needs of many citizens—especially blacks and other minorities. Priorities must be reordered so that a greater proportion of funds are allocated to meeting human needs and improving the quality of life rather than devoting huge amounts to developing weapons systems and increasing overkill abilities.

Yet, as it relates to the health crisis, the Nixon administration pursues an active policy of health services retrenchment and cut backs of appropriated funds for health care.

More distressing is the President's failure to propose a health care plan which would minimally meet the health needs of all Americans. Instead, the administration sends to Congress a program which amounts to nothing more than a billion dollar bonanza for private insurance companies—one which would add an extra 8 percent of total health care transactions to insurance company coffers by 1974.

The Nixon response aims to assist the entrenched establishment of health care in America—the insurance companies, hospital bureaucracies, and the private medical profession. It is just this establishment which confuses and impedes the development of a national program of health care for all citizens—and such a condition we can all afford to tolerate.

How great is the health crisis?

Among 20 industrial nations in 1967, the United States ranked 14th in infant mortality with 22 deaths per thousand.

Infant death rates are 80 percent higher for minority group members than for whites; 35.9 deaths for 1,000 live births for nonwhites as against 19.7 for whites.

The United States ranks 11th in maternal mortality, 22d in life expectancy for men, and eighth in doctors per capita.

One quarter of all persons with family incomes under \$3,000 have activity-limiting chronic conditions.

Persons in the poorest income categories are nearly four times more likely to have an activity-limiting condition as those in higher income ranks of \$10,000 and over.

Those in high income classes are 3½ times more likely to have a routine physical examination and 4½ times more likely to visit a pediatrician or an obstetrician-gynecologist than persons in lower income groups.

Although most babies now are delivered in hospitals, as many as one-third to one-half of the women, who deliver in public hospitals have had no prenatal care. For a poor woman the cost of such care may be prohibitive and access to a clinic difficult.

The pervasiveness of the agony and torment generated by the health crisis can be seen in every major city in America. The reasons are readily apparent. Black physicians comprise only about 2.2 percent of the Nation's doctors—a

reflection of the history of discrimination which runs throughout the medical care field. And conditions in Mexican American and Puerto Rican communities may be even worse; as many as 44 percent of nonwhites have no health insurance as compared with only 19 percent of all whites.

Faced with these distressing conditions, the Nixon administration has taken an about-face in expanding Government activities in the health sector. Prior to enactment of medicare and medicaid in the mid-1960's, the Federal Government confined its health activities primarily to regulation of drugs and medical devices and to construction of hospitals. Under the Johnson administration came establishment of new and innovative programs for health. Laws authorized substantial amounts of funds for construction of mental health facilities, medical schools and public health schools. For the first time, Federal money was allocated for regional medical programs for heart, cancer, and stroke research. Programs were established for vaccinations against communicable diseases and to assist the mentally retarded.

Such programs as the Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Act of 1966 and the Health Manpower Act of 1968 all received overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress. Now, the Nixon administration has made health care a subject of controversy. President Nixon has blocked major congressional initiatives. He vetoed:

The Hill-Burton Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments in 1969 after it unanimously passed the House.

A measure to increase the supply of family doctors, after it was approved by Congress with only two dissenting votes; President Nixon waited until Congress adjourned for Christmas to utilize a pocket veto and thus avoid an almost certain override.

Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare totaling millions of dollars slated for health programs. Since the President has not sent Congress any meaningful proposal for national health care insurance and since he has backtracked on his support for health maintenance organization, these vetoes are irresponsible.

On rank-and-file health programs authorized under the Public Health Service Act, the Nixon administration either has no view or recommends against any extension. For example, during hearings on the Emergency Health Personnel Act Amendments last year, the administration portrayed characteristic negativity. A spokesman acknowledged there was a need to get doctors into scarcity areas and that this was a specific Nixon objective. However, the spokesman urged that the legislative authority to do so not be extended, pending review—a contradiction in positions at best.

Since Congress has not acted on any viable proposal to obtain better health for all citizens, the "buck" stops here. We must realize there are no easy an-

swers and that no single program is going to work for all the people. There must be a continuing effort which no doubt will include national health insurance. Enormous costs of such a program necessitate a closer look at how services are delivered. And, because health problems are so interlaced with social and economic hardships, Congress must design a health care package which adequately meets the needs and aspirations of poor and minority groups. Finally, we must deal with the entrenched and highly active health providers who oppose needed changes.

We can achieve better health care for all citizens. The President must reorder priorities to end the disgrace which exists in the health care field today.

POSITION OF CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS ON HOUSING AND ECONOMIC BLACK DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield my time to the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding at this time.

It is my pleasure and privilege to call upon the gentleman from the State of Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) who serves on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and who at this time will state the position of the Congressional Black Caucus with reference to housing and economic black development.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, historically, the struggle of black Americans and other minorities for inclusion in the mainstream of American life has been preoccupied with obtaining and seeking enforcement of civil rights and other constitutional guarantees through vigorous affirmative action by the Federal Government. It was a preoccupation that I feel was necessary and vital for black survival.

However, the tenor of our struggle in recent years has changed. Today, black Americans and other minority groups are actively and vigorously seeking full participation in the economic process. The seventies have brought recognition of the fact that equal justice and civil rights are linked to economic security, and that political empowerment must be undergirded by economic empowerment.

As a result of this new dimension to our seemingly never-ending endeavors to achieve full participation in the American system, various inadequately funded government programs have sprang up purporting to address themselves to our economic plight. Despite this administration's stated commitment to minority owned business as a first line effort to address black needs, performance has fallen far short of the promise. While

the Office of Minority Business Enterprise has moved from a powerless public relations office to achievement of some visible progress, the overall performance of the administration has tended more toward rhetoric than reality.

In 1969, the Department of Commerce conducted a census of minority business which showed all too clearly where minority business stood in the American economic system. The Minority Business Census Report revealed that approximately 322,000 minority business enterprises—representing only 4 percent of the total number of all enterprises—had total receipts of \$10.6 billion, and accounted for a mere 0.7 percent of the receipts reported by all U.S. firms, even though minorities—black, Indians, Eskimos, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Cuban-Americans and others—constituted 20.89 percent of the total population, as of the 1970 census. At last, the extent to which minorities was excluded from the American marketplace was known. This report only bore out what many black Americans and their minorities had suspected all along.

Supposedly in response to this situation, a March 1969 Executive order created the Office of Minority Business Enterprise—OMBE—to serve as the coordinator of all Federal efforts to enhance minority enterprise. Although OMBE's credibility in the minority business community has risen considerably since the days of its beginning, there is an inadequate commitment of funds to underwrite vastly expanded loans from the private sector through OMBE.

As a result of this modicum of success, it appears that the administration is going to put most of its minority enterprise emphasis in OMBE. But this position is looked upon cautiously by minority entrepreneurs and businessmen, and with good reason. Many minority businessmen, who generally are delighted with OMBE's new facelift, express caution and concern about OMBE's future and indeed the entire Government minority enterprise program.

Many black business leaders see important gaps in OMBE's program still, and a need for substantially more funds if OMBE is going to make a dent in the minority enterprise problem.

Moreover, technical assistance and training alone are not enough. Other facets of the total minority enterprise program seem less promising and less well supported than the OMBE program. For instance, although the Small Business Administration—SBA has increased its loans, guarantees, and other forms of credit support from \$107.1 million in fiscal year 1969 to \$297.5 million in fiscal year 1972, of the total loans and grants made to all small businesses, the percentage going to minority businesses has actually declined over the past two fiscal years.

The Office of Economic Opportunity's Title I-D: Special Impact Program—now title VII under the most recent OEO legislation—which venture capital as well as technical assistance and support funds to Community Development Corporations, buttressing their efforts to lessen

the impact of unemployment and underemployment in urban and rural poverty communities, have decreased grants from 31,241,000 in fiscal year 1970 to 24,000,000 in fiscal year 1972.

It is this kind of backsliding in minority programs that has caused many black Americans to be apprehensive about the future of minority enterprise programs, for there is no indication that these declining allocations will be reversed nor will they be ploughed into OMBE programs to cover these slippages from other agencies.

By far the most highly touted program instituted early in the Nixon administration was the minority enterprise small business investment companies programs. Established in November, 1969, the MESBIC program was to specialize in providing long-term venture capital to minority businesses. Since very little Federal money is available for equity investment, the private-sector was looked upon to furnish the needed equity capital. The MESBIC concept was to be the vehicle to lure this private sector equity capital.

Despite high expectations voiced by then Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans in 1969, MESBIC's have been put on the back burner of the administration's list of priorities. Three years after the program was launched, it is only halfway toward the goal of 100 investment companies set for July, 1970. The fiscal year 1972 Progress Report on minority enterprise programs proudly points out that the 51 licensed MESBIC's have a total private capitalization of \$17.5 million. This, however, is a far cry from the 100 MESBIC's with private capital of \$225 million envisioned by the Nixon administration.

Moreover, of the \$36 million MESBIC's are eligible to borrow from SBA for reinvestment, only \$5 million has been actually received from SBA. The 1972 Fiscal Year Progress Report also beams with pride that 442 financings were made by MESBIC's by the end of 1972, using \$7.6 million of MESBIC capital to generate \$35.9 million for the same portfolio companies in additional investments and SBA guaranteed bank loans. When viewed against the enormous capitalization disadvantaged businessman need if they are to have more than a microscopic share of America's business, the MESBIC achievement is hardly impressive. Despite recent legislation to improve MESBIC operations, the program still suffers from lack of administrative support funds, too much emphasis on mom and pop store-type businesses and undercapitalization.

It has been stated over and over again that the real growth of minority enterprise will come only when the private sector is made to recognize that investing in minority business is good business. But the private sector has at best, put only a minimum amount of capital into minority businesses, at worst they have adhered to an attitude of diffidence toward minority enterprise.

Although Federal procurement has shown a substantial percentage increase in recent years, the total of \$393.9 million for fiscal year 1972—inclusive of \$151.6 million of 8(a) procurement—still repre-

sents less than 0.4 of 1 percent of all Federal procurement.

The Congressional Black Caucus was not impressed then, and it is not impressed now. It is true that increases have been made in Federal procurement but present levels are still only a drop in the bucket of this multibillion-dollar business.

In our original 61 recommendations to the President in March 1971, we recommended that "in addition to increased Federal support and employment of direct set-aside programs for all procurement, that he support the enactment of legislation requiring that contractors working on federally assisted and financed projects set aside a specified percentage of their subcontract work for minority firms."

Again we submit the above recommendation to the President as well as to the Congress, for the recalcitrance of major contractors has denied minorities access to their fair share of the Government procurement market. By his own admission, Mr. Thomas Kleppe, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, stated that there is major resistance from middle management, in both Government and the private sector, toward minorities obtaining a piece of the Federal procurement action in particular, and economic parity in general.

In addition to increased Federal financial support, new and innovative programs and legislation are essential. For instance, one such piece of legislation was introduced in the Senate in the last session of Congress. This bill proposes to guarantee equity investments in minority businesses by private investors. This is the kind of legislation that should be seriously and actively discussed, analyzed, and pursued by both the Congress and the administration.

We urge the President to continue to fund Community Development Corporations which, as part of OEO, are under administration attack. Despite inadequate funding, CDC's have contributed significantly in the creation of jobs, increased community income, and expanded minority ownership opportunities. Support should also be continued for the highly innovative and promising demonstration programs of the Opportunity Funding Corporation.

The Congressional Black Caucus also continues to urge the creation of a major federally financed guarantee organization to insure securities and obligations of CDC's.

To seriously address the continuing problem of scarcity of risk capital for minority enterprise, an independent publicly funded development bank should be organized with an initial appropriation of \$1 billion. This agency should be under the direction of a board with broadly representative minority membership.

As far back as 20 years ago, the Federal Government recognized the need to undergird U.S. corporate investments overseas. Over the last 20 years the State Department, and more recently, additional governmental mechanisms, have written some \$7 billion of insurance and guaranteed loans totaling \$160 million for major U.S. corporations.

Our minority business development effort, deserves and needs the same type of Government consideration before the present downward trend can be corrected. The Congressional Black Caucus urge the President and our congressional colleagues to meet the real needs in minority enterprise. We must provide the true resources needed to establish a development bank for minority enterprise.

Even were the President and Congress to implement every recommendation in this report immediately, it would not be enough to lift black and other minority Americans to anything approximating economic equality during the lifetime of anyone now alive. For historically, black, brown, and red Americans are the only Americans who have never benefited from preferential economic treatment by the Federal Government. Enslaved blacks, embattled Indians and economically enshackled Chicanos were in poor position to capitalize on the Preemption and Homestead Acts, so that the vast majority of the 1.6 million families who acquired Western homesteads were white Americans, many of them recent immigrants. Having been excluded as landholders, minority Americans were in poor position to benefit from the expansion of agricultural credit in the first third of this century. Even less were they in position to take advantage of what DuBois has described as "the widespread custom" during the industrial revolution of "public investment for private profit." When Federal, State, and local governments paid three-fifths of the cost of the railroads and handed them over to individuals and corporations, no black man profited or gained a piece of ownership.

Thus it is no accident that blacks are today among the most propertyless of all Americans, excluded from the mainstream of the American economy—not by their own indolence or lack of entrepreneurial instinct, but by the fact of slavery and its aftermath, which placed them on the sidelines when the great national giveaways were occurring. Only, then, by a massive program to bring large numbers of these propertyless people into the ownership class can America hope to convert them from opponents of the economic and political system which now excludes them to supporters of the system. This goal cannot be achieved cheaply. It cannot be achieved by awarding a few franchises, establishing a few hundred small businesses—or even creating a few black millionaires. Achievement of this goal means that minority Americans must be given preferential access to investment capital, and preferential access to sheltered markets. Therefore, the Congressional Black Caucus calls once more on the President, the Congress, and the Nation to initiate a truly effective minority economic development program.

Over the past 4 years of the Nixon administration, we have witnessed a deterioration of our cities across the country. This deterioration continues despite that handful of local housing authority heads in each city who are doing their best to provide decent housing for all. It continues despite a plethora of pro-

grams and endless reiterations of high-minded goals. For millions of ill-housed Americans, the very real fact is that the Federal Government has barely constructed more housing than it has demolished.

Accompanying this deterioration has been a calculated retreat by the executive branch from its legislated responsibility to house our Nation's citizens. This responsibility is clearly spelled out in the Housing Act of 1937, which committed the Government to a policy of utilizing its funds and credit to assist the States and localities in providing decent housing for low-income families. The responsibility was formalized with the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, which quite clearly, called for "the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American." Finally, the Housing Act of 1968, the Congress set forth the goal of some 26 million housing units to be built by 1978. Six million of those housing units were to be for low- and moderate-income families. This Federal responsibility has been reaffirmed by the Congress in each of the 4 Nixon years.

As the second term of the Nixon administration begins, conventional starts have been well ahead of schedule. But the subsidy programs—those that create housing for the poor—have been beset with problems, from scandal-ridden FHA programs to fiscal abandonment by HUD. Rather than reform the program or present realistic alternatives, the administration imperiously cuts off housing for the poor.

This drastic action follows on decades of Federal housing assistance to the well-to-do. FHA, through low-interest rates on guaranteed loans, stimulated the growth of America's suburbs after World War II. In the 25 years following its birth, it insured more than \$81 billion in residential mortgages for seven and a half million middle-income families. During that time, however, the agency actively discriminated against blacks and other minorities by discouraging investment in racially mixed areas. By extending full credit for developments outside of the city limits and by refusing to offer even conservative credit to builders and buyers in the city, FHA successfully closed off the suburbs to blacks and simultaneously contributed to the decline of the inner city. In 1968, the Congress paved the way for FHA's entry into the inner city by deleting the economic soundness stipulation for mortgage insurance and substituting "acceptable risk" for families that lived in older, declining neighborhoods. Though the Federal intent was to provide more housing for the low- and moderate-income families, the result has been the victimization of many by speculative builders and investors aided by unscrupulous FHA employees who looked the other way. Leaky basements, poor plumbing, inferior wiring and inadequate insulation are just a few of the problems that have confronted new subsidized homeowners.

The fiscal abandonment by HUD comes at a time when capital and operating costs are at all-time highs as a result of inflation. The Congress, on its

part, has been emphatic in its commitment to solving this housing crisis. It enacted the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 that contained the Brooke amendment forbidding local housing authorities to charge tenants rent in excess of 25 percent of their adjusted incomes. By the same statute, it increased HUD's contract authority by \$75 million to cover the costs incurred. In 1970 and again in 1971, it amended the terms of the Brooke amendment, further reducing the rent burden upon low-income families by defining more stringently the income base against which the 25 percent stipulation was to be computed, and extending the coverage of the provision to include welfare tenants not covered in the original legislation.

The administration's response to this affirmative action by the Congress has been thorough disregard. Not until fiscal year 1971-72 did HUD pay general operating subsidies to local authorities, and even then, the Department refused to obligate itself except on a year to year basis. This past year, with a HUD projection of \$325.4 million needed to cover deficits and provide adequate services, it sought only \$170 million. The President said that he lacked contract authority for the additional funds. Congress gave him that authority in the sum of \$150 million more than he sought. But as the year ended, these desperately needed funds still had not been released by the President.

Again, during the period ending June 30, 1972, this administration released funds totaling \$200 million less than Congress appropriated for Housing production. This impoundment meant that 144,500 units less of subsidized housing than the President guaranteed the Congress at budget time was produced.

HUD's administrative regulations have been equally discouraging. One regulation declared that local authorities could evict or bar mothers with out-of-wedlock children, despite a Supreme Court ruling to the contrary. Another announced that no more units of public housing could be built unless operating expenses could be held down to 85 percent of rental income. This gave preference to the high-income poor. Still another declared that tenants would have to earn enough so as not to spend more than 35 percent of their income on rents to be eligible for admission into moderate income projects, under section 236 housing.

The result of these calculated measures has been to leave those who are unable to pay increased rents at the mercy of the private housing market, in which decent housing for low-income families is virtually nonexistent.

The picture is quite clear then. The recently announced moratorium on assisted housing is no more than the culmination of a well laid plan by the executive branch to disregard the actions of the Congress and to completely emasculate the statutory rights of millions of Americans.

That it comes at a time when housing experts across the country are calling for a tripling of our efforts in subsidized housing is completely understood by the President. He knows that millions of poor

people will remain ill-housed and at the mercy of unscrupulous landlords as a result of his actions.

In short, the moratorium is no mistake. There is no misunderstanding. This is phase I of the administration plan for complete withdrawal from the field of housing. These callous actions that ignore the will of Congress and eschew a basic need and right of a massive number of this country's citizens must be stopped.

Local housing authorities across the country have been forced to take this administration into court in order to gain the release of the impounded funds so vitally necessary for their survival. Tenant associations in all of our major cities are gearing up for a protracted struggle. But we in Congress must also do our part.

We strongly urge the President to take the following steps:

First. The immediate release of all impounded funds for housing programs;

Second. If the President is insistent about the moratorium, the caucus recommends that he extend coverage of the moratorium to all phases of Federal housing; not just that for the poor. At issue here is whether this country becomes one that builds houses primarily for shelter or rather one that builds houses primarily for profit.

Additionally, we strongly urge that the Congress take the following steps:

First. With emphasis being placed on tax reform in this session, the Congressional Black Caucus calls again for tax legislation to provide for broadening favorable treatment of investment in new and rehabilitated housing to provide identical preference to investment in inner city real property development, sponsored or substantially owned by a community development corporation or other organization of minority or low-income citizens.

Second. Finally, we again call for \$1 billion a year through a large-scale housing allowance program to go directly to families. This will give them some choice in housing. Subsidies for new housing would still be necessary though, to make up for the continuing shortage of units.

It is only through such measures as these that we, in the Congress, avert for America the disaster to which it is headed.

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I would be delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I not only agree with the gentleman, but I would hope that every white American would not quibble on this issue. I am hoping that out of the gentleman's remarks will grow a deeper understanding on the part of our colleagues in the Congress, supporting the logic the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my distinguished colleague.

Maurice Stans lamented and moaned and the President said, "Oh, we must do something about this." Promises were made and some actions were initiated. Let us look at those actions that were initiated.

The OMBI program came into being and it has taken on a greater credibility in the black community in recent months. Black businessmen are beginning to see it as a viable program, but we warn that that program is inadequately funded. Unless it is adequately funded it will not make a dent in terms of the enterprise system in this country. You had better fund it adequately, because a large number of black, brown, and red Americans are asking the question can the system of capitalism really work for us. If you do not bring us in, you simply add to the idea that it is not going to work for us and we will have to look elsewhere for direction.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Is there any evidence that the program will be funded?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. There is every evidence to point out this program will suffer the fate of other domestic programs. There is no indication at all from the White House that the OMBI program will be adequately funded. However, that becomes a responsibility of this body to assure that it is adequately funded.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. You are quite welcome.

Let us look at the shell game, which is what it was—a shell game, a great game that was played. Now you see it and now you do not. Here it is and here it ain't. Let us look at the Small Business Administration.

There is a great deal of talk about the amount of loans made by the SBA, but if you trace it from 1970 up to the present time, the actual number of loans that were made to black enterprises have decreased and not increased. It started in 1970 at 41 percent of the blacks getting loans, and now it is down to 16 percent. Concomitantly with that decrease there has been a decrease in the dollar volume, according to black businessmen.

Let us play another little game and let us look at the massive confidence game that has been played in terms of black enterprise.

We talk about the OEO programs and the community development funding programs. OEO is threatened and those funding programs are threatened. Therefore we fear there is no great hope in looking in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to stand here and tautologize this discussion. I simply want to point out what we need in the black community is equity capital. We are not going to get it through the private sector or entirely through expanded governmental loan programs. What I would like to see—and the caucus knows this—is the establishment of a national development bank funded initially to the tune of \$1 billion. That will provide the equity capital needed by black interests.

There are several other recommendations that I have to make. The hour is late, and I will not take up your time on this. I will include it in the Record

and see that all parties concerned get copies of the recommendations.

Now let me talk about the matter of housing briefly.

Do not be fooled by a housing moratorium. Do not let anyone tell you this was a mistake on the President's part; he did not understand what he was doing; he operated in terms of insufficient information. I submit to you it was no mistake. The President knew exactly what he was doing. It is part of a cruel, callous, cynical plan on the part of the administration to withdraw the Government from the area of housing. That is where we are going. It is his intent to turn the whole housing sector back over to the private sector. That private sector has made no contribution in our major urban areas in the field of housing in the last 20 years. What the President is suggesting, in short, is let them be ill housed, let the private sector ignore them, let the black poor and red people and other minorities become the victims of those who would exploit us in that area of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I have lots more I would like to say. My time is limited and your time is limited.

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I just merely wish to add my voice to that of the voice of the gentleman in the well speaking now, and also to that of the voices of those who preceded the gentleman. I would also like to take advantage of the opportunity he has so generously given me to say that there is historically a very important resemblance in this period with one precisely 100 years ago. After the Civil War, the struggle, the sacrifice, and the achievements on the legislative front of some gains we had a revision to what one would call reconstruction. I think that we can say that in interpreting as the President is doing the election as a mandate in 1972, that this is in turn a reconstruction period.

I rise to compliment the gentlemen in this group in the Congress because I believe that perhaps here lies the only countervailing force that will give us the needed initiative to make it impossible to have a second reconstruction period in which the breakthroughs of the 1960's and the great promises of the Great Society are being destroyed.

Take, as an example, another group—the Spanish-speaking minority in the United States, and there too it reflects the truth of what the gentleman has said, in the very callous disregard of the promises made in the heat of passion in the campaign of last October. Even to the point where the President had his picture taken at San Clemente with a group that had been granted funds in the manpower training sector programs. With a great fanfare they announced that the President was about to give twice as much money to what is known as SER. But like on a New Year's Eve when they say "Happy New Year," they

were saying, "Forget it, that contract has been canceled." Yet, they had a great fanfare about this during the campaign, and they would go to the Spanish-speaking communities and say, "Look what the President has promised, and look whom the President has appointed. He has named a woman, Romana Bafuelos, to sign the dollar bills in the Treasury," and they laughed at us when we said, "It is great, it is wonderful to have this woman signing dollar bills," and it is fine that she happens to be what you call a Mexican. But we are interested in seeing that those dollar bills are accessible to the Mexicanos. We do not care who signs those dollar bills, because that does not put the workman in a position of having access to them.

Further, we find that the President has destroyed the model cities program.

But we find that the only hope for the future is right here, just as these gentlemen during this colloquy have stated so eloquently, it is in this Congress, and the Congress itself is faced with a great challenge.

The President has stated, and his party is following through, that they will have a thousand-dollar-a-plate dinner in a few weeks for the purpose, as the President explains it, to get the kind of Congress that is needed in 1974, and by that means to continue what was done in 1874, and to try to undo the sacrifice of all the men who died in the name of humanity.

I thank the gentleman in behalf of what I am sure will be thousands and millions of Americans who did not have a voice, who have these voices now. Hopefully some of us will be willing to join them, and hopefully we can paint a different history in the 20th century than the 19th century did.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I am heartened by the comments of the distinguished gentleman, my colleague, from Texas, and sincerely grateful for them.

My time is up. I want to take 2 minutes in terms of commenting on what he has had to say.

No. 1, the more diabolical aspect of the administration was that it deliberately played Mexican Americans off against black Americans prior to the election. There was the holdout promise that the Mexican American, Spanish-speaking people ought to get their fair share; that the blacks are getting it all. That game was played in deliberate diabolical fashion.

The other comment was during the debate on the busing issue when I stood at this precise spot in the well of the House and said:

I believe that black Americans stand poised on the brink of a second post-war reconstruction period, and unless the Congress acts with some sense and some guts and some gumption, there is a danger that that period might indeed return.

I thank the gentleman for giving me time to speak.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his very articulate statement and presentation on this occasion, which the entire Congressional

Black Caucus can certainly stand behind in every respect.

