

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 5, 1973

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

*The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord; and he delighteth in his way.—Psalms 37: 23.*

Almighty God, in fear of whom is the beginning of wisdom and in love for whom is the beginning of life, we come to Thee knowing that in losing ourselves in Thee we find ourselves and we discover that we find our brother also. One in Thee makes us one with our fellow men across all barriers of race, color, and creed. Living with Thee may we become channels through which Thy healing power may flow into our world.

May our loyalties be deep, our sympathies wide, our faith high, and our hope for better days bright. Make us great enough in mind and good enough in spirit to keep ourselves devoted to the best that the best may come to renewed life in us.

In the spirit of Him who being good went about doing good 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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 261. An act to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments for 4 additional years, and for other purposes;

S. 606. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to extend the life of the Commission on Highway Beautification established under section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 92-500, appointed Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BUCKLEY as members on the part of the Senate, of the National Study Commission under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Resolution 32 of the 73d Congress, appointed Mr. HUBLESTON to the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission in lieu of Mr. Anderson, retired.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 89-491, appointed Mr. NUNN to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission in lieu of Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-259, appointed Mr. STEVENS to the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control in lieu of Mr. Boggs, retired.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-944, appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. HATHAWAY to the Senate Office Building Commission in lieu of Mr. Jordan of North Carolina and Mr. Gambrell, retired.

## AMERICANS MISSING IN LAOS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, it is of the utmost importance that we obtain a more factual accounting of the 311 Americans missing in Laos. The latest list from Paris shows only three of the 311 as prisoners.

Based on past experience, it is fairly accurate to say that of the 311 shot down over Laos, at least 45 percent or well over 130 of these Americans were alive when they hit the ground.

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether or not these men are still being held captive in Laos, North Vietnam, or even China or were they executed or died from starvation after being captured. The families of the missing are entitled to know the fate of their loved ones. I urge officials at the Department of Defense and State Department to press the North Vietnamese, and press them hard, for concrete information on these missing Americans. We are living up to our part of the peace agreement. It is well past time for them to live up to their part.

## COSTLINESS OF "COLLEAGUE" CORRESPONDENCE

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to come forth and comment with concern upon the fact that this Congress has already become captured by the compulsion to continually crank out correspondence commonly commencing with "Dear Colleague."

I am a man of caution and, I hope, a man of commonsense, but I cannot contain my contempt for the current, colossal volume of these communications. We have created a carousel beyond compare, and this is a circumstance swiftly becoming beyond the capacity of many to contemplate—to say nothing of simply trying to calculate the carloads of colleague letters being carried to our offices each day. If this must continue, perhaps my colleagues will consider converting their comments to a recycled condition and, thus, constitute a case for commendation by conservationists.

I do commend my distinguished colleagues for their characteristic desire to carefully convey their wishes to have co-

sponsors in the creation, cancellation, or continuation of certain legislative programs, but let us commence to exercise control in connection with "Dear Colleague" correspondence.

I conclude that if we truly want to curtail costs, we should come home and closely examine the costliness of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will my dear colleague yield?

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would it help if they were addressed as "Dear Ms."—whatever that means—or "Dear M." or another of those fancy abbreviations in vogue these days?

Mr. CARTER. I think it might well help. Sometimes I find myself using "Ms." if I am in doubt as to the gender.

## TRIBUTE TO VIETNAM WAR DEAD

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

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which pays tribute to the great sacrifice made by American fighting men and women in Vietnam who laid down their lives to preserve the ideals of freedom throughout the world.

My bill would provide that the American flag be flown at half staff for one month from February 27th to March 27th. This is a small, but just way to express the sadness of a nation tired from a draining war and weary from the wounds of her lost sons and daughters.

I hope that my colleagues in the House will join with me in supporting this measure as one way we may honor our Vietnam war dead.

## IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

(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, we have heard a tremendous amount of discussion about impoundment of funds, budgetary cutbacks in funding and actual curtailment of funds for categorical programs. Interestingly enough, we heard from the Democratic Governors a couple of weeks ago, and today, Mr. Speaker, you were visited by Mayor Alioto, the mayor of the city of San Francisco.

The Democratic Governor, Mayor Alioto, and the 11 mayors who are members of the legislative action committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors are alarmed about impoundment of funds and the public employment program. They are crying "outrage" because President Nixon has broken the promise he made to them in 1969 that general revenue sharing would be in addition to, not a substitute for specific programs for the poor and the minorities who make up so much of central-city populations.

This was a promise that Alioto told

you, Mr. Speaker, the administration had welshed on. Apparently, this promise was repeated by high administration officials as late as the day before Mr. Nixon's second inauguration. Though the mayors had no precise figures on the total damage that the proposed budget would do to the cities, they could begin with the 36 percent cut in funds for HUD, from \$4.2 billion in actual spending this year to \$2.7 billion requested for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, it was less than 2 years ago that the President of the United States unleashed the Governors and mayors in an extensive lobbying effort to coerce Congress into passing a program in which they were interested. That program, of course, was revenue sharing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what happened to the commitment that the President made to the Governors and the mayors not to cut back on urban programs by substituting general revenue-sharing funds for existing specific Federal grants.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
February 2, 1973.

The Honorable CARL ALBERT,  
The Speaker,  
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 11:47 a.m. on Friday, February 2, 1973, and said to contain an overview Message from the President concerning the State of the Union.

With kind regards, I am  
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives  
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

#### STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union:

To the Congress of the United States:

The traditional form of the President's annual report giving "to the Congress Information of the State of the Union" is a single message or address. As the affairs and concerns of our Union have multiplied over the years, however, so too have the subjects that require discussion in State of the Union Messages.

This year in particular, with so many changes in Government programs under consideration—and with our very philosophy about the relationship between the individual and the State at an historic crossroads—a single, all-embracing State of the Union Message would not appear to be adequate.

I have therefore decided to present my 1973 State of the Union report in the form of a series of messages during these early weeks of the 93rd Congress. The

purpose of this first message in the series is to give a concise overview of where we stand as a people today, and to outline some of the general goals that I believe we should pursue over the next year and beyond. In coming weeks, I will send to the Congress further State of the Union reports on specific areas of policy including economic affairs, natural resources, human resources, community development and foreign and defense policy.

The new course these messages will outline represents a fresh approach to Government: an approach that addresses the realities of the 1970s, not those of the 1930s or of the 1960s. The role of the Federal Government as we approach our third century of independence should not be to dominate any facet of American life, but rather to aid and encourage people, communities and institutions to deal with as many of the difficulties and challenges facing them as possible, and to help see to it that every American has a full and equal opportunity to realize his or her potential.

If we were to continue to expand the Federal Government at the rate of the past several decades, it soon would consume us entirely. The time has come when we must make clear choices—choices between old programs that set worthy goals but failed to reach them and new programs that provide a better way to realize those goals; and choices, to, between competing programs—all of which may be desirable in themselves but only some of which we can afford with the finite resources at our command.

Because our resources are not infinite, we also face a critical choice in 1973 between holding the line in Government spending and adopting expensive programs which will surely force up taxes and refuel inflation.

Finally, it is vital at this time that we restore a greater sense of responsibility at the State and local level, and among individual Americans.

#### WHERE WE STAND

The basic state of our Union today is sound, and full of promise.

We enter 1973 economically strong, militarily secure and, most important of all, at peace after a long and trying war.

America continues to provide a better and more abundant life for more of its people than any other nation in the world.

We have passed through one of the most difficult periods in our history without surrendering to despair and without dishonoring our ideals as a people.

Looking back, there is a lesson in all this for all of us. The lesson is one that we sometimes had to learn the hard way over the past few years. But we did learn it. That lesson is that even potentially destructive forces can be converted into positive forces when we know how to channel them, and when we use common sense and common decency to create a climate of mutual respect and goodwill.

By working together and harnessing the forces of nature, Americans have unlocked some of the great mysteries of the universe.

Men have walked the surface of the moon and soared to new heights of discovery.

This same spirit of discovery is helping us to conquer disease and suffering that have plagued our own planet since the dawn of time.

By working together with the leaders of other nations, we have been able to build a new hope for lasting peace—for a structure of world order in which common interest outweighs old animosities, and in which a new generation of the human family can grow up at peace in a changing world.

At home, we have learned that by working together we can create prosperity without fanning inflation; we can restore order without weakening freedom.

#### THE CHALLENGES WE FACE

These first years of the 1970's have been good years for America.

Our job—all of us together—is to make 1973 and the years to come even better ones. I believe that we can. I believe that we can make the years leading to our Bicentennial the best four years in American history.

But we must never forget that nothing worthwhile can be achieved without the will to succeed and the strength to sacrifice.

Hard decisions must be made, and we must stick by them.

In the field of foreign policy, we must remember that a strong America—an America whose word is believed and whose strength is respected—is essential to continued peace and understanding in the world. The peace with honor we have achieved in Vietnam has strengthened this basic American credibility. We must act in such a way in coming years that this credibility will remain intact, and with it, the world stability of which it is so indispensable a part.

At home, we must reject the mistaken notion—a notion that has dominated too much of the public dialogue for too long—that ever bigger Government is the answer to every problem.

We have learned only too well that heavy taxation and excessive Government spending are not a cure-all. In too many cases, instead of solving the problems they were aimed at, they have merely placed an ever heavier burden on the shoulders of the American taxpayer, in the form of higher taxes and a higher cost of living. At the same time they have deceived our people because many of the intended beneficiaries received far less than was promised, thus undermining public faith in the effectiveness of Government as a whole.

The time has come for us to draw the line. The time has come for the responsible leaders of both political parties to take a stand against overgrown Government and for the American taxpayer. We are not spending the Federal Government's money, we are spending the taxpayer's money, and it must be spent in a way which guarantees his money's worth and yields the fullest possible benefit to the people being helped.

The answer to many of the domestic problems we face is not higher taxes and more spending. It is less waste, more



results and greater freedom for the individual American to earn a rightful place in his own community—and for States and localities to address their own needs in their own ways, in the light of their own priorities.

By giving the people and their locally elected leaders a greater voice through changes such as revenue sharing, and by saying "no" to excessive Federal spending and higher taxes, we can help achieve this goal.

## COMING MESSAGES

The policies which I will outline to the Congress in the weeks ahead represent a reaffirmation, not an abdication, of Federal responsibility. They represent a pragmatic rededication to social compassion and national excellence, in place of the combination of good intentions and fuzzy follow-through which too often in the past was thought sufficient.

In the field of economic affairs, our objectives will be to hold down taxes, to continue controlling inflation, to promote economic growth, to increase productivity, to encourage foreign trade, to keep farm income high, to bolster small business, and to promote better labor-management relations.

In the area of natural resources, my recommendations will include programs to preserve and enhance the environment, to advance science and technology, and to assure balanced use of our irreplaceable natural resources.

In developing human resources, I will have recommendations to advance the Nation's health and education, to improve conditions of people in need, to carry forward our increasingly successful attacks on crime, drug abuse and injustice, and to deal with such important areas of special concern as consumer affairs. We will continue and improve our Nation's efforts to assist those who have served in the Armed Service in Viet-Nam through better job and training opportunities.

We must do a better job in community development—in creating more livable communities, in which all of our children can grow up with fuller access to opportunity and greater immunity to the social evils and blights which now plague so many of our towns and cities. I shall have proposals to help us achieve this.

I shall also deal with our defense and foreign policies, and with our new approaches to the role and structure of Government itself.

Considered as a whole, this series of messages will be a blueprint for modernizing the concept and the functions of American Government to meet the needs of our people.

Converting it into reality will require a spirit of cooperation and shared commitment on the part of all branches of the Government, for the goals we seek are not those of any single party or faction, they are goals for the betterment of all Americans. As President, I recognize that I cannot do this job alone. The Congress must help, and I pledge to do my part to achieve a constructive working relationship with the Congress. My sin-

cere hope is that the executive and legislative branches can work together in this great undertaking in a positive spirit of mutual respect and cooperation.

Working together—the Congress, the President and the people—I am confident that we can translate these proposals into an action program that can reform and revitalize American Government and, even more important, build a better life for all Americans.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 1973.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER—SUBPENA SERVED ON THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following subpoena:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action File No. 27-73]

## SUMMONS

The Regent Cecil J. Williams Plaintiff v. Carl Albert, M.C. Speaker, et al. Defendants. To the above named Defendant: Carl Albert, M.C., Speaker.

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon the Regent Cecil J. Williams, P.P., whose address is 1417 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 60 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

JAMES F. DAVEY,  
Clerk of Court.

RUBIN CUELLAR,  
Deputy Clerk.

Date: January 5, 1973.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1973.

Hon. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,  
Attorney General, Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On January 23, I received a summons and Complaint in Civil Action No. 27-73 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, against me in my official capacity as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In accordance with the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 188, I have sent a copy of the summons and Complaint in this action to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia requesting that he take appropriate action under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General. I am also sending you a copy of the letter I forwarded this date to the U.S. Attorney.

Sincerely,

CARL ALBERT, *The Speaker.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1973.

Hon. HAROLD H. TITUS, Jr.,  
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia,  
U.S. Court House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TITUS: I am sending you a copy of a summons and Complaint in Civil Action No. 27-73 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, against me in my official capacity as Speaker of the House of Representatives, received on January 23, 1973.

In accordance with the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 118, I respectfully request that you take appropriate action as deemed necessary, under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General, in defense of this suit against the Speaker. I am also sending you a copy of the letter that I forwarded this

date to the Attorney General of the United States.

Sincerely,

CARL ALBERT, *The Speaker.*

## MESSAGES OF SYMPATHY AND CONDOLENCES FROM THE AMBASSADOR OF TURKEY AND THE SPEAKER OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF TURKEY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Ambassador of Turkey:

JANUARY 29, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to enclose herewith the message of His Excellency Sabit Osman Avci, the President of the National Assembly of Turkey, to Your Excellency, on the occasion of the death of His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, former President of the United States.

In sharing the sentiments expressed in the message, please accept, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my wife and myself, our heartfelt condolences.

MELIH ESENEL,  
Ambassador of Turkey.

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

I am deeply grieved by the news of the death of H.E. Lyndon B. Johnson, former President of the United States of America.

On this very sad occasion I wish to convey to your excellency my sincere feelings of sympathy and condolences.

SABIT OSMAN AVCI,  
Speaker of the National Assembly  
of Turkey.

## DESIGNATION AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1973.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,  
*Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the following Members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Hon. Wilbur D. Mills; Hon. Al Ullman; Hon. James A. Burke; Hon. Herman T. Schneebell; Hon. Harold R. Collier;

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,  
Chairman.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to submit my resignation, effective this date, as a member

of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Thank you very much.  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRAY,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.  
There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL COMMISSION ON MODERNIZATION OF HOUSE GALLERY FACILITIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 499(a), title 4, Public Law 91-510, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Commission on Modernization of House Gallery Facilities the following Members of the House: Mr. WAGGONER, of Louisiana, chairman; Mr. DENHOLM, of South Dakota; Mr. DANIELSON, of California; Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska; and Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia; Mr. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin; and Mr. ARMSTRONG, of Colorado.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island; and Mr. STEELE, of Connecticut.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLFF, of New York; and Mr. WYDLER, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. STRATTON, of New York; Mr. RHODES, of Arizona; and Mr. HORTON, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 89-491, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. HANSEN of Washington; Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts; Mr. WHITEHURST, of Virginia; and Mr. WILLIAMS, of Pennsylvania.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON BANKRUPTCY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 91-354, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. EDWARDS of California; Mr. WIGGINS, of California.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FATHER MARQUETTE TERCENTENARY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1(a), Public Law 89-187, the Chair appoints as members of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GRAY, of Illinois; Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin; Mr. RUPPE, of Michigan; Mr. FROELICH, of Wisconsin.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 513, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ICHORD, of Missouri; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; Mr. MURPHY of New York; Mr. GUDE, of Maryland, and Mr. FISH, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 44 U.S.C. 2501, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BRADENAS.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a), Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; Mr. ULLMAN, of Oregon; and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 715a, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DINGELL, of Michigan; Mr. CONTE, of Massachusetts.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL PARKS CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 91-332, the Chair appoints as members of the National Parks Centennial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FOLEY, of Washington; Mr. MELCHER, of Montana; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; Mr. SKUBITZ, of Kansas.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. ROY, of Kansas; Mr. CAMP, of Oklahoma.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 91-145, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop the following Members of the House: Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, chairman; Mrs. GREEN of Oregon; Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(b), title 4, Public Law 91-510, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BROOKS, of Texas; Mr. GIAMMO, of Connecticut; Mr. O'HARA, of Michigan; Mr. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire; and Mr. DELLENBACK, of Oregon.



#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HALEY, of Florida; Mr. UDALL, of Arizona; and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW OPERATION OF BUDGET CEILINGS AND RECOMMEND PROCEDURES FOR IMPROVING CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER BUDGETARY OUTLAY AND RECEIPT TOTALS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 301(a), Public Law 92-59, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee to Review Operation of Budget Ceiling and to Recommend Procedures for Improving Congressional Control Over Budgetary Outlay and Receipt Totals the following Members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. ULLMAN, of Oregon; Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois; Mr. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COLLIER, of Illinois; and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

And the following Members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi; Mr. ROONEY of New York; Mr. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. CEDERBERG, of Michigan; Mr. RHODES, of Arizona; and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

And the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL).

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, and Mr. FREY, of Florida.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL STUDY COMMISSION UNDER FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 92-500, the Chair appoints as members of the National Study Commission under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota; Mr. JONES of Alabama; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. HARSHA, of Ohio; and Mr. GROVER, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT FOR CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 602(b), title 6, Public Law 92-352, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, and Mr. MAILLIARD, of California.

And the following members from private life: Dr. Stanley Wagner, of Oklahoma, and Dr. Arend D. Lubbers, of Michigan.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FINANCING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 140(g), title I, Public Law 92-318, the Chair appoints as members of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BRADENAS, of Indiana, and Mr. DELLENBACK, of Oregon.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 202(b), Public Law 90-259, the Chair appoints as members of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. PETTIS, of California.

#### HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) to amend section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 establishing the Commission on Highway Beautification, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 123

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (1) of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1727-28) is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof:*

*"(1) The Commission shall not later than December 31, 1973, submit to the President and the Congress its final report."*

*(b) Subsection (n) of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1727-28) is amended to read as follows:*

*"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$450,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available to the Commission until expended."*

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is simply to extend for 1 year the life of the Highway Beautification Commission.

The Commission was created by Congress in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, and it was originally contemplated that it should have completed its labors and become able to go out of existence by February 10. Unless something is done to extend the life of the Commission, it will expire on the 10th of this month.

The reason it seems necessary to extend the life of the Highway Beautification Commission is that it was late in receiving funds with which to begin operations. It was created in 1970. It was funded only in August of 1971. Thereafter, because of a variety of reasons, it was unable to begin its deliberations until last year, 1972.

The Highway Beautification Commission, on which four Members of the House and four Members of the other body serve along with three Presidential appointees, has conducted throughout the past year a series of some seven public hearings scattered throughout the United States in an attempt to make it feasible and convenient for the public to come and give to us its views as to the directions in which Congress should proceed with any contemplated amendments to the Highway Beautification Act.

Serving on this Commission on the part of the House in the past year have been the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONSON, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), and myself.

We believe the Commission has thus far done good work. We have tried to hold it within a reasonable budget and not to expend any money unnecessarily. The Commission has had conducted for it two nationwide polls among the motor- ing public, the people for whom, presumably, we build and beautify highways, to ascertain from them what they would like to have done.

I believe, the Commission having issued an interim report, copies of which are available on both desks for any Members who desire to read it, that it is timely and proper that we extend this Commission for 1 additional year.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I refer to House Report 9117, page 31, which was reported out by the Committee on Government Operations of which I am a member.

It says on page 10:

Immediately prior to January 1, 1970, 198 presidential commissions, committees, task forces and other boards, panels and similar groups were appointed at an average annual cost in excess of \$50 million.

Does the gentleman from Texas know whether or not the expenses of his committee are included in this estimate?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would have to respond to the gentleman from Arkansas by saying that these expenses probably

would not be included in that total, because the Beautification Commission was created subsequent to the time on which those figures were applicable.

With respect to this present resolution, there is involved only a matter of \$250,000.

It seems to me, while I fully agree with the conclusions of the Committee on Government Operations, on which the gentleman from Arkansas and I both serve, that this was a Commission created by the Congress and given a specific task to perform by the Congress. It has been unable yet to complete that task because the Congress was late in funding it.

For those reasons it seems to me that this is an exceptional circumstance and one we should allow.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course I yield further.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is a Commission on Highway Beautification not a congressional function?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is a Commission created by an act of Congress. The Congress obviously felt it desired the input, the advice, the consultation of such a study as was contemplated in the creation of such a Commission to assist us in the Congress in performing our legislative function of writing highway legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time yielded by the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Of course, any substantive change in the highway beautification law would have to be made by the Congress of the United States. The Commission cannot alter the law. It can only recommend.

The Congress apparently decided in 1970 that it wanted the advice of such a Commission, and the Commission has given partial advice in a total of eight recommendations included in the interim report, copies of which are available here today.

The eight of those recommendations was that it have 1 additional year in which to investigate certain other facets and phases of highway beautification that its members were not able to get into last year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have one further question. Is it not a function that could be performed by the Congress?

Mr. WRIGHT. The function of writing the law must be performed by the Congress, I say to my friend. The Congress in its wisdom created the Highway Beautification Commission and asked for its consultation and advice. In so doing Congress was performing its function, it seems to me, in creating a body the purpose of which was to make an in-depth study and inquiry into public attitudes and desires and then report back to the Congress.

Any change in legislation, of course, will have to be made by the Congress.

I am merely recommending, at the request of the Highway Beautification Commission and the Committee on Public Works, that this work be extended for 1 additional year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman

will yield further, with respect to this one Commission, at a time when the public is out crying for Government to cut its expenses and at a time when the Congress is complaining about the loss of its functions to the White House, I am constrained to advise the gentleman I cannot support his proposal.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his candor. I would hope he would support it.

The SPEAKER. The time yielded by the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I would hope, the Public Works Committee having voted unanimously to recommend this to the House, that it would be relatively noncontroversial and that most Members would see fit to support it. It only involves, as I said, some \$250,000.

As for its being a Commission on which the President has something to say, I believe that is proper. Eight of the Commissioners are Members of the Congress, and there are three Presidential appointees. I do believe any one can say it is dominated by the executive branch.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Texas has explained what has been presented to the House from the committee, in the request for extension of the Highway Beautification Commission, very adequately. There is no real reason for me to go into detail.

Certainly the principal issue is one of extending the Highway Beautification Commission, as was included in the Highway Act of 1972, which, as most Members of the House remember, was not finalized for congressional action. So, as a consequence, the Commission would die in February of this year, without the completion of its recommendations to the Congress and to the President.

In 1965, the Congress passed the Highway Beautification Act. It embodied three separate programs to control outdoor advertising, junkyards, and to promote landscaping and scenic enhancement. The approval of these programs reflected the increased awareness of the need to preserve, protect, and enhance the highway environment.

Unfortunately, the 1966 act contained many imperfections. This was especially true with regard to provisions dealing with the control of outdoor advertising and junkyards.

Our knowledge of how to successfully implement the provisions relating to them was inadequate. We had no real idea of how to go about the business of removing signs, how many there were, how much removal would cost or even what the end result of our efforts might be. In other words, there were still many unanswered questions concerning the scope, purpose, and cost of the highway beautification program.

To try to find satisfactory answers to them, Congress in the 1970 Highway Act, created the Highway Beautification Commission. Its mission was to study existing statutes and regulations, review policies

and practices of Federal and State agencies charged with administration of the beautification program and compile the information necessary to understand and ascertain the essentials of a viable highway beautification program. Once a thorough study was made, it was contemplated that recommendations to modify and effectuate existing laws, regulations and policies so as to better serve the public interest would be submitted by the Commission for congressional consideration.

The 1970 provision contemplated that the Commission would complete its work by February 10, 1973. Because of organizational and other delays, however, the Commission did not really begin full operations until December 1971. Consequently, it has not had time to fully explore all of the areas assigned it in the depth contemplated by the enabling legislation.

To complete its work, additional time is needed. It is for this reason that House Joint Resolution 123 was introduced and approved by the Committee on Public Works.

It would extend the life of the Commission on Beautification to December 31, 1973 and would provide an additional \$250,000 to fund its work.

This Commission's work is important. Its life should be extended in order that it can complete its work.

I strongly urge approval of House Joint Resolution 123.

I believe the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) has some comments he would like to make, so I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time and I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question or two concerning the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Surely, Mr. Speaker. Mr. GROSS. How much money has been expended thus far on this Commission?

Mr. WRIGHT. Approximately \$200,000 has been expended thus far. This was the amount that was authorized, and that authorization would expire, as I said earlier, on the 10th of this month, the Commission not having completed its labors, unless we take action today to extend it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman, I believe, advised the House that the further requirement would be for \$250,000; is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct. The amount is requested, and the resolution from the Committee on Public Works is for an additional \$250,000 for the present calendar year.

Mr. GROSS. Then may I ask the gentleman, why is the provision for \$450,000 contained in the resolution?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman, if the gentleman would yield—

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that the \$450,000 figure is a cumulative figure. In other words, in amending the parent act which was passed in 1970, we strike "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "an authorization of \$450,000, \$200,000 of which has al-



ready been expended." So that what we are talking about today is an additional sum of \$250,000 for the present calendar year.

Mr. GROSS. Already \$250,000 has been expended. In other words—

Mr. WRIGHT. No, no. If the gentleman would yield, I will explain it. I may not have been clear.

Mr. GROSS. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. The sum of \$200,000 has been expended. We are asking for \$250,000 for 1 more year.

Mr. GROSS. Now, then, in the original legislation in 1970, did you not ask for \$800,000?

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman would yield, I do not recall that we asked for \$800,000; I think we asked for \$200,000 for 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. I thought it was \$800,000 and the Committee on Appropriations cut it to \$200,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman may be entirely correct.

No, the gentleman is not correct. I am reading from Public Law 91-605:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$200,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available to the Commission until expended.

So the Committee on Public Works and the Congress did not initially ask for \$800,000, but, rather for \$200,000.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of a staff do you have on this committee?

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. If I may reply to the gentleman, we had a staff of some seven people, consisting of three very fine professional people and four secretarial people. We recruited from the Department of Commerce an extremely able lawyer, who is the Director of the Commission. We were able to gain the services on a half-pay basis of a very able man from the Department of the Interior, they paying half of his salary and the Commission paying the other half.

We have a third professional person, whom we have included at the suggestion of Senator WEICKER, from New England, who is also doing a very excellent job.

I might at this point explain this to the gentleman from Iowa as one of the reasons why we have asked for a little bit more than we did last year. As the gentleman knows, salaries have increased 5.1 percent.

We were successful also last year in gaining from the Federal Highway Administration the loan of a fine secretarial person. This lady has returned now to her regular place of employment. The Commission was not paying her; we were getting her services gratis from the Federal Highway Administration. We are now going to have to replace her and get someone in her place.

Mr. GROSS. How many more are on the staff for which the Commission is going to be given \$250,000 for less than a year? I believe the life of the Commission expires on December 31 of this year.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will

yield further, our proposal is that salaries would be approximately \$113,000 out of that amount. Last year they were \$98,000. The difference is explained as I said earlier. We would expect to budget \$73,000 for operational expenses. That includes Commission meetings, hearings, and investigations, office related and printing expenses, and \$64,000 for research and consultants. Last year we had \$98,000 for salaries and approximately \$71,000 for operational expenses and some \$31,000 for research and consulting.

Mr. GROSS. Beyond the regular staff of seven or eight people, you have one on loan, and it is proposed to hire "think factory" personnel or consultants to help with this deal. Is that correct?

Let me ask you this: Has the Commission felt the need of any kind of foreign travel with respect to the beautification of American highways?

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield further, none whatever, and we do not anticipate spending one penny on foreign travel.

As I mentioned earlier, the Commission has been very busy. We had seven hearings, one in Atlanta for the southern area, one in Los Angeles for the western, one in St. Louis for the midwestern, one in Syracuse, N.Y., and another in Meriden, Conn., for the Northeastern States, one in Washington and one in Iowa in the gentleman's home State. So the Commission members have not been derelict in their duty in trying to get out and listen to the people from the States.

In each of these meetings the official State representatives came and gave us some very useful information, I think, as to their attitude toward the Federal acts.

Mr. GROSS. That is all very nice, but it is going to hustle us to pay for what remains of the interstate highway construction. If we ever get the Interstate System put together and try to maintain any kind of financial stability in this country, it is going to be difficult. It will cost us everything that we can rake up and dig up to pay for that, much less so-called beautification.

I have seen some examples of alleged beautification of the highways up to this point, and it is my observation that it has not been very productive, I will say to the gentleman.

I must join with the gentleman from Arkansas in opposing the continuation of this Commission for this purpose.

I do not want to take all of the gentleman's time. I thank you for yielding to me, and simply add by way of conclusion that I am waiting for the day when one—just one commission approved by Congress—will live up to its promises by reporting on time and without doubling the spending it originally stated would be necessary.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, "Highway Beautification" is indeed high sounding rhetoric. Who in the world could be against it? I am certainly not against it. I am voting against authorization of this additional \$250 thousand, however, to express my protest to what I see happening in my district and across the country. Interstate 55 traverses my district for a distance of about 200 miles. Across these acres of Ozark Foothills on the North and Mississippi Delta on the South are to be seen the

most fascinating natural beauty existent anywhere. I find where there is a plethora of beautiful trees and other natural growth, vast sums of money being spent for bushes and trees which actually have the effect of being artificial in the environment in which they are placed.

The other facet of my chagrin in the great lengths that we go to in my district, and in this country, of permitting this gorgeous natural beauty to which I have above referred, bring intermittently and fragmentarily blotched with ugly road signs.

So I say, let us stop the wasteful spending of money, and the ecologically damaging permissiveness of highway road signs and use this \$250 thousand additional authorization to build much needed highways.