It is my pleasure and privilege at this time to present to you another member of the Congressional Black Caucus, a gentleman who will make a presentation to us on drug addiction and crime, the distinguished gentleman from the State of New York, Mr. CHARLES RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the chairman for this opportunity to discuss this very serious area of concern, and also to thank Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ from Texas, because I think what he has done is emphasize the need and the cause of the Congressional Black Caucus as we attempt to highlight the needs of black people being excluded from the state of the Union, the atrocities that have been committed on poor people and Spanish-speaking people; as we have seen that those people who have been denied so much the opportunity to share have sometimes found themselves in the cities fighting over the crumbs that have been left by this Nixon administration. I think by the insertion of the gentleman's remarks that he properly reflects the thinking of the Congressional Black Caucus as we attempt to take care of the needs of the poor people in this Nation, which, of course, is highlighted by the needs of the black poor of this Nation.

We talk now about narcotic addiction and crime.

President Nixon attempted to give the impression of significant progress in the drug and crime war by his May 1971 responses to the recommendations of the Congressional Black Caucus. But, the claims of tremendous efforts in law enforcement, drug rehabilitation, and education do not begin to paint an accurate picture.

During the first 4 years of the Nixon administration, we have seen the narcotics addict population in this Nation double in size; we have watched the spread of heroin and other harmful drugs to our elementary schoolchildren; we have seen the flow of illegal heroin into this Nation jump from under 5 tons to around 10 tons; and we have experienced an increase of 60 percent in the number of violent crimes committed.

In the area of drug abuse and crime prevention, despite any claims to the contrary, the real state of the Union after 4 years of the Nixon administration is a sorry one at best.

During the last year of the Johnson administration, 4,500,000 serious crimes were reported. In 1971, after 3 years of the Nixon administration, 6 million serious crimes were reported; and this was to have been a "law and order" administration.

In two of the communities I represent, the Harlem-East Harlem sections of New York City, the everpresent crime is inextricably bound to the plague of drug addiction. As in communities across this Nation, between 50 and 70 percent of crime in these two communities is drug-related.

In fact, the problems of these communities are but a small sample of the picture across the country. A recent

Gallup poll of urban residents showed crime in the streets identified as the most important problem facing America today. One in three of these persons had been a victim of crimes against person or property, with one in five among all Americans being personally victimized.

An examination of the Harlem section of New York does present, however, some clear evidence of what the future holds and what the present is like for other areas.

According to an extensive survey of the Harlem community by the Small Business Chamber of Commerce of New York, 51.2 percent of those interviewed said they had been victims of criminal assault during 1970. Sixty-nine percent of those interviewed blamed the narcotics addict for the recent increase of crime in Harlem.

In a study conducted by the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 11,762 of the 52,479 narcotic arrests in New York City for 1971, or one in four cases, occurred in Harlem.

Even more alarming than the stark statistics on drug addiction and crime is the effect of these forces on my district and the rest of the Nation. The Fleishmann Commission study of New York's schools and the roving hearings held by the House Select Committee on Crime found evidence that between 40 and 50 percent of this Nation's high school students have used or are using some form of mind-altering drug.

Reports from Miami to Seattle tell of 8-year-olds beginning to experiment with drugs and cases of heroin addicts who are this young are not uncommon in areas of high addiction concentration.

The National Institute of Mental Health reported that in 1971, for example, there were 18,000 addicts living in a 40-block area in Central Harlem. Of these, approximately 6,000 were between 16 and 21 years of age, and 2,000 were between 7 and 15 years old. There are an estimated 40,000 addicts in all of Harlem, about one in every 6 people.

DRUG EDUCATION A FAILURE

In the face of these kind of staggering problems, the Nixon administration launched a "drug education by horridification" program which, by the Government's own evaluation, is doing more harm than good. Particularly in the area of drug films, the administration's use of overly simplistic approaches bolstered with twisted or inaccurate misinformation has succeeded mainly in convincing some formerly uninterested youths to try drugs out of curiosity.

I am sure the Nation's pushers are extremely pleased with the state of the Union when the Federal Government helps them sell their deadly goods.

UNITED STATES AIDS ASIAN HEROIN TRADE

While this stream of daily death pours into every corner of our society, this administration has seen fit to subsidize, with tax dollars, the Air America Co. This company, according to congressional studies, aids in the transport of heroin from Southeast Asian poppy fields to nearby refineries. "Air Heroin", as Air America is sometimes called, travels its routes of death and destruction under

the supervision of the corrupt generals and government officials in the totalitarian dictatorship of the Thieu regime. This is happening at the same time the administration has seen fit to refuse to provide money for adequate cemeteries to bury the thousands of Americans who died so that democracy might flourish in Vietnam.

ORGANIZED CRIME AND CORRUPTION FLOURISH

This is the real state of the Union. In addition, only this year have the Nation's criminal investigation agencies taken their heads from under the 19th century to see the corrupting, cancerous criminal influence exerted by the Mafia and its followers.

The Knapp Commission report and other studies tell us that the New York City and other police departments are riddled with the kind of corruption that only the organized forces of international crime can generate. But this administration's so-called Department of Justice spends its time filing suits to block the court and congressionally ordered integration of the Nation's schools. This too, is the real state of the Union.

ANTIADDICTION EFFORT NOT INCLUDED IN ANNOUNCED WAR ON CRIME

The inevitable link between heroin addiction and the criminal justice system necessitates an increased commitment of Federal funds to permit the criminal justice system to respond to the special problems presented by narcotics addiction. In his response to the recommendations of the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971, President Nixon stated that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was providing the impetus for the development of new and effective programs to reduce crime. The record of the 19 months which have passed since this Presidential response shows clearly that LEAA has not addressed the problem of drug-related crime.

While LEAA funds have been invested in bigger and better armaments, including police toys, such as tanks and armored helicopters, the severe problems of revolving-door justice for narcotics addicts have gone largely untouched by LEAA. Narcotics addicts typically are arrested, let loose on bail and often are rearrested before trial on the first offense because of their continued need to steal to support their habit. Even if the addict is tried and convicted, as soon as he is released he will be back on the street stealing to support his habit if nothing is done to treat his addiction while in jail. Unless the criminal justice system intervenes to provide treatment and rehabilitation of the narcotics addiction at some point in this cycle, nothing is being done to help the addict or to protect society from his criminal activity.

TREATMENT METHODS INADEQUATE

The implications for black and poor communities go far beyond the problems of crime and fear of criminal activity by narcotic addicts. The willingness of this administration to pour the heroin substitute methadone into these communities without providing counseling, job training, or placement assistance threat-

ens to permanently narcotize a significant portion of the young and poor.

Despite the administration's mouthings that drug abuse treatment and prevention is one of its top priorities, there is scanty evidence of an appropriate effort.

How many addicts are presently under treatment? Although it is difficult to obtain reliable information in this area, the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention estimates that at the end of October 1972 there were approximately 60,000 narcotics addicts in treatment and rehabilitation programs in the United States, with another 30,000 addicts desiring treatment but remaining on waiting lists because existing programs are filled to capacity.

It is estimated by most narcotics treatment experts that half the Nation's 560,000 addicts would voluntarily seek treatment if treatment were available. Thus, although actual waiting lists may contain only 30,000 names, there are an estimated 190,000 addicts who would like to obtain treatment for their addiction but are unable to do so.

That such a large number of sick people remain untreated in a society which has more than enough resources to provide adequately for their medical needs would be a national scandal if these 190,000 addicts were untreated tuberculosis patients.

Our failure to provide adequate treatment opportunities for 90 percent of the addict population is proof of our failure to adequately address the drug-abuse problem as a whole.

The Federal Government bears ultimate responsibility for every ounce of heroin that enters the lifeblood of our society. The opium poppy cannot be grown in commercial quantity in the United States; it, therefore, must be imported through our borders, whose integrity is the responsibility of the Federal Government. So long as the Federal Government is unwilling to prevent the smuggling of heroin into the United States, it has the moral responsibility to alleviate the consequences of its failure by providing for the care of those who have become addicted to heroin.

ADMINISTRATION COMMITMENT LACKING

The administration's fiscal 1973 budget was a disappointment to those of us who expected tangible evidence of substantial effort to meet the national emergency of widespread drug addiction, as declared by the President's June 17, 1971, message to the Congress on the drug problem. This message gave hope of a substantial new effort against drug abuse—it called for new approaches to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and more coordinated Federal responsibility for the drug problem and spoke of new initiatives by law enforcement against drug pushers and smugglers.

The administration's fiscal 1973 budget, however, failed to provide adequate funding for the commitment announced by the President. Although the budget for drug abuse programs totaled \$365.2 million, a substantial increase over previous years, an examination of this increase showed that most of the addi-

tional funding was scheduled for programs designed to meet the problem of drug abuse in the military.

For example, of the \$230.2 million budgeted for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in fiscal 1973, \$84.2 million was allocated to the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, leaving but \$146 million for the treatment and rehabilitation of civilian narcotic addicts. This \$146 million represented only \$21 million more than was allocated for nonmilitary treatment and rehabilitation programs in the fiscal 1972 budget and fell far short of the amount allocated by New York State alone for treatment and rehabilitation, which budgeted \$161.5 million for drug abuse treatment programs during its 1971-72 fiscal year.

Thus the massive new Federal treatment and rehabilitation effort described by the administration in the summer of 1971 withered in implementation to a program that is not even as large as that conducted by a single State, the State of New York.

As great as is the need to provide treatment and rehabilitation services for the returning addicted Vietnam veterans, the Federal Government cannot pretend to be waging a war against drug addiction if its increased spending for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts is limited to the addicted veteran and provides no significant increases for programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of the large and growing civilian addict population.

There needs to be an immediate commitment by the Federal Government to provide treatment and rehabilitation to every narcotics addict in the country who desires it; beyond this there is the need to provide supportive services for rehabilitated addicts so that they may return to their former roles as productive members of society.

STEPS FOR CHANGE

The critical steps to bringing this about are:

First. The immediate enforcement of the Foreign Assistance Act provision I authored which provides that aid funds should be cut off when a country does not make every effort to stop the export of illegal drugs to the United States. South Vietnam should be first.

Second. An immediate end to all methadone addiction control programs that do not offer supportive services, or the addition of these services to the programs. Also, the prohibition of heroin maintenance.

Third. An all-out Federal crash program to find an effective, nonaddictive heroin antagonist.

Fourth. The elevation of an all-out Federal attack on organized crime at the highest level. The damage from this source is far greater than that from seasonal campus radicals or so-called ghetto revolutionaries. The FBI and other agencies should put their efforts where the danger really exists.

Fifth. At least a threefold increase in the capacity of addiction treatment programs, remedial education, job training, placement and counseling services to

meet the needs of our low-income communities and the Nation generally.

Sixth. A revision of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration guidelines to mandated development of programs to combat drug-related crime.

Seventh. Strict enforcement of drug laws at every level, with an emphasis on suppliers and major pushers.

Eighth. A major tightening of our borders to prevent the heavy influx of illegal drugs.

Ninth. An all-out Federal effort to clean up State and local law enforcement agencies where Federal laws are violated. I firmly believe the sagging confidence in our criminal justice system can be restored if we determine to root out corruption.

Tenth. An immediate reform of drug education programs and drug treatment and rehabilitation programs to include greater input from members of affected communities and ex-addicts.

If this administration can somehow be shown in the next 4 years that this Nation will not survive under its present policies, these steps can be implemented before the cancers of crime and drug addiction destroy us.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from the State of New York, for his very eloquent and articulate statement on this occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak on revenue sharing.

Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing under Richard Nixon is nothing more than a convenient excuse to cut categorical programs for minorities and the poor. More and more, people who come to Washington for help are sent home again to fight for a small slice of the revenue-sharing pie.

In the Congressional Black Caucus statement to the President 2 years ago, we urged that this concept be utilized to meet the desperate human needs of our cities and States. Unfortunately, the Nixon response is to promote revenue sharing primarily as a means to reduce local taxes rather than to improve urban services. As such, revenue sharing becomes a political expediency rather than a solution to pressing human needs or a way to return decisionmaking to local citizens.

Indeed, given the inherent weaknesses of the revenue-sharing law and the Nixon administration's adherence to the dubious principle of benign neglect, we have much to fear from this concept. Already, we hear from mayors and Governors wondering whether they may have lost more in categorical program funds than they will ever gain from revenue sharing.

If we are to target funds where they are most needed, we cannot simply accept a block grant program based on a cold, computerized formula frozen into law. Flexible programs must be developed to meet specific needs, and we here in Congress must shoulder our responsibility to create the machinery to meet those needs.

For us, as representatives of the poor, minorities, and disenfranchised, revenue

sharing is not—and will not—be the answer.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE

For example, even though the revenue-sharing law contains a nondiscrimination provision, the Nixon administration shows no sign of preparing to force compliance. In a letter to the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights pointed out glaring weaknesses in these nondiscrimination regulations. We subscribe to these comments and we stand ready to take legislative action if the administration fails to make necessary changes.

Regulations already issued do nothing more than recite the statutory requirements found in the law as passed and in title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The administration could have required State and local governments to report on civil rights compliance—but it did not. The administration could have spelled out how fund recipients would be expected to carry out their equal opportunity obligations—but it did not. The administration could have outlined other Federal agencies' responsibilities to monitor and investigate compliance—but it did not. The administration could have endorsed our 1971 recommendation that neighborhood groups be included in planning distribution of funds—but it did not.

Apart from the outright discriminatory aspects of revenue sharing as now practiced by the Nixon administration, there are other—equally dangerous—problems. Distribution formulas can be altered by State legislatures to the disadvantage of poorer and needy communities. And already, one State is moving toward ceding authority for allocating funds to a regional planning body which is not answerable to any elected official.

EXTENDING THE BLOCK-GRANT APPROACH

Yet, given these serious shortcomings, the Nixon administration now wants to extend revenue sharing to specific areas such as health, education, and housing. And President Nixon seems determined to hold hostage funds appropriated by the Congress until he gets special revenue-sharing legislation enacted.

This strategy is clearest in the area of housing. The President wants to replace existing housing subsidy programs with a special revenue-sharing package. If the President has his way, block grants would go to local communities for housing and then Federal programs to solve specific housing problems would be eliminated. And while Congress considers Nixon's proposal and possible alternatives, no new Federal funds will reach communities.

However, before we take action on these special revenue-sharing programs, it would be wise to analyze the one existing prototype in this area—the LEAA program. We view LEAA's block grants as an example of the possible perversions of the revenue-sharing concept. Without controls, without sufficient planning requirements, without civil rights enforcement, LEAA programs are marked by inefficiency, waste, racism, maladministration, and in some cases, corruption. Worst of all, this hundred-million-dollar effort has had little—if any—impact on the incidence of crime in America.

With all these serious fallacies, the Congressional Black Caucus intends to seriously question the need for further revenue sharing. We will work to insure that Government funds are directed toward the Nation's most critical needs and that they are allocated in an equitable, nondiscriminatory manner.

It is my pleasure and privilege at this time to recognize the distinguished gentleman, a new member of the Congressional Black Caucus and a distinguished Member of this body; that is, the gentleman from the State of Georgia (Mr. YOUNG) who will speak on the subject of rural development.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for this opportunity to speak.

In the increasingly urban society, the 64 million Americans living in rural areas and small towns are too often forgotten. The resulting problems contribute directly to the crisis we face in the Nation's cities.

Much of rural America is destitute. More than one-fourth of the rural population is impoverished. Substandard housing is widespread. Employment opportunities remain scarce. Education is woefully inadequate. The available medical care is often too little, too late, and too expensive. In rural areas where the needs are greatest, government programs and services are the poorest.

It is no wonder, then, that families of small farmers and small town residents continue to move into the cities, despite their love of rural life and despite their lack of preparation for living in the city.

Any serious approach to solving urban problems, therefore, should take into account the urgent need for redevelopment of our rural areas.

To a much greater extent than most people realize, our urban problems are a result of a massive exodus from rural America to the cities. The cities will never be able to solve their problems until that massive immigration is slowed down or reversed. Housing, jobs, and educational opportunities must be made available for rural Americans. It has been customary of late to speak of black problems and urban problems interchangeably, but the fact is that 51.5 percent of the black population of America still reside in 11 Southern States. With the mechanization of farming they are forgotten and unwanted.

The Farmers Home Administration in testimony before Congress less than a year ago estimated that a minimum of \$12 billion was needed to supply water and waste disposal systems to the small towns of rural America: Yet what has happened? The Nixon administration has terminated the water and waste disposal grant program. This is a four-fold loss. Disease and ill health will continue to plague communities with inadequate water supplies; inadequate—more likely, nonexistent—waste treatment will further pollute the streams and water table spreading the problems; it will deprive small communities of the additional employment opportunities such public works provide; and, it will continue to force more people into the cities where at least

the basic amenities are available. This Nation cannot afford such economics.

One might suppose that a nation dedicated to education as the tool of upward mobility would indeed devote specific sums of money toward improving rural and small town schools and educational programs. Indeed, Congress so intended with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Migrant Education Act, among others. But the administration of those and other educational acts has been so warped by urban thinking and urban administrators, that the money is largely spent in urban school districts attempting to correct the presumed deficiencies of rural children forced off the land into cities. And this administration's answer has not been to improve the administration, but rather to cut back the programs. Such reasoning only contributes to the general decline of educational standards in both rural and urban areas. It will not surprise you to hear that black households have the worst of it, and that, relative to white households, they have lost ground since 1960. Representing less than 10 percent of all households, blacks account for 24 percent of substandard and/or crowded occupancies. In nonmetropolitan areas, less than 40 percent of the black households live in dwellings which are not one or the other. This is considerably better than in 1960—when less than 20 percent of the black families in nonmetropolitan areas lived in standard, uncrowded housing—but parity with white households is, in a sense, further away. In 1960, the incidence of substandard and/or crowded housing was about three times as high for nonmetropolitan blacks as for nonmetropolitan whites. In 1970, the figure for blacks is almost four times as large as for whites.

And the need for Indian housing is even greater. Nearly two-thirds of all occupied housing under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are rated as substandard.

Efforts to implement the congressional pledge of 1949 to provide a decent, safe and sanitary home for every citizen are not being carried forward by this administration, and that is particularly true in rural areas.

Lack of sanitary housing and water supply, inadequate basic education all contribute to increased need for medical care, but, as in almost all areas of rural life, the medical care available is too often too little, too late. While this administration tells us the Hill-Burton Act has resulted in a 20-percent oversupply of hospital beds, they fail to mention that the oversupply is in the urban and particularly suburban areas. There is still a shortage in rural areas—as there is of doctors and paramedical personnel, of clinics and nursing homes, of emergency ambulance service and visiting nurses, and of public health services generally. Once again in rural areas where the needs are greatest, the programs and services are poorest.

Last year the Economic Research Service of the USDA prepared for the Senate Government Operations Committee a study on "The Distribution of Federal Outlays Among U.S. Counties." It largely confirms that pattern of "metropolitanism" into which this country has

lapsed. Per capita income in nonmetropolitan counties is more than \$1,000 below that in metropolitan counties and the level of per capita outlays is more than \$100 less than in metro counties. Figures for the housing programs—excluding public housing and rent supplements, neither of them generally available in rural areas—work out to \$91 per capita in metropolitan counties, \$40 in nonmetropolitan counties, and only \$35 in the most rural counties.

It is no wonder then that transportation, job training, public employment programs, community facilities and programs of all kinds for senior citizens are tragically absent from our rural communities. And their continued absence makes almost certain the continued migration from rural areas to metropolitan centers.

We call upon the Nation to recognize both the strength and the need of our rural citizens and to act with both commonsense and compassion. Commonsense in recognizing that it is in the long run both easier and more economical to treat social and economic problems where they first occur, and compassion in admitting our policy mistakes of a generation which have forced rural areas and their citizens into second-class citizens.

Nixon administration economic policies have been disastrous for low income and poor citizens—especially when we analyze the suffering caused by the inequities of policies which have led to controls on wages, to soaring prices, and to soaring profits.

Those persons fortunate enough to have jobs as wage earners are the main victims of Nixon's new economic programs. At the low end, wages have been held in check, but prices have not been stabilized. While workers have produced more goods and services—raising gross national product by \$100 billion in 1972 alone—the bulk of this increase shows up in record profit levels which rose 12 percent in less than a year. The prospect for 1973 looks to be the same.

Blacks, poor people, and blue-collar workers will see a lot more of the same from recently inaugurated administration, because, already they have been told by their President to "ask not what the Government can do for you, but ask what you"—poor people—"can do for yourself."

We ask: What can the poor and blue-collar worker do for themselves when for nearly 18 months a cruel, callous, and repressive economic squeeze has been so tightly clamped about their lifelines? Or, is Nixon really saying: "You take care of yourselves and I will take care of the rich and established."

The poor and working classes will not be able "to do for themselves" because:

Their jobs are the ones most affected by Nixon policies.

Unemployment in the inner city—where the Nation's poor generally live—has soared to postwar highs at least double the national average.

They pay an inordinate amount of their income for the basics, shelter, food, and utilities. Under the Nixon policies, food prices have risen at the most rapid rate in a decade, inadequate controls on

rents have made the poor an immediate prey of exploitative landlords, and utility rates have skyrocketed.

There have been no attempts to control insurance premiums, interest rates, mortgage rates, land prices, costs of homes, clothing, used cars, and furniture—key items purchased by low wage earners, welfare recipients, senior citizens, and the poor.

They have no advocates within the administration or on the agencies created to administer the overall economic policies.

And so, the low wage earner, the poor and aged have felt a rising assault by the privileged classes who are continually exempted and favored by the Nixon economic programs.

A first policy for this Congress must be to make sure that wage and price restrictions are equally applied. Working people will support a stabilization program—if it covers profits, investment earnings, fringe benefits, as well as prices and wages.

But, the overall goal must be to return the economy to a system which generates growth and production instead of death and destruction. In such an economy we will be able to achieve maximum employment and production—along with stable prices—and we will not need any artificial controls.

We urge that the collection and utilization of Federal revenues be reformed, beginning with an entirely new system of equitable taxation and expenditures of taxes collected from the people and as allocated by the Congress.

If phase III of the Nixon game is to mean anything to the average American family, there must be strenuous attempts to equitably regulate prices, interest rates and profits. Compensatory individual tax allowances of substance will certainly be encouragement enough for the individual to do something for himself and his country. But, if phase III turns out as did phase I and II, then there are catastrophic days ahead, and the greatest burdens will once again be placed upon the poor, working poor and blue collar citizen.

Since President Nixon has consistently shown his economic interests are not with the poor and working American, it becomes the responsibility of Congress to provide the aggressive leadership in rebuilding an economy of peace and justice.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG) for his statements on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion this evening, this being in a sense another historic occasion, since this is the first time that the Congressional Black Caucus has taken the occasion to deliver to this Nation its own state of the Union message. Our action was necessitated by virtue of the fact that in the state of the Union messages delivered to this body over the past 4 years by the President of the United States he has not in fact addressed himself to the problems of black, poor, and disadvantaged people in this Nation.

So, on this occasion I want to person-

ally thank each and every member of the Congressional Black Caucus for his or her participation in this special order this afternoon. I think each of them have rendered a service, not only to this body but a service to this Nation.

Also, I want to thank those other Members of this body, our friends and our colleagues, who have taken the time to come here this afternoon and participate in this special order with us.

Before I make my concluding remarks, I want to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, would not the chairman join with me as we anticipate that these remarks, being spread across the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that he invite our colleagues in the Congress to carefully peruse the subject matters which we have discussed here today on both sides of the aisle, and hope that they will feel constrained to join with us in any of these remarks; present to us any points that they would have made and illuminate us to any objections or exceptions that they have to any of the remarks that were made here today in the course of this extraordinary and lengthy special order.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and certainly join in the gentleman's remarks.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Apropos of the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, I want to reemphasize the point that, though we have challenged and have been highly critical of the administration, this whole special order ought also be construed as a challenge to this 93d Congress. It is this Congress, if it intends to seize the power usurped by the President; it is this Congress if it intends to reach out for a common humanity rather than individualistic, selfish motives; it is this Congress that must act upon the recommendations that we made in this colloquy.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his apropos remarks on this occasion.

I yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman from the State of California (Mr. DELLUMS) for his comments.

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

I rise only to place in specific terms the comments made by the two previous speakers, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I would only say that we as Members of Congress do have a major responsibility to take back the power that has been taken from us by the administration, because I think we in many ways face a very serious constitutional crisis.

In that regard, if we as the Congress want to take back our power, there are three areas we must become active in and propose legislation about.

No. 1. The Congress must assume the responsibility for making this place a democratically run operation. I believe

the Democratic caucus has gone a long way in establishing reforms that will allow this body to operate democratically.

Second, the Congress must assert its authority to see that its will is being carried out. In that respect we make three proposals.

No. 1 is that we must establish stringent administrative procedures on the issue of impoundment. As to that, we are simply saying that the President should be required, through the Office of OMB, not only to inform the Congress of an intent to impound but also to state clearly the circumstances in the general economy that precipitate the need for the impoundment.

As to the impoundment of funds, it should not be a statement as generic as, "We are attempting to fight inflation."

No. 2. With respect to the stringent procedural requirements for impounding, the President ought to state, after presentation to and perusal by the Congress, what is required, and ought not to move until such time as the House and the Senate in joint resolution concur in the impoundment.

No. 3. Operation of the GAO certainly ought to be strengthened. At present from time to time reports are made available to the public. I believe the GAO ought to be strengthened so that we may regularize reports available to the American people. The thrust of those reports should not simply focus on administrative efficiency, but should determine whether or not the administration is effectively and efficiently carrying out the mandate of the Congress.

Certainly third and high on our list is that there has been some debate around this country in the past few weeks as to a stringent limitation on the President's use of executive privilege. We think that privilege ought to be invoked only on the issue of national security and that the President certainly should not be able to slam the door in the face of the House and the Senate, duly elected by the American people.

I would say that we must modify and amend the Administrative Procedure Act in order to protect the rights of those persons who are immediately affected by the programs in the general population, so that they do have access to the hearings and rulemaking procedures.

Finally, I think we should give serious consideration to whether or not we make some serious amendments to the present rule of civilian immunity. At this point in time we can bring a lawsuit against the Federal Government on the issue of money, but the American people cannot bring a lawsuit against the Federal Government for blatant violations of law. I think we ought to spend some time debating those issues.

If we in fact do those things, we as a Congress can exercise the power of Congress and try to make America a better place to live.

Mr. STOKES. I thank my friend and colleague for those excellent observations.

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a very brief moment, if I may, speaking as a Representative of a district whose black population is not much more than 2 percent, to thank my colleagues of the Black Congressional Caucus for taking the time to express their valuable views in what they have said. I believe the message is a broadly human one, a broadly constitutional one.

The way these gentlemen and women have called upon the President to fulfill his constitutional responsibility to enforce the laws of this land, rather than simply to cry "law and order," is very much in order.

As I say, I take this occasion to commend my colleagues and to thank them on behalf not simply of the minorities of this Nation but for all of the people of the Nation for whom they have spoken clearly and very eloquently.

Thank you.

Mr. STOKES. We certainly thank the distinguished gentleman for his very excellent comments on behalf of the caucus. We certainly appreciate his participation here this afternoon in this special order.

This has for us, Mr. Speaker, been a rather long day. It began at 11 a.m. this morning with a press conference held before all of us came to this Chamber to participate in this special order.

Of necessity, into such a day go many hours of work. At this time, on behalf of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and as chairman of that group, I want to express to the individual staffs of each of the Members our sincere appreciation for the tireless effort that they put in, working on behalf of the presentation which we have made here this afternoon, along with the members of the staff of the Congressional Black Caucus itself.

It is a unified effort and one which we are highly appreciative of, for everything that went into it and all those who participated in the preparations for this occasion.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we have now heard from the members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We have set forth our views as to the true state of the Union and the path we feel this Nation must follow. We hope to help stimulate the revival of the Congress as an effective, innovative, coequal branch of Government. We must begin a massive new effort to meet the human needs of this country. To accomplish our goals, we will need the cooperation of our colleagues in the Congress. Let us hope that this Congress will rise to the challenge. Let us hope that it will be the 93d Congress that will be remembered as the Congress that cared about people. History will in its own inevitable way record for all posterity Mr. Nixon's stand against people.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the efforts of the Congressional Black Caucus to draw attention to the failures of the administration to face the needs of millions of Americans.

It is appropriate that this subject should be discussed under the ominous shadow of the 1974 budget. As is well known to our colleagues, this budget

is an unmistakable retreat from the historic commitments made by our Government to better the lives of the disadvantaged.

I fear that this budget is designed not to benefit the broad public, but to maintain the privileged position of a few. It is, as other Members of Congress have said in recent days, a "special-interest" budget, a "big-business" budget.

The President claims that this is a "fiscally responsible" budget. These are strange words coming from the man who in his 4-year stewardship has presided over an increase in the national debt of \$106 billion—nearly one-fourth of the entire debt. The budget proclaims a deficit of "only" \$13 billion, but as our colleague Chairman MAHON has pointed out, the real deficit implicit in this budget, when not masked by the so-called "unified budget" accounting manipulations, is estimated to be \$28 billion.

As unfortunate as the fiscal problems left unsettled by this budget are, they in no way compare with the injury it threatens to many "people programs." What has been proposed is the wholesale elimination of the very programs which have brought help to those Americans who need help most.

In the years following the Great Depression, this country made a commitment to improve the lives of Americans living in poverty. This commitment was expanded during the last decade to include the enactment of long-overdue civil rights legislation. Yet for all that was done, the poor in our country continue to lead downtrodden lives, trapped in poverty to which they were born and from which many cannot escape. Black Americans for example, continue to be handicapped by a society that has institutionalized racism in many overt and covert ways.

The answer to these challenges is not the "self-reliance" that the President brandishes as a cure-all before the country. For what is "self-reliance" to the ghetto, or to Appalachia? "Self-reliance" is just another code word, this time symbolizing a proposed governmental neglect of poor people.

It requires vision to make this country decent for all people, and this vision entails a grave responsibility. The responsibility is not a mathematically calculated political gain, or to one faction at the expense of another, but to all people.

There are ghettos to be cleared, decent housing to be built. There are Americans who are sick, but in our society their health is a privilege of wealth, not a right. There are the ill educated who require special help. There are the handicapped and the mentally ill. There is pervasive, lingering discrimination. There is the obnoxious malignancy of drug abuse, and continuing crime in the streets. There is foul air and filthy water. There is a system of justice that demands reform. This litany of sorrows could go on indefinitely. But to catalog the ills of America no more solves them than do admonitions of "self-reliance." These ills require not words, but work and dollars.

Where is the progress, the "self-reliance," in the new budget? Does it come in the form of a \$200 million increase in military aid to Southeast Asia, for a total of \$1.5 billion? Does it come in another \$45 million for the cold-war relics, Voice of America and Radio Liberty—an increase of \$6 million? Does it come in another \$4.7 billion for the Defense Department? Or in \$657 million for an unneeded nuclear aircraft carrier, or \$1.7 billion for a ballistic missile submarine that is likely to be obsolescent before it is built? Will it come from the additional \$12 million the Atomic Energy Commission will spend to build new atomic artillery rounds—weapons that will in all likelihood serve no purpose other than to gather dust?

It is the administration's desire that this be a time of retrenchment for domestic people-oriented programs. The emergency employment program, which has provided 140,000 jobs at a cost of \$1.2 billion—about the cost of one new Trident submarine—is to be wiped out. The Office of Economic Opportunity is to be dismantled and its important programs scattered on a piecemeal basis. Despite the chronic housing shortage in many areas of the country and the abundance of substandard housing everywhere, virtually the entire government housing program is to be shelved. Urban renewal, model cities, and other community development programs are to be dropped. Most of the landmark programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, including aid to disadvantaged education, special schooling for the handicapped, vocational aid, and school support, are threatened. The Hill-Burton hospital construction program is on the way out, as are funds for regional medical programs, community mental health centers, and National Institutes of Health medical research grants.

What is to be done to existing programs is bad enough. But the central failure of this budget is not in what it does, however misconceived, but in what it does not do. This is a budget that confuses motion for progress.

Mr. Speaker, in the months ahead we in Congress will be faced with a choice of priorities. Do we turn our backs on the real needs of the people? Or do we reassert our Government and strive after the great goal of a better society?

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Roy Wilkins has said that Mr. Nixon has put the black community in a state of siege. The proposed budget would make that siege permanent. But the budget would rob all—black and white, young, and old, urban or rural—all except the big league financiers. It is socialism for the rich and do-it-yourself for the poor.

It would take money away from the young, dismantling most elementary and secondary educational programs, even taking the milk out of school lunches.

Although providing funds for a new scholarship program for college students, it provides no money for direct aid to colleges and universities. Many of our educational institutions, already in dire straits, simply cannot survive without Federal assistance. And for what do

we citizens pay taxes if not to provide for future generations?

The proposed budget takes money from city dwellers—largely by dissolving the Office of Economic Opportunity's community action program.

Ineligible welfare recipients and overpayments are to be ferreted out, presumably by a small army of well-paid bureaucratic snoopers.

It eliminates public service jobs which have been literally life savers for so many people.

It ends many urban development programs including model cities.

The proposed budget takes money from the elderly; for example, by requiring 23 million Americans eligible for medicare to pay an additional \$1 billion a year in hospital costs.

It eliminates new housing for low-moderate- and middle-income groups.

It takes money from health services, actually ending aid to hospital construction and mental health programs at a time when the shortage of hospital beds and the rise of mental illness are national scandals.

It cuts training grants for all but doctors and dentists, eliminating paramedical personnel, even phasing out basic training grants.

It takes money from research at a time when knowledge is essential even to keep up with scientific progress, to say nothing of advancing it.

The proposal cuts environmental programs supported by more and more citizens weary of living in and dying from polluted air and water. Funds to control water pollution are cut from \$6 to \$3 billion.

And where is the saving to go? Why, to the Pentagon, for items useless to human beings, such as a new strategic submarine launch cruise missile. Total military spending is raised from \$76.4 billion in fiscal 1973 to \$8 billion in fiscal 1974.

The President threatens that if Congress does not approve his budget, he will have to raise taxes. Why does he not suggest the other alternatives, such as tax reform? Why does he not close the loopholes that give tax breaks to corporations, to millionaires, to agribusiness firms? Why does he not cut military spending, as the Nation has been urging him to do? His own policy of detente with China and the Soviet Union would be furthered by cutting military spending. Why is it to increase?

Last year, with an election campaign ahead of him, Mr. Nixon talked a great deal about tax reform. This year, the whole idea seems to have slipped his mind.

The budget he proposes simply wipes out the gains we have all made with so much effort during the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. Archie Bunker's song says, "we need a man like Herbert Hoover today." Well, we have got one—and you and I are old enough to remember the depression that ended the Hoover era.

We in this Congress have a duty to oppose such retrogression. For all its faults, we have fashioned a society which offers

some measure of protection to the individual against ever-increasing technology. Protection of the individual was the basis of the founding of our society, yet this budget would strip the individual of his right to food, shelter, housing, education, and health care unless he is able to make it on his own through the technological jungle.

Congress has the power of the purse. Revenue sharing proposed throughout this budget as an alternative takes away that power and distributes it without control through the Executive to State and local governments.

We must not allow this to happen. We in Congress must propose our own state of the Union message with adequate concern for the rights of every American, not just the millionaires.

HOW PEACE CAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, every American and undoubtedly every thoughtful person in our war-weary world is gratified that a cease-fire has finally been negotiated for Vietnam.

While we are breathing a collective sigh of relief over the fact that a peace agreement has, at long last, been signed, it is also time for us to reflect on those events that brought the parties to the peace table.

It was interesting that Newsweek magazine in its January 15 edition in "The Periscope" said:

Diplomats read the holiday travels of Anatoly Dobrynin, Soviet Ambassador to the U.S. as strong evidence that the Kremlin played a large role in Hanoi's return to the Paris Peace Talks.

The article goes on to say:

Embassy Row saw Dobrynin's moves as confirmation of other signs that Moscow pressed Hanoi to resume talks because their interruption had disrupted Soviet efforts to keep improving relations with the U.S. Faced with another poor wheat harvest, the Kremlin will need more American grain and more East-West trade to earn the dollars to pay for it.

Newsweek is certainly not a farm magazine, but its article shows an interesting insight into just what has been happening in the past several months.

I would hope that the residents of our big cities, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, who are joining with those of us who live in the more rural areas of this great Nation in relief that peace seems to be finally at hand, will similarly take a careful look at the contribution our farmers have made toward this goal. I have long felt that our country could win far more friends with food than with bullets and bayonets.

Last summer the whole world heralded the courage and imagination of President Nixon's trips behind the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. These visits allowed the beginning of a more normal exchange of ideas and commerce between our countries. The trips were made possible by many months of painstaking negotiation on the part of President Nixon and his

staff with the leaders of both Russia and China. I submit, however, that one of the positive agents sparking interest for such talks on the part of the Russians and Chinese was the prospect of drastic internal food shortages and their new felt need to do something about it.

Consumerism has emerged, not only in our country, but seemingly also in Communist lands. When Russia has had droughts before, their government has told their people to get along on potatoes and water. The changed attitude turned their thoughts to the possibility of bringing in adequate food supplies from overseas to raise their people's standard of living, to provide more wheat, the basic necessity of life, and to provide feed grains to produce the meat that makes high protein diets possible.

The only place they could find these grains in abundance and at a reasonable price was in the United States, and they set about ways and means of opening doors to trade with us. Along with the trade which has benefited the farmers of our country and the consumers behind the Iron Curtain, came an even greater benefit—the peace dividend.

Everyone knows that peace, once gained, is even more difficult to keep and maintain. The fact that what our farmers had to offer bridged the gap between our two very dissimilar cultures and types of government makes it incumbent on us to maintain and broaden this type of trade.

A decade ago we had the glimmer of a beginning of such trade—in 1963 under President Kennedy. Then, obstinacy on both sides of the ocean set up so many pitfalls that after the initial sale, no further sales were able to be made, and during that decade we not only lost trade, but also the opportunity for better understanding.

There are those who say that sales were made at the expense of the American consumer. The American housewife's cost for food is far less than the cost housewives pay in other countries in this world. Wheat has now reached the \$2.50 level in the United States. Compare that with the price of wheat in Europe, which is \$3.75 a bushel. Our consumers are continuing to get, as they have for the past 2 decades, the greatest bargain in food costs in the world. Twenty years ago hard red spring wheat, the premier flour wheat, brought \$2.45 in my home State, North Dakota. Now, 20 years later, after disastrously low prices the price of wheat in North Dakota has again finally gone above the \$2 a bushel figure. It should be pointed out that 20 years ago the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was 16 cents and now with wheat coming back to the same price range it was when bread sold for 16 cents, a 1-pound loaf sells for 25 cents. Clearly, the big part of the price rise is caused by other than farm price increases.

These new sales overseas have not only benefited the American farmer, but the American transportation industry, our maritime people, implement dealers, and a host of other economic groups. We can also put a dollars and cents value on the more favorable balance of payments we have gained. But, a far greater benefit—a benefit that no one can put a dollars

and cents figure on was the benefit of better understanding in a troubled world.

This new trade relationship with Russia and China undoubtedly, as Newsweek pointed out, provided the push for peace that they exerted on Hanoi after the summer trade began. So, Mr. Speaker, in celebrating this step toward peace, let us not forget to take our hats off to the most basic industry of any nation, our farmers who have helped make possible this day we have waited for so long.

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join a number of my colleagues in paying tribute to that so often neglected segment of our society, the American farmer.

AGRICULTURE, A NATIONAL KEYSTONE

The strength and greatness of our Nation has always been in the strength and determination of our people and nowhere is this attitude more evident than in the agricultural sector of our economy. Agriculture, which has always been one of the keystones of our national economy, has led our entire economy in annual increases in productivity per man-hour.

Through the Agricultural Act of 1970 the American farmer gained greater independence in the utilization of his resources and thus was better able to plan his own production. The result has been a record output with increased markets both at home and abroad.

INCREASE IN FARM EXPORTS

During the Nixon Administration the downward trend in farm exports was reversed. Foreign sales of American farm commodities have soared to an all-time record high of almost \$10 billion in 1972 and it is expected to exceed that margin in fiscal year 1973. One out of every four farm acres in this country is used for export and agriculture is one of the very few areas in which we have a trade surplus. With agricultural imports of \$6½ billion in 1972 we were able to reflect a trade surplus of almost \$3½ billion.

AN EFFICIENT PRODUCER

The American farmer has established himself as the biggest, best, and most efficient producer in a number of agricultural areas, including corn for grain—41 percent of the world market—and soy beans—73 percent of the world market. Although no one can truly estimate the impact of "trade for peace," the political opportunities gained through such moves as our wheat, soy beans and seed grain sales to the Soviet Union—\$1.2 billion—and to mainland China—\$58 million—should not be underestimated. Our leverage for negotiation with the world's powers is closely related to what we have to offer them.

Equally important to the economic significance of our agricultural strength and its influence on our relations with foreign nations is the humanitarian factor. Every year American agricultural commodities valued at approximately \$1 billion is exported to developing nations under Government concession terms.

The importance of this program and of such agricultural commodities as, for example, soy beans, which alone accounts for over \$2 billion of our agricultural exports, is especially significant when we recognize that not only is it a high pro-

tein commodity of value in itself but that it increases the quality of living through the development of animal agriculture.

INSURE EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR OUR FARMERS

The American farmer is indeed a crucial element in our society. We must, therefore, insure that our farmers receive fair returns for their labor and investments. If Government uses the products of the American farmer in its policies then Government policy must equally insure equity and fairness of treatment for our farmers.

Increase in farm costs have been slowed and we are now losing fewer farms. We must insure that this trend continues and that the rural areas share in the affluence of our Nation.

A SALUTE TO OUR FARMERS

I am happy to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the American farmer and I share in my colleague's salute to our farmers. As President Nixon said in his radio address of 1971:

Nothing I have seen anywhere on earth can ever begin to compare with the success story written by the men and women of agriculture in our country. The surging vitality of our agriculture has made our country the best fed, the best clothed nation on earth and it has contributed to our strength abroad and to our strength at home.

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman from North Dakota for yielding and for calling to the attention of the Congress the great importance of the role of rural America in bringing about peace in Vietnam.

In an era when urban living draws the focal attention of the American people, rural America—though its population is declining—continues to prove the backbone on which the economy of the Nation and the peace of the world is based.

As an example of the former: An integral part of the problem of inflation has been our continuing deficit of payments. In 1972 this trade deficit jumped to \$6.4 billion. The figure was reached despite the fact that exports jumped 13 percent overall and agricultural exports jumped 22 percent. Grain sales to Russia accounted for about a quarter of the increase.

Mr. Speaker, American agriculture has never been more important to the world than in 1972. Indeed, food supplies, or the lack of them, were a strong influence in the peace negotiations.

The urgency of an adequate food supply for military personnel and civilians in a country involved in a war has been demonstrated time and again since the beginning of history. That "an army travels on its stomach" can be proved over and over. It is a certainty that a nation hard-pressed to feed its people will be even more severely pressed to support an army.

North Vietnam and its allies, China and the Soviet Union, were all faced with serious food shortages in 1972.

Last July all laborers including military reinforcements and refugees were pressed into service to harvest the North Vietnamese spring rice crop. The Hanoi government urged its people to devote every inch of tillable land to food crops. Even in good years, North Vietnam has had to depend on China and Russia for

50,000 to 60,000 tons of food imports per month. These imports were greatly hampered by American bombing and the blockade of Hanoi's harbor.

China has had a historic problem of keeping its food supply apace with its population growth. In September China purchased 15 million bushels of wheat from the United States to ease its problem. A month later the wheat was followed by 12 million bushels of American corn.

Various factors were held responsible for the food crisis facing Russia. During the fall, this problem was eased with the purchase of 400 million bushels of American wheat. China and Russia, facing problems of feeding their own people had no supplies to send their ally, North Vietnam.

In September, Mr. Speaker, Cambodia faced a severe food crisis—a crisis greatly eased by the productivity of the American farmer. The United States airlifted 30,000 tons of rice to this nation. South Vietnam loaned Cambodia 10,000 tons from its stores—rice which had been earlier supplied by the United States. Our assistance to Cambodia reached \$56.3 million in fiscal year 1972.

Public Law 480 has fed needy nations of this world for many years. Title I of the law permits the United States to sell food to foreign nations in exchange for local currencies. Much of this currency is used to promote the economic development of the purchasing country.

Taking advantage of Public Law 480, South Vietnam purchased with its currency almost \$110 million worth of agricultural commodities in fiscal 1971 and \$100 million more in fiscal 1972. Long-term loans for the purchase of food were also provided for South Vietnam and Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, volunteer relief agencies have also had a role as well as our technological and Aid for International Development teams. Thousands of technicians have been sent in to the countries to help farmers cope with or conquer pests and weeds, and initiate new crop varieties. AID teams have been sent in to advise on agricultural practices, land reform, flood control, and irrigation.

With the peace agreement, the U.S. farmer stands ready to aid his country in keeping the peace, as he has done following other wars. The U.S. farmer can produce economically and abundantly, the substance to feed and clothe a population of hundreds of millions. That we can do this efficiently and cheaply is an incentive for nations that hunger to retain our good will.

Mr. Speaker, as a South Dakota farmer, I am very proud of the role American agriculture plays in the world today. Thank you.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of Mr. ANDREWS' special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

FAIR, EQUITABLE, AND FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE MILITARY RETIREMENT PROGRAM IS ESSENTIAL

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 26, I introduced a bill which, if enacted, would help this Nation keep faith with the men and women who gave a major part of their lives to the security of our country as careerists in the military services. My bill would have us return to the practice of computing retirement benefits for these public servants on the basis of the current salaries of men and women who hold the rank and have the years of service which the retirees held and had when they left the service.

This action on my part does not mean that I fail to recognize the probability that the Congress should review the retirement program which has been established for persons in our military services. Indeed, I believe that such a review should be undertaken. A fair, equitable, and fiscally responsible military retirement program is essential if our Nation is to maintain the quality of defense system that we must have.

The terms of the retirement program, and the manner in which it will perform in the future, in relation to our national economy, must be clearly spelled out for the men and women who wish, and whom we want, to make military service their career.

Today the pension for retired military personnel is raised in response to increases in the cost of living. This practice was instituted in 1958, ending the practice of computing retirement pay on the basis of the current salaries for persons of equal rank and years in service.

To me, this action was a breach of trust with the men and women who had served our Nation loyally and well in the Armed Forces. For them their salaries would not have been unacceptable but for the pension program which could be considered deferred salary.

Is it not deceitful to encourage men and women to make military service a career with one kind of pension program in operation, and, after they have retired, change the rules to penalize them for their trust.

I endorse, indeed, I urge that a re-evaluation of the military pension program be undertaken and that just and equitable solutions to the problems involved in it—including those created by the 1958 law—be enacted.

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER O'NEILL ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I find the President's economic report deficient on both humanitarian and economic grounds. It is obviously a blueprint for repetition of the economic witches brew which featured the first 2 years of the

Nixon administration. That unhappy era was characterized by what economists had previously felt was unattainable; soaring prices and escalating unemployment at the same time.

If one strips away the academic and bureaucratic jargon in which this document is encased, it is apparent that the President and his economic advisers have coolly and indifferently written off the 4½ million still unemployed. What is it in the background and training of Mr. Nixon's economic counsellors which enables them to analyze and discuss human misery and want with such detached and amoral pronouncements? Neither the academic cloister nor the carpeted and well appointed office of the high level Federal functionary provides a suitable environment for acquiring a knowledge of what inflation and unemployment truly mean in human terms.

Unemployment is a cancer, a cancer of the human spirit. The father who cannot find a job to support his family, or may be even forced to leave them so they can qualify for welfare, is not a statistic. He is a fellow human being. Prolonged unemployment will inevitably destroy that human being in every meaningful sense.

What is inflation? Inflation is the price of hamburger and bread and potatoes and other necessities of life on which the working people of this country spend their paychecks. This administration never did believe in controlling prices. It was only political necessity which forced the President to impose price controls in August 1971. Those controls were limited in their scope, they never applied to food, and in those areas which they did apply they were never enforced very rigorously. But they were better than nothing. Now, for all practical purposes, there will be no controls.

If this economic message is unenlightened from a humanitarian point of view, so it is equally deficient in its economic approach. The President is obviously fearful that a nonexistent boom is about to get out of hand. He proposes to rein it in by reducing public expenditures. At that same time, we may be sure that his friend Dr. Burns of the Federal Reserve Board, fearful of the results of the premature abandonment of price controls, will invoke a restrictive monetary policy. This combination, a retrenchment in the fiscal area and the imposition of tight money, will guarantee a halt in economic expansion and produce a repetition of the unemployment and inflation which characterized the 1969-71 period.

SENIOR CITIZEN INTERN PROGRAM RESOLUTION

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

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am today joined by 37 colleagues in introducing a resolution establishing a senior citizen intern program in the House of Representatives. As some of my colleagues will remember, I proposed such a project toward the end of the last Congress.

Briefly, the program is patterned after the college summer internships, although on a smaller and more limited scale. As outlined in the resolution, each Member would be authorized to hire two additional employees, aged 65 or over, for 2-week periods during the month of May. Each would receive a stipend of \$100 per week. Since one of the purposes of the program is to give the senior citizens the opportunity to learn more about current congressional activities, the interns must be employed in the Member's Washington office. The reason for specifying May as the internship period is to facilitate the organization of special programs, briefings and the like for the benefit of all the interns as a group.

The idea for this program resulted from an internship I made available to a senior citizen couple from my district last April. They studied and received briefings on current Federal programs involving the elderly and pending legislation of interest to senior citizens. Their schedule also included committee hearings and briefings with staff of Hill committees and private organizations concerned with senior citizen affairs.

This program offered the senior citizens a unique opportunity to learn firsthand how their Federal Government is attempting to resolve the problems of the aging. As representatives of several senior citizen clubs in my district, the interns were able to provide me with a greater understanding of the specific needs of the elderly in my local area. When they returned to the district, the interns reported on their experience in Washington before several groups and have since become a helpful communication link between their fellow senior citizens and the Federal Government.

I know my colleagues will agree that perhaps the most challenging task facing Congress today is the restoration of public confidence in government, generally, and Congress, specifically. One of the ways in which this may be achieved is for Congress, through individual Congressmen, to improve lines of communication with all segments of the population. Senior citizens represent an articulate and organized body of individuals with whom we should and can maintain closer relations. An intern program along the lines of the one I have introduced today will, I believe, go a long way toward helping Congress relate more meaningfully to a most important segment of the population.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting and participating in the senior citizen intern program.

HIJACKING SPEECH

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, to provide for the suspension of air transportation between the United States and foreign countries in cases of international aircraft hijacking.

The crisis in both domestic and international air transportation is well known

to every citizen. Daily we witness accounts in radio, television, and newspapers of the current progress of the "hijacking" of the day. One might even say that it is rapidly becoming one of our most avid spectator sports.

Yet we obviously cannot afford to treat this subject lightly. The spiraling costs of hijacking, measured not only in terms of dollars and cents, but in the far more precious terms of human deaths and injuries, are more than we can tolerate.

Air service is constantly disrupted. Would-be passengers are becoming leery of air travel. We have even witnessed the disastrous effects of an international pilot's strike to protest the inaction of the world's governments.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to act, in a positive and constructive manner, to curtail any further incidents. This bill will permit the President to suspend air transportation between the United States and any foreign country when a hijacking has occurred and where that country has either failed to return the hijacker to the United States within 30 days, or failed to return the passengers, crew, aircraft, and any extorted ransom moneys within 5 days. This suspension shall remain in effect until the President determines that the resumption of air traffic will not endanger the safety of any aircraft or its passengers, crew, and cargo.

In conjunction with this bill, Mr. Speaker, I also offer the following resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to an international conference on air piracy. It calls on the President to take such steps as necessary to convene a conference for the purpose of establishing new and improved international policies and procedures designed to facilitate the apprehension and punishment of hijackers, as well as assure the safety of aircraft, passengers, and crews. It is further hoped that the conference will consider specific measures directed against international aircraft hijacking which should at least include, but not be limited to, the sanctions proposed in the bill which is companion to this resolution.

The purpose of these measures is evident. The suspension of air traffic will invoke economic pressure on foreign countries to refrain from aiding or abetting international air hijackers. If, through the aegis of an international conference, we can induce other governments to enact similar sanctions, then a great step will have been made toward curbing the dangerous spread of hijacking.