Mr. DON. H. CLAUSEN. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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 283, nays 40, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—283

Abdnor	Corman	Ginn
Abzug	Daniel, Robert	Gonzalez
Adams	W., Jr.	Gray
Anderson,	Daniel,	Green, Oreg.
Calif.	W. C. (Dan)	Green, Pa.
Anderson, III.	Daniels,	Griffiths
Andrews,	Dominick V.	Grove
N. Dak.	Davis, Ga.	Gude
Annunzio	Davis, S.C.	Gunter
Archer	de la Garza	Guyer
Arends	Delaney	Haley
Ashley	Dellenback	Hamilton
Bafalis	Dellums	Hammer-
Baker	Denholm	schmidt
Bennett	Dennis	Hanley
Blester	Dent	Hanrahan
Boland	Diggs	Hansen, Idaho
Bolling	Dingell	Hansen, Wash.
Brademas	Donohue	Harrington
Bray	Downing	Hawkins
Breaux	Drinan	Hays
Breckinridge	Dulski	Hebert
Brooks	Duncan	Hechler, W. Va.
Brotzman	du Pont	Heckler, Mass.
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	Helstoski
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Calif.	Henderson
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Hillis
Broyhill, Va.	Eshleman	Hogan
Buchanan	Evans, Colo.	Hollifield
Burgener	Fascell	Horton
Burke, Mass.	Findley	Hosmer
Burlison, Tex.	Fish	Howard
Burton	Fisher	Hudnut
Butler	Flood	Hutchinson
Eyron	Flowers	Johnson, Calif.
Camp	Foley	Johnson, Colo.
Carter	Ford, Gerald R.	Johnson, Pa.
Casey, Tex.	Ford,	Jones, Ala.
Chappell	William D.	Jones, N.C.
Clark	Forsythe	Jones, Okla.
Clausen,	Fountain	Jones, Tenn.
Don H.	Fraser	Jordan
Clawson, Del	Frenzel	Kastenmeier
Clay	Fulton	Kazen
Cleveland	Fuqua	Keating
Cochran	Gaydos	Ketchum
Cohen	Gialmo	Landrum
Collier	Gibbons	Latta
Collins	Gilman	Lehman

Lent  
Lifton  
Long, Md.  
Lott  
Lujan  
McCloskey  
McCollister  
McCormack  
McDade  
McEwen  
McFall  
McKinney  
McSpadden  
Macdonald  
Madden  
Madigan  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Mallory  
Martin, N.C.  
Mathias, Calif.  
Matsunaga  
Mazzoli  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Metcalfe  
Mezvisinsky  
Mills, Ark.  
Minish  
Minshall, Ohio  
Mitchell, Md.  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Mizell  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead, Calif.  
Moorhead, Pa.  
Morgan  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nichols  
Obey  
O'Brien  
O'Hara  
Owens  
Parris

NAYS—40

Alexander  
Armstrong  
Beard  
Blackburn  
Burlison, Mo.  
Cederberg  
Clancy  
Crane  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Flynt  
Froehlich  
Goodling  
Gross

NOT VOTING—108

Addabbo  
Andrews, N.C.  
Ashbrook  
Aspin  
Badillo  
Barrett  
Bell  
Bergland  
Bevill  
Biaggi  
Bingham  
Blatnik  
Bowen  
Brasco  
Brinkley  
Broomfield  
Brown, Mich.  
Burke, Calif.  
Burke, Fla.  
Carey, N.Y.  
Carney, Ohio  
Chamberlain  
Chisholm  
Conable  
Conlan  
Conte  
Conyers  
Cotter  
Coughlin  
Cronin  
Culver  
Danielson  
Davis, Wis.  
Derwinski  
Dorn  
Edwards, Ala.

Fassman  
Felman  
Fepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Peyser  
Pickie  
Fike  
Poage  
Powell, Ohio  
Preyer  
Price, Ill.  
Pritchard  
Quile  
Rallsback  
Rangel  
Rees  
Reid  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Rinaldo  
Roberts  
Robinson, Va.  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers  
Roncalio, Wyo.  
Roncalio, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rose  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Runnels  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sarasin  
Sarbanes  
Schneebell  
Schroeder  
Seiberling  
Shoup  
Shuster  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.

Snyder  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Stark  
Steele  
Steelman  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stubblefield  
Studds  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Taylor, N.C.  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Tiernan  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Waggoner  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles, Tex.  
Winn  
Wolff  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Young, Ill.  
Young, S.C.  
Young, Tex.  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Goldwater.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mrs. Burke of California.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Conable.  
Mr. Patten with Mr. Harvey.  
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hinshaw.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Conlan.  
Mr. Udall with Mrs. Chisholm.  
Mr. Udall with Mr. Mayne.  
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Coughlin.  
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Heinz.  
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Young of Georgia.  
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Roybal.  
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Nix.  
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Hastings.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Stratton.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Brown of Michigan.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Chamberlain.  
Mr. Bingham with Mr. McClory.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Cronin.  
Mr. Carney of Ohio with Mr. Harsha.  
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.  
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Maraziti.  
Mr. Podell with Mr. King.  
Mr. Roy with Mr. Esch.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Frey.  
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Kuykendall.  
Mr. Symington with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Robison of New York.  
Mr. McKay with Mr. Sandman.  
Mr. Bevil with Mr. Mills of Maryland.  
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Rousselot.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Saylor.  
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Myers.  
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Ruppe.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. Vander Jagt.  
Mr. Thornton with Mr. Walsh.  
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Whalen.  
Mr. Andrews of North Carolina with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Koch with Mr. Wyder.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Young of Florida.  
Mr. Bowen with Miss Holtzman.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
The title was amended so as to read:  
"Joint resolution to extend the life of the Commission on Highway Beautification established under section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970."  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING LIFE OF COMMISSION ON HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) to extend the life of the Commission on Highway Beautification established under section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

The Clerk read the title of the joint Senate resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res. 42

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (1) of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1727-28) is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof:*

"(1) The Commission shall not later than December 31, 1973, submit to the President and the Congress its final report."

(b) Subsection (n) of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1727-28) is amended to read as follows:

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$450,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available to the Commission until expended."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1973, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, February 8, 1973, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, February 19, 1973.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO APPOINT, AS AUTHORIZED BY LAW, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until February 19, 1973, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding

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



any adjournment of the House until Monday, February 19, 1973, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3577, INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 3577, to extend the interest equalization tax, together with any supplemental or other views.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, scientific research and development are fundamental to the economy and security of our Nation. The American position in international trade depends on our technologically intensive industries. Solutions of many if not most of the grave problems facing our country—such as the energy crisis—depend in the long run on the results of R. & D.

Underlying any success that the United States may have in exploiting technology is an adequate pool of highly trained, and in some cases, retrained, scientific and engineering manpower. In other words, scientific research and science education must have highest priority if we are to meet the challenges which face us at home and abroad.

The Congress of the United States has a responsibility in setting budget priorities, including those in science. As elected representatives of the people we know better than any other single group what our constituents want and need, and must insist that these wishes be heeded.

For these reasons I am introducing today a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1974. This bill differs from the bill introduced at the request of the administration in two very important ways: in the amount of money it contains, and in the degree of congressional control over how that money is spent.

This legislation will make available to NSF in fiscal year 1974 the same obligatory authority as the House of Representatives approved last year, a total of \$702.5 million including \$7 million in excess of foreign currency. \$60.9 million of this total consists of impounded funds scheduled for release in fiscal year 1974. Therefore, the bill I am introducing authorizes a total of \$641.6 million, \$59 million above the administration request.

I would like to emphasize that neither I nor the Science Subcommittee have made any judgments on the merits of the fiscal year 1974 NSF budget. All my bill does is set a bench mark for use in a detailed consideration of the budget by the Subcommittee during its upcoming hearings. This bench mark is the budget total which we approved last year, with no allowance for inflation or increased NSF responsibilities such as those being transferred to it under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973.

The NSF, in spite of the importance of its science education and research programs to the future of this country, has had significant impoundments of funds authorized and appropriated to it in the past. For example, with an estimated obligation in fiscal year 1973 of about \$615 million, the administration has impounded \$66.4 million. Three budget categories had minimum spending levels specified in both the authorization and appropriation acts: Institutional improvement for science, graduate student support, and science education improvement. Almost half of the funds appropriated and specifically limited to these categories by the Congress have been impounded. This flagrant violation of congressional intent cannot continue. Strong measures such as the bill which I am introducing are needed to reassert congressional authority over spending by executive agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to prevent selective impoundment of funds appropriated to the NSF for the next fiscal year. It will not prevent an overall,

general impoundment of NSF funds, but it will assure that congressional priorities within the NSF budget, whether impounded or not is honored. It combines the carrot with the stick: if the administration wants to obligate funds for programs it wants, it must obligate funds for programs the Congress wants also.

To my knowledge this is the first time legislation designed to thwart selective impoundment has been introduced as an integral part of an annual authorization bill. I think this approach has advantages over more general legislation designed to prevent executive impoundment of appropriated funds, although I have given and shall continue to give my strong personal support to broad legislation in this area. The NSF is one of those agencies which must have its programs specifically authorized each year, and my Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development has the responsibility of approving its annual authorizing legislation. Because authorization acts are prerequisite to any obligation of funds by agencies such as NSF, they are the logical vehicle for effective anti-impoundment provisions. The same is not true of appropriations bills because legislation attached to such a bill makes it subject to a point of order.

The bill which I am introducing today breaks out the NSF budget into line item categories, rather than a lump sum total for the agency. Section 2 of the bill requires NSF to spend the appropriated funds on pro rata basis for the various budget categories approved by Congress. The percentage of authorized funds actually spent for any category cannot differ from the percentage of authorized funds actually spent for any other category by more than 5 percent. The only exceptions are for impoundments or transfers between categories which are submitted to Congress by the President. Such actions must be submitted to Congress and either House can veto the impoundment or the transfer within 60 legislative days. This permits certain flexibility in the Foundation budget but at the same time assures congressional approval for any changes. These procedures are based on those in the Legislative Reorganization Act and their constitutionality is well established.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point tables which show details of the NSF budget and the bill which I am introducing:

NSF FISCAL YEAR 1973 BUDGET CATEGORIES

	Actual fiscal year 1971	Estimate fiscal year 1972	NSF estimate fiscal year 1973	House figure fiscal year 1973		Actual fiscal year 1971	Estimate fiscal year 1972	NSF estimate fiscal year 1973	House figure fiscal year 1973
1. Scientific research project support.....	\$180,369,112	\$246,600,000	\$274,600,000	\$270,600,000	12. Planning and policy studies.....	\$3,219,556	\$2,700,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
2. National and special research programs.....	49,856,551	85,600,000	109,100,000	106,900,000	13. Program development and management.....	21,768,818	24,136,655	26,800,000	26,800,000
3. National research centers.....	37,174,560	40,400,000	42,300,000	42,300,000	Total.....	494,408,290	598,267,397	646,000,000	673,800,000
4. Computing activities in education and research.....	15,042,905	21,000,000	20,500,000	19,500,000	Impounded fiscal year 1972 funds expected to be released:				
5. Science information activities.....	10,694,898	9,800,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	1. Scientific research.....			700,000	700,000
6. International cooperative scientific activities.....	2,179,996	4,000,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	9. Institutional improvement for science.....			5,000,000	5,000,000
7. Research applied to national needs.....	33,955,291	55,930,742	80,000,000	80,000,000	10. Graduate student support.....			4,800,000	4,800,000
8. Intergovernmental science program.....	800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,200,000	11. Science education improvement.....			11,200,000	11,200,000
9. Institutional improvement for science.....	34,392,183	21,000,000	7,000,000	18,000,000	Total.....			667,700,000	695,500,000
10. Graduate student support.....	30,494,681	20,000,000	9,200,000	20,000,000	Foreign currency program.....	1,996,322	3,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
11. Science education improvement.....	68,316,550	66,100,000	58,800,000	71,800,000					

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FISCAL YEAR 1974

[Millions of dollars]

Budget category	I	II	III	IV	V	Budget category	I	II	III	IV	V
	Admin- istration bill		Davis bill	Fiscal year 1973 im- pounded funds to be released	Total NSF obligational authority		Admin- istration bill		Davis bill	Fiscal year 1973 im- pounded funds to be released	Total NSF obligational authority
(1) Scientific research project support.	274.8	(C)	286.2	0.2	286.4	(9) Institutional improvement for science	0	9.0	9.5	9.0	18.5
(2) National and special research programs	91.0	(C)	94.8	8.6	103.4	(10) Science graduate student support	6.7	17.5	18.2	2.5	20.7
(3) National research centers	46.2	(C)	43.1	1.8	49.9	(11) Science education improvement	29.2	41.0	42.8	30.8	73.6
(4) Computing activities	8.3	(C)	8.6	1.7	10.3	(12) Planning and policy studies	2.0		2.1	.2	2.3
(5) Science information activities	6.2	(C)	6.4	2.1	8.5	(13) Program development and management	28.8		30.0	2.0	32.0
(6) International cooperative scientific activities	6.2	(C)	6.4		6.4		579.6		636.6	58.9	695.5
(7) Research applied to national needs	79.2	(C)	82.5		82.5	Foreign Currency program	3.0		5.0	2.0	7.0
(8) Intergovernmental science program	1.0	(C)	1.0		1.0		582.6		641.6	60.9	702.5

<sup>1</sup> Amounts added to fiscal year 1973 impounded funds (col. IV) in order to equal the fiscal year 1973 authorization level for institutional improvement for science, science graduate student support, science education improvement.

## THE ILLUSION OF POWER

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of Friday, February 2, contained an editorial called *The Illusion of Power* on which the select committee we created last week, and the rest of us also, might well ponder. Among other things this editorial says the following:

## THE ILLUSION OF POWER

If it weren't such a waste of time and motion, we would almost be entertained by the mumbo jumbo that has preoccupied the denizens of Capitol Hill these several weeks. Like lodge brothers who exchange the secret sign or embrace with the secret grip, members of Congress are engaged in a revival of the congressional mystique, banding together for courage and resolve as they prepare to assault that other lodge at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave.

We know they are taking seriously this business of a "constitutional crisis" between the Legislative and Executive Branches. But from a distance it does appear a bit comical. Because somehow, while they weren't looking, Mr. Nixon and his immediate predecessors snatched away congressional prerogatives and carried them back in a sack to the White House, Senators and Representatives of both parties now line up daily to co-sponsor legislation, sign petitions to various federal courts, and generally declaim against monarchical revanchism.

There is, of course, a power struggle of sorts shaping up. But the irony is that Congress will fail to revitalize itself as an institution unless it manages to "lose" the battle with the President. For what is at issue has little to do with the level of federal spending, but is mostly concerned with the level of federal activity. Mr. Nixon shows not much aversion to spending; his budgets grow by leaps and bounds. But at least he aims to have state and local governments play a much greater role in deciding how they want to spend that money.

Congress, though, is choking on the illusion that it now has the power to decide how all that money is spent; that it can actually run the country from Capitol Hill. It is increasingly aware that the programs it wrote and the money it spent with noble intent during the past decade or so have had miserable results. Yet it clings to the notion that the

problems are mechanical, and can be ironed out in Washington.

Thus, we see the cry to oust the tired, old committee chairmen who don't have the zip and vigor that it takes these days to write dazzling, imaginative legislation. They also insist they have to change the rules so that it's easier to write new legislation.

And if imperfections still exist in the legislative process, the defenders of Congress maintain, it is because Congress is over-worked. By gosh, the Executive Branch has dozens of computers and Congress has only one, which keeps track of the payroll. And the Executive has a couple million employees, Congress only 30,000. If it could buy some computers and hire more staff, it could perfect itself.

This is nonsense, of course, but it is being swallowed whole on the Hill, especially by members of the freshman class of the 93rd Congress, who don't know any better. More computers and more staff will simply produce more legislation that Senators and Representatives will adopt without reading. And since legislation invariably creates at least as many problems as it purports to solve, succeeding Congresses will be forced to write more and more detail into ever-bulkier bills. There will be a cry for more computers, more staff, and committee chairmen who have the vision and stamina of adolescents to keep up with the challenge.

There is only one way to reduce the congressional workload and enable Congress to once again serve as a deliberative body. President Nixon has hit on it in his plan to simply close out those programs that have no salvage value and to collapse others into special revenue-sharing grants to states and cities.

This plan might not only elevate the prestige and influence of Congress on those issues it would then have time to address. It might also bring rationality to the expenditure of public funds; the city council of Moline or of Seattle surely doesn't have to be told by Congress that libraries have higher priorities than fire engines, or vice versa.

But instead of embracing this plan as its salvation, Congress gives out with tiresome flummery about congressional prerogatives and constitutional crises. It has used its power to dissipate its power, and there is little left but illusion. At this point, Congress has nothing to lose by endorsing Mr. Nixon's reforms.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, may I take this time to announce that we are scheduling for floor action on Wednesday H.R. 2107, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to spend the \$210 million for the rural environmental assistance program, subject to a rule being granted by the Rules Committee.

That is the only piece of legislation I know of at this time that will be on the floor this week.

As the gentleman knows, we have already passed a resolution providing that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, February 19. The only business for that day—of course, we will give out a program later in the week—which is Monday, February 19, will be the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address, which has been a custom around here for years.

On the following day we hope to bring up for consideration the Interest Equalization bill. It is expected that the Rules Committee will meet either tomorrow or Wednesday or Thursday, to grant a rule so that the Interest Equalization bill would be on the floor on Tuesday of the week we come back. That would be Tuesday, February 20, we anticipate at this time.

May I also say that this bill will be the first major piece of legislation on the floor of this Congress from the Ways and Means Committee to be considered under an open rule since March 30, 1929, when the Smoot-Hawley bill passed this Congress with an open rule. Since that time the Ways and Means Committee has reported each tax measure with a closed rule.

It is my understanding this matter would be up under an open rule on Tuesday, February 20, and I would advise all Members to be here.



Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it intended that the House will meet tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday, with the only business being the legislation the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is correct. There is no legislation scheduled for tomorrow at this time. I know of no resolution or anything of that nature.

We will read the bill on Wednesday.

While we will meet on Thursday, at this time we know of no legislation on that day.

#### POSTAL SERVICE PERFORMANCE

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent report published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, E. T. Klassen, Postmaster General, wrote:

Our (The Postal Corporation) first goal was service improvement. While our service performance is still uneven, our tests indicate the mail service overall continues to improve.

Klassen also said:

Ninety-four percent of the first-class mail deposited by 5 p.m. and destined for local delivery is being delivered the next day. In small communities, the percentage is usually even higher.

Mr. Speaker, this statement will be difficult for many people to believe.

I am sure that a friend of mine, who lives in Kokomo, Ind., would not believe it. He just received a letter from his son in Detroit, and it took 7 days to be delivered.

A woman in Scarsdale, N.Y., sent a letter to herself to test the Department's overnight service. She received the letter in 3 days.

A man in Utica, N.Y., wrote me and explained that a card was mailed to him from Long Branch, N.J., on December 18. He received the card on December 28. The same man told of a letter mailed from Utica to New York City on December 22—this was received on January 2.

A housewife in Marion, Ind., writes:

I used to receive letters from West Virginia in three days. It now takes five.

Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General's statement on improved mail service does not seem to impress the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to excerpts from a letter I received from a mail carrier:

I am a letter carrier . . . please let the public know how the investigation goes, and report what you find. Don't let it go by the boards. I used to be proud of being a mailman, but now you mention your line of work, and people say to you how they received a letter that took a couple of extra days in getting someplace.

A man in Hartford City, Indiana, writes that it took eight days to receive a letter from New York City and seven days from Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a little longer than a week since I first made the charge that the mail service is slow and has to be improved.

In that short period of time I have received hundreds of telephone calls and

letters from throughout the United States, and I am sure that this is just the beginning.

These cannot be isolated cases.

An Iowa Congressman sent me a copy of a letter he received from one of his constituents: It says, in part:

This morning, January 23, I received a letter from a friend residing in the western outskirts of Chicago, postmarked the afternoon of January 16. This letter was nearly seven days en route over a 230 mile distance. The Pony Express of 120 years ago would have done better.

If we can spend scores of billions of dollars on our space program, can't we expend a few billion to upgrade and expedite first-class mail service by reinstating the Pony Express?

Mr. Speaker, a Kentucky postmaster wrote me and said:

Postal Service is not doing a good job. There are supervisors, inspectors, S.F.C. Postmasters and some other high-salaried people that have just an education and no real experience. This is giving older and experienced people trouble. We are using up valuable time making reports that are of no value.

A Catholic priest in Mt. Calvary, Wis., reported that it takes 5 to 7 days for mail to move 200 miles. He claimed that the mail service has never been worse.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Congress will take an active role in helping to solve this problem. Something must be done. We should make an all-out effort to improve the postal service and not take the word of others that everything is OK, when the facts simply do not back this up.

#### INDIANAPOLIS STAR AND INDIANAPOLIS NEWS TRIBUTES TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to include in the RECORD at this point the following tributes to the late President Lyndon B. Johnson which appeared in the Indianapolis Star and News.

The first was written by Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Star and News, and a long-time personal friend of the Johnson family. Following are the special tributes written by Ben Cole, of the Star, and Lou Hiner, of the News, as well as the editorials appearing in both newspapers:

"A TRULY LOVABLE MAN," EUGENE C. PULLIAM SAYS

"Lyndon B. Johnson was one of my dear personal friends for more than 30 years. Ours was a unique friendship. The public didn't know it, but he was a truly lovable man. We disagreed on many things political, but it never affected our friendship. I don't know how many times when I have introduced him to a small group of friends or to a large audience he prefaced his remarks by saying 'Gene Pulliam is my dear friend. A long time ago when I was still a senator we learned we could disagree without being disagreeable.' And that statement from President Johnson was an inspiring and deeply rewarding gift of our friendship.

"It was just about the same with dear

Lady Bird and my wife, Nina, when they met for the first time. It was like old friends greeting each other after a long separation.

"We had had many letters from both Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, the last one just last week. They always expressed the feeling that they looked forward to seeing us soon again.

"I am not trying to write a eulogy to a great President. The cup of tributes and praise will run over from every state in the Union. But I do want to express our deep-down affection for a man we both knew and loved as a true and wonderful friend. And to let dear Lady Bird know our sympathy and understanding come from the bottom of loving and saddened hearts."

EUGENE C. PULLIAM, Publisher.

#### L. B. J. CONQUERED WASHINGTON WITH TEXAS-STYLE VITALITY

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—The vitality that Lyndon Baines Johnson gave to everything he did was the hallmark of his style, and it will be a long time before the nation's capital sees his equal.

His presence began to be felt almost as soon as he moved from the House of Representatives to the United States Senate in 1949 after his 87-vote hair's breadth landslide of 1948.

The Senate was his milieu. He took to its mysteries as a duck takes to water, and he set about instantly to make himself known and his ability and ambition understood.

David E. Botter, later to become a McGill School of Journalism professor before his death, had come up from Dallas the year Mr. Johnson moved to the Senate as a correspondent for the Dallas Morning News. His senior colleague, Walter C. Hornaday, preferred the commoner clay of the House and Botter covered the Senate—which pretty much meant Lyndon Johnson.

In the late summer, probably at Mr. Johnson's suggestion, Botter arranged an evening with the tall Texas freshman for a handful of his newspaper colleagues. The Indianapolis Star's correspondent, as new to Washington as Botter, fortunately was included in that company.

All the issues of the day were discussed, and Senator Johnson did the discussing. His performance was a revelation to the newsmen—he ranged easily over foreign trade, oil and gas problems, the Southerners' problems with civil rights.

What he said that night is forgotten, but not the style. Among the reporters on hand was William S. White, now a syndicated columnist but then of the New York Times. White became the best interpreter of Mr. Johnson among the Washington press, and the two men were fast friends.

It wasn't long before the senator from Texas was given the chair of leadership. One of his first moves was to hire out of the press gallery a big, bushy-haired Hoosier, pipe-smoking George Reedy, the son of an old Chicago front-page type newsman of the same name. As deliberate and careful as Mr. Johnson was mercurial, Reedy was a happy choice for the senator from Texas.

During his majority leader days, Mr. Johnson wore loose-fitting, brightly colored silk suits, and he loved to jangle coins or keys in his pockets while his haberdashery rippled in the light.

Majority leader Johnson never lost his publicity sense, and he knew a good story when he had one to give the press. One day this reporter was sitting in an inordinately dull Appropriations Committee hearing, hoping to get a few notes on the fate of an immigration office at Tucson, Ariz. Some of the committee staff joined the lone reporter at the press table just to keep him company.

Mr. Johnson strode into the hearing, glanced at the press table and noted that several persons were seated there. He almost

immediately attacked the then-commissioner of immigration for having gone to Juarez, Mexico, to hire a maid.

The story appeared in one newspaper, but next day it became a sensation.

Mr. Johnson's influence on young people was pronounced. When he was Vice-President, he spoke each summer to the students doing intern work in the Federal service. A University of Virginia student who later took up a government career returned home from one of Mr. Johnson's speeches with eyes alight.

"Mr. Johnson told us that the one thing that distinguishes the American system from any other system in the world is that a young man who is willing to work hard may hope to succeed," he said. It became the young man's article of faith in America.

During the summer and autumn of 1964, when he was completing the term of President Kennedy and before he was elected in his own right, Mr. Johnson enjoyed his happiest moments in office. The Vietnam war had not yet become a fester, his election prospects were good and the country was solidly with him.

Going to the White House every Saturday was an adventure, because most of the time the President would call the press into his oval office and conduct a give-and-take news conference. Then he would adjourn to the White House lawn and walk for miles around the circular driveway, thoroughly enjoying the gaggle of reporters jostling each other to get closer to him.

The routine became established: If you had something special to ask the President, you lagged behind the main body of his infantry and allowed him to catch up with you. Then you could ask your question, and usually get an answer before the herd engulfed you and you were pushed away.

The campaign that year was a romp for the big Texan. He loved to turn the press out at dawn, take off for a day or so of frantic campaigning that could cover all of New England or sweep the South or cover the Middle West. His face was alight when he leaped into the crowds to shake hands. Once, in Brooklyn, he became so ebullient that he simply hauled an ecstatic woman into his open car and hauled her along in his caravan for a mile or two.

President and Mrs. Johnson, unlike some first families, always included members of the working press in the social lists for state dinners. There is no thrill like attending a state dinner for the first time, and President Johnson was aware of the fact. He didn't forget the men and women in the press gallery who shared the story of his fabulous career.

One of his favorites in the press corps was Mrs. Elizabeth May Craig, the grandmotherly little woman who appeared often on the TV show, "Meet the Press." At Portland, Me., during a campaign trip, President Johnson turned the city hall rally into a May Craig appreciation event. Mrs. Craig, by the way, had sent Mr. Johnson a note every day that he was hospitalized with his 1955 heart attack, and he never forgot her thoughtfulness.

When he entertained the press at his ranch in Texas the day after the 1963 election, there was an auction of some of the campaign paraphernalia. Among the items sold was the bull horn that the President had used in haranguing the crowds along the campaign trail. A joyous May Craig bid it in.

A week later she received a phone call from the President of the United States, imploring her to return his treasure. He hadn't intended to let his bull horn get away, he said, and May would be doing him a big favor to return it. She did.

As the bitterness over Vietnam closed in on him, and his own worry for the men he was committing to battle deepened, the Presi-

dent became withdrawn from the press and there were no more walks around the White House driveway.

Once he held a news conference in the White House rose garden, and while the preliminaries were in progress he appeared prematurely and asked for George Reedy, his trusted press secretary. George was engaged in answering queries from a group of reporters, and the President groused, "Reedy thinks he works for you-all instead of for me."

In a light-hearted way, this reporter suggested, "Well, Mr. President, there are more of us than there are of you." But the President wasn't in the mood for light banter with an Indiana newspaperman, and the little jest fell flat.

The final years of his administration were saddened by the hostility that was heaped upon President Johnson, often by men who owed their political lives to his skill and generosity. Bill White, now a syndicated columnist, was one of the voices raised in defense of the President and Bill was chagrined when, during the 1972 campaign, Mr. Johnson allowed Senator George McGovern (D-S.D.) to visit the ranch along the Pedernales, giving a modicum of endorsement to the Democratic nominee's campaign.

Any newsman who lived in Washington for that golden span of years between 1949 and the end of the Johnson administration has a storehouse of memories that come alive this day. Lyndon Baines Johnson, for all the criticism some elements of the press found it convenient to heap upon him, was a newspaperman's President. He made the front page exciting every single day.

#### DOWN-TO-EARTH: L. B. J. NOTED FOR HIS WIT AND HUMOR

(By Lou Hiner, Jr.)

Among many things, the late President Lyndon B. Johnson will be remembered for his wit and humor.

He liked a good belly laugh himself and he often provided the same to those in his company. Many of his stories were ribald but mostly his was a down-to-earth humor.

When the American Society of Newspaper Editors met in Washington in April 1964, Johnson invited the editors and their wives to drop in for a visit at the White House but he received them instead in the Rose Garden.

He explained: "The reason I wanted you in the Rose Garden is simply because if we had gone inside the White House, Lady Bird would have insisted that I turn on all the lights. We are going in shortly to the White House, so you can pick up your candles in a box over there."

(LBJ at the time was on a turn-off-the-lights kick.)

In May 1964 he let Washington correspondents bring their families to the White House grounds for an outdoors news conference. After the 30-minute session before the wives and children, Johnson announced:

"Friends and reporters—I hope you are the same—and children of reporters. I am so glad so many of you youngsters are here today . . . I want to ask all the children to come up here and pose with me for a group picture. Let's don't have any mamas or papas. They are always crowding into pictures, anyway."

After being introduced with lavish remarks at a meeting in Nashville, Johnson responded:

"I honestly believe that is the second best introduction I ever had in my life. The best one was when the governor was supposed to introduce me one time at Memphis but his legislature was in session and he didn't make it and I had to introduce myself."

Sen. Barry M. Goldwater, R-Ariz., was one of LBJ's favorite friends. Even so, he said of Goldwater during the 1964 presidential

campaign: "He wants to repeal the present and veto the future." He invited the Goldwaters to a White House dinner before the GOP convention, and after dancing with Mrs. Goldwater he quipped: "I have to be nice to Peggy. I might want to get invited back here next year."

Johnson often liked to tell the story of Rep. Magnus Johnson, D-Minn.: "One day, Magnus Johnson rose in the House and declared, 'What we have to do is take the bull by the tail and look the situation in the face.'"

He called the late President Truman in Independence when Truman was celebrating his 80th birthday anniversary in 1964. He began the conversation: "I wanted to call collect but Lady Bird wouldn't let me."

Truman and the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn, D-Texas, were men he greatly admired and respected. He often recalled the advice Rayburn gave Truman after Truman became President: "Harry, they'll try to put you behind a wall down here. There will be people that will surround you and cut you off from any ideas but theirs. They'll try to make you think that the President is the smartest man in the world. And, Harry, you know he ain't, and I know he ain't."

#### LYNDON B. JOHNSON

The death of Lyndon Johnson has taken the last of the nation's former living presidents, barely a month after the passing of Harry Truman.

Johnson will be deeply missed by political friends and foes alike. In a way he was the most American of our presidents, a figure larger than life, embodying within himself all the fantastic energy of a sprawling and powerful nation. A son of the South Texas prairie, Johnson worked his way from humble beginnings through the many stages of political endeavor to assume the highest office in the land. And like the state which nurtured him, he was cast on a gigantic scale.

The former President's career spanned the epoch of modern politics—from his early congressional service in the days of Franklin Roosevelt to his own White House tenure in the '60s. When he was majority leader in the U.S. Senate, stories abounded of his fabulous energy, ability to reconcile conflicting views, and aptitude for practical results. He was a worker for the causes in which he believed, and seldom has a legislative leader accomplished so much under a president of another party as did Johnson under Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Perhaps the most memorable single moment in Johnson's career was his ascension to the presidency in the aftermath of the Kennedy assassination. At that time of national pain and confusion, the man from Texas provided the nation with a steady hand and effected a quiet but surefooted transition. He was able to unite the country in an hour when healing leadership was needed, and that leadership was confirmed by an enormous margin in the election of 1964.