We of the Congress are extremely familiar with the expression "power of the purse" and all that it implies. If the responsible countries of the world join ranks in the cause of eliminating hijacking, and exercise their cumulative powers, then those countries who currently harbor these international fugitives will have to contend with pressures which are far more substantial than the somewhat ephemeral force of world opinion. The first step in this process, of course, is for our body to resoundingly endorse the bill and resolution which have been introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this bill and the attendant resolution:

H.R. 3348

A bill to provide for the suspension of air transportation between the United States and Federal countries in cases of international aircraft hijacking

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1501-1512) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SUSPENSION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

"SEC. 1113. In any case in which an aircraft registered in the United States is operating in interstate, overseas, or foreign air transportation and is hijacked to a foreign country and the President determines that such foreign country—

"(1) has willfully failed to return the hijacker to the country in which the hijacking originated within thirty days; or

"(2) has failed to take adequate steps to assure the safety of the hijacked aircraft, together with its passengers and crew, and provide for their safe return to the country from which the flight originated within five days; or

"(3) has willfully failed to return all funds or other valuable items extorted by the hijacker within five days;

the President shall suspend all air transportation to such foreign country by any aircraft registered under this Act and shall suspend all air transportation to the United States by any aircraft registered in such foreign country. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the resumption of air transportation suspended under this section will not result in danger to the safety of any aircraft operating in interstate, overseas, or foreign air transportation (including its passengers, crew, and cargo)."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the center heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1113. Suspension of certain air transportation in cases of international aircraft hijacking."

H. CON. RES. 101

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to an international conference on air piracy

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to call for an immediate international conference on air piracy for the purpose of establishing new and improved international policies and procedures designed to facilitate the apprehension and punishment of individuals guilty of international aircraft hijacking and to assure the prompt and safe return of the aircraft, together with its passengers and crew.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to assure that the international conference referred to in the first section of this concurrent resolution will consider specific measures directed against international aircraft hijacking, which measures should include, but not be limited to—

(1) a requirement that any individual guilty of international aircraft hijacking must be returned to the country in which the hijacking originated within thirty days;

(2) requirements that each country must take adequate steps to assure the safety of

the hijacked aircraft, together with its passengers and crew, and provide for their safe return to the country from which the flight originated within five days; and

(3) appropriate provisions requiring that all funds or other valuable items extorted by the hijacker must be returned together with the hijacked aircraft, its passengers and crew.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I think that Members of Congress and the American people should be kept informed of the good works of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

This 31-member international organization has assisted in the movement of nearly 2 million persons to new homelands during its 20 years of existence. Of this number, one-half have been refugees who, through no fault of their own, had to abandon their homelands due to fear of religious or political persecution. Over the years, ICEM has done an excellent job in helping to keep the refugee camps of Europe free of build-ups of refugee cases and has responded rapidly to emergency situations, such as the Hungarian crisis in 1956 and the need of the Czechoslovakian refugees in 1968.

In the early days of October 1972, a new crisis began to develop in Uganda when Uganda President Idi Amin decreed that all Asians residing in that country had to leave by November 8, 1972. As that date was nearing, grave concern developed in the countries of Western Europe as to what would happen with the Asian expellees if they were not granted refuge in other countries.

ICEM was the first international organization to send personnel into Uganda to assist in the movement of Asians who were being expelled. For days the ICEM team of counselors and medical personnel registered and medically examined 300 to 400 persons a day. ICEM arranged travel accommodations on regularly scheduled airlines servicing Uganda and by chartering additional flights. After concentrated efforts in which the staff members worked practically 24 hours at a stretch, some 5,000 Asians were moved to those European countries which had offered their facilities as countries of first asylum.

ICEM is continuing to work with the Asian expellees who are now in transit centers in Europe and is assisting these people in finding countries of permanent resettlement. Many families have been separated during the period of the hasty exodus and ICEM, along with the International Red Cross, is attempting to reunite these unfortunate families.

I wish to stress the point, Mr. Speaker, that ICEM, established through the initiative of the United States, deserves our continued support in its activities which recognize the humanitarian needs of the oppressed and the homeless.

I would also like to pay tribute to the

American voluntary agencies who have worked so closely with ICEM in assisting persons who have found it necessary to leave their homelands in search of freedom.

BABY SEALS PROTECTED UNDER MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of January 24, 1973, I told my colleagues that I was seeking information concerning the "undue economic hardship" exemption which had been applied for under the Marine Mammal Protection Act to permit the importation of about 10,000 dressed Beater and Blueback sealskins for resale. My action was prompted by a notice in the Federal Register that the Department of Commerce had received such an application from the Bergner International Corp., of New York, N.Y.

We have now received a copy of the Bergner application, which I will insert in the Record below, indicating the request is to import 10,000 dressed skins from Blueback seals 1 month old, and from Beater seals ranging from 1 to 16 months in age. The seals would be taken during the Canadian hunting season which commences in late March and continues to the end of June 1973.

Sections 103 and 104 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act authorize the Secretary of Commerce to issue permits for the taking of marine mammals following consultation with the Marine Mammal Commission. That Commission has not yet been appointed by the President, but I am informed that it will probably be announced within the next 2 weeks. Such permits are to be issued on the basis of the best scientific evidence available concerning good conservation practices and the preservation of marine mammal species.

Additionally, under section 101(c) of the law, the Secretary is authorized to exempt persons from the provisions of the act "in order to minimize undue economic hardship," for no more than 1 year from the date of enactment. The fair inference from this 1-year limitation is that Congress intended to provide a reasonable period of time to find alternative sources of income for, and for "phasing out," those persons who are engaged in the business of dealing in marine mammals and marine mammal products, as well as to provide a reasonable interval of time in which to establish the Marine Mammal Commission and the Committee of Scientific Advisers so that permits can be issued under sections 103 and 104.

The act does not spell out exactly what constitutes "undue economic hardship" nor are there any regulations which define "undue economic hardship." Rather, in applying for the exemption, the applicant is expected to show such economic hardship to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

However, the Bergner application

raises a more serious question in that they are requesting an exemption to import, for resale, sealskins from animals that have not yet been slaughtered—in fact, many of these animals have not yet been born.

Section 102(b) of the act, flatly prohibits the importation of marine mammals which are "nursing at the time of taking, or less than 8 months old, whichever occurs later," except for purposes of scientific research. Thus, even if the Marine Mammal Commission and the Committee of Scientific Advisers were in existence, I doubt that the Secretary would be authorized to issue a permit for the taking or importation for resale.

In support of its application, Bergner notes that it is the principal importer into the United States of sealskins, and that this importing is "a very important part" of Bergner's business. They state that, if the exemption is not granted, it will result in "the curtailment of a very substantial portion of the business of the applicant and of the businesses which are supplied by the applicant."

They also state they are seeking alternatives, but they do not indicate that the viability of their business will be threatened by the curtailment. But the basic premise of the Bergner application is that the sealskins will be taken regardless of whether they are eventually imported into the United States.

In other words, if these skins are not sold here, they will be sold somewhere else. There is room under the law for an exemption because of undue economic hardship, but there is no room for the Bergner contention that an exemption should be granted because "these skins will be produced regardless of whether or not this application is granted."

Congress passed the Marine Mammal Protection Act in order to close off the lucrative U.S. market to marine mammal products taken from certain animals which we want to protect from exploitation. We did this in the belief that the U.S. market is a substantial part of the world market, and without the U.S. market, exploiters of marine mammals will have less economic incentive to take the animals, or at least that fewer animals will be taken.

The application of Bergner International follows below:

BERGNER INTERNATIONAL CORP.,

New York, N.Y., January 3, 1973.

Re Chapter II, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, Part 216 Regulations governing the taking and importing of marine mammals. Public Law 92-522—86 Stat. 1027. Application for Economic Hardship Exemption under Subpart C Paragraph 216.13—Application Number Two.

The DIRECTOR,

National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to Paragraph 216.13 (a), we apply for an economic hardship exemption with relation to importation of certain Sealskins to be produced in the Dominion of Canada during the sealing season February/June 1973. This is a second application—not to be confused with our application for an economic hardship exemption concerning the voluntary registration of "inventories and stocks" of marine mammals

held by us—not physically located within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The information required by Paragraph 216.13(a) (2) (i) as outlined in Paragraph 216.12(a) appears below:

(1) The name and address of the applicant is: Bergner International Corp., 130 West 30 Street, New York, N.Y. 10001, Telephone: 212-565-3715.

(2) We are applying for a hardship exemption which will permit us to import at least during the calendar year 1973, dressed Seal-skins bearing the scientific name: *Pagophilus groenlandicus*; common or trade name: Beater Saleskin—country of origin: Dominion of Canada; and also, scientific name: *Cystophora cristata*; common or trade name: Blueback Seal-skins—country of origin: Dominion of Canada.

The population stock would be hundreds of thousands—exact numbers unknown. The age of the animals would be one month to sixteen months of age in the case of the Beaters and about one month of age in the case of the Bluebacks. The sexes will be mixed. There will not be any pregnant or nursing animals involved.

(3) The taking would occur in the North-west Atlantic Ocean and/or the Gulf of St. Lawrence and/or the Straits of Belle Isle by licensed sealing vessels operating under the flag of the Dominion of Canada and also by native fishermen who are also known colloquially as "landsmen", operating on the Canadian Labrador and along the coastal areas of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Newfoundland. The seal hunting would commence in late March, in the case of the Seals, to which this application refers, and continue until about the end of June 1973.

The seal-skins would be exported from the Dominion of Canada to a European country for processing and would then be imported into the United States through the port of New York.

The total number would be about 10,000 skins.

It is respectfully submitted, in support of this application, that:

The applicant is and has been, for very many years, the principal importer into the United States of Seal-skins of these varieties and of many other varieties.

The Seal-skin business is a very important part of the business of the applicant.

The applicant's certified public accountant has made a statement in support of its application No. 1 for economic hardship exemption. This statement shows the statistical and financial significance of the seal business to the business of the applicant. An additional copy of this statement is attached to this application.

Public Law 92-522 and the regulations thereunder has the effect of terminating this part of the applicant's business, abruptly. It is respectfully suggested that the relative provision of the Act, and this provision of the regulations, were intended to apply, amongst other, to the applicant's situation.

The Seal-skins, which are the subject of this application, shall be produced under any circumstances. The ships which shall produce them shall be operating, lawfully, under the laws of the Dominion of Canada with the sanction of ICNAP. The "landsmen" shall be hunting (for their livelihood), as usual. In the ordinary course of business we shall be handling these legal catches for distribution in Canada and in Europe. In the regular course of business we would have imported the quantity applied for, or a larger quantity, for sale in the United States of America and also for distribution from bonded warehouse to European buyers.

Small businesses, in the United States of America, rely upon these skins for their productions of manufactured goods.

(iv) None of these marine mammals or marine mammal products is listed as an endangered species pursuant to the Endangered

Species Act of 1969 and has not been designated by the Secretary as depleted.

(v) (b) (1) The granting of this exemption will not affect the species or population stocks in question because these skins will be produced regardless of whether or not this application is granted.

(2) The degree of economic hardship to be anticipated, should the exemption not be granted, is the curtailment of a very substantial portion of the business of the applicant and of the businesses which are supplied by the applicant.

(3) The economic alternative available to the applicant are to find substitutes for this business, which the applicant intends to do. If this application is granted it will help the applicant to tide over the abrupt curtailment of this business.

At this point, with respect to "legal alternatives", we should assert our belief that the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries creates an automatic exception of these skins, under Paragraph 216.7, but until this legal position is clarified, this exemption would enable the applicant to operate its business without danger of being engaged in an unlawful act.

This application is without prejudice to our rights under Section 102(a) (2) and Subpart C, Paragraph 216.7 of the regulations thereunder or any other applicable law or regulation which would make this application unnecessary.

I hereby certify that the foregoing information is complete, true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that this information is submitted for the purpose of obtaining a permit under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 1027) and regulations promulgated thereunder, and that any false statement may subject me to the criminal penalties of 18 U.S.C. 1001, or to penalties under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.

The applicant respectfully begs leave to amend this application when and if necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

I. BERGNER,
President.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR VOLUNTEER WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Albert Schweitzer once said:

I don't know what your destiny will be, but one thing I know: the only ones among you who will be really happy are those who have sought and found how to serve.

Throughout the Nation, millions of people have found how to serve their fellowman through giving of their time and themselves in volunteer work for worthwhile organizations.

Today I am introducing a bill to provide a special tax deduction for volunteer work with public or private nonprofit groups. It is my hope that if we recognize the remarkable accomplishments of this Nation's volunteers by providing deserved incentives, the hours given to volunteer work will multiply.

The deduction provided in my legislation would be available to any individual who has contributed at least 50 hours of uncompensated volunteer work during the year. The amount of the deduction would equal the number of hours multiplied by the Federal minimum wage of \$2, whichever is greater, with a maxi-

mum deduction of \$2,000. If both a husband and wife want to claim this deduction, each of them must meet the 50-hour requirement. The deduction would apply to a variety of recognized public and private nonprofit civic organizations, including social and charitable groups, church groups, volunteer firemen and civil defense workers, and nonpartisan work for electoral or legislative reforms.

This bill would prove a boon for volunteer work in America. The people in this Nation have always helped their neighbors through volunteer work—from barn-raising to collecting contributions for local charities. According to estimates, there are over one million independent voluntary organizations in this country. A Gallup poll taken last year revealed that over 61 million Americans are willing to give 4 hours per week as volunteers, efforts that are in great demand by hospitals, libraries, and other institutions and organizations which require the selfless dedication and personal good will of volunteers.

Volunteer work widens personal interests, decreases boredom, and allows an individual the opportunity to go beyond narrow specialized job activities. At a time when so many people feel alienated from their fellow man, volunteer work in a civic or social organization brings them closer together in a common cause. Volunteer work also provides a sense of achievement as people help their neighbors to overcome problems that so often affect all of us.

At this time, many public and private nonprofit organizations must continue their operations with small overworked staffs. Passage of this bill would establish an appropriate way to thank and encourage these dedicated individuals.

In 1968 an article in *Time* stated:

If the country's social problems are curable, the cure is likely to be found . . . in a lot of little efforts by lot of people.

I would hope that passage of my bill would provide deserved recognition for the significant, albeit "little efforts" of the thousands of volunteers throughout this great Nation.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an example being set in a far corner of the world that all of us here in the United States can take inspiration from. I speak of the people of Latvia, who on last November 18 celebrated their 54th anniversary of independence. Like our forefathers, Latvians paid an enormous price for their freedom by expelling two invaders in 1918 and 1919. Although their freedom from foreign domination lasted only slightly more than 20 years, Latvians made tremendous strides in their quest for a just society. They proved their devotion to democracy by establishing an advanced form of representative government with a parliament, cabinet, president, and

freely organized parties. All the basic freedoms we so cherish here in the United States, enunciated by our own Bill of Rights, were guaranteed to Latvians.

Latvia joined the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, and proved to be a model member, persevering in trying to spread peace and understanding to all parts of the world. Latvia was blessed with fine leaders in its early years. People like Janis Cakste, Gustav Zemgals, Karlis Ulmanis, Janis Goldmanis, Karlis Zarins will long be remembered for their dedication and sense of purpose. We should all remember the tyranny that destroyed their aspirations and dreams for Latvia.

Latvia has become a radiant symbol for the great majority of Americans who believe in freedom for all nations, large or small. During these years of ruthless tyranny by the Soviet Union, the Latvian people have not lost hope for the reflowering of democracy in the land they so love. I salute Latvian people the world over and I am certain that the American people join them in their prayers and hopes that soon they will be free in their homeland.

AMNESTY

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

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked by President Nixon's statement at his press conference this morning that individuals who resisted the draft or deserted from the Armed Forces because of their objection to our involvement in Vietnam must pay a criminal penalty if they wish to return to this country.

The amnesty issue must not be dismissed out-of-hand in the vindictive tone Mr. Nixon takes. Now that the prisoners of war are returning, we must make provision for the return of the hundreds of thousands of political refugees who were compelled to leave their homeland or go to prison for their beliefs.

Amnesty is not only for these young men, who were the conscience of a nation, but also for their families and friends. This significant section of an entire generation must not remain hostages of an immoral war, and I hope that Congress will give early approval to my universal and unconditional amnesty bill (H.R. 236).

This measure, entitled "The War Resisters Exoneration Act of 1973," would grant unconditional and automatic amnesty to individuals who refused registration or service under the Selective Service Act or who deserted, went AWOL or missed a troop movement while in the military during the Vietnam era. Granting automatic amnesty in these cases avoids discrimination against those who are less well-educated by not requiring a sophisticated explanation of motives.

The bill also establishes an Amnesty Commission empowered to grant amnesty on a case-by-case basis for other offenders, first whose violation was in substantial part motivated by opposition to the war and, second who were not responsible for significant property damage or substantial personal injury. If

such damage or injury did result, the Commission could still grant amnesty if it finds that the conduct was justifiable on the basis of a moral or ethical belief deeply held by the individual. This last proviso would probably result in a grant of amnesty for the Catonsville 9, who destroyed draft records, but not for the individuals whose bombing of a University of Wisconsin building resulted in the death of a student.

Amnesty granted under this bill would restore all civil rights. It would also expunge all notations relating to violations from the records of courts and law enforcement agencies. Where an individual received an other than honorable military discharge in substantial part because of a violation for which amnesty is granted, the discharge would be changed to honorable. Finally, the bill would permit anyone who renounced his citizenship because of opposition to the war to recover that citizenship.

H.R. 236 differs from other amnesty legislation in that it covers not only draft resisters, who are generally middle or upper class, but also deserters, who are more commonly poor, and other violators. Also, it would not require any alternative or punitive service on the part of those to whom amnesty is granted. I include the text of this bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

Now that our tragic involvement in Vietnam appears to be nearing an end, we must resolve not to condemn to permanent exile or obloquy the thousands of young Americans who for reasons of conscience refused to go along with our intervention in Vietnam.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 236

To exonerate and to provide for a general and unconditional amnesty for certain persons who have violated or are alleged to have violated laws in the course of protest against the involvement of the United States in Indochina, and for other purposes

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 "War Resisters Exoneration Act of 1973".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that a general and unconditional amnesty, with full restoration of all civil, political, property, and other rights is a necessary measure, after the cessation of United States military operations in Indochina, for the reconciliation and reinstatement of persons who have been prosecuted, or who may be subject to prosecution, for failing to comply with any requirement of, or relating to, service in the Armed Forces during the involvement of the United States in Indochina, or for engaging in any nonviolent activity or activity justified by deeply held moral or ethical belief in protest of, or opposition to, the involvement of the United States in Indochina.

(b) The Congress further finds and declares that it is an immunity of citizens of the United States (within the meaning of section 1 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States) to enjoy the annulment of all legal disadvantages that have been incurred or suffered by reason of opposition to the involvement of the United States in Indochina, to the greatest extent consistent with the preservation of life and property.

EFFECT OF GENERAL AMNESTY

SEC. 3. The general amnesty granted by or under this Act shall, with respect to any violation of law enumerated in section 4 or covered under section 6—

(1) restore to the grantee all civil, political, citizenship and property rights which have been or might be lost, suspended, or otherwise limited as a consequence of such violation;

(2) immunize the grantee from criminal prosecution for such violation;

(3) expunge all notation relating to such violation from the records of courts and law enforcement agencies;

(4) require the granting of an honorable discharge to any person who received a discharge other than an honorable discharge from the Armed Forces if such violation was solely the cause, or a substantial cause, of the granting of such other than honorable discharge; and

(5) nullify all other legal consequences of such violation.

AUTOMATIC GENERAL AMNESTY

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, general amnesty is hereby granted to any person for violation of one or more of the laws enumerated in this section, or regulations and policies promulgated pursuant thereto, if such violation was committed between August 4, 1964, and the effective date of this section. Such amnesty is automatic, and no application to the Amnesty Commission or any other agency is necessary to effectuate it.

(b) General amnesty is granted for violations of any of the following laws:

(1) Section 12 of the Military Selective Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 462) with respect to the following prohibited acts—

(A) evading or refusing registration, evading or refusing induction into the Armed Forces, or willfully failing to perform any other duty under such Act, or conspiring to do so;

(B) knowingly counseling, aiding, or abetting others to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or conspiring to do so; or

(C) publicly and knowingly destroying or mutilating any registration or classification card issued or prescribed pursuant to such Act and knowingly violating or evading any of the provisions of such Act, or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating to the issuance, transfer, or possession of any registration or classification card.

(2) Section 882 of title 10, United States Code, which prohibits the soliciting or advising another, or attempting to solicit or advise others, to desert the Armed Forces of the United States.

(3) Sections 885 and 886 of title 10, United States Code, which prohibit deserting or going absent without leave from the Armed Forces of the United States.

(4) Section 887 of title 10, United States Code, which prohibits missing the movement of a ship, aircraft, or unit with which it is required in the course of duty to move.

(5) Section 888 of title 10, United States Code, which prohibits using contemptuous words against the President, the Vice President, Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Governor or legislature of any State, territory, Commonwealth, or possession on which he is on duty or present while a commissioned officer in the United States Armed Forces.

(6) Section 1381 of title 18, United States Code, which prohibits the enticing or procuring, or conspiring or attempting to entice or procure any person in the Armed Forces of the United States, or who has been recruited for service therein, to desert therefrom, or aiding any such person in deserting, or in attempting to desert from such service; or harboring, concealing, protecting, or as-

sisting any such person who may have deserted from such service, knowing him to have deserted therefrom, or refusing to give up and deliver such person on the demand of any officer authorized to receive him.

(7) Section 2387 of title 18, United States Code, which prohibits the advising, counseling, urging or in any manner causing or attempting to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, with the intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States.

AMNESTY COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) There is established a commission to be known as the Amnesty Commission (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members, qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience, as follows:

- (1) One appointed by the President.
- (2) One appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.
- (3) One appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- (4) One appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.
- (5) One appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

Individuals who are officers or employees of any government are not eligible for appointment to the Commission. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) (1) Members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive an annual salary equal to the annual salary payable to a judge of a United States district court.

(2) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. The Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(f) The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as it deems desirable, including such hearing examiners as are necessary for proceedings under this section. The provisions applicable to hearing examiners appointed under section 3105 of title 5 are applicable to hearing examiners appointed pursuant to this subsection.

(g) (1) The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this section. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(2) The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(3) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

GRANT OF GENERAL AMNESTY BY THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6 (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall grant general amnesty as provided for in section 3 of this Act to any individual who, during the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on the effective date of this Act, violated any Federal law (other than one enumerated in section 4 of this Act) or State or local law if the Commission finds that—

(1) such violation was in substantial part motivated by the individual's opposition to, or protest against, the involvement of the United States in Indochina; and

(2) the individual was not personally responsible for any significant property damage or substantial personal injury to others in the course of his violation of any such law;

except that, in any case in which the Commission finds that an individual was personally responsible for significant property damage or substantial personal injury to others in the course of his violation of any such law, the Commission shall grant amnesty if it finds that such conduct was justifiable on the basis of a moral or ethical belief deeply held by the individual.

(b) (1) Whenever the Commission grants general amnesty under this section to an applicant who received a discharge other than an honorable discharge from the Armed Forces, it shall make a finding as to whether any violation of law for which general amnesty is granted was solely the cause, or a substantial cause, of the granting of such discharge.

(2) The Commission shall also have jurisdiction to hear and determine applications from individuals entitled to automatic amnesty under section 4 of this Act and aggrieved by the refusal of the military board concerned to grant an honorable discharge to him under section 3(4) of this Act.

(3) Any finding or determination made by the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall be conclusive upon the military board concerned and is not reviewable by any agency or member of the Armed Forces or any civilian officer of the military establishment.

(c) Any individual desiring amnesty under this section, or review of the decision by a military board to deny him an honorable discharge, shall make application therefor to the Commission in such form as it shall prescribe. The Commission shall not receive any application for amnesty or discharge review under this Act after the close of the forty-eighth month after the month in which this section takes effect.

(d) Any application for amnesty or discharge review which is timely filed shall be determined on the record after opportunity for hearing in accordance with sections 554, 556, and 557 of title 5, United States Code. The entire record developed at the hearing on any application shall be certified to the Commission for decision. All decisions of the Commission shall be by majority vote.

(e) Any applicant may obtain judicial review of a decision by the Commission which is adverse to him by filing a petition for review in the United States court of appeals for the circuit wherein he resides within sixty days after the date on which the decision is made. The Commission shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the Commission based its decision, as provided in section 2112 of title 28. The court shall have jurisdiction to review the decision in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5 and to grant appropriate relief as provided for in such chapter.

(f) Any individual not able to apply to the Commission for a determination under subsection (b) (2) of this section because the decision of the military board concerned to deny him an honorable discharge was made after a date sixty days prior to the closing date specified in subsection (c) of this section may obtain judicial review of such decision by filing a petition for review in the United States district court for the district wherein he resides within sixty days after the date of such decision. The military board concerned shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the board based its decision. The court shall have jurisdiction to review the decision of

the military board in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, and to grant appropriate relief as provided for in such chapter.

RESTORATION OF CITIZENSHIP

SEC. 7. Upon petition to any district court of the United States, the United States citizenship of any former citizen who states that he renounced such citizenship solely or partly because of disapproval of involvement of the United States in Indochina shall be fully and unconditionally restored.

SUITS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

SEC. 8. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction without regard to the amount in controversy to hear actions brought to redress the deprivation of rights granted by section 3 of this Act, and to grant such legal and equitable relief as may be appropriate.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2283 of title 28, United States Code, or any successor provision thereto, a district court hearing an action brought pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may grant injunctive relief staying proceedings in a State court.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 11. Sections 4, 6, 7, and 8 of this Act shall take effect upon the date of cessation of United States military operations in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand which date shall be proclaimed by the President and shall be not later than three months after the date of enactment of this Act.

THE AIRLINE PASSENGER RIGHT TO TRAVEL ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which I feel will achieve a major step toward the elimination of aviation hijacking. This practice is the bane of air travel, and one of the most devastating crimes in modern times against the general public. The time for definitive action has come.

My proposal contains two principal elements, one concerning international aspects of hijacking, and the other relating to the domestic problem.

First, the international aspects. In December 1970, representatives of some 77 nations attend a meeting at the Hague for the purpose of drawing up a convention designed to present a more universal opposition to aerial hijacking. That 77 nations agreed to take part in such a meeting reflects a widespread concern over this evil practice.

The convention declares that persons taken into custody who are found guilty of aircraft hijacking shall either be prosecuted or extradited, and further, that the aircraft in question, and its passengers and crew shall be allowed to continue onward.

The United States signed the Hague Convention on December 16, 1970, and in September 1971, the Senate ratified it. By the end of 1971, nearly all those nations represented at the meeting had signed. All of which points up the degree of international concern over hijacking, and a willingness to take steps to suppress it on a mutual basis.

Having become a party to the convention, the United States must now go one step further to implement it. This, of course, requires legislation, and that is one of the elements of my bill. The thrust of this legislative implementation is the universal jurisdictional provision which has the effect of making hijacking committed in another country an offense in the eyes of U.S. law enforcement officials. In other words, this part of my legislation constitutes an additional step we must take in order to make our participation in international implementation of the Hague Convention fully effective. Thus, it is "must" legislation on which the Congress should act promptly.

Another major provision in my bill is a specific authorization to the President to invoke a national boycott against nations which refuse to either punish or extradite hijackers. This gives the President discretionary power to suspend air transportation between the United States and nations which do not implement the general principles of the Hague Convention. Further these sanctions may be applied against any nation which, it is determined, is used as a base of operations or training, or as a sanctuary, or which aids in any way, terrorist groups or organizations involved in hijacking or terrorist practices.

Mr. Speaker, the French, the Africans, and the Russians have ruptured current attempts in Montreal, Canada, to put teeth into the existing Tokyo and Hague antiskijacking conventions by refusing to take sanctions against countries that provide "safe havens" for skyjackers.

The French are fearful of angering Algeria and other Arab nations and thereby losing commercial airline business. The African nations have interpreted "safe haven" sanctions as a threat to small countries waging wars of liberation and the Russians have decided to support the unaligned countries to curry favor with them. The net result has been a breakdown of any international plan to eliminate areas of the world to which skyjacks could abscond.

This development coupled with the recent United Nations decision to defer action on "safe haven" resolutions—and study the causes of terrorism for a year—has given lunatics, criminals, and political extremists a license to hijack airliners.

These are the reasons that I have not only required in this legislation that the President of the United States institute boycotts of air service against nations that fail to extradite or punish aerial criminals but I also require that he deny landing rights in the United States to planes from nations that provide a sanctuary for sky pirates.

Strong measures, some will say. However, I am convinced that measures containing some substance are clearly essential.

The second basic element of my bill concerns the domestic hijacking problem—a problem, unfortunately, we are far from solving at this time. The main thrust of this problem is the inadequate amount of protection and surveillance provided at the Nation's airports for the traveling public and for airline and other employees involved in air travel.

I am proposing that the Federal Government assume the full and basic responsibility for provision of airport protection. Under its terms, the Federal Aviation Administration will be required to establish an air transportation security force of sufficient size to provide much greater safety at airports. I am convinced that the urgency of the problem demands our assumption of this responsibility with whatever means are appropriate. In a word, we must match the effort with the need for safety.

Such a security force will cost money. For this, my bill provides an authorization of \$50 million for the first year and a like amount for future years. I consider such an expenditure not disproportionate to the task and the responsibility of protecting the public.

I envision that such a security force would have delegated to them the authority to detain and search any person intending to travel by air to determine if he is carrying a dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destruction substance. Second, the security force would be empowered to search and inspect luggage and property intended to be placed aboard aircraft. Third, to make arrests of any person whom the security force has reasonable cause to believe the individual has violated the security laws. Fourth, the security force is authorized to be armed sufficiently to carry out their responsibilities.

The Federal Aviation Administration is directed to issue a regulation to the effect that persons refusing to submit to such a search are to be refused transportation.

Another feature of my bill is the provision of funds for the purchase of additional magnetometers which are electronic devices for screening individuals and their luggage for metal objects such as guns or grenades. To rationalize, if the responsibility for a security force properly falls on the Federal Government, which I sincerely believe to be the case, then it follows that the provision of surveillance devices is also incumbent on the Federal Government. Accordingly, my bill authorizes \$7.5 million for the purchase of additional magnetometers and the development of new weapon detection devices.

There is a further provision in my bill which would greatly limit the amount of carry-on baggage. This would curb the ease with which some hijackers carry their weapons aboard with them.

These are the major elements of my bill to put some teeth in our antihijacking efforts. I would like to make the observation that the Senate passed a bill in the last Congress which contained proposals similar to mine. The Senate passed that bill by a 75-to-1 margin. The lone dissenting Senator later stated that his objection centered solely on a point other than any of the provisions I have dis-

cussed here. Such substantial support reflects concern over a serious problem, and a desire to provide measures to correct it.

Mr. Speaker, I am too deeply concerned about hijacking, and I am certain that my colleagues herein this Chamber share my concern. Temporary "crash" programs against skyjacking have caused a recent drop-off of piracy attempts. This is to be expected. In the long term, however, this infamous practice, is continuing to grow, particularly in scope and motivation. Blackmail on a massive international scale, and political extortion have become common manifestations of hijacking. New schemes feed on the success of past excursions. We are in a kind of vicious cycle and only firm, effective and lasting measures can resolve this problem.

In this regard, I consider the administration's current move to place the burden of airport protection on the local authorities to be totally inadequate and doomed to prove ineffective. For one thing, some of the local authorities are opposing the takeover of the security responsibility on grounds that they do not have money to fund it. And rightly so.

Perhaps the most serious weakness is the inconsistency from airport to airport which is bound to follow. Moreover, a centrally directed security force can benefit immediately from experiences, and even mistakes, as they occur. I am convinced that the answer lies in a Federal security force which is highly trained to perform what is a specialized task.

It is for all these reasons that I submit, for proper reference, my bill on anti-hijacking measures.

THE GREAT RIVER ROAD—A SCENIC HIGHWAY FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for significant Federal participation in the up-coming national celebration of the Mississippi Tricentennial—the 300th anniversary of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Marquette and Joliet.

The legislation I reintroduce today would, for the first time, provide Federal assistance, to the 10 States concerned to help in the building and beautification of the Great River Road—the scenic highways that America will build along the shores of the Mississippi—scenic roads stretching from Canada, through Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of the Great River Road has been discussed since the 1930's. Originally it was hoped that a great National Parkway would be located on the banks of the Mississippi. After all, it is the most significant north-south scenic corridor in the Nation, and is within easy driving distance of millions and millions of American families. There is no need for me to rhapsodize on the beauty and diversity of the Mississippi River Valley—it is a combination of the

swift Colorado, the tropical and delta Niles, the bluff-shadowed Rhine, the Blue Danube triumphant—and all beginning in the lake country of Minnesota as a clear, fresh, north-country stream.

Over 8 years ago the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty recommended the establishment of a system of scenic and recreational highways and parkways. The Council recommended a \$4 billion, 10-year program to provide the American people with the kind of roads they deserve, if they are really going to be able to enjoy the scenic and recreational values of this vast and beautiful expanse of America and its people.

Mr. Speaker, no type of recreation in this country is as popular as pleasure driving. Americans drive more than 300 billion miles a year for pleasure—that is nearly 11,000 trips down the entire length of the Great River Road—from Lake Itasca to the Gulf of Mexico.

A study of outdoor recreation in Iowa, suggests that the demand for decent, safe, and attractive scenic roads is far outpacing the roads we are providing.

Like the rest of the country, in Iowa, pleasure driving is the most popular outdoor recreation activity—78.7 percent of all Iowans average 18 days of such driving—or a total of more than 28.1 million user-days a year.

Driving was then followed by other activities closely associated with and available along the Great River Road—77 percent picnicking; 59 percent sightseeing; 58 percent hiking and walking; 40 percent fishing; and 35 percent boating.

Clearly the demand for the access and the recreational facilities that would be provided by roads such as the Great River Road is overwhelming and is increasing almost geometrically.

Mr. Speaker, the day may very well come when we will see stretching along the banks of the Mississippi the parkway that Americans deserve. Clearly the need is there. But today, in consonance with recommendations of the Federal Highway Administration and the National Park Service, we must necessarily tailor our plans to the financial realities we face. It is for that reason that I introduce a bill that embodies the philosophy and hopes of the two distinguished chairmen of the Public Works Committees of the Congress, Congressman BLATNIK and Senator RANDOLPH and yet pays heed to the economic realities of the day.

Today, I am introducing a bill that will provide a beginning of this system of scenic highways we all recognize as so necessary.

I would like to emphasize that the Great River Road is not to become an expressway or super highway designed for heavy commercial traffic and thus deface the essential environmental and esthetic values we are trying to preserve along the banks of the Mississippi. The system is and will continue to utilize present rights-of-way, but these rights-of-way will be improved in order to provide permanent protection for the road and the river—protection from inappropriate and unsightly development.

The bill I introduce would provide \$30 million for each of 2 fiscal years. It would help States begin acquisition of properties and easements necessary to protect the environmental and esthetic values on the Mississippi banks. It would also provide some beginning help in constructing and reconstructing the road surfaces themselves and the attendant scenic viewing points and roadside parks necessary for proper enjoyment of the vistas the Mississippi affords.

Thus, this project clearly demonstrates that this type of highway improvement and scenic development is not incompatible with the essential job of preserving and enhancing the environment.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin somewhere. I sincerely hope that the Great River Road will serve as a worthy prototype of the national system of scenic highways we will eventually enjoy. I can think of no more worthy place to begin nor a more auspicious date on which to begin this undertaking. The Mississippi is an integral scenic corridor—we celebrate the 300th anniversary of its discovery this year—the need is recognized—modest funds are requested—congressional awareness and support are promising.

It is my hope that the Congress will take this opportunity to provide all Americans with this beginning—a beginning too long delayed; but a beginning whose time has come.

There is a phrase very much in evidence today: "Let's make driving a good thing again!" Mr. Speaker, let us in the Congress provide a place for that to happen—along the beautiful, scenic, and historic banks of the great Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to thank the very distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee for sponsoring this bill with me. His guidance and encouragement has been the critical force in holding out hope to us all that this long delayed dream will be realized.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD:

H.R. 3372

A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for the Federal funding of land and easement acquisitions and the construction and improvement of necessary roads and scenic viewing facilities in order to develop a national scenic and recreational highway program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 145. Development of a prototype of a national highway program.

"(a) (1) The Congress finds—
 "(A) that there are significant esthetic and recreational values to be derived from making places of scenic and natural beauty and historical, archeological, or scientific interest accessible to the public;

"(B) that there is a deficiency in the number and quality of scenic roads, parkways, and highways available to the motoring public;

"(C) that with increased population, greater leisure time and higher percentage of privately owned automotive vehicles, more fam-

ilies than ever are seeking suitable areas in which to drive for pleasure and recreation; and
 "(D) that the growth of cities and large metropolitan centers has decreased the quantity of open-space and recreational areas available to the general public, especially urban dwellers; and

"(E) that substantial economic, social, cultural, educational, and psychological benefits could be gained from a nationwide system of attractive roadways making possible widespread enjoyment of natural and recreational resources.

"(2) It is therefore the purpose of this section to provide assistance to the States and to other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to develop highways throughout the Nation to satisfy such needs and to prove the actual national feasibility of such a system through direct Federal participation in the improvement and construction of the Great River Road and attendant facilities and to further provide for Federal participation in the celebration of the tricentennial of the discovery of the Mississippi River.

"(b) As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish criteria for the location and construction or reconstruction of the Great River Road by the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in order to carry out the purpose of this section. Such criteria shall include requirements that—

"(1) priority be given in the location of the Great River Road near or easily accessible to the larger population centers of the State and further priority be given to the construction and improvement of the Great River Road in the proximity of the confluence of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River;

"(2) the Great River Road be connected with other Federal aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System;

"(3) the Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs;

"(4) effective control, as defined in section 131(c) of this title, of signs, displays, and devices will be provided along the Great River Road;

"(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements for scenic purposes, and the construction or reconstruction of roadside rest areas (including appropriate recreational facilities), scenic viewing areas, and other appropriate facilities determined by the Secretary for the purpose of this section.

"(d) Highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this section (except subsection (g)) shall be maintained by the appropriate state or local jurisdiction and shall remain within their present highway system designation except with respect to such provisions of this title as the Secretary determines are not consistent with this section.

"(e) Funds authorized for each fiscal year pursuant to subsection (h) (1) shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River on the basis of their relative needs as determined by the Secretary for payments to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(f) The Federal share of the cost of any project for any construction or reconstruction pursuant to the preceding subsections of this section shall be 80 per centum of such cost.

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to consult with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over

Federal lands open to the public in order to enter into appropriate arrangements for necessary construction or reconstruction of highways on such lands to carry out the purpose of this section. To the extent applicable criteria applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed by the States pursuant to this section shall be applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this subsection. Funds authorized pursuant to subsection (h) (2) shall be used to pay the entire cost of construction or reconstruction pursuant to this subsection.

"(h) There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (1) not to exceed \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and 1975, for allocations to the States pursuant to this section, and (2) not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and 1975, to carry out the provisions of subsection (g)."

Sec. 2. The table of contents of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"145. Development of a prototype of a national scenic and recreational highway program."

DELEGATE ANTONIO B. WON PAT

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I request permission to insert into today's RECORD a resolution from the 11th Guam Legislature hailing the election of the territory's first Delegate to the House of Representatives, my good friend and colleague, ANTONIO B. WON PAT.

Delegate WON PAT has served his people well, as many of you here know. For over two decades TONY WON PAT has been coming to Washington as an emissary before the Federal Government for his constituents. During the years TONY has made countless appearances before congressional committees in his efforts to gain additional benefits for Guam. And, the amazing record of his accomplishments as a result of his hard work is a tribute to TONY WON PAT.

As this resolution indicates, the legislature and the people of Guam are proud of the tremendous progress, both politically, and economically, which they have made in the past few years, and rightly so. It is hard for those of us who enjoy the full benefits of our American citizenship to realize just how far our fellow Americans in the Western Pacific have come. Less than 6 years ago, even though they too were American citizens, the people of Guam not only lacked representation in Congress, but they were denied the right to choose their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Moreover, Guam was not included in the overwhelming majority of Federal grant programs, thereby placing a serious stumbling block in their progress.

Largely due to the dedicated efforts of one man, TONY WON PAT, and with the generous understanding of the Congress, Guam today participates in over 100 grant-in-aid programs, elects its own chief executive, and last November the people of Guam voted to send its

foremost spokesman, Delegate WON PAT, to serve with us in the House.

As an old friend of the Guam Delegate, I welcome him as our colleague, as I am sure so do my fellow Members.

The Guam Legislature's resolution follows:

ELEVENTH GUAM LEGISLATURE, 1972 SECOND REGULAR SESSION—RESOLUTION No. 667

Introduced by F. T. Ramirez, W. D. L. Flores, J. B. Butler, J. R. Duenas, T. C. Charfauros, J. A. Perez, A. A. Sekt, A. L. Cristobal, L. S. N. Paulino, A. C. Sanchez, F. R. Santos, P. J. Bordallo, O. L. Delfin, F. G. Lujan, and G. M. Bamba.

Relative to commending the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat upon his election as Guam's first non-voting delegate to the United States Congress and declaring the election of Guam's representative in Congress as one of the milestones in Guam's attainment of local self-government.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas, the territory of Guam was ceded to the United States as a result of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, which ended the Spanish-American War; and

Whereas, the island of Guam was administered by the United States Navy for almost fifty years, its indigenous people having the status of nationals of the United States; and

Whereas, the Organic Act of Guam enacted by the United States Congress in 1950 established civil government on Guam and bestowed American citizenship upon its inhabitants, the Congress of the United States thus granting the people of Guam a substantial measure of self-government; and

Whereas, another milestone in the territory's constitutional development was achieved in 1968, with the passage by the United States Congress of the Elected Governorship Bill for Guam, which resulted in the election of Guam's first elected Governor and Lt. Governor in November of 1970; and

Whereas, H.R. 3237 enacted by the 92d Congress of the United States in 1971 extended representation to the territory of Guam in the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas, Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat was elected in November of 1972 to hold the prestigious office of Guam's first non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, the members of this Legislature recognize that the cornerstone of our democratic system of government is the concept of self-government in which the people determine their own form of government; and

Whereas, it is the consensus of this Legislature that the people of Guam desire closer ties with their fellow citizens in the American Mainland and that, having gained a voice in the halls of the United States Congress, Guam has made substantial and undeniable progress toward the attainment of this goal; and

Whereas, the people of Guam who now enjoy this measure of self-determination and self-government consider any requirements for periodic reports to foreign powers or the United Nations relative to their political, economic, and social status as an intrusion and infringement on their dignity and rights as a self-governing people; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Eleventh Guam Legislature on behalf of the people of Guam does hereby commend the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat upon his election in November of 1972 as Guam's first elected Non-Voting Delegate to the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, that the Eleventh Guam Legislature on behalf of the people of Guam does hereby declare any requirement for making

periodic reports to any foreign power or to the United Nations on its political, economic and social status to be an infringement on Guam's present level of self-rule and demeaning to the people of Guam and does hereby assert that any such requirement should therefore be terminated forthwith; and be it further

Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President of the Senate, to the Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Governor of Guam.

Duly and regularly adopted on the 17th day of November, 1972.

A. C. SANCHEZ,
Acting Speaker.

F. G. LUJAN,
Acting Legislative Secretary.

ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday morning I held a press conference to announce my intention to introduce a constitutional amendment (H.J. Res. 261) reestablishing constitutional protections for the unborn which the U.S. Supreme Court has abolished. The questions and answers from that press conference might be of interest to our colleagues. I, therefore, insert the material in the RECORD at this point:

PRESS CONFERENCE

Question. Under the wording of the amendment, are there any provisions by which abortion may be permitted to protect the mother's health, or along those lines?

Mr. HOGAN. Yes, it has always been the law that when there is a decision between the survival of the mother and the survival of the baby, it is justifiable to choose one life over the other. My amendment would in no way change that.

Question. The latest Gallup poll showed that, by a very slim margin, the majority of the American people—not just the women—but the people—favor abortion. Realistically, what are your chances of getting two-thirds of the House and the Senate to support your amendment?

Mr. HOGAN. First of all, on the Gallup poll itself, I do not know how the questions were phrased, so I have no way of assessing the validity or the efficacy of this poll as to real public opinion on abortion. A more efficacious "poll" is the fact that some 37 state legislatures have rejected liberalized abortion proposals. The politicians in those legislatures obviously are responsive to the people who elected them. As I pointed out, abortion was also rejected by referendum last November in North Dakota by 77% and in Michigan by 63%. Now, as to the second question: Candidly, the hopes are slim. It might take decades to turn around this decisions. It also took decades to turn around the Dred Scott decision.

Question. I've noted that the opposition to abortion is portrayed as coming from the Roman Catholic Church. I represent the publication of a Protestant denomination, which is also opposed to abortion. I would like to ask you if you think the opposition has been fairly or unfairly portrayed by the

media as coming primarily from the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. HOGAN. I feel that it has been unfairly represented as coming from the Catholic Church. Abortion is no more a Catholic issue than extermination of the Jews in Nazi Germany was a Jewish issue. This is a moral, legal and an ethical question. In the State of Maryland, the leader of the anti-abortion forces is a Baptist minister. In the State of Minnesota, the anti-abortion effort is led by Lutherans. This is by no means a Catholic issue or even a religious issue.

Question. Do you have any co-sponsors of your constitutional amendment?

Mr. HOGAN. At this point, I have no co-sponsors. Although I know a number of Congressmen who do support the concept. I did not ask for co-sponsors because (1) I wanted to respond as quickly as possible while the American people still had fresh in their minds the Supreme Court's decision. (2) I know that trying to persuade and convince my colleagues is going to be a tough struggle, because abortion is a very controversial political issue. I did not want to ask for co-sponsors until I have had a chance to convince them.

Question. In view of the comments the President has made on abortion, and his very strong feelings against it, have you had any indication that the White House might get into this at all?

Mr. HOGAN. I hope that the President will lend his support to this Constitutional amendment. He has clearly indicated his opposition to abortion. Two years ago, I was active in working with the White House to turn around the Department of Defense's policy regarding abortions in military hospitals. Since we had the support and cooperation of the White House in that, I hope we will have it in this. I hope that all men in all walks of life, civilian and public, in the legal profession, the medical profession and every other, will join with us in this effort. And I say, in all sincerity, there is no more important issue before the American people and before the Congress. If this remains the law of the land, then all other rights have no meaning whatsoever. Because once you concede that government has the right to take life, it's a short step to say "We can take the life of the unborn so we can take the life of the senile and the infirm and the lame and the retarded and then the blacks and the Jews, or other minorities. This is a terrible first step for us to be taking, and we have to turn it back if our civilization, as we know it, is to survive. I don't say that to be dramatic; I mean that literally.

Question. Your amendment is also directed against euthanasia?

Mr. HOGAN. Yes.

Question. Does this mean withholding medical treatment in hopeless cases?

Mr. HOGAN. That is an ethical question for the medical profession itself. What this amendment prohibits is a positive act to conclude life. Denial of medical assistance in a particular situation may be justifiable morally, ethically and legally. One is not required to use extraordinary measures to keep a person alive, but one cannot take direct, positive measures to end another's life.

Question. There are those who say with a bill such as yours, there will be lots of unwanted pregnancies. Without the proper day care centers . . . How do you answer this?

Mr. HOGAN. Let me answer by asking you a question: Can you say that you were a convenience to your parents when you came along? That you were a "wanted" pregnancy? This is a thing we ought to think about. Now, in my case, if you'll pardon a personal reference, I was born in the depression, and my father was out of work. I know that the news of my impending arrival was not met with hosannas of great joy. At the time when the family was under a terrible strain just to survive, I was on the way. It would have been

very convenient and it would have solved a lot of economic problems, for my family to have eliminated my presence through abortion. But thank God they didn't.

Maybe your mother and father were in the same situation. Maybe you were an inconvenience to them. Is the convenience of two people or one person sufficient justification to deny life to another human being? That is the basic question involved in abortion. Let's extend this argument. There are so many people who have young children who are greatly inconveniencing them. The mother wants to work, or she wants to go places; the father doesn't want to be burdened with the responsibilities of parenthood. The child is a burden. He cries all the time and keeps his parents awake. Should we give them the right to destroy this unwanted post-pregnancy? A one-year-old child cannot survive without the sustenance of his mother and father or another human being and neither can a fetus. All we're talking about is a matter of age. From conception to death. Pregnancy to childhood to old age. That's the life span. Where in that spectrum do we have the justification to take life? Interestingly, the Chinese count age not from birth, but from conception, and that's one of the most ancient civilizations of all.

Question. Congressman, a number of Constitutional experts have speculated that it's possible to pass a bill by a simple majority of Congress limiting the courts' appellate jurisdiction and to prevent the courts in that way from forcing this present situation. Have you given any thought to this?

Mr. HOGAN. Yes, I would support it if it would be effective, but I don't think it would be. There is a recent history of the Supreme Court ignoring the actions and intentions of Congress. And, without bringing up another controversial issue, busing is in that same category. A simple statute will not do the job. I think the only answer to cope with this problem is a Constitutional amendment. People talked to me sometime ago about a Constitutional amendment on abortion and I said that I didn't want to introduce a Constitutional amendment because the Constitution already protected the right to life of the unborn child, because no human being could be denied his life or liberty without due process of law, and that we're all entitled to equal protection of the law. That had been the law of the United States prior to January 22, 1973. Now due process and equal protection of the laws are denied to one segment of the population who had always been afforded these Constitutional protections. That's the minority that can't speak for themselves, the unborn children. So now I'm an enthusiastic supporter of a Constitutional amendment, because I think that's the only way we can overturn this decision.

Question. Would this preclude the death penalty in the future if this is passed?

Mr. HOGAN. No, it would not, because under the death penalty an individual is accorded due process.

Question. Congressman, under the recent Supreme Court decision, the Court will not allow any kind of abortion that will affect the life of the unborn up to the time of viability; then from viability to the moment before birth only if the laws allows to save the life and health. The courts have also defined health to be the psychological and emotional state of the mother and family, her age. The Court has also held that the prosecutor may not call the doctor to the stand. So a prosecutor would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, without calling the doctor, that in the mind of the doctor the abortion was not performed for all these various reasons. Based on your experience in law enforcement, would you say that, in essence, the Supreme Court has allowed abortion on demand up to the day of birth?

Mr. HOGAN. Yes. I think that is a good statement. All the phraseology in the decision

will have the effect of creating wholesale abortion on demand without any restrictions. We have experience in the District of Columbia to back up this contention. The *Vuitch* case, in effect, threw out all restrictions on abortion in D.C. The Supreme Court in that case said that the statute *Vuitch* was convicted under was not Constitutionally vague, but it said that the mental health of the mother was justifiable reason for terminating pregnancy. So that has become a very frivolous excuse for aborting unborn babies.

No assessment of any kind is made. No psychologist, no psychiatrist, examines the woman in depth to make a determination that her very mental health requires the termination of pregnancy. The effect is that anyone who wants an abortion in D.C. gets it, for any reason, and that's abortion on demand. This recent Supreme Court decision will create abortion on demand all over the Nation.

Question. You note that many abortions have been performed primarily so the woman will not have a baby, and in the light of this, could you give us some idea of your attitude toward contraception and specifically whether you plan to co-sponsor and work for renewal of the Tydings bill to provide family planning services.

Mr. HOGAN. I don't know about any Tydings bill—he's not around anymore. When the Family Planning Bill was before the Congress, I did support it. Let's make one thing abundantly clear: There is a complete difference between contraception—birth prevention—and abortion. And it's unfortunate that people do confuse them in their minds. But let's define what they are. Birth control, contraception, is prevention of birth—not allowing life to start. Now, that's acceptable, as far as I'm concerned. But once life has begun, then I say no human being has the right to conclude that life without due process of law. I distinguish the two completely.

Question. Suppose a morning-after pill were developed. Wouldn't that be tantamount to abortion?

Mr. HOGAN. Well, I'm not a physician and I'm not a medical scientist, but it's my understanding that it would not, because it would prevent conception from happening. It would prevent the seed of life from beginning.