Most assessments of Johnson's career will praise his domestic record while asserting that he floundered on the subject of Vietnam. While the record on both these topics can be read in various ways, we tend to think the verdict of history will be the reverse of current assessments. The domestic initiatives of the Johnson presidency, indeed, have already begun to be reevaluated; it was in his repeated statements that the nation must stand firm against the tide of Communist aggression that Johnson came closest to striking to the core of historical reality in the 20th century.

Lyndon Johnson was a big man who embodied within himself the many impulses that are America, and whose life was itself a continuing chronicle of modern American statecraft. Our politics will be infinitely the poorer for his passing.



## LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Lyndon Baines Johnson became the 36th president of the United States against a background of national grief and shock, and left office in a time of strife and questioning of the things he stood for and the things he did.

But history may prove to be a fairer judge and a more honest one than some contemporaries in whose eyes disillusionment with the recent past seems overwhelming.

Born on a farm near Stonewall, Texas, he was also born to politics, his father and grandfather having served in the Texas state legislature. As a young man he taught school and as a teacher, learned much about how everyday Americans lived.

In 1937 he won a contest for a vacancy in the United States House of Representatives in which he was to serve five full terms, and after serving as a Navy lieutenant commander in World War II was elected to the Senate, becoming Democratic leader in 1953. His brilliance as a parliamentary tactician and strategist carried him to the top level of leadership and put him in line for the vice-presidency in 1960.

It was not only his Great Society programs, launched after he became President, that aroused whirlwinds of controversy that would rage beyond his days in the White House, but the escalating U.S. involvement in Vietnam, which in spite of a heavy cost in the lives and wealth, came more and more to seem like a futile, unendable conflict.

His welfare, civil rights, and anti-poverty legislation produced mixed results and sharp differences of opinion, as to their merit, among the people. The high cost and expanding bureaucracy, in the view of many, were not justified by the debatable effects. Yet on the whole the care of the aged and poor and improvement in the rights of minorities made undeniable strides.

The war aroused the hottest, bitterest debate of all. Yet hindsight has conferred upon LBJ's sharpest critics a vision which most lacked in the early stages of the war. And despite the war's out-of-focus grand strategy, it has not yet been demonstrated conclusively to the majority of Americans that the defense of the perimeters of the free world is possible without recourse to arms, or that freedom and U.S. national interests are not worth defending.

Lyndon Baines Johnson has been characterized by his bitterest enemies as an inept and evil president, but we think the record shows he was a good-hearted man, often struggling against terrible odds, who did his best—which was not inconsiderable—in behalf of what he and most of his fellow countrymen considered the best interests of the nation as he understood them.

And history may well judge that he was among those presidents who helped to defend freedom in its hour of greatest peril and made possible for many millions of whom it had been hitherto denied a greater measure of realization of what is often called "the American dream."

## FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS OF NURSING

(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, I would like to take a very brief period of time to call to the attention of Members of Congress and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the segment of the President's budget which deals with Fed-

eral assistance to the 1,362 schools of nursing in this country.

The Congress appropriated \$144 million for fiscal 1972 to help train registered nurses under the authority of the Nurse Training Act of 1971 enacted in November of that year. The purpose of this act was to reaffirm and expand the Federal commitment to education of top quality registered nurses to help meet this Nation's increased demand for more health manpower.

In the budget we now have before us I see that the President has revised his fiscal 1973 request for nursing downward from the original \$123 million to \$94 million, and is asking for only \$53 million for fiscal 1974.

These funds provide construction grants and loan guarantees, institutional support, and student aid to the nursing schools and students. These same schools have met the Government's challenge to train more nurses faster by increasing the number of 2-year associate degree schools and by increasing total graduations per year from 43,639 in 1970, to 50,900 in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I share the President's well-publicized determination to hold down Federal spending to a predetermined ceiling, but for the life of me I cannot understand why he continuously picks out such programs as the training of nurses to make his cuts.

There are two people involved in the direct delivery of health care in our hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and medical offices. They are the doctor and the nurse. One cannot function to the best of his potential without the other. We need more of both and we need them now.

Let us return fiscal integrity to the budgetary process. But in the light of what we learned about the problems of health manpower shortages after passage of medicare, let us not effect a false economy by severely reducing aid to nurse training on the eve of consideration of major new health care legislation.

I suggest that if we are really concerned about saving the taxpayer some money, one sure way we can do this is to make sure we have an adequate supply of well-trained health manpower ready by the time a program such as national health insurance goes into effect.

This country's nursing schools have demonstrated their ability to meet the challenge of expanding their enrollments and training new types of nurses. In return they deserve better than to have Federal support cut out from under them. I support, and I hope others will join me, a continued major Federal commitment to students and schools of nursing and hope that the Committee on Appropriations will see fit to recommend the same.

## OUR TIMBER RESOURCES

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I am continuously reminded of the spiraling cost of housing. Lumber plays an active role in the building of a house. As my fellow members may realize timber prices have fluctuated unbelievably during the last 3 years, a main reason being the sporadic supply of timber resources. There seems to be a great demand for the wood product during certain times of the year which is evidently more than our Nation's forests can produce.

One of the areas of our country which could develop necessary timber resources, yet has been neglected, is the Southeastern United States. At one time, this area had large forests, but through mismanagement and intensive agricultural cultivation, the forests have been depleted. However, through the proper management of forests belonging to small landowners, there is a chance that we could alleviate this situation. Consequently, today I am introducing a bill which gives special emphasis to providing assistance to nonindustrial forest landowners to increase the flow of public benefits for the proper management and use of those forest lands in private hands.

Small landowners hold 49 percent of the Nation's possible productive land base which is more than three times the acreage available in the national forest system. These lands in aggregate already produce huge amounts of pulpwood, sawlogs and other timber products needed by America's growing economy. However, due to neglect and mismanagement these small properties are producing less than half of their potential in terms of wood products.

The question arises in how can we utilize this unproductive woodland. I suggest that we increase the incentive to plant trees, practice reforestation in established stands, seeding to prevent soil erosion, creating wildlife habitats, and providing public access for recreational use. Yet, nevertheless, all of these activities require public funds. Because the immediate return from cultivation of forest lands is not quickly realized and because of the work and taxes involved, many people, even those owning sizable tracts of land, have been reticent to invest in this area. My legislation would provide for the financial incentives necessary to trigger these vital investments.

As I have previously stated, the increasing demand for timber, pulp, and other products used to meet housing and other needs is clearly evident. For example, housing starts in 1972 set an all-time high. Unless well-planned investments on these private lands are made now, the pressures of meeting this demand will continue with the relative increase in prices to be met by future consumers. In addition, increased costs will encourage the use of substitute materials which must come from the Nation's store of nonrenewable resources rather than the renewable forest resources. To try to avoid the predicted increase in prices, we need to insure an abundant supply of

timber in the species and sizes needed by the construction company.

Three hundred million acres of land is the key to solving our future timber construction supply problems. This is the acreage affected by my legislation. The act would encourage nonindustrial farm owners to apply modern forest practices that would result in a wide range of public benefits. The primary incentive will be the sharing of the cost of installing these practices with the Federal or public share of the cost not exceeding 80 percent of the total expenditure. However, this will not be another Federal giveaway program where private landowners benefit at the expense of the general public. My bill provides that whenever these forest products are transferred through sale, the Federal Government will have a first lien on the properties, and the money that has been invested by the Government will be paid back to the Secretary of Agriculture with the appropriate interest. In addition, there are many side benefits that stem from this program. Investments in thousands of acres of idle forests will make them productive and many new jobs will be created to insure the necessary planting, cultivation, and harvesting of the product. I feel that this is the only fair and equitable way in which the Government can encourage investment in this sector. I urge the Committee on Agriculture to consider holding hearings on this legislation as soon as possible.

#### FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION TO PUBLIC FUNDAMENTAL TO EXISTENCE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the free flow of information to the public is fundamental to the existence of self-government. Democracy will perish at that point at which the press ceases to function free of intimidation, harassment, and censorship.

In the United States, the free flow of information is not a right or privilege to be doled out in controlled quantities at the whim of a Government agent. The people of this Nation have given no agency the power to infringe on freedom of the press or the free exercise thereof.

Restrictions on the news media arise in many disguises, some very obvious and some so subtle as to escape unchallenged for many years. Nevertheless, the cost is the same: A deterioration in our democratic form of government.

The ability of the press to fulfill its obligation to provide the public with a full and accurate account of events and ideas is severely impeded if courts and other governmental agencies are allowed to compel persons engaged in gathering and publicly disseminating news to reveal their sources of information. The collection and publication of the news must be unhampered by the threat of incarceration or public reprisal. Personnel working in the news media must be free to publish the results of their work, or,

equally, to refuse to publish or to divulge the source of their information.

Personally, I find ample protection from governmental intimidation in the first amendment to the Constitution. However, recent actions taken by some courts and Government agencies, State and Federal, have created sufficient doubt, which in and of itself, imposes an unacceptable limitation on freedom of the press. For this reason, I am today introducing legislation that will once again publicly state to the people of this Nation and to all Government officials that we in the Congress hold freedom of the press to be a sacred and vital part of free government, and that we do not intend for it to be tampered with or chiseled away.

My bill is very simple. The language reads:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person shall be required to disclose any information, or the source thereof, directly received or obtained by him in the process of gathering or the presentation of news or other information intended solely for public dissemination or distribution unless overwhelming evidence shows that refusal to disclose the information or its source would adversely affect the public safety to a substantial degree.*

In essence, the issue is the survival of that great experiment in the self-government of free people. Failure to protect freedom of the press and the uninhibited exercise thereof will exact a costly toll from America's constitutional form of government.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1973

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 26, 1973, President Nixon transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973, proposing to abolish certain components of the Executive Office of the President and to transfer to line departments and agencies those functions which are to be continued.

According to the plan, the National Aeronautics and Space Council will be abolished outright. The Office of Science and Technology will be abolished and its functions transferred to the Director of the National Science Foundation. The Office of Emergency Preparedness will be abolished and its functions transferred to the President, who has stated his intention to delegate these functions further as follows: Relief in civil emergencies and disasters to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, continuity of civil government operations to the General Services Administration, and investigation of imports affecting national security to the Treasury Department. The Deputy Secretary of the Treasury will replace the OEP Director as chairman of the Oil Policy Committee, whose functions are to be continued subject to general supervision of the As-

sistant to the President for Economic Affairs, Dr. George P. Shultz. At the conclusion of my remarks I will include a fact sheet prepared by the White House giving more information on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 has been referred, as is customary with reorganization plans, to the Committee on Government Operations. Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, the plan lies before the Congress for 60 days, which is extended by any House or Senate adjournment of more than 3 days. Unless a majority of either House rejects the plan by adopting a disapproving resolution within that time, the plan takes effect; that is, it has the force and effect of law and is entered into the statute books.

A disapproving resolution can be introduced by any Member of either House. Such resolutions are referred to the Committee on Government Operations, which under the terms of the statute and the corresponding rules of the House, has a period of 20 days after the introduction of the resolution to consider and report its recommendations. Before making a report, the committee holds hearings on the reorganization plan and decides whether to recommend for or against it. A negative vote of the House on the disapproving resolution would be a vote in favor of the plan; a favorable vote on the resolution would kill the plan.

Our Committee on Government Operations intends to hold hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 as soon as possible. I would point out that in view of the President's submission of the plan so early in the session, we may have a timing problem. The committee cannot be organized until certain prior procedures adopted by the Democratic Caucus of the House have been applied and the approval of the full committee has been secured in a formal session.

I note that the leadership has scheduled a 10-day recess from February 9 to February 19, for the convenience of Members who want to make Lincoln's Birthday addresses.

The problem arises in the event a disapproving resolution is introduced and the committee is unable to report within the prescribed 20-day period because of the unavoidable time lags mentioned above. After the 20-day period, any Member favoring the disapproval resolution can move to discharge the committee and bring that motion to the floor. If the motion prevails, then the reorganization plan would be debated without the benefit of the committee's findings and recommendations.

In view of the timing problem, I would ask the Members' forbearance against forcing floor debate on the issue before the Committee on Government Operations has had an opportunity to hold its hearings and submit a report, which will be done as promptly as possible. I might add that even if a disapproving resolution is not introduced, the committee still would hold hearings on the reorganization plan, so that a record is made and the essential facts assembled, in-



forming the Congress what is involved in the reorganization.

To place Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 in context, I should explain that the President is sponsoring a reorganization effort comprising three parts:

First. Substantial reduction in the size of the Executive Office of the President. In recent years, by legislative enactments and executive orders, the Executive Office of the President has grown to large and unwieldy size. It contains about 18 offices, agencies, and councils, with approximately 4,250 employees and budgetary outlays of \$96 million—not counting OEO grants to the States. In a White House statement of January 5, 1973, the President announced his intention to halve the size of the Executive Office by transferring various components to line departments and agencies. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 is the first installment in this transfer program.

Second. Departmental reorganization. Two years ago, in his State of the Union message, President Nixon announced his proposal to reorganize the executive branch by creating four new departments in place of seven—later six—existing ones. These proposals were amplified in a special message to the Congress on reorganization dated March 25, 1971. Draft bills were submitted with this message and introduced in both Houses of Congress. Overview hearings were held by the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. Our committee also held hearings on the bill to establish a Department of Community Development and reported the bill favorably with amendments in May 1972. The Committee on Rules did not clear it for floor action.

Third. Department/agency coordination. As set forth in a White House message of January 5, 1973, the President designated five persons as assistants to the President and three Cabinet members as counselors to the President. The three counselors will have responsibilities for coordinating Government policies in designated areas across department and agency lines; and they will report to the President's Assistant for Domestic Affairs, John D. Ehrlichman. The counselors also will be heads of their respective departments: Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Housing and Urban Development. The areas for policy coordination assigned to the three counselors approximate those which would be included in the proposed Departments of Natural Resources, Human Resources, and Community Development. Consequently, if such new departments were created by statute, the coordinating responsibilities of the counselors would no longer be operative.

I include the White House fact sheet on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 be included with these remarks.

The fact sheet follows:

FACT SHEET—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1973

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
January 26, 1973.

The President is today transmitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 which will achieve the following objectives:

1. The Office of Emergency Preparedness (OEP) will be abolished and its functions transferred to other line agencies;
2. The Office of Science and Technology (OST) will be abolished and its functions transferred to the Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF);
3. The National Aeronautics and Space Council will be abolished.

On January 5, 1973, the President announced a comprehensive program for the Executive Branch which includes a sharp reduction in the overall size of the Executive Office of the President, and a reorientation of that office back to its basic purpose of assisting the President in top level policy and management matters. This reduction will be achieved through budget or other administrative means or by the issuance of Executive Orders. Where necessary changes require consideration by the Congress, appropriate actions will be forwarded. This Reorganization Plan represents a major step in that direction.

Implementation of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973 will achieve the following objectives:

It eliminates three organizations in the Executive Office of the President;

It reduces the numbers of employees in the Executive Office by 389 positions (from an estimated 4,250 to 3,861), and achieves an estimated \$2,000,000 in budget savings;

It transfers necessary continuing functions to line departments and agencies where they can be better performed;

It streamlines the Executive Office and contributes to making it more effective and responsive to Presidential needs.

The following specific actions will be taken:

1. Office of Science and Technology

This office will be abolished and its functions transferred to the Director of the National Science Foundation.

OST has performed with distinction since its creation in 1962, during the post-Sputnik period when major evaluation and coordination of science and technology programs was vital. Increasingly, the research and development capabilities in line departments and agencies have been upgraded and our R & D programs have stabilized. With a growing range of capability in the NSF, the President will now look to its Director as a principal advisor in science and technology matters.

2. The National Aeronautics and Space Council

NASC, under the leadership of the Vice President, has helped bridge a period of time when our Space programs were being defined and brought into being. We now, however, have effective resolutions of our space and aeronautics objectives and have achieved necessary coordination among the agencies concerned. We are, therefore, able to abolish the Council at this time with no transfer of its functions.

3. The Office of Emergency Preparedness

The Office of Emergency Preparedness will be abolished in a two-step process:

First, the present authority of OEP consists mainly of authorities delegated to it by the President, plus certain statutory functions assigned to the Director.

The Reorganization Plan will transfer those statutory functions not already vested in the President to him.

Second, after the Reorganization Plan becomes effective, the President will then delegate all of the functions now performed by OEP in the following manner:

a. All OEP responsibilities having to do with preparedness for, and relief of civil emergencies and disasters would be transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This would provide greater field capability for coordination of assistance provided by Federal agencies with

that furnished by states and local communities and would further the objective of creating a broad new Department of Community Development.

b. OEP's responsibilities for measures to insure continuity of civil government operations in the event of major military attack would be reassigned to the General Services Administration (GSA), as would responsibility for management of national security stockpile objectives and policy. Coordination of these responsibilities would be provided by the National Security Council and the Council on Economic Policy respectively.

c. Investigations of imports which might impair national security (Sec. 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962) will be reassigned to the Treasury Department. These investigations result in reports making recommendations to the President for his action.

d. The Oil Policy Committee will continue to function as it does now, except that the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury will be designated to replace the Director, OEP, as committee chairman. The Oil Policy Committee will function under the general supervision of the Assistant to the President (Dr. Shultz) concerned with economic affairs.

Those disaster relief authorities which have been reserved to the President in the past, such as the authority to declare major disasters, would continue to be exercised by him under these arrangements. Certain emergency situations calling for rapid government response will be coordinated by the Executive Office of the President under the supervision of the Assistant to the President in charge of executive management.

The background and current resources of the affected agencies are varied and diverse. The Office of Emergency Preparedness is the successor to several preceding organizations dating from 1947, and it has an estimated FY 73 budget in excess of \$6.3 million and permanent employment of 323 persons. The Office of Science and Technology was established in 1962, also the successor to related previous organizations, and its estimated FY 73 budget is over \$2 million and permanent employment is 50 persons. The National Aeronautics and Space Council was created in 1958, and has an estimated FY 73 budget of \$500 thousand, with a permanent employment of 16 persons.

Reorganization Plans of this kind are provided for under special reorganization authority. The Plan will be considered for 60 days in both Houses of Congress, and will become legally effective after 60 days, unless either House formally disapproves. Actual change of agency responsibility will take place July 1, 1973, to allow time for an effective transition to be planned and executed after the period of Congressional review.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION ON  
ROLLCALL VOTE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that I may correct the RECORD. During the last roll-call I used my card right in this machine here, and I thought I looked up at the voting register. I understand now from the assistant tally clerk that I am not recorded.

Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I also understand that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) also voted, and he has been notified that his vote did not register.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may be corrected to show that I voted "yea."

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUN-

GATE). The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is not a correction of the rollcall?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Iowa that this is not a correction, this is a statement, and the gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, did the Chair state that my statement will appear in the RECORD? I had asked unanimous consent for the RECORD to show that I had voted "yea." I voted during the last rollcall, and the gentleman from New York also voted during the last rollcall, and we ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD to show that we voted. And the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has told me that he voted on one other occasion, and that the machine did not record his vote at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold his unanimous-consent request, and the Chair would ask that the gentleman discuss the matter with the Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. I will.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION ON ROLLCALL VOTE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to make the same sort of a request, specifically as it relates to rollcall No. 10 in the question of the establishment of a select committee to study the operation and implementation of rules 10 and 11 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, taken on January 31, 1973, I was incorrectly recorded as not having voted.

I actually cast my vote "yea" on the question.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and the Journal be corrected to indicate my vote "yea" in this matter.

Further, Mr. Speaker, concerning the last rollcall vote, I also would like to discuss that matter with the Chair for the purpose of having my vote recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that the gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD, and the Chair would appreciate it if the gentleman will also discuss this matter with the Speaker, since this is a matter of first impression.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the Speaker.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE COLLINS OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNGATE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past December tragedy befell the House of Representatives when our esteemed colleague the Honorable George Collins of Illinois was killed in an airplane crash.

As fate would have it, George Collins was returning to his Sixth Illinois District to sponsor an annual children's Christmas party, an event he partici-

pated in every year. The day he died George Collins was doing what he did best; he was serving the people he represented. I am certain that if George Collins had any premonition that he was going to die that day he would have wanted it to happen as it did, working for his people.

Though in Congress for a brief time, having been elected initially in November 1970 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of his predecessor the Honorable Daniel J. Ronan, George Collins made his mark in the House of Representatives. He was well respected and regarded as an able legislator who was looked upon as a Member who did his homework, worked hard for his district and lived by a set of principles all men seek to emulate.

A veteran, an active member of his community and an artful political practitioner, George Collins is a man who is missed; not only by his family, his friends, his constituents, his colleagues but the Nation as a whole. George Collins, in his quiet, dignified way working continuously to improve his district and the Nation as a whole, made a lasting impression on the House. He was affectionately referred to by his colleagues as the man with the big, perpetual smile.

His perspective was both individual and national in scope. No problem was too small; no problem too large. George Collins had committed himself to a public career to serve the people. No stranger to politics at any level of government George Collins used his talents and knowledge to the benefit of the people.

George Collins never lost sight of the fact that the people of the Sixth District sent him to Washington to represent them. He died going back home to them. Nor did he lose sight of the fact that by working to strengthen the Nation as a whole the people of the Sixth District would benefit.

It was my distinct pleasure to work closely with George Collins on legislation that was designed to revitalize the American economy. Serving on the Committee on Government Operations and the House Public Works Committee, George Collins took keen interest in putting the full resources of the Federal Government to work for the development and improvement of the American people. He worked tirelessly to help all Americans share in the full benefit of this country and to realize their full potential.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the people of the Sixth District will be spared further hardship. In the span of 3 years they have suffered two grievous losses, the deaths of Dan Ronan and George Collins. And, if I may be permitted a partisan aside for a moment I sincerely hope that Mrs. Cardiss Collins, the widow of George Collins, will be successful in her efforts to succeed her husband in order to carry on the work he started.

Mrs. Price joins me in offering our deepest sympathy to Cardiss Collins and her son Kevin.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO).

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation, for yielding. I want to commend MEL PRICE, who is known as the dean of our delegation, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the chairman of the Ethics Committee in the House of Representatives, for taking this time this afternoon to eulogize and pay tribute to George Collins who served in this body as a distinguished Congressman from the Sixth District of Illinois, and who in November of 1972 was elected to the Congress from the Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I represented the Seventh Congressional District in the Congress for 8 years, and because of a previous court decision, a new Seventh Congressional District was formed, and Mr. Collins is in this newly defined Seventh Congressional District and was elected by more than 75 percent of the vote of that district.

Mr. Speaker, George Collins was cut down in the prime of his career. He had a long and varied career of service in our city, the city of Chicago, before coming to the House of Representatives. With his wise experience in human affairs, he combined a deep and sympathetic understanding of human beings and of humanity itself.

George Collins had the ability to look perceptively beyond the facts and paperwork, and he had the ability to understand the hopes and fears of human beings. George Collins, with his experience and depth of human understanding, will be missed in the House, because it is men of this caliber who are needed in a democracy. We shall miss the ideals of George Collins, his faith in humanity, and his ability to understand the elements which give life and spirit to our system of Government. I shall miss George, who was my neighbor in the city of Chicago.

I want to extend on behalf of Mrs. Annunzio and myself our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Collins and her son Kevin in this time of great tragedy in their lives.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE).

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank very much the dean of our delegation, the distinguished leader of the delegation from Illinois, MEL PRICE, for yielding to me in order to afford me an opportunity to join in this eulogy.

Mr. Speaker, today, we as a body, are eulogizing a late Member of this body. It is indeed a sad day. For George W. Collins was first and foremost a black American; a man dedicated to helping his people in whatever way he could. His people were the poor, the unfortunate and the lonely. They were black, brown, yellow and white; they were people.

In all the years that I had known George Collins his greatest asset was that he gave unstintingly to the people of the community and the district. Action always speak louder than words.



and George was above shouting to all corners his own praise. George worked hard to see that all of the "forgotten" people in the district, the underprivileged children and the senior citizens, were remembered; he did this by giving each of them an annual party.

Not only was George concerned with the people of his district, but he made himself available to the people. He was available to people who came into his office if he was there. Constituent or non-constituent, probing or antibusing, he would try to meet with all of them.

I am referring to a man who loved life and people as few of us are ever able to appreciate. George was born and raised in the heart of Chicago. With only the barest essentials of life, his family never wanting for love and understanding, George started at the bottom of the Democratic organization in Chicago. Through hard work George was finally elected an alderman on the city council and a committeeman for the 24th ward, the ward that Harry Truman called the greatest Democratic ward in the country. Through George's leadership the 24th ward kept the title that the late President bestowed upon it, and it maintained its tradition of helping the needy. It was because of this dedication and leadership that George went on to be elected and reelected to this esteemed body. He carried this dedication to the Congress and worked very hard for the people of his district and the people of this country.

I am going to miss George, not only as a colleague, but also as a friend. As we all know, it is very difficult to have any time to get together with one's friends during a hectic week here at the Capitol. George and I would manage to find the time on our weekly flights to and from Chicago. It was on these flights that we would discuss the situations in Washington and Chicago and try to map out strategy for our common areas of concern. Those discussions were invaluable for the both of us.

The loss of George Collins is very deeply felt not only by those in Chicago, but by the poor and minorities around the country. His memory will always be with us; his wife, Cardiss, and his son, Kevin, can be very proud of the prestige that he brought to the family name of Collins.

George was very proud of the associations and friendships that he made on the Hill and in Washington. His hard work in the Congressional Black Caucus, the Democratic Caucus, and the Congress brought him respect and friendships that he always enjoyed. He will be well remembered for his efforts to improve the quality of life for all our citizens.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct honor of going to the funeral services of our late and beloved colleague, George Collins. It was one of the most beautiful services that I had ever attended. The church was crowded to full capacity, showing the love, the affection,

and the respect that those who lived in George Collins' neighborhood had for him.

I had only known George, of course, since he became a Member of the Congress. To all of us in this Chamber who knew him, George Collins exuded an effervescent personality, a keen mind, and a great sense of humor. And it was easy to see that he loved his fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have the remarks that I made at the memorial services for George Collins placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

REMARKS AT MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR  
GEORGE COLLINS

The flag above the Capitol hangs at half mast today in tribute to our late friend and colleague, George Collins. The death of a Congressman is always marked by sadness as we recall past associations and achievements. But the death of George Collins is doubly tragic, for we mourn not only a distinguished past but an even more promising future lost.

George Collins was a politician in the finest sense of the word—a man whose purposes and accomplishments were utterly and completely in the public interest. In his brief years in the House, George developed a reputation for fair-mindedness and knowledgeability that few exceeded. He was known to be loquacious—but just because he did not discuss and deliberate upon an issue at great length did not indicate that he was uninformed or disinterested. On the contrary, he was so well-informed and so interested in issues—especially those affecting Illinois, the youth of America and the minorities—that he often gave accurate off-the-cuff answers to extremely complicated questions, constantly impressing his colleagues with the scope of his knowledge.

Sudden death always stuns and saddens. This is especially true when death deprives us of someone who has been so beloved by his family and so respected and admired by all who knew him.

There are many things we shall long remember about George Collins. His family will keep him in their hearts as a loving son, a devoted husband and father. The people of Chicago will cherish his memory as one of its most illustrious and faithful citizens, who brought to his native city honor and pride and distinction. The Congress will always remember him as a fighter for the rights of all people.

We all read how George Collins had taken the ill-fated flight rather than rest for a later one, so that he could personally participate in purchasing toys for the thousands of children at the annual Christmas party in his area.

That was typical of George Collins. Whether it was arranging the annual dinner for the elderly or working on a program for the poor, George Collins was a champion of the little people.

What was there about George that made him the wonderful person that he was? What motivated him? What was it that influenced him and inspired him to be such a devoted family man, such a concerned citizen, such a dedicated public servant?

Because he loved his community, he plunged into its affairs and gave of himself, and of his talents, his excellent education, his genuine selflessness. Because he loved the people of Chicago and because he loved this nation which he served in time of war,

he spent himself in the service of Chicago and of America, very often at the sacrifice of personal and family pleasures and joys. Yes, the answer is love. Love was the reason.

The word "LOVE" is a word that is used very loosely today. It is scrawled on walls and painted on banners. But love is more easily written than lived. Love is more often betrayed than followed. True love never destroys. It creates. True love never tears down. It builds. Real love does not separate or polarize. It unites.

Young people sing that what the world needs now is love. And they are right. But the kind of love the world needs is the love exemplified in the life of George Collins. Love for the good, and in the service of others, no matter what the cost to self. This kind of love is the kind that ultimately prevails. This is the love that wins the final victory—even victory over death. It conquers death, because, the good it does lives on. It overcomes death because it is united with the love of the risen Lord who overcame death by his resurrection.

To his beloved family, his devoted wife, Cardiss, and their fine son, Kevin, we express our sincere sympathy. We pray that the Lord of all consolation will comfort them in their grief and sustain them in their sorrow.

Alleluia!

The strife is o'er, the battle done.

The victory of life is won.

The song of life eternal has begun.

Alleluia! Alleluia!

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, time has erased in some measure the numbing shock with which we received the news of the untimely death of my good friend, Congressman George Collins.

George was a great Congressman. He was diligent, he was able, and he was hard working. His warm and friendly personality endeared him to everybody in the House. His death left a real void in the representation of our State in the Congress.

George was ever conscious of the needs and wishes of his people, but most of all the plight of the cities and the plight of the city of Chicago in particular were very close to him. He fought for better housing, lower cost housing, and for subsidized housing. He fought for better health and medical centers, for research grants for sickle cell anemia. He fought for better education, particularly for more funds for title I of ESEA. He fought for every measure that would better the lot of the average person. The little person received the support of George Collins, and he never faltered. He was faithful to his trust, and faithful to the end.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Yates joins me in expressing our most profound sympathies to Mrs. Collins and to George's family, with the hope that time may in some measure dim the grief they now feel.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late good friend, George Collins. As the previous speaker has mentioned, George

was a warm and dear friend whose only concern was for his people, both black and white and rich and poor. He represented a unique district in Chicago where we have the downtrodden poor and then the rich along Lake Michigan.

George served both segments of his community diligently. His warm smile and congenial manner will always be missed. His presence, though short in Congress, will always be remembered for his concern for his fellow man.

As an attorney in Chicago, I remember there would not be a week or two go by without George calling and asking if I could get a lawyer to represent some poor person from his district who was in trouble. He was constantly working for the poor.

Mrs. Murphy joins with me in conveying our profound sympathy to Mrs. Collins and their son Kevin.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

George Collins was a member of the Committee on Government Operations during his period of service here in Congress. I can attest as chairman of that committee that he was diligent in attendance; he was always cooperative and willing to move the best legislation forward. His death represents a great loss to the community, and I wish to extend my sympathy and best regards to his family. I hope that they will understand how much the Members of the Congress appreciated George Collins.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

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

I would like to commend the gentleman and all of the Chicago delegation for holding this special order in memory of my friend, the late Congressman George Collins from Chicago.