Question. With the state laws now struck down, we have in effect abortion of demand for nine months. Is that correct?

Mr. HOGAN. Yes, that is my interpretation of what the Supreme Court decision will mean, regardless of the way they have phrased it. Here's another point: They say that for the first three months of pregnancy, without any conditions whatsoever, the woman can have the baby destroyed. So what's to prevent a woman from going in who's six months pregnant and saying she's three months pregnant?

Question. If this decision is permitted to stand, how long do you think it will be before the right to life is denied other classes of people?

Mr. HOGAN. Well, that would be speculative on my part. I will comment that the Florida state legislature has had introduced a euthanasia bill which says that an individual can decide when his life will be destroyed but—now get this—if you think that I am exaggerating in what I said during my introductory remarks about where this is going to take us—this proposed statute says that when an individual is not competent to make that decision for himself, it can be made by his next of kin! So that means that any of us has the right to say, "My mother is senile, a dreg on society, and it's very expensive for me to keep her in that nursing home, and she doesn't make too much sense when I go to see her anyway. She's not competent to make that decision, that she ought to now

die so I'm going to make it for her." If that doesn't shock the conscience of America, nothing will.

Question. You make a parallel with Nazi Germany. Just as speculation, suppose we were living at the time of Nazi Germany, and we knew this was going on, but we were unable to change it. I don't know what the demands would be then. But to bring it to our present situation, suppose the Constitutional amendment is not successful, or it appears it's going to be 70 years. Suppose it is that long. We are faced, or people who believe that life begins at conception are faced, with many years of killing of their fellow citizens, their fellow human beings. Would you be inclined to speculate or to recommend any sort of remedial action? I mean, what does one do if all the old people are being killed off? What would be the responsibility of their fellow citizens?

Mr. HOGAN. Well, that would be a difficult question to answer, because if you accept our form of government, where we're supposedly a government of laws and not of men, (and, as an attorney, my confidence in that situation as existing in the United States is very shaken at this point), we have to work within the system. There is a vehicle through which we can impose the will of the majority on the courts and that route which is open to us is the Constitutional amendment. That is the route I have chosen.

Question. Of course, if the Gallup Poll is right, and it's not the will of the majority, that makes it in an even more difficult, isn't it? Because it's still medically, morally and ethically a human being.

Mr. HOGAN. Yes, it's a very dark day. Maybe we should start shopping for another country.

Question. What is your response to those who have said that your amendment would threaten religious freedom for those who do not believe in abortion?

Mr. HOGAN. First of all, there are several sects which oppose abortion. Orthodox Jews are as opposed to abortion as any group in America. But again, as I said, earlier, this is not a religious issue. This is a moral issue. This is a legal issue. The point is that the unborn child has legal rights that have now been obliterated. He had those rights. We've always given him the legal right to inherit, to sue, have a guardian appointed for him, to have things done to preserve his life. We've always done that. And now we say he has no right to live. So this is a legal, medical and moral question. It is not a religious question. But we ought not even to consider the religious aspects of this, because I think they are extraneous to what it is we're talking about.

Question. Congressman, a lot of women are going to be concerned with this in terms of its enforceability. What you are doing in fact, with this restrictive abortion law, is

forcing us back to the back-alley abortionist.

Mr. HOGAN. First of all, if it's illegal, a woman should not go to any abortionist, whether it's back alley or a fancy Fifth Avenue walkup abortion mill. The point is, if it's illegal, or if it's immoral, she ought not to do that. Some of the present abortion mills are just as shocking in their hygiene and competence of their personnel as the back alley abortionist. One of the other tragedies, of this is the number of babies not available for adoption in this country today. There are many homes that want children. So when we say an unwanted child, perhaps it's unwanted by that one individual, but there are a lot of other human beings who do want that child. There are ten couples who do want that child. There are ten couples who want to adopt a child for every adoptive child available. And that's the problem. I know all the arguments of women who have said, "I have the right to do with my body whatever I want." She does not have that right! She does not have the right to commit suicide. She does not have the right to engage in prostitution. She does not have the right to take drugs. She does not have the right to take a part of her body—her fist—and smash it into someone else's face. She has a limited use of her body, and a limited right to use her body as long as it does not interfere with the rights of other human beings. And that's the crux of this issue.

Question. Thank you, Congressman Hogan.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET REQUEST FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(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, for the information of the Members of the House, I am pleased to submit details on the fiscal 1974 budget request for military construction. The total of the request for a new obligational authority is \$2,937,900,000. This compares with an appropriated amount for fiscal 1973 for \$2,323,221,000.

As indicated, the total increase in funds is almost \$615 million. Of this, \$432 million is for military construction and \$183 million for family housing.

The number of new family housing units requested this year is 11,688. This compares to the 11,720 funded directly last year and the 11,938 new units programmed from all funds last year. The

Army has greatly increased its new family housing units as compared to last year, whereas the other services have declined. Nevertheless, the amount programmed for new units in fiscal year 1974 is \$357,604,000, an increase of approximately \$50 million over the previous year. This is largely due to proposals to upgrade the type of housing being constructed and to meet cost increases. The amount for improvements and minor construction of family housing is to increase by \$5.6 million from fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974. Last year the committee added \$13 million to the minor construction program, so that overall there are significant increases in this important area. There are also major increases for operation—\$40 million—and maintenance—\$45 million. There is a significant increase in leased units from approximately 14,000 units in fiscal year 1973 to about 16,700 units in fiscal year 1974.

A major increase in military construction is for Army bachelor housing facilities. This program has been increased from \$238 to \$412 million from fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974, an increase of \$174 million.

There is another lesser increase of \$27 million in the medical category. The total requested for fiscal year 1974, which is \$118 million, would have been considerably higher had not the new generation hospital proposed at Travis Air Force Base been slipped from fiscal year 1974 to fiscal year 1975, because of the complexity of the planning involved. There is likewise no construction money for the Combined Armed Services Medical School. This is largely due to the fact that DOD apparently has not defined the manner in which the school will be organized.

Pollution abatement funds are to increase for the Navy and decrease for the other services.

The overall picture for military construction for 1974 poses a healthy increase over previous programs and recognition of the fact that there is a requirement for improved living, working, and training facilities for the military services if morale and retention goals are to be achieved.

I have prepared a table showing a comparison of funding for 1973 and funding requests for 1974 by agency and item:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION ACT, 1974

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1973	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, 1974	Increase (+) or decrease (—), 1974 budget compared with 1973 appropriations	Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1973	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, 1974	Increase (+) or decrease (—), 1974 budget compared with 1973 appropriations
Military construction, Army.....	\$413,955,000	\$664,900,000	+ \$250,945,000	Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	\$7,000,000	\$10,000,000	+ \$3,000,000
Military construction, Navy.....	517,830,000	685,400,000	+ 167,570,000	Total, military construction.....	1,355,841,000	1,787,500,000	+ 431,659,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	265,552,000	291,900,000	+ 26,348,000	Family housing, Defense.....	1,064,046,000	1,250,567,000	+ 186,521,000
Military construction, Defense agencies.....	36,704,000	19,100,000	- 17,604,000	Portion applied to debt reduction.....	-96,666,000	-100,167,000	- 3,501,000
Transfer, not to exceed.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	—	Subtotal, family housing.....	967,380,000	1,150,400,000	+ 183,020,000
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	40,000,000	35,200,000	- 4,800,000	Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,323,221,000	2,937,900,000	+ 614,679,000
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	16,100,000	20,000,000	+ 3,900,000				
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	38,200,000	40,700,000	+ 2,500,000				
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	20,500,000	20,300,000	- 200,000				

THE VERY SAD PROBLEM OF AMERICAN MIA'S AND THEIR FAMILIES

(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, the moment of truth is fast approaching for the

families of American MIA's. Prisoners of war lists thus far published by the Communists show a shockingly large number who still are unaccounted for. It is a very

sad commentary that many and quite probably the majority of the 1,300 who are carried as missing in action will not be found. It is to the families of these brave men that the sympathy of all America should go out. These are days of terrible trial to wives, children, mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers of the missing.

Some of those listed as missing will, of course, eventually be accounted for and some of them will be returned to their homes. Surely, there are those who are in the hands of the Vietcong or the Pathet Lao or in remote areas in South Vietnam or Laos. Still others may be in hiding in small villages as yet unaware of the cease-fire.

The brave families who still must sit and wait for word while others around them rejoice at the virtually certain return of their loved ones are truly the heroic figures of this tragic war. Every family in our country which is held in this terrible suspense should be helped and comforted by all those around them.

TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, on behalf of 13 colleagues and myself, legislation to give news reporters and their editors near-absolute privilege to protect confidential sources of information.

Frankly, I am appalled that this legislation is necessary. It should not be. The first amendment in the Bill of Rights states quite clearly that freedom of the press is not to be abridged. But a serious threat has arisen as a result of Supreme Court action last year. The threat appears even more ominous in the current climate of repression against the news media.

As Members know, the Supreme Court ruled 5 to 4 that a reporter has no automatic right to refuse to appear before a grand jury; to refuse to divulge information gained in confidence, and to refuse to name the source of the information. The result was to legitimize an open subpoena season on investigative reporters. All too often the pursuit of a reporter's source assumes greater importance than an investigation of the abuses the story may have revealed.

Certain other relationships in our society are deemed sufficiently important to be classified as privileged communications. These include communication between husband and wife, between doctor and patient, and between lawyer and client. As a lawyer and former prosecutor concerned about the free flow of information in our society, I believe the reporter-source relationship is at least as important as these other privileges.

It was horrifying to me that the Supreme Court did not recognize the reporter-source privilege as a commonlaw right, let alone a constitutional right. It is all too easy to visualize the chilling effect on the news media.

An investigative reporter now faces an agonizing dilemma: Am I prepared to go

to jail to protect this source? Which leads to the next question: Is this story really worth the trouble? How many stories revealing abuse of power or wrongdoing in our society will end up spiked on a desk or dust-covered in a reporter's drawer—never to reach the public because of a lack of privilege to protect the source? And how many informants will entrust their careers and the well-being of their families—when they can't predict what a reporter will do if faced with the choice of revealing the informant or going to jail. The logical extreme of this vision is a journalism output of stultifying blandness designed not to offend the sensibilities of the local district attorney. It must never be allowed to happen if this country is to survive as a free society.

In last year's decisions the Supreme Court did point out that Congress may enact legislation to give news personnel the privilege to protect sources. I believe the legislation we are introducing today can offer sufficient protection.

Basically, the bill would offer newsmen absolute privilege, with the stipulation that this privilege could not be used as a defense in a civil libel suit. There are significant differences, however, between our bill and other news shield legislation.

First, it is spelled out that the privilege extends to editors or supervisors of the reporter who may have knowledge of confidential material or sources. Much of the investigative reporting in this country is done on a "team" basis and this language is to cover the possibility of the editor being subpoenaed without privilege.

Second, the bill specifically closes the loophole opened by a court in Los Angeles when reporter William Farr temporarily left the news media. It was on this basis that he was jailed for refusing to reveal the source of a story in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner. Our bill covers a reporter regardless of whether he left the news media after the story appeared.

Our bill also covers material gathered for the story but left unpublished or not broadcast.

There is no provision in this bill setting criteria for a U.S. district court order to remove privilege under certain circumstances. It was our feeling after reviewing recent rulings that as few loopholes as possible should be left.

I urge favorable consideration for our bill.

PERENNIAL FISCAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this 93d Congress under a cloud of fiscal uncertainty we are hearing a lot about how the Congress needs to reassert its authority over the budgetary processes of the Federal Government, and how the House and Senate need to stand up on their hind legs and take back the control they have lost over Federal appropriations.

One of the perennial fiscal problems we face is our inability to process the annual appropriation bills before the

start of the new fiscal year to which they apply. During the past 8 years, only six of nearly 100 regular appropriation bills became law before the beginning of the new fiscal year. The 91st and 92d Congresses saw none of these bills approved in time.

Now, there are many valid reasons for these delays, not the least of which is the ever increasing amount of time required to review a Federal budget that becomes more complex each year. But, the fact is that every funding bill delayed past July 1 creates confusion and hardship at all levels of government, and leaves schools, hospitals, and communities all over the country in a fiscal limbo.

I think one of the best places to begin fiscal reform is right here, by changing the Federal fiscal year to coincide with the regular calendar year, and today 90 of my colleagues and I are introducing legislation to accomplish this.

This change from a July-June Federal budgetary period to a January-December one would eliminate much of the present confusion, extend our fiscal deadline, and bring the system into line with the realities of our present congressional schedule and workload.

The current situation is disruptive not only for the Federal budgetary process, but also for the managing and planning of State and local budgets throughout the country. The Federal Government is not the only place where administrators are by law accountable on a split calendar year basis. All but three of the States use the same fiscal year as the Federal Government. This at one time may have been convenient, but any convenience has long since ceased to exist.

Public understanding of the fiscal process is another victim of our present system. The split year really lends itself well to the kinds of shell games some folk seem to enjoy playing with the budget. It is difficult enough for Members of Congress who are closely associated with the budgetary process to understand the complexities of split-year accounting, but for much of the general public, the whole system is a complete mystery.

I know that I do not have to explain to any other Member of Congress the results of the failure of our present system. We have all heard from the educators when the education bills are late; we have heard from the hospital administrators, from the builders, from our State and local officials, and from many others when appropriation bills have been delayed.

Of course, when we have a veto situation, as with the fiscal 1973 Labor-HEW bill, these problems are compounded, but the point is, if we could put our own fiscal house in order here in Congress, we would be in a much better position to deal with such contingencies.

The difficulties we face in this area of fiscal timing have no single source, but have developed because of a number of substantial changes which have occurred in Congress and in the Federal Government in recent years. Above all, these problems are not the result of obstinacy, of procrastination, or of intentional delay. They are of quite a different nature.

Take the budget for example. I have served in this body since 1957, and have been closely associated with its operations since 1949. During that time I have seen the Federal budget move from around \$41 billion annually to where it is today.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have watched and waited while authorization bills were stalled in committee, necessitating a rush of tardy appropriations during the legislative logjam that occurs near the end of a late-running session of Congress.

One of the principal reasons for this is that the large number of annual authorizations and the proliferation of Federal programs in all areas have required longer and longer periods for consideration of both authorization and appropriation bills.

As the role of the Federal Government expands, it becomes more and more difficult for Congress not only to obtain the kind of information we need to legislate and to appropriate wisely, but also to digest it, to analyze it in order to arrive at any meaningful conclusions on which to base policy decisions, and this process simply takes more time than we are allotted under our present Federal fiscal year system.

In recent years, some appropriation bills have not been enacted until the 12th month after the budget was presented. Major appropriation bills may require nearly a year for enactment, and on the average over the past decade, the largest ones have required about 8 months. We are, in effect, already operating on a calendar year basis.

As we look at the problems associated with changing the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year, it is apparent that the benefits of such a shift far outweigh the disadvantages.

Perhaps more to the point, there are no compelling reasons why such a change should not be made, and many good reasons why it should.

For instance, many businesses have a natural fiscal year, which ends at the seasonal low of their activities. In the administration of Federal finances, however, there is no natural period for receipts and expenditures.

Tax collections and other receipts reach their low point in October, with other lows in March, May, and July, and peaks in April, June, September, and intermediate levels in other months.

Expenditures reach low points in February and July, but tend more toward 2- or 3-month highs rather than monthly peaks.

Obligations data show a different month-to-month pattern from receipts or expenditures. One review of obligations, for instance, showed that the high months for defense obligations were January, June, and November, and that the high months for nondefense obligations were April and June, followed by September and November.

These patterns occur despite the fact that the fiscal year ends with June.

But, if there is no natural fiscal year for the U.S. Treasury, there definitely is one for the U.S. Congress. That year starts with the beginning of each ses-

sion in January and ends with the close of the session—usually December now.

No one who has been associated with the work of the Congress will deny that we all tend to think in terms of winding up a session, and cleaning up or clearing the legislative decks for the new one. This is the self-imposed deadline we work toward, the end of the natural period for the conduct of the congressional business—including the business of appropriation.

If we cannot use the argument that the present fiscal year is natural, neither can we raise the objection that it should not be changed because of tradition.

Over a hundred years ago Congress ran into a similar problem when they met in December and tried in the next 3 or 4 weeks to pass all appropriation bills for a fiscal year beginning January 1.

This system worked for a time, but when the activities of the Federal Government increased and the budget expanded and became more complex, Congress kept falling further and further behind.

So, in 1842, the fiscal year was pushed 6 months ahead to begin on July 1. Why should we now hesitate to make a similar needed change?

The shift from the split year to a calendar year would not be without problems, of course. Some Members may feel that they would not be able to exert the impact they would like on Federal fiscal matters, since in the first session of each Congress, the Government would be operating on funds appropriated by a previous session of Congress.

Another problem relates to the budget and the economic report. The budget would have to be delayed until the spring if it is to contain any information about the finances of the previous fiscal year.

Congress rarely gets organized until well into February anyway, and the budget delay would also afford the Appropriations Committees more opportunity for independent examination of special fiscal problems which they feel need more attention, prior to receipt of the line-item justifications.

The economic report might become a semiannual or quarterly report, and in this way the timespan for economic forecasting and advance planning might be reduced.

There are likely to be problems for State and local governments in adjusting to a change in the Federal fiscal year, but again, the obvious benefits to administration and long-range planning would outweigh the disadvantages of such adjustments.

I will be the first to concede that simply changing the dates of the fiscal year would do little to solve some of the more basic authorization-appropriation problems we face.

Aside from allowing Congress to "make an honest woman" of our fiscal process by legitimatizing what we are doing now in actual practice, the principal benefits of changing the fiscal year would be in helping those whose operations are dependent on Federal funds to plan better, and hopefully, to utilize our tax dollars more wisely and effectively.

I do not believe that this, in itself, is an inconsequential goal.

There are many aspects of the authorization-appropriation process which need improvement, even drastic overhauling. The quality of the budgetary information on which Congress must base its funding decisions, for example, and the whole question of how we can accurately measure program effectiveness, need attention. The problem of how to project budgetary needs for the next fiscal year with any kind of preciseness is another problem that currently plagues the executive branch as well as the Congress. And perhaps the biggest problem, of course, is how Congress can deal with the level of the total budget, as well as the individual items.

Clearly, all these problems demand our attention and our conscientious efforts if we are to adequately fulfill our responsibilities as legislators.

But, we have to crawl before we can walk, and looking at the situation very realistically and practically, I believe the place to start is with a change in the dates of the Federal fiscal year. The time is right, the climate is right, and the need is clear, so I urge my colleagues to support the proposal we are presenting this afternoon.

NO RETURN TO VIETNAM

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which provides that, after the release of all American prisoners of war and a full accounting for all our missing in action, no further expenditures may be made for U.S. military involvement in Indochina without specific congressional approval. This restriction applies to all funds, including those which were appropriated prior to the signing of the Paris ceasefire agreement.

This bill is identical to S. 578 which was introduced in the Senate on Friday, January 26, by Senator CASE and Senator CHURCH. I am honored to have as cosponsors of this legislation Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Miss JORDAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YATRON.

The American public welcomes the end of the lengthy and tragic U.S. involvement in the Indochina fighting, and in my judgment it wants no recommitment of our military forces in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia once our POW's are home and our MIA's are accounted for. However, unless this Congress takes the initiative in reasserting its rightful role, the

road will remain open to the President to reinvolve American military forces in the Indochina struggle.

The present cease-fire in Indochina represents a very fragile peace, for its success depends upon the cooperation of adversaries who are fundamentally opposed to each other and who have been willing to continue their armed conflict for two decades. The cease-fire agreement leaves unanswered the basic question of how the peace will be enforced.

President Nixon has made the ominous suggestion that the United States would "see to it" that the agreement would be carried out. Realistically, in the event of a breach of the agreement by Communist forces the only means which the United States has to achieve the enforcement of the agreement is the reintroduction of American troops, tanks, and ships into Vietnam and a resumption of massive aerial bombing. However, the American public simply does not want that course of action, and it is the responsibility of this Congress to see to it that the will of the people is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, the past decade has witnessed the steady erosion of the stature of the legislative branch of our Government. Even when popular opposition to the Vietnam conflict grew to enormous proportions in America and the ramifications of the U.S. involvement threatened to shatter the foundations of our society, this Congress remained virtually paralyzed.

The time has come for Congress to reestablish its authority in relation to the President. Now that all American forces are being withdrawn from Indochina pursuant to the Paris agreement, the U.S. Government must abandon any lingering notion that it may engage in future military operations in Indochina. The President's authority as Commander in Chief does not give him the power to intervene on behalf of foreign governments whenever or wherever he pleases. Our Founding Fathers denied such unfettered authority to the President, and they gave to this Congress the power to declare war and control the national purse strings. We Members of Congress have an obligation to take notice of that separation of power and of our responsibility to protect this country from further military adventures, disasters, and waste of life.

The legislation which I am introducing would guarantee that once the issue of prisoners of war and men missing in action is completely settled, not one more dollar would be spent for American military operations in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia without the approval of Congress. If we had only acted years ago, the monumental tragedy which has ravaged the nations of Indochina and fragmented our society could have been avoided.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3350

A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American Forces in Further Hostilities in Indochina

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

SEC. 1. Congress welcomes the President's achievement in reaching an agreement with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and its allies, signed in Paris on January 27, 1973, designed to bring about an end to military hostilities in Indochina, to secure the return of United States prisoners of war, to obtain an accounting of United States personnel missing in action, and to complete the withdrawal of United States military forces from Indochina.

In order to prevent further American involvement in hostilities in Indochina, Congress directs that no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended to finance the reinvolvement of United States military forces in hostilities in or over or from off the shores of North and South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia, without prior, specific authorization by Congress.

SEC. 2. The provisions of Section 1 shall take effect 60 days after the agreement was signed in Paris on January 27, 1973, or upon the release of all United States prisoners of war held by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and its allies and an accounting of United States personnel missing in action, or upon the enactment of the Act, whichever is later.

DREW PEARSON AWARD

(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, on December 13, the second annual Drew Pearson Foundation Award for Investigative Reporting was presented at a luncheon at the National Press Club in Washington.

The award for outstanding investigative reporting was presented to the Washington Post for its investigation and reporting of the Watergate affair.

Honorable mention was bestowed this year upon the New York Daily News for the outstanding investigative reporting by a team from that newspaper who wrote a series of 20 articles exposing cronyism, nepotism, payroll padding, and outright corruption in the government of the city of New York, leading to an investigation of the same area by the City Council of New York and the Labor Department.

The three reporters who did the outstanding reporting of the Watergate affair for the Washington Post and received the \$6,000 Drew Pearson prize for excellency in investigative reporting were Carl Bernstein, Bob Woodward, and Barry Sussman.

The reporters who did the outstanding investigative reporting job in respect to corruption in New York City and shared the honorable mention award, each receiving a check for \$500, were Joseph Martin, Martin McLaughlin, and James Ryan.

The awards were presented by the great and gracious widow of Drew Pearson, Mrs. Luvie Pearson. Mrs. Pearson spoke with moving sentiment about her gratification and that of the Drew Pearson Foundation that these two great newspapers and their distinguished reporters had so eminently lived up to the great record of investigative reporting of Drew Pearson.

Mrs. Pearson, in commenting upon the award to the Washington Post for the

investigation of the Watergate "Caper," make the following touching remark:

It makes me a little bit sad to think about the saga of the Watergate "Caper" because there has surely been no story that has ever come up in Washington that Drew Pearson would rather have had than that one.

And, she added further with reference to the Watergate affair:

What these boys dredged and dug up is surely the most bizarre chain of unbelievable episodes in the entire political life of Washington.

Mr. James Ryan of the New York Daily News responded for the three recipients of the honorary mention award for the investigation of New York City corruption.

Mr. Barry Sussman spoke for the investigative reporting awardees of the Washington Post.

Mr. Warren Rogers, president of the National Press Club introduced the guests at the head table and made an able and meaningful address about the significance of these Drew Pearson Awards for outstanding investigative reporting and upon the timeliness of these awards in a period when the press is under such attack from the Government. Mr. Rogers said:

Never in my 21 years in Washington and 33 years in the news business have I seen such a blatant attack as today on the First Amendment.

Following Mr. Rogers, and before the presentation of the awards by Mrs. Pearson, Jack Anderson, longtime intimate friend and associate of Drew Pearson, the recipient of the award last year, spoke. He, too, stressed the grave concern he and so many knowledgeable and thinking people express today about the preservation of the integrity of the first amendment, and what it means to the preservation of our freedom that that amendment shall be the viable and dynamic instrument our forefathers intended it to be.

Another outstanding speaker, who, out of his rich and rare experience, talked about the attitude of some of our great leaders toward the freedom of the press and what that freedom meant to our country, was the elder statesman of our time, the Honorable Averell Harriman.

Mr. Speaker, at this critical time in our Nation's history, when the freedom of the press and all the news media is so much in jeopardy, this second annual Drew Pearson Awards luncheon has an especially meaningful significance. Involved is the right of the people to know and the right of the media to inform them about what Government is doing and not doing respecting their interest.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of the Congress and all who read this RECORD will profit greatly by the addresses to which I have referred which were delivered on this stirring occasion. I ask, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in the following order the addresses of Mr. Warren Rogers, president of the National Press Club, Mr. Jack Anderson, Mr. Warren Rogers again, Mrs. Luvie Pearson, Mr. James Ryan, Mrs. Luvie Pearson again, Mr. Barry Sussman, Mr. Warren Rogers again, and the Honorable

Averell Harrison, in that order, appear following my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

DREW PEARSON AWARD LUNCHEON, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, DECEMBER 13, 1972

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Warren Rogers. I am the President of the National Press Club and it is my honor, my privilege to welcome you once more to a National Press Club luncheon. This time we have a very special luncheon for you, the Drew Pearson Awards.

On our head table today, on my left, the Chairman of the Drew Pearson Foundation, Mrs. Luvie Pearson. On my right, Publisher of the Washington Post, Mrs. Katharine Graham. On my right, former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Arthur Goldberg. On my left, my successor, the newly elected President of the National Press Club, Donald Larrabee. On my left also, the Senator from Arkansas, the Honorable J. W. Fulbright. On my right, Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Jennings Randolph. Also on my right, Congressman from Florida, the Honorable Claude Pepper. On my left, Executive Editor, Washington Post, Benjamin Bradlee. On my right, Managing Editor, New York Daily News, Michael O'Neill. On my left, of the Drew Pearson Foundation Board, Wayne Morse, I guess he isn't here. On my right, a winner from the Washington Post, Barry Sussman. On my left, winner from the New York Daily News, James Ryan. On my right, Washington Bureau Chief, New York Daily News, Jerry Greene. On my left, new man in town, Washington Bureau Chief, New York Times, Clifton Daniel. On my right, St. Louis Post Dispatch, Mark Childs. On my left, the former president of NBC, Robert Kintner. On my right, winner from the New York Daily News, Martin McLaughlin. On my left, winner from the New York Daily News, Joseph Martin. On my right, winner from the Washington Post, Carl Bernstein. On my left, our old friend, Liz Carpenter. On my right, CBS News, Dan Schorr. On my left, from the Drew Pearson Foundation Board, Joseph Bor-kin. Also on my left, Stewart Mott. On my right a great investigative reporter, Izz Stone. On my left, winner from the Washington Post, Bob Woodward. On my right, from the New York Times, and last year's winner of the Drew Pearson Award, Neil Sheehan. On my left, from the Drew Pearson Foundation Board, Ernest Cuneo. Also on my left, Bureau Chief of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, Clark Mollenhoff.

Ladies and gentlemen, as those of you who have been to other lunches here know, it has been my custom to let somebody else who knew the subject better and the principals better to do the introductions, the presentation. But this time it is different—I'm going to do them all.

It is a distinct honor for me to preside at these ceremonies, the second annual presentation of the Drew Pearson Awards. I am delighted that the Drew Pearson Foundation has chosen the National Press Club as the home of this prize, already a prestigious and coveted one in our hectic and—especially these days—much-maligned profession. The relationship between the Press Club and the Foundation is a continuing one, and, in fact, we are talking about making it even closer and more formal.

There is no better service a newspaperman can perform than investigative reporting. It is the hardest, most attacked and least rewarding thing we do. Investigative reporters are the shock troops of journalism. They hit the beaches first and they do the dirty work. There is nothing glamorous about the dirty-fingered business of digging through courthouse files, making just one more phone call to get a date or a place right, risking your reputation or even your life to keep asking who, what, when, where, why and how long after the fancy-dan writers have fled for

cover or long before they even think up the questions or develop the sense of outrage that all good reporters must have.

And the rewards are few. A fellow with a way with words is far more apt to have income tax troubles than the inquisitive, insatiable, tenacious worrier who keeps burrowing after the facts. Which is why I like the idea of the Drew Pearson people in making this award \$6,000, which is six times the usual amount for journalism prizes, and \$1,500 for honorable mention. Shock troops like Drew Pearson, Izzy Stone and the men we honor today make the rest of what we do possible. They take the beaches and all too often it is the rest of us who issue the victory communiques.

I should say, however, that it is the investigative reporter who is far more likely to have his income tax return investigated by IRS. It is one of the hazards. These men and women who blow the whistle on chicanery and moral lapses by government officials must be like Caesar's wife, not only free of guilt themselves but also above suspicion. They thus not only grace a noble profession but ennoble their personal lives in the bargain. All they have to worry about then are threatening phone calls in the middle of the night, being sandbagged by those they are investigating, and getting beat up or thrown into jail on trumped-up charges.

Good reporters, in the long run, have no constituencies. They are the purveyors of truth, and nobody likes the truth, deep down, unless it is about someone else. Getting killed in a war or on the city streets, being jailed or thrown out of a job or robbed of your good name are risks that any reporter worth his salt is glad to take. Because he knows that this fragile democracy of ours cannot work without him. We are the only truly free press in the world and, especially, today, the efforts to make us less free and eventually un-free are as relentless as the tides.

We are both the allies and the enemies of government officials. We and these officials agree in principle on what we are trying to accomplish—to apply the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to our society. It is on the method of application that we disagree. And, while government officials may feel, through a Papa-knows-best approach, which I have seen in every administration, I have watched in Washington since Harry Truman, although the degrees vary widely, they feel that it is all right for them to cut corners because the end justifies the means. Therefore we must be the strictest of strict constructionists. There can be no compromise with truth. If the emperor wears no clothes, we must say so. And when he does, we must say that, too.

Never, in my twenty-one years in Washington and 33 years in the news business, have I seen such a blatant attack as today on the First Amendment. It says that we "shall make no laws abridging freedom of the press" and just the other day I found myself talking to a friendly congressman who is drawing up legislation to define freedom of the press, which can only mean restricting it, which is abridging it. Ladies and gentlemen, the press is in trouble. And, while we won't win any popularity prizes among the people, nor should we ever expect to, if the press is in trouble, then the people are in trouble.

We at the National Press Club this year have sought to emphasize the professional aspects of our organization. We have taken many steps—our closer association with the Drew Pearson Awards is among them—we have taken these steps to emphasize that we are a different kind of club. Our purpose is not to get together and socialize, although we do that, too. Our purpose is to foster the ethics of our profession and, as the representative of the sum of all our parts, to protect the ramparts of the First Amendment wherever they are assailed. Toward

that goal, we created a Professional Relations Committee that is working on putting out a journalism review, we protested wherever we saw a need to, we joined in setting up a Press Information Center to help newsmen claim their rights under the Freedom of Information law, and we have undertaken a study of the media's relationship with the Nixon Administration, with a report to be made public next month. Our voice, so long unused, is being heard. And, as I leave this office, I have every confidence that Don Larrabee and his administration will continue to assert that voice.

Like many people, but apparently not enough, I was outraged by the Watergate affair. If the electronic bugging by one party of the headquarters of another can be dismissed as mere political capering, then the whole point is lost. The point, it seems to me, is that, if, at the highest level of partisan politics, one side can do this to the other, how long will it be before bugs can be planted in the workshop, the offices, the living rooms and the bedrooms of anybody in the whole United States? And, if that is accepted by the American people in 1972, can 1984 be far away?

What we are experiencing here is not, as popularly supposed, a struggle between the media and the government of the day. We of the media are not the issue at all. We are merely the transmission belts of information. We don't commit the acts or omit them. We merely report what was done and what was left undone. The struggle is between the people and the government. The question is not whether our jobs are going to be easier or harder to perform. The question is whether the people have the right to know, without all but the most patently necessary restrictions on what is publishable and what is privileged. The question is whether we continue this great experiment in self-government or whether we give it all up as too unwieldy, too much trouble, and settle into a spoon-fed, automatic-reflex, by-the-numbers obedience to a set of life rules laid down by a chosen few for all the rest of us.

Ladies and gentlemen, our first speaker is a man of many parts. He was born in California and he grew up in Utah. He started in the newspaper business at the age of 12 as a Boy Scout Editor of the Maury, Utah, Eagle. He worked as a full-fledged reporter in Salt Lake City for awhile and then, as a Mormon, he did his two years of missionary work in the south. During World War II he was a war correspondent covering the Chinese guerrillas when he received his draft notice. After the war, he walked into Drew Pearson's office one day and asked for a job. He has been on that job ever since—for nearly 30 years. He has won many journalism prizes including this year's Pulitzer and I think you would agree that he won a different kind of prize last August, the 1972 Oop's Award. Ladies and gentlemen, Jack Anderson.

JACK ANDERSON, In view of the award that we are giving today it is at least nice to be able to speak in front of microphones you can see. Mrs. Pearson, Mrs. Graham, President Rogers, honored guests, it is my great honor as a member of the Drew Pearson Foundation and as Drew's successor to be with you today. I endorse completely everything Warren has said and I pay my greatest respects to those who will receive the Drew Pearson Awards today.

I got a note just as I came up from someone down the line, "why with all the scandal uncovered regarding the Watergate caper has the Washington Merry-Go-Round been so sparse with news about it?" Well let me start off by answering that question. The reason is that everywhere we went we found the Washington Post ahead of us. It's because they did a better job than we did. It's because they got there sooner. And

that they had dug deeper. And it is altogether fitting that they should receive the Drew Pearson Award for this investigative work.

I know a little about investigative journalism. I know that if we are going to find out what the government is doing that we cannot find it out from government spokesmen. I have never known a government official to call a press conference to confess his wrongdoing. I have never known a Federal agency to issue a press release spelling out its mistakes. There are those correspondents who believe that good journalism is getting an appointment once a week with Henry Kissinger. But I have discovered that Henry Kissinger and the other spokesmen of government never tell the press anything that the President doesn't want the public to know.

Now the people who are honored here today are the kind of reporters who want to know what the government doesn't want them to know. Now for that kind of reporting these correspondents have had to dig. There are no press conferences, there are no press releases, there are no press kits for investigative reporters. The job is to uncover what the government would cover. The job is to dig out what the government would hide. The job is to report what the government doesn't want the public to know. As Warren has said, the First Amendment has given us the license to dig out government secrets. To expose the government and to oppose the government and to contradict the government. Our founding fathers intended that we should do this. Our founding fathers intended that the press should be the watchdog on the government. And those who will be honored here today are great watchdogs.

It has been my experience that the government, the bureaucracy, the new elite—those bureaucrats—that not a day goes by that they do not issue some new regulation to increase their power over us. That not a day goes by that they don't put out some new form for us to fill out to make their work easier. To make their lives more pleasant. Now those who work for the public—those who accept their pay from the public are supposed to serve the public. Increasingly, they expect the public to serve them. Increasingly, they are turning into a Frankenstein's monster which is turning upon those who should be the masters. Our founding forefathers understood that government by its nature tends to oppress the free people. That government by its nature must have a watchdog. That it must have restraints. And this is the job of the press. And this is the reason that in Drew Pearson's name we reward those who dig out the stories that the government doesn't want told. And those here today have been selected as the very best in investigative reporters for the work that they have done this year.

Every president that I have known has been a decent man. Every government official that I have known has been a basically dedicated servant. I have known very few who aren't decent and dedicated and devoted to their work. But when a man gets lifted up to the Olympian heights—when he gets up there in that lofty air, that heady, that exhilarating atmosphere and looks down upon the rest of us, far down below, it brings a change over him. And a president begins to feel that he knows what is best. That he knows better than we, what is good for us. It's not that he's unpatriotic, it's not that he is a dictator by spirit. It's rather that all the information comes in to him. He gets the jigsaw pieces of intelligence from all over the world and they are assembled in the White House and he there puts the picture together and so he feels quite naturally that he understands better than the rest of us what the story is—that he sees the whole picture better than those who don't have access to all those jigsaw pieces.

And, of course, he feels in his spirit, he feels in his heart that the country would be better off if it were united behind his policies. And so he not only sees the picture but he tends to present it to the public through his eyes. And he does it in good conscience, he does it because he believes that he knows best and he tends to give us only the part of the story, only that version of events which supports his policy. And he tends to withhold from us those things that would raise questions and bring opposition.

Lyndon Johnson certainly meant well. Lyndon Johnson certainly believed he was right. I had a number of talks with him and I had no doubt that he believed in what he was doing. That he thought that the policies that he laid down were best for the country. And that he believed that if there were national solidarity behind those policies the country would be stronger. Those policies have cost us 60,000 American lives. One hundred and fifty billion American dollars. He needed a watchdog. He needed restraint. Every President needs a watchdog. The government needs to be restrained, because they will try to control, if they possibly can, the flow of information to the public. They will try to manipulate public opinion. They will try to manage the news because this is the way that government stays in power. And this is the experience that we have had here in Washington. We have had it with presidents both Democratic and Republican. We have it from all people who get in power.

One of the finest men I've known, a man I've spent some time with, I've been at his dinner table, I've been thrilled by his burning passion for freedom. The man's name is Ferdinand Marcos. Ferdinand Marcos wore the American Army uniform when the Japanese attacked the Philippines and he was rounded up with our boys and herded into the Bataan Death March. Some Japanese guard caught him in the backside with a bayonet. Ferdinand Marcos took offense at this and he took the rifle away from the guard and he rammed it down his throat and he walked off and he became the greatest guerrilla of the Philippines and men used to gather at his camp and listen to his fiery, impassioned speeches about freedom and democracy. And he fought for democracy and he fought for liberty and he came out of the jungles at the end of the war the most popular man in the Philippines. He was elected President of the Philippines. He is the only Philippine who was elected who has been re-elected. But recently his term is about to run out. He has declared martial law. He has assumed dictatorial powers. This man who has been my great friend, at whose table I have sat a number of times, whose burning speeches I have heard on freedom, on liberty. What do you suppose was the first thing he did when he gained dictatorial power over the Philippines. He closed down the newspapers and he jailed the opposition editor. You see, you can't trust them. Our role is the role of the watch dog. It is appropriate that we are here today to honor some very fine watchdogs. I thank you.

WARREN ROGERS. Thank you Jack. And here to present the awards is one of the gracious ladies I know. Her late husband for whom these awards are named and in whose honor they are given made many friends in a long and fruitful career but I think you will agree with me that he also made some enemies. Yet, even those who were the most wary of him were quick to praise his wife. Drew Pearson, in his lonely calling, had the good sense to choose a wife who would be his good ambassador to both friend and foe. I have never heard anybody say anything unkind about her. Ladies and gentlemen, Luvie Pearson.

LUVIE PEARSON. Thank you Warren for those really, really nice words. And thank you all, ladies and gentlemen of the press, and Governor Harriman and Kate Graham

and everyone who took their time in this terribly frantic pre-season Christmas to come here because you really have an interest in the Drew Pearson Foundation and what it stands for.

This year we are giving an extra prize of honorable mention because we thought that a team of reporters from the New York Daily News deserved special attention for a series of 20 articles in which they persistently unearthed what has been graphically described as a refinement of the 19th century spoils system. As a result of their investigation the government of the city of New York was exposed as rife with cronyism, nepotism, padded payrolls and outright corruption. So the City Council of New York and the Labor Department are now making their own investigations of this. In fact the hearings of the New York Council are supposed to open today. So these reporters have really done a great job in the Drew Pearson tradition. They will come up and get their share of the honorable mention award which is a check of \$500 each, Mr. Joseph Martin, Mr. Martin McLaughlin and Mr. James Ryan.

MR. JAMES RYAN. As would any good investigative reporter, I've got the document. This ironically is written on the back of a congratulatory message from Mayor Lindsey which at least insures that it is going to be short.

Governor Harriman, members of the Foundation, honored guests, fellow subversives, we three are proud and delighted to accept this Drew Pearson Award. As an indication of the status that a Pearson has already obtained in the journalistic sphere, one of the black reporters at our paper remarked that even though we only won honorable mention, the three of us, Martin, Ryan and McLaughlin were all a credit to our race.

This is indeed a high honor but we are not resting on our laurels. I am happy to report that we are already at work on another more far-reaching expose. This one, like the superb Watergate disclosures, reaching into the White House itself. This much I can say now. Spiro Agnew is already making plans to run for president in 1976. He will try to create for himself the image of a statesman, a noble patriarch far above the pusillanimous practice of petty politics. To forge this image he will go before the American people with dignity in a series of televised fireside chats with his dog Chappaquidick at his knee.

If the disclosures that one dishonorable mention today accomplished anything, I think they serve to put up that civil service whose weaknesses and shortcomings were the root causes of Mayor Lindsey's spoil system, that civil service is perhaps the crucial problem facing government today. As it is presently constituted, the system, 90 years old this month, serves only to hamstring administrators, demoralize the people within it and frustrate the many others locked outside by its aged rules. Civil service has failed to keep pace with changing personnel needs and skills. It has ignored, in New York at least, the emergence of powerful municipal labor unions and if it is true as some say that the war on poverty is over and poverty has won, then the rigidity of civil service in keeping minority workers out of government jobs has certainly contributed to this lamentable victory.

Civil service as a subject has never set anyone's heart fluttering. Yet for all its dullness, for all its mediocrity, civil service is the root cause of virtually every juicy scandal that appears from time to time with appalling regularity at virtually every level of government. Our thanks to the Foundation for recognizing this sad fact and for giving us this award today.

LUVIE PEARSON. It makes me a little bit sad to think about the saga of the Watergate Capers because there has surely been no story

that has ever come up in Washington that Drew Pearson would rather have had than that one. What these boys dredged and dug up is surely a most bizarre chain of unbelievable episodes in the entire political life of Washington. But what was even more important was the revelation of what those who exercise great power and authority can and will do if the press is not alert. The title of Chief Justice Earl Warren's current book was taken from a remark that Benjamin Franklin made to a couple of old ladies who asked him what kind of a government they could expect. "It's a Republic" he said, "if you can keep it." Well, I think we are all doing our very best to keep it. Certainly Katharine Graham is contributing an enormous share in publishing one of the world's outstanding newspapers and in giving so many fine young reporters a chance to be heard. The reporters who have done more than their bit also are receiving the \$6,000 Drew Pearson prize for excellency in investigative reporting. Carl Bernstein. Bob Woodward. Barry Sussman.

BARRY SUSSMAN. Thank you Mrs. Pearson. Good afternoon. We're not used at the Post to having deadlines this early in the day so this speech is a little bit rough.

The three of us are very proud to have received this award. It represents 6 months of nearly total commitment, an effort that is still continuing. Bernstein and Woodward were aided by other reporters in this coverage, and I certainly wasn't the only editor involved. So the three of us, who worked together on this speech, would like to state our appreciation not only to the Pearson Foundation but to those other Post reporters and editors who shared in the stories. I'd like to single out several of them:

Howard Simons, our Managing Editor, who early in July said we weren't doing enough to follow up on the Watergate. It was at that point that I asked Bob and Carl to work full-time on it.

Harry Rosenfeld, our boss and Assistant Managing Editor who is known for his toughness and fairness. He demanded proof with every paragraph.

Doug Feaver, Larry Fox and Bill Brady, all Editors on the City Desk who followed the stories as closely as anyone, asked the right questions and often were the responsible editors on any given story.

Al Lewis, our veteran police reporter who on June 17 gave the Post a jump on the Watergate break-in by being the only reporter present as police went through the Democratic National Committee headquarters for hours.

And those other reporters who worked on aspects of the story: Karllyn Barker, E. J. Bachinski, Peter Osnos, Lawrence Meyer, Kirk Scharfenberg, Sanford Ungar, Robert Meyers on the West Coast.

Also Roger Wilkins, whose incisive editorials for the Post gave the reader the benefit of intelligent judgments that, as straight reporters, we could not offer in the news pages.

We have saved until now Ben Bradlee and Katharine Graham. We feel the words of the Pearson Foundation, in announcing the award, state their role better than we can: "The Foundation also congratulates the publishers and editors of the Washington Post (and the New York Daily News) for the support provided their investigative staffs. It is a critical element in the defense of a free press. . . . In both cases there was . . . the willingness to risk retaliation and vilification from a powerful and entrenched opposition."

This, in brief, is what we found out in the Watergate inquiry:

We have learned about money kept in the safe of a former Secretary of Commerce and what it was spent for. We know that those funds were controlled by, among others, an attorney general of the United States, both

while he held office, and later, when he managed a presidential election campaign. We know that undercover agents, hired in some instances by the White House, traveled around the country on behalf of the re-election of the President and attempted to wreak havoc with the primary campaigns of the opposition party. We know about the Mexican laundry and the Segrettis and the Canuck letters and the destruction of documents and the attempts to bug the headquarters of presidential candidates. We have learned, only in the past week, about a camouflaged telephone listing in the White House, a telephone apparently used only for the purpose of facilitating communication between Mr. Hunt and Mr. Barker. We know that, to the best of their ability, field agents of the FBI conducted a vigorous investigation and that many of their key findings are still locked in Justice Department files and were never brought to members of the grand jury.

We learned that the bugging of the Watergate was but one part of an unprecedented campaign by an incumbent administration to cripple the political opposition through spying and disruption.

In other words, the federal investigators in the Watergate case uncovered an unprecedented campaign not just to learn about the opposition—but to throw a wrench into the workings of the most precious machine in the American political system: free elections.

And what has been the government's response? This is the government that has given the widest latitude to conspiracy prosecutions, witness the Chicago Seven Trial and the Berrigan case. It has never feared to go to the public on matters before the courts, witness Calley and Manson and busing.

Yet, even as the General Accounting Office and FBI agents were making startling discoveries into the Watergate, this government ignored evidence of a real and chilling conspiracy to violate the most basic civil rights in the electoral process.

The government worked to quash other investigations, and then its spokesmen, ostensibly out of concern for the civil rights of its own aides indicted in the Watergate, sought to conceal official malfeasance. That was the legal response.

As for the response to allegations of wrongdoing in high places—well, from June to the beginning of October, that is, until the Watergate came to be regarded as one incident among many, the government's usual response was silence. It would ignore almost every allegation or disclosure. No answers. But in mid-October, as the stories got closer and closer to the President—the response changed dramatically.

The government still made no attempt to explain anything to the people. Rather, as former Attorney General Ramsey Clark said in an interview, the Nixon Administration tried to make the conduct of the press the issue—and not the conduct of the Administration.

Apparently perceiving, and quite possibly correctly, that the years of attack by Agnew on the press and TV had left their mark, the government began to call in the chips.

What followed, from the White House, the re-election committee and the GOP National Committee was probably as bitter an attack on the Post as any American government has ever launched against a single newspaper. Dole, Ziegler, MacGregor, Agnew, Colson tried to make the public believe that the Post had somehow invented the allegations and was not simply reporting the findings and statements of federal investigators and others close to the situation.

Ladies and gentlemen, how do such charges sit with the great bulk of the people who hear them? Are they a receptive audience? If they do distrust the press, why

do they, and what can be done to change that?

It is our belief that the public is skeptical of what it reads in the newspapers and to a lesser degree sees on TV. And, speaking for the three of us, we feel that there is good reason for that skepticism. We think the public knows what is wrong with the press and TV—we aren't good enough. Our feeling is that the solution is not to be intimidated, the way Agnew might have us but to do better by being more thorough and aggressive.

In reporting the Watergate, there came a time when we wanted to write about Mr. Haldeman, the White House Chief of Staff. We went to our library and elsewhere and found virtually no clips of substance on him. We couldn't even find a recent picture and the wire services were of little help (luckily, Haldeman has the same crew-cut that he had three years ago.) Haldeman was in effect a mystery man. There is no reason to have mystery men running this Republic. Right from the start of the new administration here is something that the press and TV can do better. Take away the mystery. Let there be more investigative coverage of the action of government as it takes place under the rocks. Internationally, nationally, and locally, encourage reporters to work into the night, knocking on doors, refusing to accept lame answers—as Bob and Carl did.

What will create public confidence in newspapers and TV? It is not hand-wringing over protection of confidential sources, although we believe adamantly they should be protected; it is not better packaging of more human interest stories, although we favor that; it is not having the story before the other person, although we favor that too.

We feel that to a limited extent more and better investigative reporting will help restore public confidence in the news media. But investigative reporting is a threat to government, to its secrecy, to corruption and to institutionalized misuse of power. So there will be strong resistance to it. That is what we fought in the Watergate.

The net effect of the Watergate stories will not be known for some time. Not in a month or a year but in possibly two or four years as the country goes through more elections. Then we will see if Watergate politics are rejected or absorbed.

As reporters and editors we feel that the truth is somehow cleansing, that if we find the facts and print them, then the wrongs will be corrected. As human beings we know that to be terribly naive. In a sense it is a battle and not a happy battle. We can hope and build confidence in our efforts by realizing our limits. We probably should not be optimistic that we will restore anything—openness in government, better news reporting, good will or good sense.

But we must try, and in that way it is not a battle, but an enterprise that can be very proud work—that is its own reward because it is done honestly. Thank you.

WARREN ROGER. Thank you Barry. Our featured speaker is a man I am proud to call my friend. He is without question one of the most influential men of this century. His list of attainments is almost endless. The world knows him as our Ambassador to the Soviet Union during the difficult years of World War II, as Secretary of Commerce later, as our Ambassador at Large who negotiated major settlements without fanfare, quickly and with lasting effects, as a highly successful Governor of New York. Those of us who have been fortunate enough to come close to him, know him as a man of wit and wisdom, tough mindedness and compassion, courage and daring, dedication and tenacity. I have worked with him on occasion and I am much the better for it. With all the jobs he has held, I believe I share with many of you a bewilderment sometimes to know how to address him, as

Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Secretary, Governor or what. With all his attainments, I believe his common sense interpretation of what this country is all about comes through when you ask him as I once did what to call him. "Governor," he said, "because that title was given to me by the people." Ladies and gentlemen, Governor Averell Harriman.

AYERELL HARRIMAN. Thank you Warren for that kind introduction. I only recognize myself occasionally in those words but when you get older, one likes flattery so please don't take anything back. Luvie Pearson, distinguished, all of you, members of the press who are here today, the award winners, it seems to me that I am about as anti-climatic as anybody could be. The show has been on and finished and therefore I will be very brief.

It is a joy for me to be here with you and to share this day. It's quite right as Warren said about Luvie Pearson—I've never heard anybody say an unkind thing about her but part of that is because I've never really heard her say an unfair thing about anyone. I was going to say unkind but then she has her deep convictions and some of them lead to some unkind remarks. But she is one of the most wonderful friends and I am very proud to be her friend.

We're here in the name of her husband, Drew Pearson, and very little has been said about him and I would like to say a word or two about him as I do believe his name should be kept alive and I do commend the Foundation for the purpose that they are giving to his name in these awards. They are the kind of awards which he would like to have had his name associated with.

Now I was brought up as a black Republican and was well established in the establishment and had a very semi-questionable view of certain people in the press who were called muckrakers, if you remember that word, and so when Drew Pearson started his career as a columnist and critic, I wondered about where he was going. I had a friend, a very close friend, who was a journalist, Herbert Swope, you remember him as Editor of the Post, a man who gave an opportunity to columnists—he really started the columnists profession. Giants of the old, Heywood Broun, Alex Wilcox and even Pegler, whom I disagreed with on most occasions—but he gave them that opportunity on the New York World's opposite page and I had a great deal of respect for him and he helped me a great deal in many ways to understand our country and to understand people. He said about Drew Pearson, "he's a man who is touched with a sense of public responsibility." That intrigued me and I got to know him and I am very happy to say that in the post-war years I became very close to him and I am proud to say that I considered him a very, very close friend. As Luvie said, he would have loved to have had the Watergate case and he would have done it well—much as I respect what Jack Anderson is doing, I don't think he (Pearson) would have been pushed aside by even what this enormous number of Washington Post editorial staff were involved in. He would have found something about it which was different and more important and I think that the first award order—and I hope these awards will always be annual—I think the first award order should always be given for a word of understanding of what Drew Pearson did for us and for what he battled for.