I would only say to the gentleman that Mr. Collins was a man that I came to know and love not only as my colleague but as my friend. I will miss him far beyond my ability to articulate here on the floor of Congress.

George Collins as a member of the Government Operations Committee served that committee and this House honorably. No man among us was more committed to serving those who sent him here than George Collins. Congressman Collins was in many ways a very simple person. At the same time he possessed the ability to direct even the most complex issue and construct its resolution in a manner that more often was not appealing to all concerned.

Congressman Collins, coming from one of this country's largest urban areas, brought to this Chamber the concerns of hundreds of thousands of Americans concerned about the quality of their lives. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus and as an individual Member of the House he consistently voted for and worked for legislation that was designed to offer some relief to the millions of

poor, uneducated, underskilled, and malnourished Americans.

I know that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to the legacy of fine work that this man leaves. It is my hope that the 93d Congress and Congresses to come will echo the sentiments and concerns expressed by George Collins as a Member of this distinguished body.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add my voice to the many others that have offered much deserved praise for our colleagues from Chicago, the late George W. Collins, Democratic Representative from Illinois' new Seventh Congressional District.

One of the best indications of the kind of man Congressman Collins was can be seen by the fact that the tragic flight to Chicago was carrying him to a Christmas party for the children of his district's 24th ward. He had insisted on buying the presents for the children himself.

My political experience was enhanced by knowing a man of such outstanding ability and commitment as Congressman Collins. He carried the concerns of his constituency to the Halls of Congress, beginning with the 91st, with same vigor he had shown in Chicago politics. As a foe of war, he sought to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Peace.

A member of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman Collins was a leader in the areas of social legislation. He worked diligently for the passage of legislation beneficial to America's 30 million black citizens.

It was my privilege to join Congressman Collins as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, Roads Subcommittee. His last draft of legislation, true to the high caliber of his efforts, would have made it unconstitutional for employers to inquire into the nature of military discharge. This has been a problem for the millions of American veterans who have been unable to find work because of less than honorable discharges. Racial bias in the military also received his close and careful attention.

Under his leadership, Chicago's Lawn-dale Youth Commission adopted a year-round program dedicated to "service to youth." This program included charm and craft classes, an annual family picnic, a scholarship program, dinners for senior citizens, and a Christmas party.

Congressman Collins' death en route to buy gifts for that party represents a loss of the highest order; particularly for his family, to whom my condolences go out, but also for the Black Caucus and the Nation.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of George Collins is an incalculable loss to his family, his community, the Congress, and the Nation. Although he served only one term in Congress, his service was singularly exceptional. Congressman Collins was assigned to the Government Operations Committee, an assignment which I too had in the previous Congress. Well liked by his colleagues, Congressman Collins made his presence known and through his diligent work had a substantial impact upon the legislative output of the 92d Congress.

The circumstances of Congressman Collins' death have special meaning to me. Only hours before, on a flight from Chicago to Washington I had been on the very plane which crashed with George aboard upon its return to Chicago. Such an unusual circumstance can only draw attention to the frailty of all human beings and the thread of fate by which we all are suspended.

Congressman Collins' untimely death has left unfinished the great work he was about. His successor will have an inspiring example and lofty goal at which to aim.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, George Collins served only one term and a small part of another in the House of Representatives. He is not, therefore, as well known here as some of my other Illinois colleagues whose service in Congress has extended over longer periods.

Before he came here, however, he had already made his mark in Chicago, the city of his birth; and he was one of the truly distinguished citizens of Illinois. He had earned the right to represent the Sixth Congressional District.

It is with sorrow that we contemplate the death of so good a man. We extend our sympathy to Mrs. Collins and their son, upon whom the tragedy of his death bears most heavily.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois for taking this special order today in order to pay tribute to our late good friend Congressman George Collins.

His untimely death last December has not only deprived the Congress of one of its most industrious Members, but also has cost the city of Chicago one of its most effective leaders. I have lost a good and old friend.

In addition to serving with him during his brief tenure in the House, I had worked with him side by side for many years on the Cook County Democratic Committee.

Both in Washington and in Chicago, George Collins was a man dedicated to public life. He was a man who was committed to his district, but more important to his people. It was this human commitment that always drove him to find the roots of the problem rather than be content with some superficial changes that might satisfy others. This dedication was no more evident than at meetings of the Cook County Democratic Committee. At these important meetings, it was George Collins who always spoke for the need to choose candidates not for their vote-getting ability or their popularity, but rather for their capacity for work and for their commitment to the trust that the electorate has placed in them.

It was this dedication, this commitment to the people that he was chosen to represent, that kept George Collins in Washington long after the 92d Congress had adjourned for the final time. It was this dedication that kept him working at his desk until this tragic day in December when he met his death.

George Collins' election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1970 was the



culmination of years of personal struggle and of endless work. It is a little-known fact that the district that first sent him to Congress that year, had not only never elected a black Representative, but in fact, was more than 60 percent white. This is a special example of the man's ability to overcome adversity in his effort to serve the public. And after his election at the age of 45, George Collins indeed served his public well. He fought for programs that would benefit all of his Westside constituents regardless of their race, creed, or political belief.

Whenever I think of George, and I shall think of him often, I shall remember a man who was softspoken, but was not soft; a man who was dedicated, yet was not intolerant; a man who lived by trusted doctrines, yet was not doctrinaire.

On behalf of my wife LaVerne and myself, I would like to offer my sincere condolences to his widow, Cardiss, and to their son, Kevin.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for taking this special order to allow us to pay our respects to the memory of George Collins. Although he had been in this Congress for only 2 years, Congressman Collins made an inestimable contribution to this Nation. As Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I was privileged to work very closely with him. His passing was a deep personal loss to me and I want to extend my sympathy to his family.

George was a quiet man. He did not seek headlines, but he worked diligently and effectively for the objectives we shared as members of the Congressional Black Caucus. He had a very special concern for senior citizens and for young people. Legislation to meet the needs of these two groups of people was his specialty, but he was active in all aspects of the work of the caucus. We will miss his talents, but hope to honor his memory with the achievement of the goals for which he strived.

To memorialize Congressman Collins, the Congressional Black Caucus adopted a resolution. The purpose of this resolution was to pledge to continue the work to which Representative Collins had such a deep commitment. The text of that resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congressman George W. Collins, who departed this life on Friday, December 8, 1972, was a Member of the Congressional Black Caucus; and

Whereas, he served in the capacity of Chairman of the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Subcommittee of the Congressional Black Caucus; and

Whereas, Congressman George W. Collins endeared himself to all Members of this organization by his dedication and commitment to the achievement of the goals and aspirations of the Congressional Black Caucus; and

Whereas, this nation is the beneficiary of his labor in seeking to eradicate inequality and impoverishment in our society; and

Whereas, in his capacity as a public servant he dedicated himself in his role as a legislator to improving life for Black, poor and disadvantaged people in this nation;

Now therefore be it resolved, that the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus are proud of their association with this distinguished and esteemed Member of Congress.

Be it further resolved, that the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus do hereby pledge to continue the work which we have collectively undertaken with our deceased brother, Congressman George W. Collins.

Be it further resolved, that this organization shall in an appropriate manner establish a means by which this Caucus can memorialize the memory of this beloved Member.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be presented to the wife and family of Congressman Collins and that a copy thereof be spread upon the journal of the Congressional Black Caucus and of the House of Representatives.

December 9, 1972.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I did not have an opportunity to serve with George Collins of Illinois in the House of Representatives. He was a distinguished man who fought hard for what he believed in, and I was looking forward to working with him.

George Collins was a man who showed compassion and concern for the problems and needs of all Americans, young and old, rich and poor, black and white. Of special concern to him, I know, was the desire to insure the fair and equal treatment of all men in the military services and to encourage the promotion of men where ability had been proven. His interests encompassed a number of other issues including housing, public health, employment, medical care for the aged, and care for the mentally handicapped.

As a Member of Congress, George Collins made important contributions to some of the major public policy questions affecting the quality of life in our country. His service to his constituents and to our Nation will be much missed.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, for having obtained this time in order to memorialize the life and achievements of our former associate, George W. Collins.

In the few months we were privileged to associate with him, George Collins gave us a refreshingly new outlook and brilliant insight into public service in its noblest sense.

George Collins possessed a quiet dignity with a militant force of personal dignity—a love of people and a hatred for evil that oppressed and exploited.

We shall miss him greatly in everything we do and all we plan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic loss for the Congress that the Honorable George Collins will not be here to fulfill the great potential which he demonstrated during his brief tenure in the House of Representatives.

Congressman Collins came to the Congress after a long and distinguished career in local government, serving first as deputy sheriff and bailiff for Cook County, and then in 1964 as alderman and ward committeeman of the 24th Ward—a ward once claimed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be the "strongest Democratic ward in the Nation."

From his experience with government at the local level, George Collins brought

with him to Congress a love and understanding of the people whom he served. A quiet, considerate yet thoughtful individual, he placed the interests and needs of his constituents foremost among his responsibilities and served them with a dedication which far exceeded congressional duty. For example, he kept his district office open every day of the year, Sundays and evenings included, always leaving at least one person in charge to let the people know that George Collins was available and willing to help them. Neither was it unusual for him to dip into his own pocket to help a needy constituent.

George was concerned not only with the personal well-being of his constituents, but also with how the Government treated them, a sentiment reflected in his legislative activities. As a black legislator and invaluable member of the Congressional Black Caucus, he provided leadership in working for legislation beneficial to black people and the more than 10 million other minorities in the United States. Housing, health, employment, welfare, and drug abuse were his particular concerns. He was also a staunch opponent of war and a passionate advocate of peace.

George Collins was a member of the House Government Operations Committee, the Public Works Committee and five subcommittees. I had the opportunity to serve with George on the Government Operations Committee and worked closely with him. From this proximity, I witnessed first hand his strong commitment to the problems of black Americans. Housing and urban development concerned him perhaps more than other problems because of the particular needs of his district. His greatest desire was to see enacted a fair and equitable housing and urban development bill. He also strongly desired passage of a Federal highway act, in particular one which would deal with displacement of the urban poor by encroaching expressways.

The untimely death of George Collins is more than the personal loss which we all share. It is the loss of a fine American, an outstanding black legislator, and a distinguished public servant whose death can only diminish the causes for which he fought.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, George Collins was only 47. He leaves behind a young widow and a son barely 13. He came to this Chamber just 3 short years ago and was reelected to continue serving his constituents in this 93d Congress by an 85-percent margin. His death came needless to say as a shocking tragedy to us all. Yet, I cannot help but recall the statement of Morris Joseph in S. Greenberg's "A Treasury of Comfort":

Something precious is taken from us, and we think of it as something we have lost, instead of something we have had.

And, as I look back upon the months and years Mr. Collins took his seat in this House, serving well and devotedly his constituents, I realize the extreme appropriateness of Mr. Joseph's words.

I recall the Honorable George Collins as a warm man, always with his special smile. He was quiet, humble, never too busy to take time to speak with and to

listen to all who had questions and suggestions for him. He would deliberate for a long while before reaching a decision. Yet, once he had reached his conclusion, he would act strongly and perceptively. I particularly recall his concern for the safety of his constituents, for his desire to have all our citizens enjoy the life of our cities, walk freely down our streets with nothing to fear. I deeply share with him these feelings and, in the days ahead, I will continue to work toward the achievement of these goals.

The men and women of Illinois' Sixth District were indeed fortunate to have been represented by a man of Mr. Collins' dedication and ability. We, in this body, were equally fortunate to have had him as our colleague and as our friend.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I know my constituents, as well as those of my Illinois colleagues, were saddened greatly by the tragic and untimely death of our friend, the Honorable George Collins of Illinois.

George Collins served what must be one of the most difficult districts in our State to represent. It included not only wealthy Lake Michigan shoreline area, but also the troubled West Side of the city of Chicago. That Mr. Collins was respected and well liked in his entire district was evidenced by his overwhelming victory last November.

Mr. Collins believed in serving his constituents which is why he was aboard the fatal plane that crashed last December 8. He was en route to a children's Christmas party in his district.

I know all of his many friends will miss him but never forget him, and I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to George and extending my sympathies to his family and friends.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues, and especially those from the great State of Illinois, in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable George Collins.

George was only with us for a few years. However, he had impressed all of us who were privileged to serve with him on committees and in the Halls of the Congress. I served with him on the Committee on Public Works and found him to be a conscientious, competent, and cooperative legislator. He came to subcommittee and full committee meetings fully prepared because he had done his homework. He was a quiet man and a gentleman in every respect.

He also served with distinction on the Committee on Government Operations, and here again he had the respect of all who were privileged to know and work with him.

The State of Illinois, the constituents he served so well, and the Nation have lost a fine Representative. We in the Congress have lost a friend and colleague.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his wife, Cardiss, and his son, Kevin.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the ablest young Members of this House, the Honorable George W. Collins, whose service to his district and the Nation was brought to an untimely end

shortly before the 93d Congress convened.

Mr. Speaker, for a man serving only a single term in this House, George Collins made a great impression upon all who came in contact with him. As a member of the Committees on Government Operations and Public Works he was a solid hard working member who was dedicated to getting the job done and not in headline hunting. Clearly, he was a man who would have made a national reputation for himself in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Mrs. Daniels and all Mr. Collins' friends in the House in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow, the former Cardiss Robertson and to their son, Kevin. In the years that lie ahead when the first shock of grief has past they will remember the many accomplishments of their husband and father. George Collins memory will always remain among those who loved him for what he was, a very fine American, a devoted legislator, and a good citizen. May Almighty God let perpetual light shine upon him always.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, George W. Collins was a bright star that shone for far too little a time.

I knew Congressman Collins of Illinois rather well because he sat next to me on the Government Operations Committee. I was impressed with his fairness and his grasp of the problems that confronted us in our deliberations.

More important, I respected him for his obvious concern about others and his determination that we were going to solve some of these problems. Had he been permitted to live, I believe he would have made great contributions to his Nation.

As it is, a respected colleague is gone. Yet, I think his example will not be forgotten by those of us who had the opportunity to know him.

He served less than one term, coming here to fill a vacancy created by the death of another of our colleagues, Daniel J. Ronan. It is obvious that he represented his people well, for they renamed him to a second term.

To his wife and son, I extend my deepest sympathy.

The tragic crash of that airplane at Chicago caused anguish and grief to many families. It caused a particular pang to those of us who knew and respected George Collins.

It is a great tragedy for those of us who know what great contributions George Collins would have continued to make for his State and Nation had he been permitted to continue his stewardship. Yet, I think all of us can look back with pride on the fact that he made so many contributions in the short span he was permitted to be with us.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable George Collins of Illinois. His tragic death in an airplane crash this past December fills me with grief and sorrow.

During his service in the 91st and 92d Congresses, I became personally acquainted with this great American who exemplified the ideals of our Nation. He

quickly acquired a wide circle of friends and admirers who recognized his outstanding ability as a legislator. More than that, we enjoyed his presence as a friend.

George Collins worked his way through life and rose to a position as a U.S. Congressman because he was willing to exert extra effort to achieve lofty goals. He showed that one could succeed by individual initiative and determination. His success is an inspiration to all who believe in dedication to one's fellow man.

Through his membership on the House Committees on Public Works and Government Operations, through his votes, and through his leadership in many other areas of legislative endeavor, George Collins was an effective advocate for his district, State, and Nation. His loyalty, integrity, and devotion to the cause of the average person, are recognized by everyone who knew him.

George Collins' departure is a grievous loss to the Congress, but we have all benefited greatly from his presence. His accomplishments will remain as a testimonial to our highest ideals of service and brotherhood.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty but also a privilege to join in honoring the memory of Congressman George Collins of Illinois. George Collins' fine career in Congress was cut short by the ill-fated airline crash which took his life.

When he met his death, he was returning to Chicago to attend the 24th ward children's Christmas party, of which he was the founder.

His service to the West Side of Chicago will long be remembered, as committeeman for the 24th ward, alderman for the same ward, and finally as a Member of Congress. He led many battles in the fields of housing and drug abuse prevention, but will be best remembered for his services to the youth of his community.

It is with sadness and pride that I pay him this final tribute.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the loss of our colleague from Illinois is one we shall all feel deeply. Having served with George Collins on the House Committee on Public Works, I had the opportunity, although briefly, to know him and to appreciate his keen mind and great insight.

George's stay in the House was short. He came in 1970, after a special election, and was reelected to the 92d and 93d Congresses. His contributions during those years, however, were substantial, and this body has indeed suffered a great loss in not having his assistance during the 93d Congress, as well as the personal loss of his warm friendship for all.

He was a man who truly believed in the future of America—a future which embodied real equal opportunity for all men. He worked hard for that belief, and earned the respect of his colleagues in the process.

Mrs. Howard joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family in their sudden and most tragic loss.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know all those who knew George Collins were shocked and numbed



by his death in a plane crash during the Christmas holiday.

I had the honor of serving with George on the Government Operations Committee and know the high regard in which he was held by both the members of the committee and his fellow delegation members of Illinois.

Although being a freshman legislator does not always offer an individual an opportunity to make an indelible mark on this institution, George Collins did make a lasting impression on those with whom he worked.

He was a fine man, and a good Congressman.

I wish to extend my condolences to his family.

I am most hopeful, if newspaper accounts are accurate, that Mrs. Cardiss W. Collins, George's widow, will join us in the House as a colleague, succeeding her late husband.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, George Collins and I came to the House together only 2 short years ago. During the 92d Congress, we served on the same two committees, Public Works and Government Operations, and our offices in the Longworth Building were only a few doors apart. Thus, I not only had the privilege of working with George in committee, but also walked with him to and from committee meetings or the House floor on many occasions.

As a Representative, he was a careful and diligent worker on behalf of his district and his country. As a human being, he was a warm family man with a smile and a greeting no matter how busy he was. It is typical of the man that when he died in a tragic air crash, he was en route to a meeting with constituents, doing his job and serving his country. We shall miss him.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Illinois in paying my respects to the memory of the Honorable George Collins. Since we are both Collins, I have kept up with him closely as our names were called together on every rollcall.

But even more, our offices were only a few doors apart in the Longworth Office Building. Nearly every day we walked over together for votes when the bells would ring. What I remember the most about George was his pleasant, delightful personality. He always had a smile on his face and he lifted me up just to be walking with him.

He loved Chicago and he loved the whole country. He was a positive thinker and was determined to build a greater future for this country. As we would walk back and forth I always enhanced my perspective with his enthusiasm and interest in his work.

George Collins was a hard-working Congressman. When I left the office late, I always noticed that George was always working in his office. All the lights were out in the other offices, but George was still working. No matter how late it was in the evening, he always had a pleasant word of greeting or some comment for action.

I have seen his young son visit the office many times. To this fine son and to his charming widow, I extend my sincerest

sympathy upon the loss of one of our most distinguished Members. The House will always remember George Collins, the Congressman from Chicago who represented Illinois so capably.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the crash of a United Air Lines jet near Midway Airport in Chicago on December 8, 1972, took the life of Congressman George W. Collins.

The citizens of Chicago's Seventh Congressional District were well represented by this able and dedicated public servant. When he perished, George Collins was 47 years old, and about to begin his second term in Congress after a triumphant reelection in which he received 83 percent of the vote. He was one of the two black Congressmen from Chicago, and the first ever elected from Chicago's West Side.

George Collins' career in public service was a distinguished one. After leaving his studies in business law at Northwestern University, he served with the Army Corps of Engineers in the South Pacific during World War II. Returning to Illinois, he served with the Cook County Sheriff's Department, the Municipal Court System, and the Board of Health. He was the president of the Lawndale Youth Commission, a member of the board of directors of the Greater Lawndale Conservation Commission, and was a member of the Professional and Businessman's Association.

George Collins was elected to the House of Representatives in what was Chicago's Sixth Congressional District. Although as a black man in the minority in this District, in his 1970 campaign he won handily with 56 percent of the vote. During his all too short tenure in the House he served on the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Government Operations.

I came to Congress with George Collins, and I can speak from personal knowledge of his dedication to Congress and to his constituents. He served his people well, working diligently here in Congress and returning to his District almost every weekend. George Collins will be sorely missed, both by his colleagues and by his constituents.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, George Collins was a friend of mine. We served together on the House Public Works Committee in the 92d Congress and we quickly developed a friendship of mutual respect. He was a conscientious and hardworking Congressman, devoted to the welfare of all Americans. He was a most effective advocate in committee and among all his colleagues for the best interests of the great city of Chicago. Congressman George Collins was tragically taken from us just at the prime of his career in public service, and we miss him greatly here.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to his family and constituents our heartfelt sympathy and deepest respect.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George W. Collins, the U.S. Representative from the Sixth Congressional District of Illinois, will be remembered by all of us as a warmhearted, intelligent, and generous man.

The late Congressman Collins was elected to fill a vacancy in the 91st Congress and was reelected to the 92d Congress.

While in Congress, I had the fortunate opportunity to work closely with him on the Public Works Committee. We worked especially hard on the effort to permit the use of highway trust fund revenues for mass transit purposes. At that time, I gained firsthand knowledge of his great concern for the aged, the young, and the minorities who are often denied the benefits of our society simply because they have no method of transportation. George was sensitive to the fact that, for these people, education, employment, and health care were out of reach except to those who were fortunate enough to possess an automobile and were able to drive. George was sensitive to the fact that highways often split neighborhoods and uprooted families. He was sensitive to the fact that highways merely brought congestion and pollution to his people, but did not relieve the problems.

George W. Collins' activities in Congress and in his district are numerous. He received various awards, including the Man of the Year Award from the Greater Lawndale Conservation Commission, and the Youth Service Award by the Chicago police department.

He was "a man of the people"; George Collins knew the people and their needs. He believed in people, and the people believed in him.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend the deepest sympathy of myself and Mrs. Anderson to Mrs. Collins and their son, Kevin.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of serving with George Collins on the Government Operations Committee and on subcommittee. I saw him in action and quickly realized his concern for the people he served. Although I was of a different party, I believed him to have been a good man and a fine legislator. We will miss him here in Congress.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late, good friend, George Collins. I was privileged to serve with Congressman Collins on the Government Operations Committee and to witness his diligence and his concern for humanity.

It is typical of the man that when he died he was on his way to a children's Christmas party. He had insisted on buying the presents himself.

Congress had lost an industrious Member, Chicago an effective leader, and we have all lost a friend. He shall be missed.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great aircraft tragedies of our century occurred on December 8, 1972, when a plane crashed near Midway Airport, causing the death of a number of passengers, including our colleague, Congressman George Collins of the Sixth District of Illinois.

In his fitting and eloquent tribute to George Collins, the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable THOMAS "Tip" O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, identified George Collins intimately with the word "love." It can be truly said that Congressman Collins was a beloved man

who was held in deep affection by his constituents and by his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the final services in memory of George Collins at his church in Chicago. The generous and heart-rending expressions heard on that occasion attest to the love which characterized Congressman Collins in his personal relationships, as well as in his public service.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have known George Collins during his lifetime, and to have benefited from the warmth and tenderness which surrounded this man of love and understanding.

I join with my other colleagues in mourning his loss, and in extending deepest sympathy to his loving wife, Cardiss, and to his devoted son, Kevin.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the memory of our late colleague, the Honorable George W. Collins of Illinois, who served so capably with me on the House Public Works Committee.

Representative Collins was most diligent in the discharge of his committee responsibilities. He was an eager scholar in examining the great need for public facilities and the internal development of our Nation. He was keenly aware of the requirements for urban improvements and sought to assure a proper place for total needs by the establishment of adequate priorities for development and enhancement of the environment for all people.

I recall with particular warmth a visit he made last year to inspect the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center and other Government activities within the north Alabama district I represent. It was a pleasure to be with him. Congressman Collins was very well received by all those with whom he came in contact. His alertness and pleasant manner gained him many new friends and admirers.

The fatal accident which cut short his congressional service was a tragedy realized far beyond the bounds of his Chicago districts.

We have all lost a generous and thoughtful colleague and friend.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the tragic, untimely death of George W. Collins came not only as a shock, but also with a deep sense of loss and sadness to all of us who worked with this distinguished gentleman from Illinois. The worst domestic airline crash of last year occurred on December 8, 1972, claiming the life of this devoted Member of Congress who was en route to Chicago to organize a children's Christmas party.

It was a great privilege and honor for me to have associated with George Collins on our Public Works Committee, where he served ably on four subcommittees in addition to his duties on the Government Operations Committee. This talented legislator will be remembered with gratitude and admiration for his vital contribution during the floor debate on passage of the historic Clean Water Act of 1972.

George Collins was a kind and gentle

person, an effective dedicated public servant. I cherished his friendship, and respected his empathy for those Americans of less fortunate circumstances. The House of Representatives and the Nation have lost an effective champion of civil liberties and human dignity.

We already miss the day-to-day association with our former colleague and I personally deeply regret that our House Public Works Committee will no longer have the benefit of George Collins' devoted service, integrity, and spirit.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Price) and join with him and others in paying a brief, but sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague, Congressman George W. Collins of Illinois.

I was shocked and saddened to learn of the tragic passing of George Collins—although his career in Congress has been cut short, we had all come to know and appreciate this fine man who was elected first to the 91st Congress. He was personable, industrious, and a gentleman.

George Collins served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and well—his background in government and civic affairs was excellent preparation for his duties and responsibilities as Congressman.

He had great ability and great potential—and he will be missed by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I also want to take this means of extending to Mrs. Collins, and their son, Kevin, this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement. Mrs. Evins joins me in these sentiments.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, during the beginning of the Christmas season we lost a close friend in Congressman George Collins.

He was on a flight to Chicago to organize a Christmas party for the children of his district.

His philosophy of government and politics was a simple one. He often said:

Serve the people 365 days a year and the votes take care of themselves.

His career was one that followed a classic route in American Government that took him through the municipal court system, law enforcement, the board of health, and the city council. When such a man comes to the Congress he has much to offer in that the millions of words that pass through his office in letters and memorandum have some meanings in that he can visualize the problems of people because he has learned so much about people and Government before he came.

George Collins served all the people of his district from the black wards of Chicago to the white wards of Cicero, Ill. In the past, the racial problems of his district had received great attention from the national press. Their Congressman was bringing the people of his district together, 365 days a year, proving once again that good politics is statesmanship 365 days a year.

We all are aware of the flashy courage that journalism devotes itself to because it is confined to one attention-getting

event. But, the kind of courage that is exhibited by men going about their work day in and day out is evidenced by good character that a man's colleagues become aware of slowly but surely. It was said of Gen. Ulysses Grant that people did not notice Grant, they became aware of him in time.

At the time of his death, George Collins was a Congressman's Congressman. He had the respect of the Members of the most important legislative bodies in the world, the U.S. House of Representatives. He earned it in 3 short years.

I will miss a friend and we will all miss a colleague.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as the 93d Congress begins, I want to express my respect and admiration for one of the truly great Americans who served in the U.S. House of Representatives.

George Collins rose through the Chicago Democratic organization to become a Congressman 2 years ago. He had a remarkable record of public service for a man who served with us for such a short period. He was a champion of the little man and an advocate of income tax reform. We served together on the Government Operations Committee and I found him to be an intelligent, diligent, and hard-working man.

He was truly dedicated to public service, and lived up to the full measure of his responsibilities. He leaves rich memories for all of us in public office.

My deepest sympathies go out to his devoted wife and family.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am most appreciative of the gentleman from Illinois who has secured this special order to honor our late colleague and friend, George W. Collins. His loss is one which all of us feel deeply and we will sorely miss his effervescent personality, his sharp mind and his gracious manner.

I am going to miss George Collins very much. He was one of those rare men who, though young in service and age, was so able to place into a perspective the difficulties that face us in these times. He understood the issues in terms of the hopes and fears of human experience which he combined with his own deep compassion and sympathetic understanding. He led the people of his district in seeking the high ideals which our Nation offered and he represented their everyday hopes and aspirations. It was in doing this that he lost his life on that ill-fated flight from Washington to Chicago. Instead of resting and going later, he took the early plane to be able to participate fully in the children's Christmas party. This was typical of his unbounding energy and selflessness. He loved his community, its people, and his Nation and he worked hard to serve them.

His motivation can be said to be founded in the city of his birth—Chicago—where he had a distinguished career before coming to Congress. He served as a sheriff, bailiff, and then alderman and committeeman. From these experiences he learned to know the city, its hopes, and its needs. He developed a special compassion for the elderly and the very young. These people especially shall miss him.



A sudden death is always tragic. Often, however, we can use the time and the tragedy to look more deeply into ourselves. I hope that we will do this because we ought not allow the motivation and the love which George had to pass on with him. I know that we will not allow his life and death to have been in vain.

My wife Dorothy extends with me our deepest sympathy to Cardiss and their son Kevin.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed tragic when a man with the exceptional ability, varied experience, and great potential of George W. Collins is suddenly taken from us. He could have contributed so much more to this great body and the Nation had he been spared for further service.

After serving his country with distinction during World War II and achieving a measure of success in business, George Collins was elected to the Congress of the United States. Although he served here for only 2 years, he quickly learned the fundamentals of the legislative process and soon had a well-deserved reputation for getting things done.

Without fanfare or flamboyancy, he worked hard on behalf of his constituents. He was, however, no mere parochial Member. His breadth of vision, his love of humanity, and his hatred of injustice knew no boundaries. We will sorely miss George Collins in the days ahead.

May he rest in peace and may his family find some comfort in knowing that he served his community, State and Nation well. Let the record that he has written inspire others to emulate his efforts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. PRICE, for taking this special order to enable us to pay tribute to a man who made his mark on Congress although here only 2 short years. I speak, of course, of the late George Collins, Congressman from Illinois, who perished in a tragic airplane crash last December.

George Collins was a quiet man. He did not seek headlines but few were as deserving of them as he. He worked hard in the Congressional Black Caucus and the Democratic Caucus as well as in Congress. He was a representative in the truest sense of the word, for he worked for the people of his district. His people were black, brown, yellow, and white; they were the poor, the unfortunate and the lonely; they were the powerless and the forgotten; but most importantly to George Collins, they were the people.

This Congress has lost one of its most dedicated, dignified, and respected Members. His memory should serve as a reminder to us all of what we are elected to do, represent the people.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his widow Carliss and their son Kevin upon their great personal loss.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of my colleague on the Illinois delegation, George Collins, just as he was about to begin his second full term in Congress, has been a great shock to us all. Elected in 1970 to fill the vacant seat caused by the death of veteran Congressman Daniel Ronan, and reelected to the 92d and 93d Congresses, George Collins was at the height of his successful career in politics and govern-

ment. His loss will be sorely felt by his constituents, by the Illinois delegation, by all of his colleagues, and many friends and admirers.

Those of us who worked most closely with George will miss him particularly. As a freshman legislator, he was outstanding in his devotion and dedication to serving the needs of his district and the State of Illinois. He was never too busy to help a colleague or a constituent who needed his assistance, though he spent long hours researching the problems and details of his legislative assignments. He was loyal to his party, but was liked, admired, and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

The Nation, the Congress, and the State of Illinois have suffered a very great loss indeed, in the death of George Collins. He was a man whose life was a demonstration of the highest ideals of public service. That life was tragically cut short, but George will not be forgotten. His memory will inspire others who may follow in his footsteps.

To his bereaved family, I join my colleagues in extending my deep sympathy and sincere condolences.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the news of a multifatality accident such as a plane crash always comes as a shock and causes concern about those who lose their lives and the families and loved ones who survive.

When we heard of the airplane crash last December at Chicago, the news was even a greater shock when we learned that among the passengers who died was our distinguished colleague, George Collins.

During the session last year I had the opportunity to meet George Collins and subsequently to watch him here at work in the House of Representatives and to learn of the zeal and dedication he had in serving his constituents of Illinois and in fact for serving his State and Nation.

He came to Washington after a distinguished career in local and State governments having held positions with the Cook County Sheriff's Department, the municipal court system, and the board of health.

He had not gained a great deal of seniority in the House but he was gaining each day in stature and respect as a hard worker.

I consider it a privilege to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute today to the Honorable George Collins.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of this body in mourning the passing of an able legislator and our distinguished colleague, George Collins. It is shocking and sad-denning that such a fine man was struck down in the prime of his life.

The enthusiasm and dedication of this soft spoken gentleman brought him the greatest respect of all who knew him. As evidenced in his overwhelming reelection victory last November, George Collins was held in the highest esteem by the people of his district. He worked hard for those constituents as well as for all Americans.

Very concerned and involved with the problems of both the young and the

very old, he worked to help many unable to help themselves. It is a tribute to this man, though a sad and ironic one, that George Collins died trying to make some children happy.

An observant and sensitive man, he sought to correct injustices when he encountered them. A veteran himself, he did his best to make fairness and equality of treatment the right of every serviceman.

Throughout his public service career, George Collins fought to provide an even break for those who for so long were denied one. For black Americans and other minorities, he labored to insure their right to equal opportunity.

With the great need for men of his caliber, our loss is truly an enormous one. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and tragic demise of the Honorable George W. Collins of the Illinois Sixth District, late last year, has come as a blow to the House of Representatives, leaving many Members with a distinct sense of personal loss. Indeed, his departure is a great source of grief so far as I am personally concerned.

George Collins had shown, in his single term in Congress, a knowledge of politics and government that rendered him a blessing to his district and to the country. His service in floor debate and committee discussion revealed his vast and sweeping knowledge of the many problems confronting us today, and the methods best suited for their imminent solution.

Closely associated over the past quarter of a century with the operations of county and city governments, George Collins brought to Washington the deepest concern for grass-roots problems, and was intent upon applying his abilities in this regard to practical effect.

A native of Chicago and a graduate of Northwestern University, where he became proficient in business law, he served the country with distinction in World War II as a member of the Army Engineers, before entering the business of government in which he was to become one of the most knowledgeable men of my acquaintance.

During the course of his pre-congressional career, he held positions with the sheriff's office of Cook County, Ill., the municipal court system of Chicago, and the Chicago Board of Health. He was president of the Lawndale Youth Commission, and a member of the board of directors of the Greater Lawndale Conservation Commission, as well as belonging to several religious and professional and businessmen's associations of considerable importance.

In all these undertakings George Collins performed with skill and with deep concern for the interests of Chicago and the State of Illinois. Following the death of the Honorable Daniel J. Roman, he was elected to represent the Sixth District in November 1970 and reelected last November, shortly preceding the airplane accident that claimed his life.

As a member of the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Public Works, George Collins revealed at once his grasp of national

issues and mastery of detail. He was clearly one of the outstanding new Members of the 92d Congress in the eyes of all who witnessed his performance at close range.

We shall sorely miss him, both professionally and personally, and I would like at this time to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and son in their bereavement.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable George Collins.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### BAKERS: THE MIDDLE LINK

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

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing and complex issues before the Government and, in fact, before every citizen of this Nation as a consumer is the relentlessly increasing cost of food. This is no news to Kansans who are both major producers and consumers of food. The administration has recognized the problem and is attempting to cope with it through continuation of controls on food processing.

The Third Congressional District in Kansas includes the metropolitan area of Kansas City and extends into the smaller towns and farmlands which make up so much of the State. Kansas is literally the breadbasket of the Nation. In Kansas we see the whole chain of wheatgrower, miller, baker, grocer, and consumer. Some States have few, if any, wheatgrowers and millers; but every State has bakers, grocers, and consumers. Bakers are the vital middle link in the chain, and it is imperative that we have a healthy, competitive baking industry. That would be true of any day, but is essential now when consumers have special incentives and needs to give greater emphasis to bread as being one of the most economical sources of balanced proteins, calories, minerals, and vitamins.

What then is the problem? If you will recall, last summer Soviet buyers contracted for massive amounts of American wheat—420 million bushels—an amount in excess of that made into flour for the entire baking industry in the United States for an entire year. Coincident with the announcement of these purchases, the price of wheat and of flour began to rise rapidly. Wheat and flour prices have been relatively stable for years. After the Russian purchases were announced, prices zoomed. Today flour on the Kansas City market is up approximately \$2.25 per hundredweight over a year ago. Identical or comparable increases have occurred on the other markets across the country. This is an increase of over 40 percent. Both the size

and the speed of the price increase are unprecedented.

The wages of production workers in Kansas City bakeries have gone up some 12 percent in 1972. Other ingredient and operational costs are up. Important as these other costs are, let us momentarily disregard them and think only in terms of flour. The latest reading from the Bureau of Labor Statistics available to us—October 1972—shows the retail price of a 1-pound loaf of white bread in Kansas City to be remarkably similar to the level that existed 5 years ago—25.2 cents in January 1968 versus 25.7 cents in October 1972. These figures not only show the intensity of competition in the wholesale baking industry but also the keen competition on grocers' shelves.

Nearly every baker is now using higher priced flour. This extra cost more than offsets the average profit for the entire industry. This means only a few of the strongest bakers will survive. For the rest it will mean plants will be closed, jobs will be lost, bankruptcies will be filed and competition in the baking industry drastically reduced. The January 9, 1973, issue of Milling & Baking News reports some 40 commercial bakeries were closed during 1972.

I sincerely hope the cost of living council will consider these factors before taking action on the American Bakers Association's appeal. The baking industry is vital to this country's welfare, and the effects of the cost of living council's decision must be considered in terms of the Nation as a whole.

Any decision by the cost of living council that would force additional independent bakers out of business is not in the National interest. Control of the industry by a few of the Nation's giant bakers would, in my opinion, result in higher prices and less competition in the industry on a long-term basis.

#### VETERANS BENEFITS FOR POW'S

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is pledged to help rebuild North Vietnam. Article 21 of the peace agreement signed by Secretary of State Rogers on January 27 states:

The United States anticipates that this Agreement will usher in an area of reconciliation with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as with all the peoples of Indochina. In pursuance of its traditional policy, the United States will contribute to healing the wounds of war and to postwar reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and throughout Indochina.

Certainly, we should make a commitment to help rebuild the lives of our returning POW's equal to our commitment to help rebuild North Vietnam. In my view, much more should be done to help those Americans who have borne one of the greatest burdens of this long war.

The bill which, 37 of my colleagues and I are introducing today, provides special veterans benefits to all POW's. This "adjustment assistance" would take the form of monthly payments similar to

those now received by veterans for injuries suffered during the Vietnam war. For example, a veteran who lost his leg during the war receives \$47 per month for the rest of his life.

Under our bill, an American soldier held prisoner would also receive monthly benefits for the rest of his life. The amount would depend upon the length of his captivity. If he were held prisoner for 1 year, he would receive \$30 per month upon being released from active duty. If he were held captive for 2 years, he would receive \$60 per month; 3 years would entitle him to \$90 per month, and so on up to a maximum of \$150 per month if he were held captive for 5 or more years.

This adjustment assistance will be greatly needed by some POW's and well merited by all. Some will have to adjust to new families, the deaths of loved ones, wives who have remarried, difficulty in gaining and holding a job, and mental stresses of which you and I cannot conceive.

Although most Americans would like to forget Vietnam as quickly as possible, by introducing this bill we state our determination that our POW's will not be forgotten.

#### COSPONSORS OF VIETNAM POW BILL

L. A. Bafalis (R-Fla).  
LaMar Baker (R-Tenn).  
Tom Bevill (D-Minn).  
Clair Burgener (R-Calif).  
Harold Collier (R-Ill).  
Phillip Crane (R-Ill).  
Mendel Davis (D-SC).  
Samuel Devine (R-Ohio).  
Harold Donohue (D-Mass).  
Don Edwards (D-Calif).  
Joshua Ellberg (D-Pa).  
Edwin Eshleman (R-Pa).  
Paul Findley\* (R-Ill).  
Edwin Forsythe (R-NJ).  
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (R-Calif).  
Julia Butler Hansen (D-Wash).  
Ken Hechler (D-W. Va).  
William H. Hudnut (R-Ind).  
Albert W. Johnson (R-Pa).  
Jack Kemp (R-NY).  
Norman Lent (R-NY).  
Edward R. Madigan (R-Ill).  
James G. Martin (R-NC).  
Matthew Rinaldo (R-NJ).  
Robert A. Roe (D-NJ).  
Angelo Roncallo (R-NY).  
Benjamin Rosenthal (D-NY).  
Harold Runnels (D-NM).  
James Symington (D-Mo).  
Charles Wilson (D-Tex).  
Lawrence Williams (R-Pa).  
Gus Yatron (D-Pa).  
C. W. Bill Young (R-Fla).  
John Zwach (R-Minn).

#### H.R. —

To provide adjustment assistance to prisoners-of-war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(t) If the veteran was detained, through no misconduct of his own as a prisoner-of-war during the Vietnam era by the Government of North Vietnam or governments or forces allied with such Government, such

\*Chief sponsor.



detailed status shall be deemed to be a disability within the meaning of section 310, and the rate of compensation therefor shall be \$30 per month for each year or portion thereof that the veteran was detained as a prisoner-of-war, up to a maximum of \$150 per month. Such compensation shall be independent of any other compensation provided in this section, and is authorized because throughout the Vietnam conflict the Government of North Vietnam and governments and forces allied with such Government persistently and grossly violated the provisions of the Geneva Convention Relative to Treatment of Prisoners-of-War, which North Vietnam ratified in 1957."

#### ADEQUATE MINORITY STAFFING FOR COMMITTEES

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this morning a news conference was held on the subject of minority committee staffing reform. The conference was hosted by our distinguished House Republican leader, GERALD R. FORD, and included the following participants: House Republican whip, LES ARENDS; Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND; Common Cause Chairman John Gardner; attorney Ralph Nader; and myself. The thrust of the news conference was to press for immediate consideration and restoration of the one-third minority staffing provision of the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act which was later deleted from the House rules on a straight party vote at the beginning of the 92d Congress. Congressman CLEVELAND and I have introduced House Resolution 167 to provide committee minorities up to one-third of the investigatory staff funds, and I have today written to Chairman MADDEN of the Rules Committee requesting a hearing on this resolution at the earliest practicable date.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the statements of each of the participants in this morning's new conference, and a copy of the letter I have sent to Chairman MADDEN.

#### STATEMENT BY HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER GERALD R. FORD

We have called this joint press conference to light a fire under our Democratic friends in the House on the subject of minority staffing and to announce support for increased minority staffing by Common Cause Chairman John Gardner and Ralph Nader.

Mr. Gardner comes to us with combat experience in a similar battle on the Senate side. Mr. Nader comes fresh into this fray but is no less dedicated to seeing that justice is done. We also have here today Congressman Les Arends, the House minority whip, Congressman John Anderson, the House GOP Conference chairman, and Congressman Jim Cleveland, former member of the Joint Committee for Reorganization of the Congress. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Cleveland are cosponsors of a minority staffing resolution, H. Res. 167, currently being considered.

Identical resolutions have been introduced by Congressmen Barber Conable of New York and William J. Keating of Ohio, H. Res. 23; Harold R. Collier of Illinois, H. Res. 46; and Jack Edwards of Alabama, H. Res. 101.

All of these resolutions would amend the Rules of the House of Representatives by striking out clause 32(c) of rule XI and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph: "The minority party on any such standing committee is entitled, upon request of a majority of such minority, to up to one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to each such primary or additional expenditure resolution."

Clause 32(c) of rule XI now reads that the minority "shall receive fair consideration" in the matter of minority staffing.

As anyone can readily recognize, the phrase, "fair consideration," is subject to as many interpretations as there are committee chairmen and committee majorities. This is no guarantee of equity and fairness.

I would like to turn now to my good friend Les Arends to give you the background of the move to increase minority staffing and to refresh your memories on how a one-third minority staffing provision became part of the Reorganization Act of 1970 but was knocked out of the House Rules in January 1971 by the Democrats voting under a binding rule adopted in caucus.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS BY HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER GERALD R. FORD

##### ARGUMENTS FOR ONE-THIRD MINORITY STAFFING

Overturning the one-third provision was a breach of faith. An agreement had been made with the Democrats, but was not kept.

Overturning the one-third provision was an exercise of raw political power, an example of a unit-rule, secret, binding party vote which prevents Democratic members from changing their minds because of floor arguments or because of conscience.

The protection of the rights of the minority is a basic tenet of governmental philosophy in the United States.

Although the minority is to receive "fair consideration" in staffing, this is in fact differently interpreted in each committee and often the spirit of the law is not observed.

If the minority is to serve as a loyal opposition, it needs staffing in order to be effective.

The minority cannot grapple effectively with the complex issues and problems generated by a post-industrial society without adequate staffing.

If the minority is to develop meaningful alternatives and responses to these problems, it needs staff assistance.

Professionalism is not inconsistent with partisanship—it is important for the minority to have minority staff with points of view different from those of the majority staff. Republicans and Democrats have different viewpoints, and minority members need to be able to work with staff members who share their outlook.

Having a sizable minority staff does not mean that the minority and majority cannot work effectively together. The Education and Labor Committee is an example of cooperation.

Some chairmen won't make staff available to other members—either majority or minority. The amendment is an opportunity for all members of committees to get adequate staffing. The allotment of staff has been abused on some committees.

The GOP has controlled Congress in only 4 of the last 40 years—the staffs that have grown over that period are not bipartisan.

The adversary system calls for the best possible presentation by both sides to achieve the goal of justice and good legislation.

Minority views have frequently influenced the outcome of legislation. Adequate staffing

is necessary to insure that those views are developed and offer worthwhile alternatives.

Congress needs adequate staffing in order not to lose its initiative in policymaking and bill drafting to the executive.

Many staff members are not quartered in the committee rooms, but are in the Chairman's or other majority members' offices where they are not accessible to minority members.

The executive branch has grown and developed into a vast bureaucracy of professionalism. Its strength has been proportional to the caliber of people it has attracted. The minority in Congress needs staff to balance and respond to this.

From 1969 to 1972, approximately one-third of the Record votes have been divided along partisan lines. Since so many important issues are decided on the basis of partisanship, it is only fair that the minority be assisted by an adequate staff so it can deal realistically with the world in which it exists.

#### REMARKS OF HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

One of the meaningful achievements of the 91st Congress was enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which tackled in a comprehensive fashion the entire subject of Congressional reform.

You may recall that one of the most significant reforms written into that Act was a provision for at least one-third of investigative committee staffing for the Minority. That provision was hammered into the legislation by a fair-minded, bipartisan coalition. This was the so-called Thompson-Schwengel Amendment, adopted on a teller vote of 105 to 63.

Six months later, however, House Democrats met in caucus, and as a result of a power play by Committee Chairmen set about overturning this one-third Minority staffing provision which the House in its wisdom had previously approved. Instead, the Caucus adopted a rule which bound all House Democrats to vote for repeal of the authority for one-third Minority staffing.

When the 92nd Congress convened, the House by a straight Party vote of 226 to 155 deleted the Minority staffing provision and returned to the so-called "fairness rule."

In my judgment, that action was most unfortunate and a further blow to needed Congressional reform. It was a backward step—and a total breach of trust!

Adequate Minority staffing is vital to the proper functioning of the adversary system in Congress, and Minority staffs should be increased so that members of the Minority Party of the House may better fulfill their obligation to the people they are elected to represent.

The question is not one of interest just to the Congress—it should be of interest to the entire nation. Because of the nature of our national problems, legislation today is becoming more and more complex. There are many divergent points of view and many alternatives to be considered. We cannot act responsibly without proper advance research—and this means adequate staffing to do the job.

I feel—as do many of our colleagues—that this should not be a partisan question but a question of what is best for the Congress and ultimately the American people.

It is for this reason that a number of House Democrats—notably Frank Thompson, of New Jersey; Donald Fraser, of Minnesota; and John Dent, of Pennsylvania—spoke in favor of one-third Minority staffing when the matter was debated on July 15, 1970, in the 91st Congress. The case for adequate Minority staffing is being supported by Democrats,

by Republicans, and by political scientists and experts in government at all levels.

To function effectively, the Minority in Congress must have better staffing. To deprive the Minority of staff is like depriving an accused person the right of counsel in a court of law.

STATEMENT OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE  
CHAIRMAN JOHN B. ANDERSON

I want to join with my minority leader and whip in welcoming our distinguished guests, John Gardner and Ralph Nader to this press conference on minority committee staffing reform. Given the credentials of our two guests, I am tempted to launch into a speech about how we are gathered here today in common cause to correct a major defect before Congress is recalled. But I shall refrain from any such oratory.

In all seriousness, I do want to commend our two guests for the work they have both done in focusing public attention on the problems and potential of the Congress as a coequal branch. I think it is a very healthy development that due to their efforts, and that of others, there is a new public awareness of the Congress and the need to strengthen and modernize it as a branch of government. I believe it was the British statesman Edmund Burke who once said, "Reform in order to preserve," and that's what the current reform move in the Congress is really all about—preserving our constitutional role.

I am therefore delighted and most grateful that our two guests, who are playing such an active outside role in the congressional reform movement are with us today to press for a very essential reform—the provisions of adequate minority staffing on committees. This is an issue which has been kicking around for as long as I have been here. I had the pleasure as far back as 1963 of serving on the Schwengel Republican Conference Committee on Increased Minority Staffing, and my friend Jim Cleveland also served on that committee. The problem received considerable attention from the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in the 89th Congress, and this eventually culminated in a successful bipartisan effort to provide up to one-third of the investigatory staff funds for the minority—an amendment to the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act.

The reason we are here today is because the Democrats broke faith with us at the beginning of the last Congress and by unit rule bound their entire membership to vote to delete the one-third provision from the rules of the House. What we are asking for today is a restoration of the bipartisan spirit which was originally responsible for the passage of this provision. As a member of the Rules Committee I am today calling upon my chairman to convene a hearing at the earliest practicable date on House Resolution 167 which Congressman Cleveland and I have introduced. There can be no excuse for further studies or delays on this basic reform issue. This is not nor should not be a matter of partisanship, but rather is a matter of restoring the vital role of Congress which cannot be done without a viable minority.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1973.  
HON. RAY J. MADDEN,  
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,  
Capital Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to request that a Rules Committee hearing be convened at the earliest practicable date for consideration of House Resolution 167 as introduced by Congressman James Cleveland and myself on January 29, 1973.

H. Res. 167 would amend clause 32(c) of Rule XI of the House Rules to read:

"The minority of any such standing committee is entitled, upon request of a majority of such minority, to up to one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to each primary or additional expenditure resolution."

This is very similar to Rule XI, clause 32(c) as provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (PL 91-510)—a clause which was deleted in the adoption of the rules of the House in the 92nd Congress. That clause reads as follows:

"The minority party on any such standing committee is entitled, if they so request, to not less than one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff personnel pursuant to each primary or additional expense resolution."

As a former member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in the 89th Congress, you are aware that the problem of inadequate minority staffing has received considerable attention and study over the years, and this resulted in the bipartisan Thompson-Schwengel amendment to the 1970 Reorganization Act, adopted by a 105-63 teller vote on July 16, 1970. For these reasons, I am requesting that we proceed immediately on consideration of our 32(c) rather than deferring this matter any longer for further study in either the Rules Committee or the new select committee on rules X and XI.

Our request for immediate consideration of H. Res. 167 in the Rules Committee has the endorsement of the House Republican Leader, Gerald R. Ford, and the House Republican Whip, Les Arends, and also received the endorsement this morning of Common Cause Chairman John Gardner and attorney Ralph Nader.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you are as interested as I am in efforts to strengthen the role of the Congress vis-a-vis the Executive. Minority committee staffing is crucial in any such effort, for the minority party in Congress is an integral part of the institution, and the legislative branch will be as strong as its weakest link. If we are truly interested in genuine Congressional reform, we must attempt to strengthen all components, including minority committee staffing. As our colleague on the Rules Committee, Congressman Bolling wrote in his book, *House Out of Order*:

"Without the staff to frame alternative proposals, the minority cannot make its position clear on bills sponsored by the majority. Surely the discussion of alternatives is an important part of the democratic process, because it informs the public, compels a more careful and penetrating consideration of bills, and in my experience nearly always results in sounder legislation."

I am in full concurrence with Congressman Bolling on the vital role played by the minority party in Congress in the democratic process and am in agreement with him that the key to that role is adequate minority staffing. For these reasons, I am requesting immediate consideration in our committee of a revision of clause 32(c) along the lines originally provided in the 1970 Reorganization Act. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With all best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,  
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF JAMES C. CLEVELAND

First a word of welcome on behalf of minority staffing to our distinguished guests,

John Gardner and Ralph Nader. Jerry, Les and John—you've been here before.

Ten years ago the "Boss Buckley" incident kindled my interest in staffing generally and minority staffing in particular. Briefly stated, the Buckley incident involved my exposing the fact that a large part of all staff of the Public Works Committee spent their time in the Bronx. There was practically no minority staff.

My interest developed further as Chairman of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Committee Staffing, first organized by Congressman Schwengel. In our book, "We Propose: A Modern Congress", which was a compilation of major reform proposals, my chapter was on minority staffing. That chapter made a point which is obviously relevant today. What is really at stake when you talk of minority staffing (indeed all Congressional staffing) is whether the Congress can work effectively and independently enough to provide the balance to the Executive and Judicial branches intended by the framers of the Constitution. An effective and independent Congress is essential to the survival of representative government, which depends on a system of "Separation of Powers". The United States has accomplished this within and by virtue of a two party system.

I hope that increased interest in strengthening Congress is not just another passing fancy, or a partisan one, prompted at this moment in history by reaction to President Nixon and some of his policies. The effectiveness of Congress is more important than that. To make government work—we should make Congress work. That is why we are here. Minority staffing, specifically, allowing us only 13% of the staff, is part of the problem. Thank you for your interest.

COMMITTEE STAFFING IN 1972 PAID FOR FROM INVESTIGATIVE FUNDS—APPROXIMATE FIGURES

1. Agriculture Committee: Majority, \$47,500; Minority, \$24,500.
2. Armed Services Committee: \$83,000; No majority and minority breakdown.
3. Banking and Currency Committee: Majority, \$575,000; Minority, \$75,000.
4. District of Columbia Committee: Majority, \$42,000; Minority, \$11,500.
5. Education and Labor Committee: Majority, \$745,000; minority, \$170,000.
6. Foreign Affairs Committee: Majority, \$370,000; Minority, \$45,000.
7. Government Operations Committee: Majority, \$750,000; Minority, \$45,000.
8. House Administration Committee: Majority, \$230,000; Minority, none.
9. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee: Majority, \$235,000; Minority, \$12,000.
10. Internal Security Committee: Majority, \$440,000; Minority, \$70,000.
11. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee: Majority, \$575,000; Minority, \$105,000.
12. Judiciary Committee: Majority, \$280,000; Minority, \$65,000.
13. Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: Majority, \$205,000; Minority, none.
14. Post Office and Civil Service Committee: Majority, \$370,000; Minority, \$65,000.
15. Public Works Committee: Majority, \$675,000; Minority, \$130,000.
16. Science and Astronautics Committee: Majority, \$300,000; Minority, none.
17. Veterans' Affairs Committee: Majority, \$65,000; Minority, \$6,500.
18. Ways and Means Committee: Majority, none; Minority, \$16,500.
19. Crime Committee: Majority, \$415,000; Minority, \$40,000.
20. Small Business Committee: Majority, \$380,000; Minority, \$75,000.



## EMPLOYMENT ON HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES (PLUS SELECT SMALL BUSINESS AND CRIME) AS OF DEC. 31, 1972

	Employees	Majority	Minority	Minority percentage of total
<b>Employees:</b>				
Statutory.....	373	313	60	16
Investigative.....	466	407	59	12
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>13</b>

  

	Cost	Majority	Minority	Minority percentage of total
<b>Funds—1972:</b>				
Statutory.....	\$6,470,000	\$5,400,000	\$1,070,000	16
Investigative.....	7,820,000	6,865,000	955,000	9½
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>14,290,000</b>	<b>12,265,000</b>	<b>2,025,000</b>	<b>14</b>

## COMMON CAUSE SUPPORTS HOUSE GOP EFFORT TO STRENGTHEN MINORITY STAFFING

(Statement by John W. Gardner, Chairman, Common Cause, at joint press conference 10:00 a.m. February 5, 1973, 2118 Rayburn Building, with Representatives Gerald Ford and Les Arends)

Common Cause strongly supports House Republicans in their effort to reinstate a provision of the 1970 Legislative Reform Act that allowed minority members of committees to select their own professional staff members.

Reform of congressional procedures has been a major activity for Common Cause since 1970, our first year.

We have specifically endorsed adequate staffing for committee members of the minority party in testimony before the platform committees of the two parties before the Republican task force on House rules and before Senator Mathias' and Senator Stevenson's Ad Hoc Committee on Congressional Reorganization. It is an essential part of any congressional reform program.

The ability of Congress to hear and consider both sides of controversial issues is restricted when the minority party has insufficient staff resources. Professional committee staff selected by and responsible only to the majority members of a committee cannot adequately assist minority members in critically analyzing proposals by majority members or in preparing alternatives. No matter which party holds the White House, committee members should not have to rely solely on the Executive Departments for legislative analysis.

The House during its consideration of Congressional reforms in 1970 adopted a proposal that allowed minority committee members one-third of the committee funds to hire professional staff members. This proposal was offered by a Democrat, Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, and was supported at the time (July 16, 1970) by a bipartisan group of Representatives.

This important reform died. It was killed at the beginning of the 92nd Congress in January 1971 when House Democrats, meeting in caucus, ordered all Democrats to repeal the 1970 reform. The caucus action, which bound Democrats to vote for deletion of the minority staffing provision, was sponsored by Representative Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), who is a committee chairman.

With the beginning of the 93rd Congress, opportunity reoccurs to correct the unfair and harmful action of 1971.

Representatives John B. Anderson (R-Ill.) and James C. Cleveland (R-N.H.), has introduced a resolution to amend House rules to allow the minority members of a standing committee to use up to one-third of the funds available for committee staff to hire their own staff members, common Cause sup-

ports this resolution and urges Democrats to enact it as part of the House rules. We believe the way in which to accomplish this change is not by decreasing the staff available to the majority, but by providing additional staff in order that the minority may meet the one-third requirement.

The early days of the 93rd Congress have been marked in both Senate and House by important steps to reform a number of antiquated procedures, especially seniority, that have contributed to the declining influence of Representatives and Senators in national affairs.

Enlightened members of both political parties have come to realize that their ability to deal with the complex problems of the 1970's depends on the procedures and rules under which Congress operates. The reforms dealing with seniority, the initiation of studies of Congressional budget powers and committee structure and the reassertion of the powers of party caucuses all promise a new base from which Congress can deal with the Executive Branch on an equal basis.

These essential reforms should be advanced another step by reinstating the 1970 rule that allowed minority party control over their professional committee staffs. Under the Legislative Reorganization Acts, professional staff are to be appointed "without regard to political affiliation." In practice, however, political ties play an important role in the appointment of committee staff.

Committee staff members invariably respond more actively and loyally to the majority committee members—and especially the committee chairman—who are responsible for his employment. Moreover, the majority employ staff members who are generally in sympathy with their view of legislative issues. Thus, minority members are unable to bring in their own staff capacity to challenge the majority's beliefs and proposals. This condition significantly reduces the minority's ability to influence legislation and to introduce fresh concepts. The real losers in this maneuvering for power are our citizens who expect the best possible performance from their elected Representatives.

## STATEMENT OF RALPH NADER ON MINORITY STAFFING

Committee staff is essential to carry out Congressional responsibilities in preparing just legislation and overseeing the Executive branch of government. As long as the Congress is going to be organized along two-party lines, committee staff should be adequate for both the majority and minority parties. There is inadequate staff for the Democrats and even less adequate staff for the Republicans. Today, the focus is on the latter problem. It is part of the overall withering away of Congress before the Executive branch juggernaut whose leader is rapidly building a "do it yourself" Congress right inside the

White House complex. If the "Hill" continues to permit an erosion of its power, it will be called "Withering Heights."

At the beginning of the 92nd Congress, following by only three months the enactment of the first meaningful congressional reform in 24 years—the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970—Rep. Chet Holifield employed a binding resolution from the Democratic Caucus to virtually command every Democrat to support an amendment deleting the requirement for at least one-third minority staffing on standing committees. As he warned his Democratic colleagues just moments before the vote: "You are down to the place where the gut cutting occurs. You are going to be practical and take what you can get, or you are going to open up a Pandora's box—and you do not know what you are going to get."

Chairman Holifield is apparently knowledgeable about the activity. His Government Operations Committee allocates only 4 percent of its investigatory staff to the minority. With the exception of Appropriations, Armed Services, House Administration and the Science Committees, which have no investigatory staff allocation to the minority, Government Operations has one of the largest staffs and the lowest allocation to the minority (three of eleven statutory employees and two of forty-six investigatory employees).

Some members, especially committee chairmen, claim objections to minority staff provisions on the basis that the committee staffs should be "bipartisan and professional." In effect, these chairmen have coopted the ranking Republican on their committees not to raise a fuss about staffing in return for small immaterial services and "deference" for the ranking minority. When confronted with the option of cooperation (even at the price of grossly inadequate expertise and servicing) most ranking minority members have chosen to avoid confrontation. They have seldom sought to demand staff under the existing inadequate rule requiring "fair consideration" to the minority in the appointment of committee staff personnel. Granted the phrase "fair consideration" is ultra flexible for the Democrats, but what could justify the proneness of the ranking minority in trying to get it to contain specific meaning, pending an amendment for greater clarity?

It is inconceivable that the ranking minority members, for example on the Ways and Means Committee which allocated 3 of 29 staff members to the minority in the 92nd Congress, or Appropriations which allocated 15 of 129, or Armed Services which allocated none at all, would not be able—if they wanted—to negotiate with the committee chairman for at least working staff capability.

The employment statistics for Standing Committees, as of December, 1972, are:

	Total number of—			Percent of minority
	Employees	Majority	Minority	
Total.....	849	743	106	12
Statutory.....	315	260	55	17
Investigatory....	534	483	51	10

<sup>1</sup> Statutory employees and funds would not be affected by any rules change.