Now it is true, and I am not going to take on stirring you up for concern for the First Amendment, Jack Anderson has done that well and so have others, I have had a chance to observe at close hand a number of presidents, the first one really was Franklin Roosevelt.

And as you know he was psychopathically opposed to columnists in general and to some of them in particular. And he didn't hesitate

to say so. It seems as if being opposed to the press is an occupational disease of the presidents. But never before has any president tried to do something about it as this president and his administration have tried to do. So it has a different connotation. Now I have learned from my experience with presidents.

I became Governor and in public life—I recognized the press as the best friend that any public official has. I think that is a subject which the public officials ought to be made to understand. I agree that the press is a watchdog but in addition to that it tells the truth and the facts about public affairs and they can do a job in explaining the importance of issues as well as explaining the deficiencies of the administrations. It is easier to explain the deficiencies because people always like scandal—it is more readable. On the other hand, it is vitally important, there are things that are going on, there are things that are being misunderstood by the American people and these are causes which the press should undertake.

I have been reading this morning and yesterday about this great meeting which has been going on in the LBJ Library on civil rights. Earl Warren made a speech which was very impressive in which he said that the most important subject was equal opportunity in education, in employment and in voting. And he told us what would happen to our country if we failed to give that equality in education and employment and voting rights. Then there was evidently a demonstration and LBJ got up again and faced it and if you want to know what he said look at the quote of the day in the New York Times this morning. The New York Times is one of my two favorite papers—if you want to know what the other one is ask yourself whom you are working for. I never believe in superlatives. But in addition to what he said about what our country should do he also said it is necessary to give special privilege to those who have been denied opportunity before in order to give them equality of opportunity today.

Many of you may have noticed last night the NBC broadcast in which David Brinkley explained some of his impressions of going around the country. Perhaps as you know, he has been talking to people throughout the country to see their reaction since the election and he said several interesting things last night. One was there wasn't very much difference in the regional attitudes towards the problems of the day. And the people were not as concerned about the things the politicians thought they were concerned about—high prices—because they felt that everybody was suffering from that. They were concerned about things that they felt that they were being discriminated against. The high taxes, the payments problems which were caused by welfare, the unfairness, wherever there was an unfairness which they felt they were subjected to.

Now, I learned very early and I am going to end very quickly because I know that two o'clock is the date on which you all leave whether the speaker is continuing to talk or not. I was in the railroad business one time and in the 20's every railroad president got up and said what a raw deal he was getting. I sought the advice of what to do when I became Chairman of the Board of the Union Pacific about 1931 to find out what it was all about and Arthur Kuttner was in the advertising business at that time and he said, the trouble with railroads is that they are always complaining and many of you, none of you ladies I know, but some of you older men here I know will remember there was an expression in the 20's about "throw him out, he's breaking my heart" and that's something to remember. If the press walls about the raw deal they are getting, they're going to be thrown out by the American people

just as if we analyse November 6 that is what my view of that election is. Causes were taken in the extreme. The American people were not made to understand their interest in it and I underline everything that has been said today about the importance of the press to the American people. We must understand that you are serving them, without you, they will suffer in a manner which cannot be retrieved.

Well, there are many things more which I would like to analyse and discuss with you but I do want to say that I fully applaud when Mr. Sussman says, the press has got to do a better job, got to do a more convincing job. I thought Teddy Kennedy this morning showed great statesmanship in either saying or giving out to the press the statement which his spokesman said he adhered to praising the President of the United States. He selected the subjects which the President should be praised for. We're still counting on Ted Kennedy to carry on the work of the men who got this award today—the Watergate incident as it is called. It must be followed through. The American people are entitled to know what happened and I think we can count on Ted doing that. But I think he showed remarkable wisdom and statesmanship in setting up the man that he was going to hit.

Now this administration has started its new career and second term—by the way, we don't have to be so concerned about Richard Nixon because President Eisenhower did a great thing for us. He got through a Constitutional Amendment that no president could serve more than two terms. So don't let's take it overly seriously as to the dangers which eventually may be happening but take seriously what the American people are suffering.

Warren Rogers did me a great service, he gave me the Annual Report of the Civil Liberties Union from June, 1971 to July, 1972. It doesn't even cover the last five months. You read that and your own problems are only part of what our country is suffering.

So I say that this administration has started its new term with a vengeance. Now I always thought that vengeance was a good word. A man starts his job with a vengeance. I suppose all of you would like to say that when you start your job but there is a different connotation to vengeance and I'm not suggesting that we show vengeance against the President of the United States but that we take a good look at what he is doing and also take a look at what he isn't doing. Because that is what the American public is interested in.

So good luck to you and everything you are doing. It certainly is a privilege for me to be here in the name of Drew Pearson. It is a name that we always want to recall and hold before us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for unlimited time on account of illness and hospitalization.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. McFALL) for today on account of death in family.

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. AREND) for January 29 through February 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. PRICE of Illinois, for 60 minutes, on

February 5, 1973, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELLUMS to change the order of his special order from first to third today.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. PICKLE) for 60 minutes on Tuesday, February 6, 1973, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter on the life and service of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Mr. PICKLE for 60 minutes on February 6, 1973, and to revise and extend his remarks.

All Members (at the request of Mr. PICKLE) to have 30 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) and to include extraneous matter and revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. BIESTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HEINZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to include extraneous matter and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELSON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. GRASSO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BELL, and to include extraneous material during debate on House Resolution 132 today.

(The following Members (as the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. MATHIAS of California in three instances.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in two instances.

Mr. ZWACK.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. LATTA.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. NELSEN in three instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. BAKER in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in two instances.

Mr. ABDNOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. CASEY of Texas.

Mr. GUNTER.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. BRINKLEY in two instances.

Mr. DANIELSON.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. THORNTON in four instances.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. ROYBAL in 10 instances.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in five instances.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming.

Mr. O'HARA.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 1, 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:

315. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

316. A letter from the Acting Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the 25th annual report and financial statements of the operations of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory, and the 15th annual report and financial statements of the operation of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium, pursuant to Public Laws 80-605 and 85-300, respectively; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

317. A letter from the vice president and general manager, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the company for 1972, together with a comparative general balance sheet, pursuant to chapter 1628 of the act of Congress of 1904 and paragraph 14 of the act of March 4, 1913, respectively; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

318. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of the company as of December 31, 1972, pursuant to paragraph 14 of the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 979); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

319. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information

Science, transmitting the first annual report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 91-345; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

320. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage and the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

321. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of various international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92-403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

322. A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a report on the disposal of foreign excess property, covering calendar year 1972, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 514d; to the Committee on Government Operations.

323. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting the 14th annual report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

324. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the reclassification of certain land in the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, pursuant to 53 Stat. 1187; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

325. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 58th Annual Report of the Commission, covering fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

326. A letter from the Director, Community Relations Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of the activities of the Community Relations Service for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 1004 of Public Law 88-352; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

327. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

328. A letter from the Federal and State Cochairmen, Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; transmitting the Annual Report of the Commission for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

329. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

330. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

331. A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Commission for fiscal year 1972; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

332. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on logistic aspects of Vietnamization—1969-72; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3341. A bill to provide for improved labor-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. RARICK, Mr. THONE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ROY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WYATT, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. BYRON, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PREYER, and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 3342. A bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. KEMP, Mr. REID, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GUBE, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 3343. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highway projects in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. FISH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. REES, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MCCLOREY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 3344. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highway projects in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.R. 3345. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highway projects in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MACDONALD, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 3346. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highway projects in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 3347. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of commercially produced domestic dog and cat animal products; and to prohibit dog and cat animal products moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3348. A bill to provide for the suspension of air transportation between the United

States and foreign countries in cases of international aircraft hijacking; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 3349. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolverment of American Forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CONYERS, Miss JORDAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3350. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolverment of American Forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOWEN (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. COCHRAN):

H.R. 3351. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 3352. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to shorten the World War I service requirement for the purposes of establishing eligibility for pension under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 3353. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the prohibition on the concurrent payment of compensation for disability because of a civilian work injury and of reduced retired or retirement pay based on service in the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 3354. A bill to improve the efficiency of the Nation's highway system, allow States and localities more flexibility in utilizing highway funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURLISON of Texas:

H.R. 3355. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3356. A bill to provide that certain provisions of the Natural Gas Act relating to rates and charges shall not apply to persons engaged in the production or gathering and sale but not in the transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers in qualified States to claim a credit against Federal income tax for 40 percent of the net cost of State income taxes and State general sales taxes, to transfer to the several States the responsibility for certain Federal education and welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 3358. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 3359. A bill to amend section 6103 of title 5 of the United States Code to

make the birthday of John Fitzgerald Kennedy a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 3360. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments and annuity and pension payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 3361. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3362. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 3363. A bill to provide increased job training opportunities for people with limited English-speaking ability by establishing a coordinated manpower training program, a teacher training program for instructors of bilingual job training, and a capability to increase the development of instructional materials and methods for bilingual job training; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 3364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct an inequity with respect to the applicability of the rules involving carryback and carryover of unused credits for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 3365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the taxation of certain cooperatives (other than marketing and purchasing agencies); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 3366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 3367. A bill to amend section 3303(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the payment of unemployment taxes by certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. SISK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 3368. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on olives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 3369. A bill to safeguard the professional news media's responsibility to gather information, and therefore to safeguard the public's right to receive such information, while preserving the integrity of judicial processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 3370. A bill to provide increased funding for accelerated planning purposes with respect to the creation of scenic highways

along the banks of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3371. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make an investigation and study with respect to the feasibility of establishing a national system of scenic highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. BLATNIK):

H.R. 3372. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for the Federal funding of land and easement acquisitions and the construction and improvement of necessary roads and scenic viewing facilities in order to develop a national scenic and recreational highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 3373. A bill to provide for the comprehensive development of correctional manpower training and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 3374. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act, to prohibit discrimination by creditors against individuals on the basis of sex or marital status with respect to the extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3375. A bill to prohibit discrimination by any federally insured bank, savings and loan association, or credit union against any individual on the basis of sex or marital status in credit transactions and in connection with applications for credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3376. A bill to prohibit discrimination by any party to a federally related mortgage transaction on the basis of sex or marital status, and to require all parties to any such transaction to submit appropriate reports thereon for public inspection; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3377. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3378. A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3379. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3380. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Desert Pupfish National Monument in the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3381. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding and improving the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3382. A bill to regulate the interstate trafficking and sale of hypodermic needles and syringes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3383. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3384. A bill to prohibit any instrumentality of the United States from using as a prefix to the name of any person any title which indicates marital status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3385. A bill to provide that meetings of Government agencies and congressional committees shall be open to the public; and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 3386. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to permit certain veterans up to 9 months of educational assistance for the purpose of pursuing retraining or refresher courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any resident of the Republic of the Philippines may be a dependent for purposes of the income tax deduction for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3388. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his or her entitlement to widow's, widower's or parent's insurance benefits or reduce the amount thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 3389. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments and annuity and pension payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 3390. A bill to provide that appointments to the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate, to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 3391. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FRASER, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 3392. A bill to increase the maximum amount of aggregate payments which may be made in calendar years after 1973 to carry out conservation agreements under the Water Bank Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 3393. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory 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. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3394. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain former alien employees of the United States who have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3395. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery at Camp Parks, Calif., for northern California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 3396. A bill to extend commissary and exchange privileges to certain disabled veterans and the widows of certain deceased veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3397. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3398. A bill to amend the prevailing wage provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to include subsistence allowances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3399. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its protection to workers employed in the demolition, dismantling, removal, and/or salvaging of public buildings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3400. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the distribution of certain surplus Federal property to certain organizations which provide for the education and recreation of young boys and girls; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3401. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts, to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3402. A bill to provide for orderly trade in antifriction ball and roller bearings and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3404. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the surviving spouse of a deceased insured individual must have paid or assumed responsibility for such individual's burial expenses in order to qualify for the lump-sum death payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 3405. A bill to authorize a White House Conference on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 3406. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside of the United States by defeated or retiring Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 3407. A bill to designate certain lands in the National Key Deer Refuge, Great White Heron National Wildlife Refuge, and the Key West National Wildlife Refuge, Monroe County, Fla., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 3408. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 3409. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Service Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 3410. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3411. A bill to provide for improved labor-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 3412. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the mailing of lottery tickets and related matter, the broadcasting or televising of lottery information, and the transportation and advertising of lottery tickets in interstate commerce, but only where the lottery is conducted by a State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3413. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to exempt certain newspaper advertisements of lotteries which are legal under applicable State law, or spon-

sored by a State, from the list of nonmailable matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3414. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 3415. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for individuals who perform voluntary public service by working for certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 3417. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 3418. A bill to amend section 505 of title 10, United States Code, to establish uniform original enlistment qualifications for male and female persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3419. A bill to create regional seed-money corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3420. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Skyline National Parkway in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3421. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard certain aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3422. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3423. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1935, to require certain contractors with the United States to give an affidavit with respect to payment of subcontractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3424. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Japanese-Americans who were placed in internment camps during World War II shall be credited for civil service retirement purposes with the time they spent in such camps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3425. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional minimum amounts to which Federal employees group life insurance may be reduced after retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3426. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain benefits presently provided to veterans who are blind as a result of service-connected disability to veterans who are blind as a result of non-service-connected disability but who have other service-connected disabilities rated as total; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3427. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction, not in excess of \$600, for amounts paid to support a parent of the taxpayer who is totally disabled, blind, or 65 or more years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to

facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3429. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide wage credits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for Japanese-Americans who were detained or interned during World War II and performed compensated service during their detention or internment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3430. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of live venomous reptiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for certain expenses of repair and maintenance of a home owned by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3432. A bill to amend section 5042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from tax for certain wine produced for personal use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3433. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the maximum educational benefits for chapter 35 trainees to 48 months and to allow additional educational benefits for certain wives and widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 3434. A bill concerning legal counsel of recipients of loans under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3435. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business, or any business having 25 or less employees in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3436. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Onslow County, N.C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.R. 3437. A bill to further the achievement of equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3438. A bill to clarify the exempt status of joint activities of educational organizations under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH (for himself and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 3439. A bill to provide additional funds to the States for carrying out wildlife restoration projects and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 3440. A bill to require congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American Armed Forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 3441. A bill to establish a National Amateur Sports Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3442. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3443. A bill to amend the Food Control Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemp-

tion (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3445. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for revenue sharing grants to the States to assist them in meeting the costs incurred in operating public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 3447. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct from gross income the expenses, not exceeding \$300 a year, paid for transportation to and from his place of abode and his place of business or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Ms.

ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BELL, Mr. BYRON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 3448. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. LEH-

MAN, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 3449. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 3450. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 3451. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 3452. A bill to designate the Manzano Mountain Wilderness, Cibola National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3453. A bill to designate the Bandelier Wilderness, in the Bandelier National Monument, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3454. A bill to designate the Apache Kid Wilderness, Cibola National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3455. A bill to designate the Sandia Mountain Wilderness, Cibola National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 3456. A bill to amend chapter 67 (relating to retired pay for nonregular service) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of retired pay at reduced percentages to persons, otherwise eligible, at age 50, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. WYATT, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. NIX, and Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3457. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 3458. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Bridgeport Indian Colony certain lands in Mono County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3459. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highway projects in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 3460. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 3461. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ERLNBORN, and Mr. ESHLEMAN):

H.R. 3462. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GIALMO, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. HUNT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. LANDGREBE):

H.R. 3463. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MCCLODY, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. ROUSSELOT, and Mr. SCHERLE):

H.R. 3464. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYATT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 3465. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.R. 3466. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3467. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to direct the President to freeze rentals and carrying charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 3468. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to provide an annuity for the dependents of persons who perform the service required under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and die before being granted retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. HUBER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. FISHER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. SLACK, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SIKES, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. YATRON, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. NIX, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 3470. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3471. A bill to make illegal manufacture of thin-gage steel drums; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3472. A bill to abolish the Commission

on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under servicemen's group life insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 3474. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the annual registration and inspection of food manufacturers and processors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3476. A bill to continue for 2 additional years the present method of providing benefits on account of black lung disease; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3477. A bill to provide for the conversion of dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River in Kentucky to a fixed-type structure, and the repair of the same, in the interest of water supply and other benefits to local interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 3478. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 3479. A bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 3480. A bill to improve the eastern approach in Rock Island, Ill., to the Centennial Bridge across the Mississippi River at Rock Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 3481. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 3482. A bill to provide for first amendment protection of the free press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3483. A bill to exempt certain income of nonresident alien authors, artists, and composers from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 3484. 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. RINALDO:

H.R. 3485. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes.

poses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3486. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3487. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3488. A bill to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76) to increase the maximum compensation allowable to receivers and trustees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3489. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to abolish the referees' salary and expense fund, to provide that fees and charges collected by the clerk of a court of bankruptcy in bankruptcy proceedings be paid into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, to provide salaries and expenses of referees be paid from the general fund of the Treasury, and to eliminate the statutory criteria presently required to be considered by the Judicial Conference in fixing salaries of full-time referees; to the committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3490. A bill 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3491. A bill to amend the civil service retirement law to increase the retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3492. A bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions in certain cases and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 3493. A bill to define the circumstances in which foreign states are immune from the jurisdiction of U.S. courts and in which execution may not be levied on their assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 3494. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3495. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 3496. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3497. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to establish an Urban Parkland Heritage Corporation to provide funds for the acquisition and operation of open-space land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LEH-

MAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POBELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 3498. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to establish an Urban Parkland Heritage Corporation to provide funds for the acquisition and operation of open-space land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 3499. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3500. A bill to provide that, after the signing of the agreement on ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam, all U.S. military involvement in Indochina shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 3501. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 3502. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3503. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transportation, mailing, and broadcasting of advertising, information, and materials concerning lotteries authorized by law and conducted by a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3504. A bill to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide penalties for the taking and holding of hostages by inmates of Federal prisons, and for the making of certain agreements with such inmates to secure the release of such hostages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3505. A bill to provide the death penalty for assassinating, or attempting to assassinate, Federal elective officeholders, or persons seeking election to Federal office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3506. A bill to grant to each coastal State mineral rights in the subsoil and seabed of the Outer Continental Shelf extending to a line which is 12 miles from the coast of such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3507. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H.R. 3508. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, to establish a National Marine Mineral Resources Trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3509. A bill: State approval of certain ocean facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3510. A bill to order the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in the southern area of New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3511. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$750 in all cases the amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 3512. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the

regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself, Mr. FULTON, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 3513. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3514. A bill to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3515. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

H.R. 3516. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radio and television receivers meet certain technical standards for filtering out interference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 3517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 3518. A bill to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface areas affected by coal mining activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 3519. A bill to provide that meetings of Government agencies and of congressional committees shall be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. REES, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 3520. A bill to protect confidential sources of the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3522. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 per centum of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3523. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the use of excess property by certain grantees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 3524. 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. YATES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 3525. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign

commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law-enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 3527. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medical programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation programs or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 3528. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$3,000 of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution to designate Christmas week as Blood Donor Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. POBELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to authorize the emergency importation of oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning April 15, 1973, a "National Plumbing Industry Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution to clarify Presidential power to order use of nuclear weapons in declared or undeclared war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Miss HOLTZMAN, Miss JORDAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to protect U.S. domestic and foreign policy interests by making fair employment practices in the South African enterprises of U.S. firms a criteria for eligibility for Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NIX, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to protect U.S. domestic and foreign policy interests by making fair employment practices in the South African enterprises of U.S. firms a criteria for eligibility for Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. GUBSER):

H.J. Res. 270. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution relating to the war power of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself and Mr. STEELE):

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to retain May 30 as Memorial Day and November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for educational programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third Saturday in June of each year as "National Hollerin' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to amend title 5, United States Code, in order to designate November 11 of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of February 5, 1973, as "National Rental Industry Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual from the moment of conception; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to an international conference on air piracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent Peace Ambassadors by the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Union should be condemned for its policy of demanding a ransom from educated Jews who want to emigrate to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to placing before the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the dual right of all persons to emigrate from and also return to

one's country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DENT, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FREY, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. MILLS of Maryland):

H. Res. 178. Resolution for the creation of congressional senior citizen internships; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. FREYER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H. Res. 179. Resolution for the creation of congressional senior citizen internships; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 180. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. QUITE):

H. Res. 181. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 175; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 182. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Eugenia C. Lytle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3531. A bill for the relief of Lieutenant Dennis J. Fritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Donald L. Tyndall, Bruce Edward Tyndall, Kimberly Fay Tyndall, Lisa Michele Tyndall, and the estate of Elizabeth M. Tyndall, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 3533. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Richard Burton, Sfc, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Lester H. Kroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Josephine Palazzolo and Michele Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 3536. A bill for the relief of Ramon Herrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Hector and Iolanda Scafati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3538. A bill for the relief of Selmer Amundson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3539. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Carleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 3540. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 3541. A bill for the relief of Madeline B. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3542. A bill for the relief of Miss

Aldegunda Togonon Juaman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3543. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Pelegrini and his wife, Angela, and their children, Giovanna and Felecia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 3544. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Beas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3545. A bill for the relief of Pasquale

Di Meglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 183. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 2218) entitled "A bill to clear and settle title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, California" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENIOR CITIZENS DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Sunday has been designated in Connecticut as Senior Citizens Day.

It is customary on this occasion for Connecticut people to pay special tribute to hard-working, self-respecting men and women who after a lifetime of service to family and community have earned the honored distinction of senior citizen. It is a time, as well, to assess honestly and realistically the status and role of older Americans in our society. Too often this period is one of loneliness, illness, and incapacity, of suffering and deprivation as they endeavor to meet basic human needs for food, clothing, shelter, and medical care on depleted incomes that are further eroded by an incessant inflation that continually lessens their resources.

These people do not need the admonition of a President to ask what they can do for themselves. Their record as members of the human race testifies to their courage, their determination, and their resourcefulness. Yet, at the very time that medical costs are soaring, they are asked to assume even higher medical burdens. Like the pensioner, who finds his promises blighted by the pension that does not materialize, medicare beneficiaries find they are expected to assume larger costs and lesser services in a system where the guarantees are only temporary and the warranty usually expires.

The proposed changes in medicare would mean that elderly patients would pay total hospital charges for the first day and 10 percent of daily costs after that. Under present law the patient now pays \$72 for the first day, and has free care until the 61st day and pays \$18 per day until benefits end on the 90th day. In addition, the initial deductible for doctor's expenses under the administration's proposal would increase from \$60 to \$85 and patients would pay 25 percent of the bill instead of the 20 percent they now pay.

The promise of no new taxes becomes a hollow boast when proposals such as these are actually a new tax for older citizens, who often are least able to bear additional burdens.

Clearly, our budget efforts should be directed toward ending waste, inefficiency duplication and unnecessary expenses. However, budget decisions which deny

vital services to the elderly because they cannot afford them are a severe injustice to those who have given so much of themselves to our Nation.

It is our responsibility to extend our efforts to better meet the needs of older Americans. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to provide outpatient prescription drug coverage under medicare for those who suffer from the most common crippling or life-threatening chronic diseases of the elderly.

In addition, I will continue to work hard for passage of important legislation for the elderly which was vetoed during the last session of Congress. These bills include the comprehensive older Americans services amendments which provide for job opportunity for the elderly, inexpensive and convenient transportation services, as well as programs to help meet other vital needs of the elderly. Connecticut would have been eligible for up to \$1.4 million under the bill toward a State plan to develop a comprehensive and coordinated system of social services for older Americans.

The vetoed National Institute on Aging bill which would provide specialized programs to deal with problems of the elderly and the vetoed nutrition program for the elderly contained in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, will also have my strongest support.

It is through the passage of programs such as these that we will enable older Americans to keep faith with the promise of America.

THE TRUE CHALLENGE OF PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long supported and voted for legislation designed to bring an early end to American military involvement in Vietnam, President Nixon's announcement of an Indochina cease-fire brings a great sense of relief. After years of frustration, I am grateful that American involvement is about to come to an end. I only hope and pray that all parties to the agreement will cooperate openly and honestly in assuring that this cease-fire is expanded into a just and durable peace. This will be a difficult task and we should all pledge our support to this end.

President Nixon has earned our congratulations in negotiating this multifaceted accord which so objectively rec-

ognizes the harsh realities of the present political situation in Vietnam. It is precisely because these political realities are frankly confronted in the cease-fire agreement that now all the people of Vietnam have an opportunity through peaceful means to participate in determining their political future. In this regard, the President has surely fulfilled the American pledge to protect the Vietnamese right to self-determination.

The larger challenge now is to build and maintain a broader peace that will endure. With Vietnam now taking a more balanced place in our international priorities, we can turn our attention to the building of durable and equitable relations among all nations. President Nixon has already performed admirably in this regard, moving to normalize relationships with both China and the Soviet Union, as well as concluding a much-acclaimed arms agreement with the Soviets.

This is a strong foundation that President Nixon has labored intelligently and forcefully to construct, but it is only a beginning, for much remains to be done. As a Nation, we remain challenged in the pursuit of a lasting settlement in the Middle East, a broader, more comprehensive arms control agreement, stable and fair trade relationships, and strengthened international institutions. In achieving these goals, the President will need our support. Despite disagreements in other areas, past or present, I believe we can and should strongly support President Nixon in these undertakings so vital to a stable world and the hope for lasting peace.

MR. NIXON DISPLAYS BOLD LEADERSHIP

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many assessments of President Nixon's second inaugural address and the direction it spelled out for the American people for the next 4 years.

I particularly like the editorial which appeared in the Nashville, Tenn., Banner on Monday, January 22, under the title, "Mr. Nixon Displays Bold Leadership."

This editorial, it seems to me, puts the President's message in the right perspective and emphasizes those points which all of should keep in mind as we attack the problems at home where he indicated the major thrust will be made