The responsibility for this poor state of minority staffing rests on both parties. In the adversary process it is not surprising that the Democrats want the Republicans to get a small or no allocation of investigatory staff. What is shocking is the willingness of the Republicans to accept such subordination. It is not beyond conception that the minority leadership gathering today is directed at putting some heat under the ranking minority of the various standing

committees as well as under the Democrats. After all, the ranking minority does have considerable practical bargaining power to obtain more adequate staff, if it wants to. In addition, it could simply not sign off on the appropriations request until the requisite staff was forthcoming. So often, the informal quid pro quo from the majority to the minority ranking is preferred on various committees—a disservice to other minority members, to the Congress and citizenry as a whole. In the growing public awareness of the weakness of the Congress in upholding its responsibilities under the separation of powers and checks and balances doctrines, can the people of this country continue to tolerate such abdications? It is not believed that they will.

#### VIRGIN ISLANDERS HAVE EARNED AND ARE ENTITLED TO THE PRESIDENTIAL VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mr. De Lugo) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in the 55 years that the Virgin Islands has proudly been a part of the United States, Congress has progressively extended the scope of political rights and responsibilities commensurate with the social and economic development and maturity of our people.

Congress has been cognizant of the capability of our people and mindful of our right to self-determination. It has wisely seen fit to grant us, step-by-step, the prerogatives of local self-government. Most significantly, Congress enabled us to elect our own legislature in 1954 and our own Governor in 1970.

We have borne these responsibilities well. The serious regard in which political concerns are held by our people has manifested itself by the intense involvement of all sectors of our society in territorial decisionmaking. The percentage of our electorate participating in both primary and general elections usually exceeds 80 percent, notably higher than in all but a few communities in the 50 States.

My address to this House today, as the first delegate from the Virgin Islands, is testament to the confidence of the Congress in our ability to participate additionally with our fellow American citizens in national self-determination.

We in the Virgin Islands have recognized that the rights, obligations and privileges of citizenship demand commitment and sacrifice. We have unquestioningly risen to the defense of our country whenever and wherever it has been necessary to preserve America's freedom and to secure liberty and the right of self-determination elsewhere. Most recently, in the horror of Vietnam, the Virgin Islands suffered casualties at a ratio that is among the most heavy.

Despite our loyalty, honorable service, and dedication to the principles and practice of democracy, our people, American citizens, are still denied the most cherished right that other American citizens possess—that of selecting the President and Vice President. That we are entitled to and deserving of this most precious right is inherent in our citizen-

ship. This premise has been affirmed by the Democratic and Republican Parties, both of which accord our citizens the right to participate equally with citizens of the States in their conventions and committees.

Not only are native Virgin Islanders unable to exercise the right to vote for president, but Virgin Islanders, natives to the 50 States and the District of Columbia, automatically become disenfranchised upon taking residence in our portion of the United States. Ironically any Virgin Islander, native or former State resident, becomes eligible to vote for president merely by completing the 30 day residency requirement in any of those jurisdictions of America where citizens are permitted the presidential franchise.

Mr. Speaker, to rectify this inequity, Delegate Won Pat of Guam and I are today introducing a resolution to amend the Constitution. The amendment would extend to the American citizens of the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands a privilege we have earned, a right we are entitled to.

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

Mr. DE LUGO. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from the Virgin Islands and the gentleman from Guam in their first, initial remarks on the floor of this House; and, secondly, on the subject matter.

I think it is totally fitting and proper that their initial remarks should be directed to this gross inequity for which they seek redress on behalf of the citizens of these two very fine areas of the United States; these territories where citizens of the United States are today being denied the right to vote for the President of this country.

It is, as the gentleman from Guam and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands have pointed out, more an accident of location than it is of citizenship, because our system has no method of giving the electoral college vote to these citizens and these territories which have been deprived of the right to cast their vote for President of the United States. I think it is a long time overdue that what they are seeking be granted to the citizens of these territories.

I commend both of these gentlemen on their initial appearances on the floor of this House in addressing themselves to this grievance which they both have spoken to me about a long time ago, and which should have been granted to their citizens a long time ago.

Mr. DE LUGO. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. DE LUGO. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Did I correctly understand that this will take a constitutional amendment?

Mr. DE LUGO. Yet, it does, Mr. Majority Leader. It takes a constitutional amendment.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am amazed at that.

May I congratulate the gentleman for his knowledgeable and erudite remarks.

Really, I have not given too much thought to this, since I recall that at a Democratic national convention some time ago a resolution of this type, I believe, passed the convention.

Listening to the remarks of the gentleman from the Territory of Guam, Mr. Won Pat, I believe the arguments are perfectly right. Just because of an accident of birth a person who is a U.S. citizen, if he lives in the area of the 50 States, would be eligible to vote. It does not seem there is a very sound argument one could make, denying a man who is a U.S. citizen who lives in a territory of our Government that right.

I want to concur with the remarks of the gentleman and to congratulate him for bringing this before the Congress. I am sure there will be lengthy studies on it. It is a step in the right direction.

Mr. DE LUGO. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind remarks.

I say to the majority leader that we will be asking for Members of the House to join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

I point out to the majority leader and also to my colleague from the State of Washington that if their constituents move to the American Virgin Islands or to the American territory of Guam they are disfranchised. This would rectify that situation.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

#### A POLITICAL GIANT SPEAKS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, former Speaker John W. McCormack has entered his fourth year as a private citizen after relinquishing the reins of House leadership at the close of the 91st Congress.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, were privileged to serve the people of the United States in the House as a colleague and under the leadership of this great man. We have missed his daily presence among us.

Retirement for our former Speaker has been in name only, for he still maintains a vigorous schedule from his office in Boston. From time to time he returns to Washington and shares his friendship and wise counsel—the benefit of his decades of experience in service to the people of the United States.

Speaker McCormack is a recognized giant among us—a man who consistently has set a standard which all of us would be privileged to attain.



Through the years he has spoken and acted with vigor and dignity, and always has offered a special perspective in approaching all problems which have come before him and the American people.

While we in the Congress have been privileged personally to come to know and hold this man dear, the opportunities for others to share his wisdom via the media have been many through the years. Most recently, *Modern Maturity* magazine's Richard W. O'Donnell enjoyed an interview with Speaker McCormack. The December-January 1972-73 edition of this fine magazine carries the account of that meeting.

I know that those of our senior citizens who had the opportunity to read the interview most certainly gained additional insights into the past decisions which greatly affected us all. I am sure that they also realized that John W. McCormack is a man who lives in the present, with his eyes focused on continuing the work to provide a better America.

Mr. Speaker, I request that Mr. O'Donnell's interview, titled, "A Political Giant Speaks," be included in the *Record* at this point for the benefit of the Members who may not have read this fine article about a man—a friend—who does indeed speak with the voice of maturity.

#### A POLITICAL GIANT SPEAKS

(By Richard W. O'Donnell)

The United States needs a strong hand at the helm if it is to remain the world's greatest power, according to former Speaker of the House John W. McCormack.

"I know there has been a great deal of talk in recent years about the President usurping powers that belonged to Congress," declares the retired 81-year-old political giant. "I don't think this is so."

Mr. McCormack, who retired in 1970 after 42 years in Congress, was interviewed for *Modern Maturity* in his 14th floor office in the John W. McCormack Post Office Building in his home town of Boston.

"This question about the President and Congress is not a new one," the silver-haired Democrat said. "It has always been with us. George Washington was faced with it. All our great Presidents have been confronted with it."

"Look at what happened under Hoover when there was a lack of leadership. The nation had the greatest depression in its history. There was widespread hunger, and 10 to 12 million people were out of work."

"Then look at what happened under Roosevelt when there was courageous leadership. There was Social Security, unemployment compensation, the minimum wage, and low-cost housing."

"There were some people who accused Roosevelt of being a dictator. Yet what he did was provide courageous and forward-looking leadership at a time when it was necessary, and he did it in accordance with the powers granted to him by the Constitution."

"Why, some people even called me 'the Bolshevik' because I was fighting for old age payments, the minimum wage, and low-cost housing."

"I expect the President to be one who has the ability to make a decision in the best interest of the country, and to have the courage to carry it out."

Of all the legislation he has supported over the years, the Massachusetts politician is proudest of the fight he led to save the Selective Service Act back in 1941.

"We won a one-vote victory," he recalls. "That was three months before Pearl Harbor. I've often wondered what the position of the country would have been if we hadn't had Selective Service when the war broke out."

The veteran legislator is also extremely proud of the role he played in getting the Social Security Act on the books.

"I led the fight in the Ways and Means Committee back in the thirties," he recalls. "I remember people called it socialism. I used to stand up in Congress and say, 'You call it socialism. I call it dynamic democracy in the industrial age!'"

"I remember fighting to get the bill through committee, and fighting for the rapid advancement of this important legislation to what we called 'the top of the hill.' Many bills made it to the top of the hill, but not over. And it was several years before we could get them back to the top again. The important thing was to get the bill over the hill, so it could become law."

"In the beginning, there wasn't much money. But it was a start, and we were able to improve upon the bill. We had it on the books. That was the important first step. We were able to make improvements as the years went by."

Mr. McCormack is delighted at the recent 20 per cent increase in Social Security payments.

"It wasn't inflationary," he declares. "They were just catching up with the cost of living. The increase might well have been given over the past few years."

Despite his alleged retirement, Mr. McCormack has a daily schedule that would leave most younger men exhausted.

"I spend my days at my office," he says. "I get phone calls from all parts of the country. And there is usually a tremendous amount of mail. I take home a dozen letters or so at night to my apartment in Jamaica Plain and reply to them myself."

In addition, the former Speaker is called upon to make countless appearances in the Boston area, where he is an authentic folk hero. During his half-century in Massachusetts and national politics, thousands of Bostonians have called upon John McCormack for help, and never once has he been known to fail them.

During the summer, Mr. McCormack was honorary chairman of the Democratic convention in Miami Beach, Fla.

"Actually, there were three chairmen," he elaborated. "Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson were also honorary chairmen, but they couldn't make it. So I flew down to Miami. I felt that at least one of the honorary chairmen should be on hand."

In December 1971, John McCormack's beloved wife, Harriet, passed away. The McCormacks were married for 51 years, and their romance was a Washington legend. It has been written that there were only two women in McCormack's life: One was his beautiful bride; the other his adored mother Mary Ellen O'Brien McCormack.

"I remember when I was 13," says Mr. McCormack. "I was interested in politics even then. I used to love to attend the street corner rallies in South Boston, where I grew up, and listen to the politicians. Back then, the big issue was women's suffrage. Everybody was against it. There wasn't one politician who would speak out in favor of it."

"It was at those street corner rallies that I made up my mind about giving women the right to vote. It was the first decision of a political nature I ever made. I would go home and look at my dear mother. I knew she was a citizen. It was only a question of marking a ballot. And I would say to myself, 'Who dares tell me my mother cannot vote as well as any man, and better than most?'"

When the future Speaker was 13, his father, a bricklayer, died, and he became

the man of the house. In addition to his mother, there were two younger brothers.

"I had a newspaper route," he recalls, "and that brought in some money. Still, I had to quit school. I never was able to attend high school or college. I've always regretted that. I have great respect for the educated man. Education is one of the greatest investments any country can make. Still, if I had to make a choice between a man who was brilliant, but lacked common sense, and one who had a limited education and common sense, I'd take the latter man. In choosing my staff members, I always favored the man with common sense. It is a most important factor." Mr. McCormack continues: "After I left school, I got a job with Western Union for a while, and then I went to work in a broker's office on State Street. I was making \$3.50 a week."

"Then William T. Way, a Boston lawyer, offered me a job for \$4 a week. I asked the broker if he could match the extra 50 cents. He couldn't, so I went to work as an office boy in a law office. That extra 50 cents was the turning point in my life. The broker went out of business a year later. By that time, I had become interested in being a lawyer."

"Mr. Way, a wonderful man, encouraged me to read law, and he made all the books he had in his law library available to me. It seemed like a hopeless task, and the odds were against me. Still, when I became discouraged, I would look at my dear wonderful mother and all my sadness would go away. I wanted to become a lawyer. I wanted her to be proud of me. I'm sorry to say she died five months before I passed the Massachusetts Bar examination at the age of 21."

For a while, John McCormack served as a practicing attorney. But politics had captured his heart, and in 1917, he was elected a delegate to the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention. When World War I broke out, he resigned and enlisted in the Army. Later, he served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives from 1920 to 1922, and in the State Senate for three years.

In 1928, the voters of the 12th Congressional District sent the young politician to Congress. He remained there until his retirement in 1970. And his memories are many.

"I remember back in 1945 when we were having coffee in a small room we called 'The Board of Education,'" he says. "Sam Rayburn was at the table with me. There were a couple of others, too. Harry Truman was also at the table, and somebody came up and handed him a note. His face went white, I remember that. He stood up and said he had to go someplace, and then left the room. Later we learned that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had died, and that Harry Truman had become President of the United States."

Then there was the matter of granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

"For some reason," he recalls, "Mr. Sam (Rayburn) felt that all states should be a part of the mainland of the United States. Lyndon had cleared the way in the Senate for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. But Rayburn was slow in bringing the matter up on the floor of the House. He was Speaker at the time, and his approval was needed before a bill could be introduced."

"Well, Lyndon and I kept talking to Sam. We kept at him. We didn't stop. And finally, after three or four weeks, Sam said, 'I will not stand in the way.' This meant he wasn't changing his position. He was still opposed to having states that were not a part of the mainland of the United States. It also meant that he wasn't going to prevent the statehood bills from being introduced in the House. Later, statehood was granted to both Alaska and Hawaii."

With a smile, Mr. McCormack adds: "I think what won Sam over was that Lyndon

and I kept telling him we should grant statehood while there was a Democratic Congress. We told him we didn't want the Republicans to get the credit later on."

There is one memory that still haunts the former Speaker.

"It was during the early forties," he says. "At the time, I was majority leader. I was summoned to the White House by President Roosevelt along with Sam Rayburn and other key Congressional leaders. We knew it was going to be an important meeting because we were told that General George Marshall, Secretary of War Henry Stimson and other key Administration officials were going to attend.

"At the meeting, President Roosevelt told us that he needed an appropriation of \$2 billion from Congress during the next two years. He said he needed it for a super weapon, but he did not reveal specific details. He did not say whether the weapon was a rocket, or a bomb, or what it was supposed to be. He kept that to himself.

"Roosevelt said that the appropriation would have to be kept a secret, because he did not want the Hitler government to know about it. He said the Hitler government was trying to build the same super weapon and that if they did, the Germans would win the war overnight no matter what we did on the battlefield. He said no matter how many victories were won, we'd lost the war if the Hitler government got the super weapon first.

"Naturally, we got Congress to appropriate the money. It was supposed to be funds for airplanes, ships and other war materials. But, with the White House's permission, we had to let members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in on the secret.

"I remember that every night before I went to sleep I would say a prayer. I would pray to God that we got the super weapon first.

"Later, the atomic bomb was dropped and the war ended. President Roosevelt once told me that we would lose a million men if we invaded Japan. The atomic bomb saved their lives.

"The weapons we have nowadays are much more powerful. They must never be used."

For 14 months after the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Mr. McCormack was the heir apparent to the Presidency in the event of the death of Lyndon B. Johnson.

"Every night, I said a prayer for Lyndon B. Johnson," he recalls. "I prayed that he would remain in good health; that he would remain fit to perform the duties of President.

"I never wanted to be President, you know," he says. "My life was in the U.S. House of Representatives. I was a legislator. It was a life I loved."

The former Speaker is a tall, distinguished gentleman. His manner is courtly; his voice, firm and clear; his mind, quick. And he has a gracious smile that probably won him more votes than he realizes.

John W. McCormack, private citizen, may no longer be winning people's votes, but he is surely winning their hearts.

#### CREATION OF AN IMPARTIAL GRIEVANCE SYSTEM FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress, congressional attention was devoted to the creation of an independent and impartial grievance system for all employees of the Foreign Affairs Agencies—the Department of State,

the U.S. Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development. Several bills containing draft legislation creating such a system were introduced in both Houses. In the Senate, a compromise bill offered by Senators BAYH and COOPER (S. 3722) passed the Senate twice, and in the House, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations held a series of important hearings on the subject, preparatory to marking up legislation. Unfortunately, time ran out and Congress adjourned before action was taken. But while final congressional legislation was not passed into law, this difficult and complicated, yet significant, issue was given in 1972 some of the urgent attention it needs.

It is the hope of all of us committed to the adoption of a due process grievance system, such as that contained in the Bayh-Cooper bill, that comprehensive, fair, and impartial grievance procedures will be instituted in the near future. The morale and future effectiveness of our important Foreign Affairs Agencies are at stake.

Certainly a primary vehicle for the establishment of due process principles is through direct negotiations between, in the case of the Department of State, management and the newly elected exclusive representative of the employees, the American Foreign Service Association—AFSA—which will result in agreement on legislation establishing a Foreign Service grievance system. Both the Secretary of State and AFSA have agreed on such legislation "in principle." We fervently hope such negotiations can commence in the next weeks and can promptly produce effective and mutually acceptable procedures to be contained in legislation. But, if negotiations do not prove fruitful and successful, the Congress should enact comprehensive legislation such as that embodied in the Bayh-Cooper bill.

#### REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMÁS DISCUSSES AMERICA'S ROLE IN WORLD TRADE

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute for Imported Steel holds a meeting every winter in New York City to discuss important issues of world trade. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMÁS) was invited to be their speaker this year. I would like to insert in the Record the text of his very informative statement:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS OF INDIANA, ANNUAL MEETING OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR IMPORTED STEEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., DECEMBER 11, 1972

I speak to you today from the viewpoint of one who has for the past fourteen years served in Congress as Representative of a farm-factory district in northern Indiana.

My district is the one where Studebaker automobiles were once produced and where AM General now makes trucks for the Army.

It is the original home of the Bendix brake and was for many years the world center for the manufacture of musical in-

struments. Today we make mobile homes and Alka Seltzer and are known as the land of Father Hesburgh and Ara Parseghian.

I represent Poles and Hungarians, blacks and Mennonites, Masons and Knights of Columbus. My constituents also belong to the UAW, the Farm Bureau, the building trades and to chambers of commerce.

My district—the Third of Indiana—voted 65% for President Richard Nixon, Republican, and 55% for Congressman John Brademas, Democrat.

So I think it fair to say that the people of the counties of Elkhart, LaPorte and St. Joseph in Indiana are not wholly unrepresentative of the nation at large, and I suggest, therefore, that the views I express to you today are not atypical or unique.

And I believe that most of my colleagues in the House and the Senate next year would agree that the issue of U.S. policy on foreign trade will command high priority in the 93rd Congress.

I speak as a Congressman who favors expanding world trade and who is aware of the benefits in terms of jobs and profits to the people of the United States that are the consequences of increasing the flow of capital and goods across international borders.

But I speak also as a Congressman who believes that the time has come for the American business and industrial community with a stake in widening foreign trade to face soberly some problems that have too long been avoided in discussing this question.

#### FACTORS IN SHAPING FOREIGN TRADE LEGISLATION

What, then, are some of the factors that Congress will be taking into account as we look at foreign trade policy next year and particularly at legislation that affects foreign trade?

Here are some—I do not pretend to review all—the emerging factors that I see.

(1) First, it is clear that the United States no longer dominates international trade as we did following World War II.

Japan and the nations of the European Economic Community have become vigorous and effective competitors, challenging U.S.-produced goods both in our domestic markets and in third countries.

And we are all aware that one of the reasons for this enhanced competition is that the governments and industries of these nations have worked closely together to modernize technology and stimulate exports, with, to repeat, extraordinary success.

(2) A second factor which must be in the minds of all who make decisions about trade policy is that last year, for the first time in this century, the United States incurred a net trade deficit of over \$2 billion. The deficit for the current year is estimated to be over \$5 billion, and there is little prospect that the deficit will disappear in the near future.

In this connection, it should be observed that, although our exports have risen steadily in the last decade, they have been far outstripped by increased imports, which have risen a staggering 165% over the same period.

#### ACTIONS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

(3) A third element in the trade outlook is that foreign governments have impeded U.S. trade performance by means of a network of subsidies and preferences conferred on their own domestic producers.

I can tell you from experience that one sermon many Congressmen and Senators visiting Japan preach to their Japanese hosts when they complain to us about burgeoning protectionism in the United States is, "Physician, heal thyself. Get rid of, or at least greatly reduce, your own fortress of import barriers against American-made goods coming into Japanese markets."

Moreover, I should add what you already know, that the Japanese have been directly subsidizing many of their exports to the United States.



Now some persons may contend that the United States has countervailing duty laws to protect domestic industry against competition from foreign companies unfairly subsidized by their governments as well as laws against dumping foreign goods on the U.S. market at prices below their fair market value.

But you and I know that these laws have either not been effective or have not been effectively enforced.

(4) Yet a further cause of our adverse balance of trade is the malalignment of currencies of our leading trading partners, particularly Japan and West Germany. Although it is impossible to assess precisely the effect on U.S. foreign trade of the undervaluation of the mark and the yen, this factor clearly played a role in the reversal of our trade position in the late 1960's.

#### THE RISE OF THE MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION

(5) Now let me recite still another in this list of elements that we should be considering as we ponder where we're going on trade policy in the months and years ahead.

Although many Americans have only the foggiest notion of what a multinational corporation is, I can tell you that the rapid rise of this institution in the world trade arena is both felt and feared by increasing numbers of American working men and women.

The substantial expansion of direct overseas investment by U.S. firms, and especially the proliferation of U.S.-based multinational corporations, are developments that are more and more viewed by American workers as directly threatening their jobs.

And as one who observed the reactions of thousands of his fellow townsmen to the overnight shutdown of the Studebaker plant in South Bend back in 1963, I can tell you that job security remains even today an overriding preoccupation with many more thousands of the people I represent in northern Indiana.

I have no hesitation in telling you that job security is a chief concern of millions of working people all over the United States. It is, therefore, no accident that protectionist sentiment has risen in this country along with chronic unemployment.

And I must tell you that men and women who have lost their jobs as a result of competing imports from abroad—or, just as important—who think they have lost their jobs as a result of foreign competition—will not accept as adequate recompense a textbook in freshman economics telling them that free trade brings benefits to people of every land.

As Jacob Clayman, of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department, put it, "Our people are not interested in the ideology of foreign trade. They are interested in jobs and the conditions that are affecting them."

(6) I, therefore, cite another element that you and I must have in mind next year as we try to think through the dimensions of a sensible foreign trade policy for the United States.

We can no longer assume that the trade adjustment assistance program Congress incorporated in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is effective in helping workers and firms adversely affected by foreign competition.

For reasons both procedural and substantive, neither the import restraint nor the adjustment assistance provisions have brought the relief Congress contemplated a decade ago. They just haven't worked.

#### TRADE POLICY AND THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

(7) Now I want to discuss one final element in this litany of forces that will bear on Congressional attitudes next year toward U.S. foreign trade policy.

I speak of the position of the Administration of President Nixon during his second term.

For I trust it will not be thought partisan if I observe that the Administration has

really not attempted during the past four years to shape a coherent policy for the United States in international trade.

This is not to say that the President ought not to be applauded for some of his major trade initiatives, most notably his moves to increase commerce between the United States and China and the Soviet Union. Only last week I attended a conference at Dartmouth College where top Soviet trade and other government officials met with leading American businessmen, such as David Rockefeller and Donald M. Kendall, as well as American academics and even three Congressmen, to talk about improving United States-Soviet relations. In addition to easing political tensions and cooperating on environmental matters, expanding trade with us was a major objective of the Soviet delegation.

As we know, Treasury Secretary George Schultz and other high Administration officials have indicated that the President intends to give great attention next year to developing an international trade policy for the United States that makes sense for the decade ahead.

Yet listen to these words from an editorial of November 24, 1972, in the Washington Post:

President Nixon is now preparing himself for the possibility that economics and trade will be the largest part of his foreign policy next year. . . . The principle of free trade is simple. The practice is more difficult. One of the reasons it has become very difficult indeed lately is the enormous confusion within the Government over our basic purposes. It is not clear to our trading partners, or to foreign businessmen, or even to the various branches of the United States Government, precisely what the Administration is driving toward. . . . Put broadly, the real question is how much foreign competition the United States is now willing to run. But the answer depends very greatly on the rules, and whether most Americans are willing to accept them as fair. Those rules now have to be worked out, and the process is just about to begin. It will take place in a counterpoint between Congress and two separate international negotiations, one on money and the other on trade. The Congressional debate will begin as soon as the Administration introduces its trade legislation early next year. Managing this process will be an extraordinary test of Mr. Nixon's political skill.

So I hope I shall not be thought captious if I suggest that it is not yet clear to some of us whether the President plans to go the way of Peter Peterson, who has come to be identified with a broader world trade role for the United States and who is leaving the Administration, or of Frederick B. Dent, Mr. Peterson's successor as Secretary of Commerce, a textile man who is widely regarded as a protectionist.

Most of you, better than I, can enumerate other zigs and zags in the trade policies of this Administration during the four years just past.

There is, for example, President Nixon's heavy reliance on temporary voluntary restraint agreements, which seem somehow to have a way of hanging on, as you steel importers well understand.

And of course you will recall the President's pleas to Congress for legislation fixing quotas on the imports of textiles while at the same time piously admonishing Senators and Representatives not to yield to the temptation to write quotas against imports that affected the people whom we represent!

So, as Congress returns to Washington next month, we have not yet heard a strong and confident voice from the White House telling us how the President sees the shape of trade in the next several years.

#### FOREIGN TRADE AND CONGRESS

But, I can tell you that, in respect of attitudes toward foreign trade, there seems to be less uncertainty in Congress.

For, despite the diversity of our membership, I think one can find a leitmotif running through most of the proposals that are likely to surface in Congress in the coming months in the field of foreign trade.

The most publicized measure is, of course, the Burke-Hartke Bill, which would make a number of far-reaching changes in U.S. foreign trade policy. The bill has won the strong support of the AFL-CIO and the alarmed opposition of much of American business and industrial leadership. The Burke-Hartke Bill is clearly one major reaction to the apprehensions about job security which I earlier discussed.

Congressman John Culver (D-Iowa), Chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has introduced legislation to develop more timely and practical adjustment programs to help workers, companies and communities hard hit by foreign imports.

Congressman Henry Reuss (D-Wisc.) has urged taxing the profits of U.S.-owned foreign based operations on a current basis as a means of eliminating what he contends is an incentive to produce goods abroad at the expense of jobs for American workers. His Wisconsin colleague, Senator Gaylord Nelson, has introduced a similar proposal.

Congressman Jonathan Bingham (D-N.Y.) a former U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations, has prepared legislation which not only includes strengthening the anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws but also increases trade adjustment aid and modifies Federal tax benefits for U.S. investment abroad.

#### CONCERN ABOUT JOB SECURITY OF AMERICAN WORKER

I have little doubt that other Senators and Congressmen will develop their own variations on these proposals. But I have little doubt, too, that a common theme will run through most of them—greater attention to the job security of the American worker.

And this concern about job security is one which, without my getting into the advantages and disadvantages of any of these several legislative proposals—as I do not, to repeat, pose as an authority on this complex subject—I must tell you I regard as wholly legitimate.

And to all these bills will, of course, be added to the comprehensive trade legislation President Nixon has promised to submit to Congress next year.

Well, then, if this Congressman's analysis is at all on target, what are the implications of it for developing a coherent U.S. foreign trade policy next year?

I conclude that there are two major lessons to be learned from the joining of the several factors I have discussed with you.

These are lessons that all of us must understand—and act on—if we want to see an expansion of trade among nations and peoples, with all the attendant advantages such expansion brings.

The first lesson is this: We must come to grips with the real and legitimate apprehensions of many American working men and women about the security of their jobs. A foreign trade policy that fails in this respect is no policy at all.

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT AND FOREIGN TRADE

This means that we must give a higher priority than the Administration has done, or appears to intend, to achieving full employment here at home.

For adequate job opportunities in the United States will directly reduce the pressures of protectionism.

Tax policies, public service employment, manpower training, insurance of private pensions, steps to stimulate U.S. exports—these are the kinds of measures that can help bring job security and correspondingly diminish fears of loss of work to foreign competition.

Let me observe in this connection that the drop in unemployment to 5.2% last month was very welcome, but that it is still very high in relation to the 4% traditionally used to define full employment in this country.

And if my argument is correct that rising protectionism goes hand in hand with high unemployment, then the October 26 statement of Herbert Stein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, that we should abandon the 4% goal is bad news indeed for all of you free traders of the American Institute for Imported Steel.

For, if what I am saying is true, you have a great stake in supporting efforts to bring down unemployment in the United States, especially among those groups which fail to find jobs even when the economy is growing.

In addition to supporting full employment, we can recognize the job security issue in another important way. In pursuing governmental policies to stimulate world trade, we must give much more serious and imaginative attention to devising trade adjustment assistance programs that are credible and effective in the real world, programs, that is to say, that make a genuine difference to the affected firms and workers.

I said that I had found two major lessons for shaping trade policy arising out of the constellation of elements I have been discussing.

The first was the requirement of greater sensitivity to the concern of American working men and women about their jobs.

#### NEEDED: CONSISTENT TRADE POLICY FROM ADMINISTRATION

The second lesson is this: That the President of the United States must display some clear and consistent leadership in developing a coherent foreign trade policy for our country.

The present ad hoc pattern has, in terms of soaring trade deficits, rising fears about job security, and a decline in our competitive economic position, brought us not the best but the worst of several worlds.

In this connection, both the Administration and Congress should engage in much more rigorous analyses of the anticipated impact on our domestic economy of the effects of Federal actions, both legislative and executive, in the area of foreign trade. We need, for example, a more careful assessment of what happens here at home when we write Federal tax laws to spur U.S. investment abroad. We may ultimately decide to write such measures but, before we do so, we should have a much clearer picture of the advantages and disadvantages involved than I sense we now have. To cite another instance of what I mean, I hope that the study now in progress by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the multinational corporation and its effects on U.S. foreign policy will shed light as well on the impact of multinationals on job creation and the domestic economy.

Here in New York last week, my colleague and friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator Javits, said that "1973 will be a watershed year for our country and for the free world and international economic relations will be decisive".

Senator Javits went on to say that, "The President has gone about as far as he can go in many areas without new legislative authority if a new spirit of international cooperation and economic prosperity is to be molded". And the Senator concluded, "This calls then for a new cooperative and collaborative spirit between the Congress and the Executive branch . . .".

As only one Member of the House of Representatives of the majority party there, I hope very much that, as we shape legislation that affects our international economic relations, there can be that "new cooperative and collaborative spirit" between President Nixon and Congress of which the Senator spoke.

And I like to think that approaching the newly elected Congress in such a spirit—he with his mandate and we with ours—will be high on Mr. Nixon's list of New Year's resolutions.

As I conclude, then, I hope I have not painted for you too inaccurate a picture of where, forty days before President Nixon's second inauguration and twenty-three days before the 93rd Congress convenes, we stand as we look at the prospects for shaping foreign trade policy for our country.

I have tried tonight not so much to galvanize or, indeed, even to sermonize, but rather, from my own perspective as a Member of Congress, to analyze some of the problems that I perceive all of us must ponder in this complex but crucial area of national and international life.

For I think we can all agree that it is imperative that we look as carefully and honestly as we know how at all the dimensions of our international trade policies.

On what we do in this field depends in no small measure the prosperity of the American people and the building of a peaceful world.

### EXPORT CONTROLS ON CATTLE-HIDES

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen KYROS, CONTE, BURKE of Massachusetts, and I, together with 35 of our House colleagues, are today introducing legislation to permit the President to reinstitute export controls on cattlehides.

Excessive foreign demand for cattlehides, created by embargoes by Brazil and Argentina on hide exports, is threatening to destroy the leather industry. The price of hides has risen up to 400 percent in the last 2 years. Tanneries, unable to meet the high cost of raw materials, have been forced to close down, and thousands of American workers have lost their jobs.

The high cost of hides makes itself felt every time an American consumer buys a pair of shoes. And the price of shoes will continue to rise until the cattlehide situation can be stabilized.

Last July, the Commerce Department ruled that cattlehide export controls were required to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of hides and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. A modest program of export controls was initiated, one which limited 1972 exports to 1971 levels—the highest export level in history.

Unfortunately, as the program began to take effect and stabilize the price of hides, Congress passed an amendment which severely restricted the President's authority to impose controls. The law was signed and the controls program ended.

Since that time, the price of hides has continued to rise, and the closing of tanneries has continued. I have written the President a number of times asking him to reimpose controls, but each time the response has been negative.

A letter I received from Richard Cook, deputy assistant to the President, makes the White House's position clear. I include his letter at this point:

#### THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., September 20, 1972.

DEAR Mr. HARRINGTON: I would like to acknowledge and thank you for your September 14 letter to the President in which you joined with several of your colleagues in urging the President to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the reinstitution of the cattlehide export control program.

As you know, on July 15 Secretary Peterson announced that after careful study of data collected by the Department of Commerce concerning the cattlehide situation, he had determined that export controls were required to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of such hides and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand.

However, in extending the Export Administration Act, the Congress adopted the Curtis-Gonzalez Amendment which terminated the Commerce Department's export controls on cattlehides. Further, it requires that any further controls on exports of an agricultural commodity must have the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, such approval not to be given during any period when the supply of such commodity is in excess of domestic requirements. (P.L. 92-412).

Although the legislative history will require the most careful analysis by the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, it appears that P.L. 92-412 expresses a clear Congressional mandate that controls on cattlehides not be reimposed.

Nevertheless, we share your concern with the cattlehide situation and the Commerce Department will continue to monitor matters closely.

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,

Deputy Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are introducing today is simple in nature. It changes the language of the Export Administration Act to allow controls on hides—controls that had always been allowed prior to August. Listed below are the cosponsors of the bill:

#### LIST OF COSPONSORS

James A. Burke, Silvio O. Conte, Peter N. Kyros, Bella S. Abzug, Edward P. Boland, Frank J. Brasco, Shirley Chisholm, James C. Cleveland, William S. Cohen, Paul W. Cronin, Harold D. Donohue, Robert F. Drinan, Joshua Ellberg, Daniel J. Flood, Gilbert Gude, Ella T. Grasso, Lee H. Hamilton, James M. Hanley, James F. Hastings, Henry Helstoski, Albert W. Johnson, Joseph A. Karth, Edward I. Koch, Stewart B. McKinney, John J. Moakley, William S. Moorhead, John E. Moss, Thomas P. O'Neill, Otis G. Pike, Melvin Price, Henry S. Reuss, Thomas M. Rees, Howard W. Robison, Peter Rodino, Herman T. Schneebell, William A. Steiger, Gene Taylor, Lawrence G. Williams, Samuel H. Young.

#### H.R. —

To amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 with respect to the exclusion of agricultural commodities from export controls

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(e) of the Export Administration Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2403(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, but excluding skins and hides, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) of section 3 of this Act."



Mr. Speaker, each day, the price of hides climbs and more workers lose their jobs. It is my hope that the Congress will act quickly to permit the reauthorization of export controls. This is the only means by which we can restore stability to the American leather industry.

#### PRESIDENTIAL VOTE FOR PEOPLES OF GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. WON PAT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege and honor of joining with my territorial colleague from the Virgin Islands, Mr. De Lugo, in cosponsoring a most historic measure—one which grants the privilege and the right to vote in presidential elections to our fellow American citizens on Guam and the Virgin Islands.

What we are asking of the Congress today is not a radical change in the American system of government. We seek, instead, the correction of an inequity in our laws—an inequity which forbids certain Americans to vote in presidential elections simply because of where they reside, and an inequity which diminishes the noble concept of our precious American citizenship.

Under present law, all qualified Americans who reside within the boundaries of any State may participate in presidential elections. However, should that same citizen move to one of the U.S. territories, he or she may not vote for the President if they register to vote as local residents. Conversely, a native-born territorial American who similarly is forbidden a voice in presidential elections may vote providing he moves to a State and registers there.

The result is a system of arbitrary discrimination against our fellow citizens solely based on their place of residence. I do not believe that this is what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they drafted the Constitution. Nor do I believe that it is in our national interest to exclude a group of our fellow Americans from participating in presidential elections on the basis of such spurious grounds.

The measure which my colleague Mr. De Lugo and I place before you today would rectify this inequity in our voting laws by amending the present system of electing our Presidents to include any U.S. citizen residing on Guam or the Virgin Islands. Each territory would be allocated one electoral college delegate. Such action, we believe, is highly important for two reasons. First, we would once and for all resolve any doubt about what part all American citizens may have in the selection of their national leaders. Second, in an age when each citizen, no matter whether he lives in California, Maine, or the territories, is vitally affected by Presidential decisions, each American of voting age can make his choice of who will lead his country for the next 4 years.

This measure follows the precedent established by Congress in June 1960

when it proposed an amendment which successfully granted the presidential vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

We believe that formula to be a sound one, and in view of its precedent in legislative history it is the path which Representative De Lugo and I now propose to the Congress.

However, we are also cognizant of the growing support in Congress for legislation to abolish the electoral college and replace it with a simple popular vote method of electing the President. Should such legislation extending the popular vote to all Americans, including those in the territories, be given favorable consideration by the House, we would be pleased to add our endorsement at the proper time.

This great country of ours was founded on the democratic principles of liberty and equality for all citizens. And I believe today, as did the Greek philosopher Aristotle over 2,000 years ago, that:

If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in government to the utmost.

As you may know, Guam, where America's day begins, first came under the American flag in 1898, as a result of the Treaty of Paris which ended the Spanish-American War. From that time on, Guam quickly became one of the cornerstones of American defense policy in the Pacific. In 1941, Guam became the only American territory to suffer the humiliation of capture and a 3-year occupation by enemy troops, after which time, I might point out, not one Guamanian was ever found to have collaborated with occupying enemy forces.

In 1950, Congress acknowledged Guam's loyalty to the flag and our growing desire for increased self-government by passing the Guam Organic Act. This act granted the people of Guam American citizenship and established civilian government for our island.

And ever since, Congress has responded to our appeals for additional responsibilities by first authorizing Guam, in 1969, to elect our own Governor, and, only last year, by authorizing Guam and the Virgin Islands to each elect their first delegate to this august body, the House of Representatives.

Guam's growing relations with the Federal Government has not been a one-way street. Since Guam became a part of the United States, our territory has benefited enormously. Our democratic system of government and our standard of living have been the envy of all of our neighbors in the Pacific basin.

America has, in return, gained the unquestioned devotion and loyalty of the Guamanian people—a devotion so great that in the Vietnam war, which, thankfully, has just ended, Guam lost more boys on the field of battle than did any other State or territory on a per capita basis. The 71 Guamanians who gave their lives in defense of American policy in Asia did so in the knowledge that their sacrifices would deter the aggressor in South Vietnam and assure their fellow Americans that Guam was ready and

willing to do its share in our common defense.

In view of our steadfast service to this country, is it not time for Congress to remove this barrier which separates one citizen from another, to cancel out any artificial bonds which prevent all Americans, no matter where they may be, from assuming their full role in America's destiny?

Congress, in its wisdom, has in recent years struck down a number of laws restricting the voting rights of Americans. We now have equal voting rights for the poor, the uneducated, and for persons of all races and creeds. Why, then, should we continue to discriminate against the citizens who live elsewhere? For the common good of our beloved country, the civic duties of all citizens should be equal, as should be the sacrifices we expect of each citizen in defense of our democratic form of government.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the proud Americans of Guam and those of the Virgin Islands want nothing more than the opportunity to join with all Americans on November 7, 1976, and to cast their votes for our next President and Vice President. I urge each of my colleagues to give this matter their earnest consideration.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WON PAT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. WON PAT). I would like to associate myself with his remarks as well as the remarks of our distinguished colleague from the Virgin Islands (Mr. De Lugo).

It is a wonderful and marvelous occasion when these two very important portions of the United States, Guam, and the American Virgin Islands, have elected and sent to Washington two such outstanding spokesmen to represent them in the House of Representatives.

The thrust of the initial maiden speeches, if you will, of the gentleman from Guam as well as the gentleman from the Virgin Islands beseeching and perhaps demanding, if you will, that all of our fellow Americans, the people that they represent, should no longer be denied the right to vote for the person of their choice who holds the highest office in this democratic land of ours is a very timely subject. So I think it is altogether fitting and proper that here on the first occasion of these two new representatives representing for the first time with full voice the offshore areas of the Virgin Islands and Guam that they should have as their spokesmen speaking to us in the House and in the other body as well as the country, two such representatives saying that the time has long since passed when anyone living on American soil should be denied the right to vote for their choice as President of the United States.

I commend the gentleman from Guam (Mr. WON PAT) as well as my dear friend and our distinguished colleague, the gen-

tleman from the Virgin Islands (Mr. De Luco) for their statements today.

Mr. WON PAT. I thank the gentleman from California for his gracious comments.

### LOCKING THE DOOR TO INDOCHINA

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

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now party to a peace agreement covering Vietnam; and so great is the relief that there is a danger that Congress, assuming the war is finally ended, will continue to abdicate its responsibility on this issue.

Unfortunately we know that the war is not over and will not be over so long as our military might rings Vietnam and is poised to strike at any moment.

The 7th Fleet cruises off Asian shores. Thailand has become a major military base for American men and equipment moved over from Vietnam.

Cambodian bombing has temporarily ceased but it is reported that the Lon Nol government will call for renewed American air support if major fighting resumes.

In Laos, Pentagon spokesman Jerry Friedheim, says:

We are continuing air operations.

That means bombing. A military adviser says that the end of the fighting in Vietnam will make more American air strikes available to Laos.

If things go badly, the temptation for President Nixon and the Pentagon to re-enter the Asian conflict will be great—and the means are close at hand. It is chilling to hear American negotiator William H. Sullivan state that this country is under "no inhibitions" if the truce collapses.

It is the responsibility of this Congress to see that the United States holds fast to its commitment to withdraw from Southeast Asia. It was reassuring that the Democratic caucus moved in this direction earlier, but after negotiations resumed, Congress paused to await the outcome. It is now clear that even with a signed agreement the Congress must act to end our involvement altogether.

Senators CASE and CHURCH and Representative BINGHAM, have introduced legislation requiring congressional approval of any recommitment of American forces in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia. These bills have much to commend them but, in my opinion, they do not go quite far enough. The bill I am about to introduce differs from others in two ways: First, it would cut off American military aid as well as American military forces, and second, it includes Thailand within the prohibition on American military presence and military aid.

To provide for a final termination of United States military involvement in Indochina and the termination of all United States military assistance to the nations of Indochina, and for other purposes

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

### BOMBING AND MINING PROHIBITED

SECTION 1. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended after the date of enactment of this Act to conduct or continue naval bombardment or mining of, or to bomb, rocket or otherwise attack by air any target within Indochina.

### WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES PERSONNEL, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

SEC. 2. In addition to the withdrawal required by the agreement and protocols signed at Paris on January 27, 1973, all United States military and paramilitary personnel (including civilians employed by the Department of Defense or the Central Intelligence Agency), equipment and supplies shall be totally, completely and finally withdrawn from Indochina not later than 60 days following January 27, 1973 or 30 days following the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

### CUTOFF OF FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY ACTIVITIES

SEC. 3. Beginning 60 days following January 27, 1973 or 30 days following the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, no funds theretofore or thereafter appropriated may be expended to support the deployment of United States military or paramilitary personnel (including civilians employed by the Department of Defense or the Central Intelligence Agency, or paid in whole or in part with the funds of such Department or Agency), or the conduct by the United States of military or paramilitary operations in Indochina.

### CUTOFF OF FUNDS FOR OTHER MILITARY ACTIVITIES

SEC. 4. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended after the date of enactment of this Act to support the deployment in Indochina of any military or paramilitary personnel other than those specified in section 3 of this Act, to support the conduct in Indochina of any military or paramilitary operations other than those specified in section 3 of this Act, or to provide, directly or indirectly, any military or paramilitary assistance to any nation, party, group, or person in Indochina.

### DEFINITION OF "INDOCHINA"

SEC. 5. As used in this Act, the term "Indochina" includes Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, the Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the airspace over each of those nations, the territorial waters of each of those nations, and the high seas adjacent to such territorial waters.

### INTENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 6. It is intended by the Congress that the requirements of this Act be interpreted strictly, and that no exceptions, direct or indirect, to such requirements shall be permitted.

This bill would terminate U.S. military activities not only in Vietnam, but throughout Indochina. It would remove our forces from Thailand and from the high seas surrounding the Indochinese peninsula, so as to remove from Mr. Nixon the temptation to change his mind on a moment's pique and plunge us back into war.

Section 1 of the bill would immediately cut off funds for U.S. bombing or mining in, over and around all of Indochina.

Section 2 of the bill would require that, in addition to the personnel and equipment withdrawals from Vietnam required by the Paris accords, all U.S. military and paramilitary personnel and equipment be withdrawn from all of Indochina within 30 days of enactment or 60 days after January 27, 1973, whichever is later. By "paramilitary," we mean

individuals who, though not uniformed, are engaged in activities which are more of a military than an economic nature. This specifically includes civilians employed by the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency. It would also include personnel of the Agency for International Development and any other personnel involved in such activities as the "pacification" program, the strategic hamlets program, the public safety program, the civil operations and rural development—CORDS—program, and various police and prison programs.

Section 3 cuts off all funding for U.S. military or paramilitary personnel and operations throughout Indochina.

Section 4 cuts off all military assistance, direct or indirect, to all five nations of Indochina and groups within those nations.

Section 5 defines "Indochina."

Section 6 of the bill recites a congressional intent that the requirements of the act be interpreted strictly.

Now is the time when we must "lock the door" behind President Nixon, before he changes his mind. Now is the time to get us out—all the way out—of Indochina, and this bill would do just that.

### MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME FOLKS ABANDONED

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving, along with other Members of Congress, many letters and telephone calls protesting the President's budget, curtailing and, in some cases, terminating many of the domestic programs passed in recent sessions of Congress for the middle- and low-income group. The unemployed, elders, educational and apprentice programs, which have been so helpful to our citizens who suffer under recession conditions are penalized or completely ignored in the President's budget.

The most shocking setback to these groups have been reduction of grants which the executive department supported through announcements previous to the election last November. Some of these announced grants for Federal participating funds have been curtailed or canceled without any explanation to the regional offices in charge of these domestic programs.

The President, in his budget message, has curtailed or eliminated priorities for community development projects, low-cost housing, apprenticeship training, programs affecting the elder citizens, and ethnic groups, health and medical grants. The Office of Equal Opportunities program is practically abandoned. It is estimated that about 50 domestic programs have been eliminated or curtailed in his budget message for 1973-74. The President gives us an excuse that the Government must economize to prevent a raise in taxes.

The President is silent about the many corporations and conglomerates who are annually increasing their profit brackets,



some of whom pay no Federal taxes and others whose tax returns are but a minimum compared to their fabulous profits. As of 1972, corporate taxes are only one-third of the Federal income taxes collected and less than one-half of the total payroll taxes. The President does not utter one word about equalizing the tax laws of our Nation.

Not one word about closing fabulous tax loopholes; and not a word about major tax reform. If the large tax loopholes were closed, there would be sufficient money to balance the budget and to fund the domestic programs.

The President does not hesitate to cut back on education, health, hospital construction, housing, antipollution and many other indispensable projects which the public is demanding. In the last 4 years the President has vetoed three major educational bills; opposed 20-percent increase in social security; vetoed environment legislation; and helped defeat a major highway bill to solve our mass transit problems.

For 3 years the executive department has been playing "footsie" with inflation by inaugurating a 90-day price freeze, phase II and now phase III.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate in my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, February 4, which extends some true facts on the President's price control failures.

#### PHASE III OR PHASEOUT?

In announcing his Phase 3 wage-price program, President Nixon has made a switch almost as shocking as when he announced his wage-price freeze on a Sunday night in August a year and a half ago. But this time he has zigged back toward his original philosophy.

The aim of Mr. Nixon's original Phase 1 freeze and Phase 2 controls was to put a halt to escalating wages and prices so that infusions of money, resulting from tax cuts, would go into creating more goods and more jobs, not just higher prices.

That combined dose of controls and tax cuts has worked reasonably well. While unemployment remains at 5.2 percent, the economy is surging forward, and unemployment should shrink further in the year ahead. But the economy is still a long way from price stability, and inflationary expectations are reviving. Last month's jump in wholesale prices—and skyrocketing of foods prices—jagged the Administration's economic policymakers as it did the nation. But far from forcing the Administration to impose direct controls at farm level, it appears to have accelerated its decision to loosen up the whole control program before consumer prices feel the full impact of the pass-through of rising wholesale prices. Indeed, it now appears certain that there will be a burst of price boosts from businessmen who feel liberated from the strictures of Phase 2 controls.

The Administration is taking a serious risk in loosening controls with inflationary pressures still so strong and the economy still so far from full employment. The economic logic, as enunciated by Treasury Secretary Shultz, is based on the claim that controls work badly and break down when there is less slack in the economy; he argues that controls then increasingly hurt efficiency and curb business investment. But business has already announced plans to increase its expenditures on plant and equipment by 13 percent in 1973. And the hopes of achieving both full employment and price stability

have been jeopardized by a premature weakening of controls.

Secretary Shultz has claimed that the Administration is keeping a "stick in the closet" with which to discipline those who lose self-control. We have the gravest doubts that this approach will work. It is more probable that it will lead to a speed-up of inflation and productivity-damaging strikes in a year when wage contracts for five million workers run out.

It is up to the Administration to demonstrate that it takes its new wage-price program seriously and is prepared to crack down on either corporations or labor unions that violate Government-supported standards. Unless those standards are defended with vigilance and skill, Phase 3 could quickly degenerate into Phase 0—or force a return to all-out controls.

#### SPEAKER ALBERT ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1973, the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, was the principal speaker at an observance of the 50th anniversary of Time, Inc., in Washington, D.C. at the National Portrait Gallery.

In his eloquent address, Speaker ALBERT commented on the issue of the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of Government and on recent reforms designed to strengthen and revitalize Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because I think this speech would be of interest to all Members of the House, I include the text of Speaker ALBERT's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

#### THE MODERN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In the first paragraph of its first issue, Time Magazine observed: "The man who was elected President by the largest plurality in history has been reproved by a Congress controlled by his own party."

This observation of 50 years ago points up the fact that the differences presently separating Congress and the President go to the heart of our sustained experiment in self-government.

The historic separation of powers between the Executive and the Legislative branches of government is being tested on many fronts and on four principal issues.

Out of the tragic lessons of Vietnam, we have been brought to realize that despite the apparent imperatives of the Cold War, this country can never again accept without question the paternalistic dogma that "the White House knows best", as applied to war and peace.

Also at issue is the question of executive privilege and the power of the President to reorganize the Executive departments when Congress has refused to act in this field.

Important as these matters are, the central and overwhelming issue at this time arises out of the impoundment of Congressionally appropriated funds.

The great question confronting us today is, as it has always been in our government based upon co-equal branches: Where does Congressional power end and where does Presidential power begin?

#### IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

No series of acts strike more directly at Congress fundamental power over the purse than the usurpation of power by the President's impoundment of appropriated funds in the final months of the 92nd Congress.

It may be argued—have not other Presidents impounded funds appropriated by Congress and refused to spend them? Of course, the answer is "yes."

Impoundment of small sums, of reasonable sums, goes back at least to Jefferson, but the President for all practical purposes appears set on repealing or emasculating laws—that is the heart of the problem.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 was passed and re-passed over a Presidential veto. The President impounded these funds, ultimately releasing less than one-half of the money provided to cope with a critical problem over the next two years. All power to legislate is specifically granted to Congress by the Constitution. The Congress has denied Presidents the item veto, the equivalent of legislative authority, for more than a hundred years. It is obvious that what Congress has refused him, the President has undertaken to seize. What Congress has decreed, the President has circumvented. The time has come for the Congress to call a halt to these wholesale executive invasions of legislative powers and responsibilities.

The President has interpreted his reelection as a mandate to strike down the domestic programs passed by Congress over the past 30 years. How such a mandate, if it is a mandate, can be carried out in the Democratic 93rd Congress, fresh from the people, is a puzzle to me. Congress has received its own mandate—a mandate which our large and able majority will meet by safeguarding and using our Constitutional and exclusive power to legislate on behalf of the people.

#### INITIATIVES TO STRENGTHEN CONGRESS

How well are we equipped for the task of halting executive incursions?

The quality of Members of Congress today, on both sides of the aisle, in both Houses, is in my opinion higher than ever before in my experience.

We are neither mired in tradition nor doomed by hardening of the organizational and procedural arteries.

All of us are acutely aware that, to maintain its strength and vitality, Congress must continually retool and reorganize. All too often, however, our achievements in this direction are overshadowed by more dramatic events, such as the progress of the President's legislative program or the fall from grace of an individual Member of Congress.

Modification of the seniority tradition, for example, actually has been underway in recent years in both Houses.

In the House of Representatives we have limited the number of subcommittees senior Members may chair and distributed these positions of influence among newer Members. We are electing, in party caucuses, committee chairmen and ranking minority Members.

Similarly, in a continuing process of adaptation, we have revitalized the caucus and strengthened the party leadership. We have opened up committee and voting procedures to provide for greater accountability. We have established a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and we have reformed our election reporting laws.

We have expanded our information resources, augmented our professional staff, strengthened existing Congressional research agencies, authorized and funded a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, and created a new Office of Technology Assessment. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, in consultation with my office,

has commissioned work on a major study of Congressional communication techniques and potential.

The pace of change, the tempo of our attempts to find more effective, more open and more democratic ways to meet our responsibilities has increased steadily over the past two years.

#### NEW REFORMS IN 93D CONGRESS

This momentum will be sustained during the 93d Congress.

A new Joint Committee on Budgetary Control is considering methods for strengthening Congressional control over the amount and direction of Federal expenditures. Meanwhile, Senator Mansfield and I are planning regular joint leadership meetings throughout the session to maintain a check on the pace of the Congress and to consider changes in the legislative program that may seem desirable.

In another area of particular concern, I have asked a select committee to study the entire committee structure, to insure that our committees do not work at cross purposes, that there is a minimum of duplicated effort, that some committees are not idle while others are overloaded—and that all have the space and professional staff needed to handle expeditiously their growing legislative workload. This is the first study of the structure of House Committees to be carried out since 1946.

Organizational, housekeeping, and other problems created by the tragic loss of the Majority Leader in the closing days of the last session brought graphically home to me the Congressional hiatus which always exists between election day and the House convening date of January 3. There is no reason why Congress should not do for itself what it has done for the Presidency, by providing for a transition from one Congress to another. We should authorize and fund a program that would enable the party caucuses to meet in the weeks after the election, nominate candidates for leadership and committee positions, and thus have most of this organizational work finished when a new Congress assembles on January 3. We should be prepared to begin our substantive work in January, and not in March. It is my hope that an improvement in this area will be added to the many reforms now being formulated.

#### INTERVENTION BY COURTS MAY BE NECESSARY

As important as continued improvement in our workways may be, this alone will not check—and reverse—the accelerating usurpation of power by the Executive branch.

What the President is doing is creating a crisis that goes to the very heart of our Constitutional system. This is the action which must be challenged by the other two co-equal branches. The courts should speak to the issue. The American people should insist that the balance of powers stipulated in the Constitution should be respected.

This is an issue to which committees in both bodies of Congress are addressing themselves. We in the Congress are calling upon our appropriate committees and Members and are seeking the help of eminent Constitutional scholars and practitioners throughout the country in developing alternative courses of action as we continue the urgent task of maintaining and strengthening representative democracy. The gravity and complexity of the problem deserves the attention of our best trained minds if we are to stem the tide of Executive overreach.

Our aim is positive in that we seek to retain the Constitutional prerogatives of our branch of government. Our aim is not to diminish the Presidency nor to attack the President. Our aim is to command the respect of the Executive for the functions of the Congress as representatives of the people. Our aim is to protect the people's branch of the government.

May I conclude by repeating that the question now is: Where does Congressional power end and where does Presidential power begin? Ultimately the people will decide.

For the present and the future, I call to mind the succinct and still meaningful answer given us by Woodrow Wilson when he said democracy flourishes only as it is nurtured from its roots. "A people shall be saved," he said, "by the power that sleeps in its own deep bosom or by none. The flower does not bear the root, but the root the flower."

#### ACKNOWLEDGING STATUS OF OMB

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post published an editorial in today's editions endorsing the need for legislation requiring Senate confirmation of the two top officials of the Office of Management and Budget.

As the House sponsor of similar legislation, which now has 62 cosponsors, I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

The importance of this approach is clearly indicated by the speed with which the Senate approved the bill today by a vote of 63 to 17.

I have written Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD of the Government Operations Committee urging prompt hearings and action in the House. OMB has become a major policymaking office and, as such, the Director should be subject to Senate confirmation just like other members of the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, the Post editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1973]

#### ACKNOWLEDGING THE STATUS OF OMB

"It is simply ironic to require Senate confirmation of the appointment of a second lieutenant in the Army and deny the Senate the power and the duty to pass on the fitness of individuals to serve as Director or Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, individuals whose powers are second only to those of the President of the United States."

The observation was made by Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina apropos of some legislation the Senate is scheduled to vote on today. The legislation, introduced by Mr. Ervin and a host of co-sponsors and somewhat amended late last week, would have the effect of making the two top jobs in the Office of Management and Budget subject to Senate confirmation. Its reach is also calculated to include Mr. Nixon's two recent appointees to those jobs, Ray Ash, who has been named Director of OMB, and Frederick Malek, who has been named his deputy. Both men, under the provisions of the bill, would need Senate confirmation to hold office.

Especially where Mr. Ash is concerned, it seems to us important to distinguish between two related but separate issues that have been raised in connection with Senator Ervin's bill. The fitness of Roy Ash for the job is one, and the relationship to Congress of the man who holds that job—whatever he might be—is the other. And although it seems apparent that questions concerning potential conflicts of interest on Mr. Ash's part have fueled the congressional drive to make this job subject to Senate confirmation, the legislation itself does not dispose of Mr. Ash's fate one way or the other. It merely addresses the question of whether the two top officers of OMB, including those who have

just been appointed for a presumably long term of office, should be required to gain the same kind of Senate approval as Cabinet officers and other government officials. We think the answer to that is yes.

The positions that are at issue, like the OMB itself, have been altered dramatically in nature over the years. Half a century ago at its inception, the Budget Bureau amounted to little more than a small advisory group within the executive branch. Today, thanks to innumerable statutes and executive orders and rearrangements that have intervened, we are talking about something quite different. We are talking about an administrative and managerial agency of some 700 persons, an agency which makes and carries out policy affecting all the other departments of government. It is, as proponents of Senator Ervin's legislation have observed, more than slightly ironic that the top officers of this all-important decision-making-and-enforcing agency should retain "advisory" group immunity from Senate confirmation proceedings, while the relevant officials of other executive branch offices much more advisory in nature require confirmation. For instance, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Telecommunications Policy all are subject to confirmation of key officials.

There appears to be widespread support in both bodies of Congress and among legislators of both parties for the principle the Ervin bill asserts, even though some have questioned the actual formulation of the bill itself. So the odds seem to be that it will be passed by the Senate and also by the House. Evidently too, Mr. Nixon's spokesmen have put it out that the President intends to veto the legislation if it passes on the grounds that it would inhibit the President's choice of advisers and also establish retroactive conditions on the ability of men he has put in office to serve. In our view the desirability of making Senate confirmation a condition of these most unadvisory of positions seems abundantly clear. And at a time when Congress and the administration seem destined for a pitched battle over the actions of the OMB, it would seem to us to be in the administration's interest that the top OMB directors be people of whom the Senate had formally approved. The dispute over Mr. Ash's qualifications and connections is bound to continue in some congressional setting until it is resolved. We can think of no more appropriate and ultimately reassuring setting for its resolution than Senate confirmation proceedings.

#### OBSCENE RADIO BROADCASTING—I

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, my city of Cleveland, like so many others around the country, has been plagued recently by radio broadcasting of talk shows that feature particularly offensive language. This poses a problem not only because of the number of complaints that these programs generate but also because of the civil liberties issues involved. The following letter to the U.S. attorney in Cleveland represents a serious attempt to cope with this problem, and I am certain that Members of the House will find it of interest. Therefore, I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD. On succeeding days, I will submit for the RECORD other letters I have written—to the Federal Communications Commission, the Office of Legislative Counsel, and the Justice Department—dealing



with other aspects of this highly sensitive topic. The first letter follows:

JANUARY 30, 1973.

Mr. FREDERICK M. COLEMAN,  
U.S. Attorney, Northern District of Ohio,  
U.S. Court House, Cleveland, Ohio

DEAR Mr. COLEMAN: On January 17, 1973, my office in Cleveland was deluged by telephone calls from citizens who demanded that the Federal Government "do something" about talk shows then being broadcast by Radio Station WERE. The complaints were that much of the language being used was obscene.

As an attorney and as a Federal official, I am of course aware of the law (Title 18, United States Code, Section 1464) which says: "Whoever utters any obscene, indecent, or profane language by means of radio communication shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both."

Because it is my duty to see to it that the concerns of my constituents not be ignored, I maintain daily telephone contact with my Cleveland office on the days that Congressional business keeps me in Washington. Consequently, on the day in question, which found me preoccupied with other matters relating to the organization of the new Congress and proposals for much-needed reforms in our procedures, I was interrupted more than once by aides telephoning from Cleveland to relay the complaints about WERE.

I took time out that afternoon in Washington to telephone the Cleveland office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with a request that, if possible, tapes be obtained of the WERE broadcasts and that these tapes be reviewed by you so a determination could be made as to whether Section 1464 had been violated. Earlier, I had telephoned friends in Cleveland whose opinions I respect in matters such as this (these are persons who are devoted to the principle of free speech), and I sought their advice. They encouraged me to take this action.

I understand that the FBI did obtain some tapes and that you are now in the process of reviewing them. I appreciate the cooperation I am receiving from your office. As a matter of fact—and I regard this as unfortunate—this is not the first time I have had to make this request of you because of broadcasts by WERE. Under similar circumstances, you listened to tapes furnished to you by that station of broadcasts made on November 1, 1972, and you reported to me on December 6, 1972, that your investigation "revealed the use of some questionable language by the broadcaster, but . . . nothing which constituted obscene language." You concluded your rather brief letter to me with this sentence: "Should you require additional information, please feel free to get in touch with me."

In this letter, I am accepting your invitation, I do need "additional information." What I need is an explanation of the criteria you use for making the judgment that certain language is, or is not, obscene. I suggest that an appropriate time to do this would be in your report to me about the January 17 broadcasts.

Should you decide to prosecute, I would of course defer to such action on your part, and I would expect my questions to be answered as the case unfolds. However, in the event that you again decide not to prosecute, I would appreciate a letter from you listing each example of the "questionable language" (to use your own phrase) that you found in your examination of the tapes, together with an explanation, in each instance, of why these utterances failed, in your opinion, to meet the legal test of obscenity.

I strongly believed it is important that this information be given to the public. There is a great deal of concern among my constituents

over the effects that these broadcasts might be having on community mores, and especially over the impact they might be having on children and adolescents. While it is true, as some have said, that anyone who feels offended by what he hears over WERE need not listen to that station, I believe this is too glib an answer for me or anyone else to give to the people concerned. Switching off the station does not stop the broadcast. Therefore, if what is being said on the air is indeed adverse to the public interest, we then have a problem affecting the entire community, not merely the sensibilities of certain individuals.

The reason I am asking you to state publicly the rationale for your decisions in this area is that I hold so strongly that it is important for the people of our community to feel assured that their oft-stated grievances are given serious consideration, and that their public officials are responsive to them. Frankly, in the face of a statute so clearly worded as Section 1464, I myself find it difficult to convince my constituents that it is not being violated time and again by some of the broadcasts emanating from WERE.

I fully realize that words like "obscene," "indecent" and "profane," while clear in meaning to the average person, do create semantical problems for lawyers and judges—especially in view of the free speech guarantee of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. But I am certain that I know the people of the 20th Congressional District, and I have no doubt that they, like people everywhere of average intelligence, would be able to understand why these words might or might not be legally applicable to some of the WERE talk shows, providing that the public officials responsible for the enforcement of Section 1464 were to offer them a thoughtful explanation. Whether they accept the explanation is another matter. But at least they ought to have it.

We are dealing, after all, with a statute which, as you know, has been held by Federal courts not to be in conflict with the First Amendment. As the United States Supreme Court observed in the Red Lion Broadcasting Co. case (decided in 1969): "It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."

I submit to you that this is a pronouncement worth keeping in mind, even though it might be argued that Red Lion is not necessarily controlling with respect to the issues that might be posed by a prosecution under Section 1464.

In addition, we have had Federal court decisions specifically upholding the constitutionality of Section 1464. I would refer you, for example, to *Talman v. United States* and *United States v. Smith*, two cases in Illinois which were decided only last year. Should your research indicate to you that these cases are not helpful in consideration of possible action against Station WERE in Cleveland, perhaps you could explain this, too, in your forthcoming letter to me.

Because we are obviously dealing here with an issue which goes to the very heart of our Constitution, it is important that we in public office face up to the challenge. I do not include you in the statement I am about to make, since I know you personally and respect you professionally, but I have no doubt you would agree that there has been too much hand-wringing by Government lawyers who fear they might be entering a thicket of irreconcilable conflicts were they to face this issue squarely. Yet we live with Constitutional tensions day by day in our country. On the one hand—to cite one recurring example—we have the guarantee of a free press, and on the other hand, the guarantee of a fair trial. When the two collide, we do not obliterate one in favor of the other; rather, since we value both of these guarantees highly, we seek to establish a public policy

that permits the two of them to co-exist—safely if not comfortably.

We are apparently faced with such a situation with respect to the WERE broadcasts. Free speech and Section 1464 are not mutually exclusive. The courts have so held. Therefore, WERE must be told and the people must be told—in terms clear enough for both of them to understand—where the rights of one party must prevail and where the rights of the second will supersede. I believe that your letter to me might at least begin the process of accomplishing this. The First Amendment is so strongly rooted in our traditions and in our jurisprudence that I have no fear it will endure whatever action you might take, whether it be in the form of court proceedings or simply an attempt to explain your rationale to the public.

At the same time, although this particular letter is directed to you, I want to assure you that I am not overlooking the responsibilities that other public agencies hold in this area. The WERE talk shows that prompt the complaints to me appear to reflect a new trend in radio programming around the country—one which, I am told, finds radio trying to win back advertising revenues from television.

I will be writing shortly to the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, which has a legal arsenal that includes not only your Section 1464 but other weapons as well, none of which the Commission appears to be using. I will be writing, too, to the Department of Justice with respect to its over-all policy on enforcement of Section 1464. And I will be making some proposals for legislative action in Congress, in an attempt to strengthen Section 1464 and perhaps purge it, as far as this can be done, of any implication of willful censorship. You will receive copies of these communications, and I would be happy to have your comments, pro or con.

In the meantime, I appreciate your interest in this matter, and I am pleased that we will be working together on this problem.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,  
Member of Congress.

#### NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT SURVEY

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the next couple of months the Congress will be debating two issues of importance to mass transportation in this country. One is whether the highway trust fund should be opened to mass transit; the other is whether the Federal Government should provide operating assistance for transit systems.

These issues are of great importance to my congressional district and to the city of New York. During the next 2 weeks I will be polling transit riders on the conditions they experience in riding the city's subways and buses every day. These people can provide some of the best insights on the conditions of present day transit systems as well as on the potential expanded use of mass transit if service were improved.

In our consideration of future transportation budgets, we must examine the various forms of transportation in terms of the impact of each on national mobility, the environment, and the energy crisis that has recently come to public attention. I hope that my questionnaire can assist in this examination.

For the interest of my colleagues, my questionnaire, along with its introductory statement, follows:

DEAR TRANSIT RIDER: Two proposals of great importance to New York City transit riders will soon be debated in the Congress. They are:

1) to provide localities with federal assistance for the maintenance and operation of mass transit systems.

2) to open the Highway Trust Fund to mass transit expenditures.

If these proposals are approved by the Congress, New York City will receive millions more in mass transit aid from the federal government than it does today. As sensible and necessary as these proposals may seem to us, however, obtaining their enactment will not be easy. The powerful highway lobby vigorously opposes the use of Highway Trust Fund money for mass transit and the Nixon Administration opposes federal operating subsidies for local transit systems.

This decade demands a national commitment to improve public transportation. This is obvious to those of us who ride the subways and buses. But, too many high ranking policy makers in both the city and federal government are chauffeured around in limousines, and they don't know how bad conditions have become.

Presently Highway Trust Fund moneys can be used only for highway construction. The Highway Trust Fund now collects some \$8 billion annually in revenue. This is too much to spend exclusively on highways when the critical needs are in mass transit.

Furthermore, federal transit funds can be used today only for capital expenditures (the purchase of new equipment and the construction of new facilities) while existing systems deteriorate because the farebox alone can no longer finance everyday operating costs. It is in the national interest that we have efficient, safe, and clean public transportation that encourages ridership, instead of discouraging it.

As a subway rider and as a Member of Congress, I will be pressing the "straphangers" case on both issues—and I already have introduced legislation to open the Highway Trust Fund to mass transit programs and to provide \$400 million annually in transit operating subsidies.

But, to be successful I need your help. I need written statements from the transit riders of New York City on the conditions of the present system, the hardships borne by transit riders, and the potential for additional transit use if service were updated.

Therefore, may I ask that you become involved in this effort to improve the City's transit by answering the following questions and returning this self-mailer to me. Your answers and comments will provide valuable testimony from the riding public—those who know best—what needs to be done.

You can help. Please become involved in the fight to obtain better mass transit for New York City by answering the following questions:

Check or indicate number where appropriate

1. In traveling to and from work, do you ride a subway —, a bus —? (check one or both if applicable).

Do you travel during—  
rush hour: AM — PM —  
non-rush hour: AM — PM —

2. In going to work, how long a ride (in time) do you have on:  
subway —  
bus —

3. Do you live in a two fare zone? —

4. How much time do you spend waiting for a bus and/or subway in going to work? —

5. How many times a week do you experience breakdowns in service in subways — buses —?

6. How many times a week do you have to

let your subway or bus go by because it is too crowded to board? —

(I need the following information to show the hardships borne by persons in two fare zones and the cost in lost man hours of transit delays):

7. Please indicate your annual income level:

\$5000 or below —  
\$5000 to \$8000 —  
\$8000 to \$12,000 —  
\$12,000 to \$16,000 —  
\$16,000 to \$25,000 —  
\$25,000 or more —

8. Please indicate by number or name the bus or subway line(s) you ride: —

9. What bothers you most about New York's subways and buses? (number in order of priority: 1, 2, 3, etc.)

Subways	Buses
— service breakdowns	—
— crowded conditions	—
— service irregularities	—
— slow trains or buses	—
— noise	—
— potential muggings	—
— dirt & graffiti	—
— other —	—

10. What recommendations do you have for service improvements

If the service improvements you recommend were made, how many additional trips would you make a week in:

rush hour: —  
non-rush hour: —

11. I am also interested in knowing whether there are bus routes which you feel are not up to date because of new community or housing developments. Please indicate the number of the existing line, and how you feel the line should be rerouted.

#### EARTH DAY RESOLUTION

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years a host of scientific studies have demonstrated the interrelated character of the environment of our planet and how pollution is no respecter of national boundaries. The flights of our astronauts and their spectacular observations and photographs of the earth taken from space have pointed up the unity of our planet and the aptness of the description of the planet as "spaceship earth."

To deal with the problem of growing pollution of our air, water, and land, a combination of government action and public education is needed. No doubt when there are pollution catastrophes such as the oil slick on the Santa Barbara coastline or a poisonous smog over an industrial city with a rapid increase in death rate, it is highly educational, a lethal form of education.

A valuable step in the direction of educating the public about the importance of preserving our environment throughout the entire planet without an accompanying catastrophe would be widespread recognition of 1 day a year as Earth Day. This could be a day to adopt new policies and start new projects related to the environment, a day to beautify the landscape, a day when the fragility and importance of our environment could be recognized in a thousand ways.

No more appropriate day could be

found for this purpose than the first day of spring, March 21, the vernal equinox. Already a large number of jurisdictions have adopted proclamations to this effect, among them the city of San Francisco, the county of Los Angeles, which includes part of my district, and the United Nations. I believe this resolution is appropriate because of the leadership role of the U.S. Government in the world in scientific research into environmental problems at the same time that, because of its industrial development, the United States is the country the most troubled by pollution. It is doubly appropriate in view of the impending arrival of spring.

Mr. Speaker, I send my resolution to the desk. I ask for its appropriate referral.

#### INTERNATIONAL CHURCH OF THE FOURSQUARE GOSPEL—A HISTORY OF SPIRITUAL ACHIEVEMENT

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, the roots of America's greatness are buried deep in the soil of freedom's liberty and religious faith. The truths of spiritual incentives have molded our lives, morals, and destiny. As a nation we are indebted to the religious institutions that have propagated their basic fundamental truths of God's love for us and our need of loving each other.

During the last 50 years the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel has been one of these outstanding religious organizations, contributing to our national, spiritual, and social progress. On January 1, 1923, this group came into being as a result of the broad acceptance of the fundamental evangelistic ministry of Aimee Semple McPherson. Using beautiful Angelus Temple as her headquarters and site of L.I.F.E. Bible College, she inspired over 6,000 graduates to go forth and find their place in religious service around the world.

The ministry of Aimee Semple McPherson emphasized God's great love and mercy for mankind, uplifted the dignity of man, urged Christian service to meet not only spiritual needs, but physical needs as well. She set an example for all to follow.

During the depression days of the late 1920's and early 1930's the Angelus Temple commissary fed and clothed over 1,500,000 persons regardless of their color or creed. No needy person was ever refused. It became a common cry from city officials and citizens alike, "If you need help, go to Angelus Temple." This humanitarian work still continues. In fact, it now is felt around the world. Recently Foursquare churches rushed aid to Nicaragua to assist during that nation's earthquake disaster.

The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel has been a very patriotic group. During World War II Aimee Semple McPherson personally conducted bond drives, selling hundreds of thousands of dollars in war bonds. Many of



her dramatic, illustrated sermons dealt with the vital need for true Americanism and loyalty to this Nation.

Although Aimee Semple McPherson passed from the scene in September 1944, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel has continued to grow throughout the world under the inspired leadership of her son, Dr. Rolf K. McPherson. Today it ministers in 29 countries, with over 3,000 churches abroad, and with 41 Bible colleges. In its numerous orphanages poor and rejected children are cared for, clothed, and educated.

This religious organization has an outstanding history. They were the first church to be licensed to operate a radio station in the United States—Station KFSG in Los Angeles. They have a continuous record of radio station ownership from March 1924 to their present operation of KFSG-FM.

Their missionary activities around the world are marked with many firsts. Among the Choco Indians of the Darien Province of Panama, the Foursquare Gospel missionary established the first village among these primitive people, and formed for them their first alphabet and written language. He then proceeded to translate the Gospel according to St. Mark into their new written language. In New Guinea, the Foursquare Gospel missionaries were the first to minister among the headhunter tribes of the Dunatina Valley, working with over 200,000 stone age people in this region. Commissioned by the Bolivian Government, they solely minister among the Sirono Indians of the Green Hill Jungle of Bolivia. Statistics show the Foursquare Gospel movement to be the fastest growing Protestant religious group in the Philippines.

As the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel celebrates its 50th anniversary, during their Golden Jubilee Convention to be held on February 21 to 28, 1973, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to, and commend, this great religious organization, whose achievements have enriched our American culture and our spiritual and social life. We are proud of their endeavors, both at home and abroad, and we look forward to their future contributions to our Nation in its pursuit of liberty, peace, and good will among all men.

#### LEGISLATION TO REMOVE AN INEQUITY IN THE FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE LAW

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for myself and for my colleagues from South Dakota (Mr. DENHOLM and Mr. ABRON), whose aim it is to remove a current inadvertent inequity in Federal disaster assistance law.

My bill is in the form of an amendment to the Disaster Act of 1970, section 254, which relates to the eligibility of disaster victims to receive Federal relocation assistance payments where Federal proj-

ects displace these people permanently from their homes.

Section 254 was included in the Disaster Act of 1970 so as not to punish those homeowners and renters who, as a result of a major disaster, were displaced from their homes longer than 180 days and 90 days respectively. Current law states that a homeowner must have resided in the home 180 days in order to qualify for relocation assistance; and that a renter must have resided in his home or apartment 90 days to qualify for such assistance. In the case of a major disaster, as many of my colleagues already know; and, unfortunately as many of you will know in the future, people are displaced from their places of residence. Such displacement excludes these already suffering citizens from the protections of the law which allows equitable replacement payments where Federal projects move people from their homes. By failing to meet the required 180- and 90-day residence requirement, these people would be denied the equal protection of the laws through no fault of their own and completely unintentionally on the part of the Congress.

The Congress recognized the need to include a section of the Disaster Act of 1970 which would waive the residency requirement for urban renewal projects in disaster areas; however, with the advent of the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act, this body must now act to waive such unequal requirements for all Federal projects and not just urban renewal. For any Federal program—be it Army Corps of Engineers levee work, Housing and Urban Development open space projects, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation park construction, indeed the entire gamut of Federal public works—should have a provision whereby disaster victims displaced from their long-term places of residence would not have to meet residency requirements not meant to apply to them in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, unless this change in law is quickly acted upon by the Congress a situation will exist that neither the Congress, nor the Executive, nor the agencies, nor the citizens of this country desire to happen. Namely, Federal projects will be initiated in areas where citizens have been forced to flee from their homes due to raging floodwaters or other natural disasters and these people will be ineligible for the relocation assistance which the U.S. Congress intended them to have.

Such a situation, though undesirable at any time, has been especially pointed up by the numerous projects which will begin soon in the area affected by Hurricane Agnes. As has been the case with so many changes in disaster assistance legislation, Agnes—the greatest natural disaster in the history of this Republic has been the catalyst. However, it should be pointed out at this time for all present to note well, that an identical situation can exist in any congressional district by this afternoon, or tomorrow evening, or a week from now, whenever disaster strikes.

It would do this body well to act with haste to end this inequity and insure that the equal protection of the laws is

provided to those who qualify for relocation assistance.

Section 254, Public Law 91-606 and text of the bill follows:

#### RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 254. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person otherwise eligible for any kind of relocation assistance payment authorized under section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 shall be denied such eligibility as a result of his being unable, because of a major disaster as determined by the President, to reoccupy property from which he was displaced by such disaster.

#### H.R. —

A bill To amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 with respect to eligibility for relocation assistance

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 254 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 is amended to read as follows:

#### "RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 254. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person otherwise eligible for any kind of replacement housing payments under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 shall be denied such eligibility as a result of his being unable, because of a major disaster as determined by the President, a natural disaster as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, or a disaster as determined by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to meet the occupancy requirements set by such Act."

#### LYNDON B. JOHNSON, 1908-1973: "EDUCATION PRESIDENT"

(Mr. BRADEMAs asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, the late President Lyndon B. Johnson wanted to be known as the "Education President."

I am confident that he will, for no President in American history worked so hard to provide opportunities for a good education to so many.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor during President Johnson's service as President, I know from my own experience the dedication and energy he brought to achieving the goal of improving the quality of education in our country and widening access to education.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record from the January 29, 1973 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, an article entitled: "Lyndon B. Johnson, 1908-1973: 'Education President'":

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, 1908-1973:

#### "EDUCATION PRESIDENT"

(By Philip W. Semas)

During his term as President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson signed 60 laws providing federal aid to education.

He often said he wanted to be known as the "Education President." Many observers believe he earned that title, since most of the legislation authorizing the first large-scale federal effort to aid education was passed by Congress under his prodding.

"We're very much in his debt," said Roger W. Heyns, president of the American Council on Education, after Mr. Johnson died last week at the age of 64. "His commitment

to education has benefitted millions of our young people."

Before Mr. Johnson became President, attempts to provide extensive federal aid to education had run up against the stone wall of the church-state controversy. The Johnson Administration went around that wall by proposing large-scale aid for specific programs, rather than general aid to colleges and schools.

In higher education, President Johnson's greatest accomplishment was the Higher Education Act of 1965, which established such programs as guaranteed student loans, educational opportunity grants for needy students, and aid to developing colleges—programs that still form the foundation for much federal aid to higher education today.

He also signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which authorized federal aid for construction of classroom and library buildings. He got Congress to pass the Sea-Grant Act, which provided money for marine research; the International Education Act, which has never been funded; and the Education Professions Development Act, which provided funds for the education of educa-

#### "TEACHER IN THE WHITE HOUSE"

Mr. Johnson, who once taught public speaking in a Texas high school, liked to be called "the teacher in the White House."

He had an almost religious faith in the value of education. Although his mother had to persuade him to go to college, he believed his attendance at Southwest Texas State Teachers College saved him from a life of drifting.

But in the end Mr. Johnson's accomplishments in education—like his accomplishments in civil rights and other domestic areas—ran afoul of the Vietnam war.

By the end of his term, he had stopped proposing huge increases in appropriations for aid to education, as the cost of the war took an ever-larger share of the federal budget. He also rejected proposals from within his administration to initiate new programs in education, some of which have since been enacted.

And the President who hoped to be hailed on college campuses for his contributions to higher education was instead the object of bitter denunciations from many students and professors for his prosecution of the war.

After he retired from the Presidency in 1969, Mr. Johnson supervised the building of a Presidential library and a school of public affairs, both of which bear his name, at the University of Texas.

The first set of his Presidential papers to be made public at the library were the documents on education, almost exactly a year ago. At that time he said, "I take great pride that I was referred to, when people tried to be generous, as the education President."

#### MAJOR JOHNSON-ERA EDUCATION MEASURES

Dec. 16, 1963—The Higher Education Facilities Act, which provided for grants and loans for classroom and library construction.

Aug. 20, 1964—The Economic Opportunity Act, which authorized work-study aid for needy students and created Project Upward Bound.

Nov. 8, 1965—The Higher Education Act of 1965, which authorized federal funds for guaranteed student loans, for colleges to buy instructional equipment, for educational opportunity grants to needy students, for library materials and librarian training, for the Teacher Corps, for aid to developing colleges, and for colleges to become involved in community service.

Oct. 15, 1966—The National Sea-Grant Program and College Act, which provided for aid to marine research at designated colleges.

Oct. 29, 1966—The International Education Act, which authorized federal funds for centers for international studies and for im-

proving undergraduate studies of international affairs.

June 29, 1967—The Education Professions Development Act, which authorized funds for the training of educational personnel from grade school teachers to college administrators.

Oct. 16, 1968—The Higher Education Amendments of 1968, which refined student-aid programs and created new programs of aid for college use of educational technology, for cooperative education, for law schools, and for graduate education, as well as extending earlier legislation.

#### L. B. J. AND THE ARTS

(Mr. BRADEMAs asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, former President Lyndon B. Johnson left us a legacy of many bold and innovative new programs.

One of the late President's interests that enriched all our lives was his commitment to support the creative and performing arts in America.

This commitment found voice in his support of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the National Museum Act of 1966, to mention only a few of President Johnson's most noteworthy achievements.

Mr. Speaker, Richard L. Coe, the distinguished critic of the Washington Post, recently published an account of the arts under the stewardship of Lyndon Johnson.

I include Mr. Coe's story, for the benefit of my colleagues, at this point.

#### L. B. J. AND ART

(By Richard L. Coe)

LBJ did more for the arts than all his 35 presidential predecessors combined. The irony was that the most vocal members of the arts community derided him and mocked his "style."

In the four eventful years from 1964 to '68, President Johnson guided into reality at least a dozen projects which the arts community had dreamed of vaguely for years. Even now many in that community are unaware such programs exist. They were:

The National Council on the Arts, authorized to develop a plan for the federal role in all the arts.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the first agency in our history specifically designed to support the growth of all the arts throughout the nation.

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The National Museum Act of 1966, providing for programs of museum training, research, surveys and publications.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting to encourage the development of noncommercial radio and TV.

Acquisition of the Joseph H. Hirschhorn collection, its building now nearing completion on the Mall.

Realization, through Arts Endowment funds and private sources, of the American Film Institute.

Grants through the Office of Education, making possible funding for artists to visit elementary and secondary schools under the Education Act of 1965.

Programs in 16 major cities to provide summer arts programs for young people.

Creation of the National Collection of Fine

Arts and the National Portrait Gallery in the old Patent Building at 8th and F sts.

Reclaiming the old Court of Claims at the corner of Penn. ave. and 17th St., now the Renwick Gallery.

Grants-in-aid programs both to regional theaters, music and dance groups and, as well, individual awards to painters, sculptors and writers.

These accomplishments had a trusted strategic planner and field commander, Roger L. Stevens, who for much of the Johnson years had three titles: White House consultant on the arts, chairman of the National Council on the Arts and Chairman of the Board of the Kennedy Center, a title Stevens still holds by vote of the board.

In the late '50s even tentative mention of such projects was deemed visionary. In the early '60s both Sens. Kennedy and Nixon, then running for the presidency, spoke virtually unanimously about more government relationship to the arts but three years after taking the oath of office President Kennedy answered a criticism of mine that no advances had been made with the promise: "Cheer up. We'll get them done." Ten months later he was dead.

President Johnson waded into the challenge with a vengeance. Within a week after he assumed office he went along with Sen. Fulbright and Rep. Thompson in altering their bill for a "National Cultural Center" into a "living memorial" for his predecessor. At the same time he urged Honolulu to name its new East-West Theater for President Kennedy. On a chillingly cold, rainy December morning of 1964, President Johnson broke ground for the Center. He looked on the project with a visionary vigor, but on his several post-White House visits to the area, never got around to visiting the building.

But he saw to it that the cream of American artists visited the White House both as guests and as performers on the elegant little stage Rebekah Harkness, his wife's friend, contributed from the design of famed Jo Mielziner. This portable stage repeated the East Room's hand-crafted panels, fluted pilasters and neo-classic capitals so that the stage seemed a part of the room itself, not a make-shift that had been shoved into place.

Hardly an American artist of distinction refused an invitation to perform for the dinner guests assembled honoring world leaders. Here, for Morocco's Hassan II, the late Jose Limon danced his great work, "The Moor's Pavanne," his "Othello" variation. Marian Anderson, Dorothy Maynor, and Duke Ellington were recognized as peerless black artists. Carol Channing's "Hello, Dolly!" was given its fourth birthday performance on Mrs. Harkness' stage and at its end President Johnson wheeled on a huge birthday cake for the star who'd spent the '64 campaign singing "Hello, Lyndon."

The most famous day—and it was all-out Texas style—was the Johnsons' Festival for the Arts, June 15, 1965. It began in the morning, lasted till after midnight and was a day spread all over the house and grounds, embracing sculpture, painting, photography, literature, films, drama, dance and music, an amazingly vast panorama of American arts. Everyone trekked over with Mrs. Johnson for lunch at the National Gallery and dinner was served under the trees of the White House south lawn, LBJ table-hopping.

If it was an expansive day it was also an abrasive one. In advance Robert Lowell had refused to attend on the grounds that "we are in danger of imperceptibly becoming an explosive and suddenly chauvinistic nation." Invited to read, John Hersey stated he would contribute sections from his "Hiroshima." He did so and was welcomed. Mark Van Doren introduced him and Ambassador George Kennan faced the topic of government and the arts:



"Art is not a political weapon but much of what the artist does is profoundly political in helping to dissolve barriers of hatred and ignorance. In this way you work toward peace, not the peace which is simply the absence of war, but the peace which liberates man to reach for the finest fulfillment of his spirit."

LBJ said: "Amen to that" and then smiled, a bit sadly I thought, at his guests, some of them visibly signing the protest against the Vietnam war which guest Dwight MacDonal was circulating for all to sign and leave behind for their host.

The man who did much to organize the day, Princeton Prof. Eric Goldman would later write a book about that experience and it would prove to be almost as abrasive a work as the controversy itself.

I doubt that LBJ read Goldman's book, though very likely Mrs. Johnson at least read its magazine excerpts. She read everything about the arts, saw all the plays from her earliest days as a Washington congressman's wife and unquestionably influenced LBJ's actions for the arts. One big occasion, a "Salute to Congress" in the fall of '65, lost most of its audience because the House was then debating, far into the night, Mrs. Johnson's national beautification bill. The President kidded Lady Bird that their spoiled party was her own fault.

What one remembers from all the gregarious gatherings is the top quality of the guests, all leaders in the arts. There was Catherine Drinker Bowen talked of how she researched her biographies, Hume Cronyn and Jessica Tandy collecting words about the Great Society, Eugene Ormandy chatting with Satchmo Armstrong, tiny Beatrice Lillie looking up at her Marine escort. There was Gregory Peck laughing about reports he was going to run for Congress. There was Charlton Heston, invited to the unveiling of Franklin D. Roosevelt's portrait and playing a scene from "Sunrise at Campobello" and Alice Roosevelt Longworth telling him: "I'm here today not because I was a close friend of Franklin but because I was a close critic."

Mrs. Johnson's interest over-ruled such obstacles as health. She'd arranged for presentation of the Margo Jones Award in the upstairs Oval Room but when the time came she was in bed with the flu. But she talked to each of the honorees on the phone to make them feel welcome and as they were leaving they had a glimpse of LBJ leaving his oval office. There was the night a company of "You're A Good Man, Charlie Brown" came in from Shady Grove to serenade Lynda Robb and her new baby, Lucinda, with an East Room performance and LBJ looked in on the small, youngish group to say good-night to his grandchild.

Roaming restlessly among his guests, sometimes hundreds of them, sometimes only a few, was the tall Texan, often not talking as you'd expect that man to do, but listening, it sometimes seemed, with his eyes; taking in all the details about this particular segment of his Great Society, the artists, finding them very different from himself but not, for that reason, to be despised. It was as though they were a luxury he'd missed along his way to the top and he wanted to grasp all he could about this colorful, assertive breed. He used his energetic know-how on their behalf and if he was puzzled at their ingratitude he was too proudly sensitive to mention it.

#### CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION— SHORTER COLLEGE

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,

this year, a very fine institution of higher learning is proudly celebrating its centennial year of service. Besides offering splendid educational opportunities, this college has a particular appeal to me as my mother, two sisters and five aunts are all alumnae.

Chartered at Rome, Ga., in 1873 as a Baptist ladies school, Shorter College is now a multidisciplinary college which enrolls approximately 800 men and women from all walks of life.

As Shorter College emerges from its first century and embarks upon its second hundred years of academic adventure, it is only fitting and proper that we in the Nation's Congress give this fine institution the recognition it so well deserves.

Therefore, at this time, I would like to read into the RECORD the extremely well-written history of Shorter College by Robert W. Gardner, professor of religion at Shorter, which I commend to my colleagues as follows:

#### A BRIEF HISTORY OF SHORTER COLLEGE

(By Robert G. Gardner)

Combining the generosity and wealth of Alfred Shorter with the insight and vision of Luther Rice Gwaltney, Shorter College stands as a memorial to these two co-founders. Originally called the Cherokee Baptist Female College, it was chartered on September 20, 1873, by a group of Northwest Georgia Baptists who formed a private stock company. For the first four decades of its life, the institution included primary, preparatory, and collegiate departments. Housed in a former residence on a hill near the Rome Baptist Church, of which Gwaltney was pastor, the school opened with five or six faculty members and 80 students. Almost immediately it experienced financial difficulties. In 1877 a local Baptist landowner, farmer, and businessman, Alfred Shorter, who was already president of the board of trustees, was induced to take a commanding role in the affairs of the institution. Because he contributed funds to erect a large and modern Academic and Chapel Building and a dormitory, the name of the school was changed to honor him and his wife, becoming Shorter Female College (and simply Shorter College in 1923). At his death in 1882, the college was provided with an endowment of \$40,000, bringing the Colonel's gifts to a total of about \$200,000.

Under Presidents Alexander S. Townes (1873-1875), Rollin D. Mallary (1876-1882), Luther R. Gwaltney (1882-1890), and Archibald J. Battle (1890-1898), the school gained stability and reputation. The department of music had been strong from the beginning, but President and Mrs. Thomas J. Simmons (1898-1910) raised it virtually to the rank of a conservatory.

Although two other buildings had been constructed and several nearby residences purchased or rented, the downtown campus was seen to be too small. Led by four Baptist laymen—J. L. Bass, J. P. Cooper, W. W. Brookes, and L. A. Dean—the trustees made the decision to move the college to its present site. Azor W. Van Hoose became president in 1910, supervising the erection in nine months of five large brick structures costing about \$300,000. A capacity enrollment of 300 was quickly reached, and unprecedented prosperity was enjoyed. The primary department was closed in 1910 and the preparatory, in 1916. The dynamic Van Hoose led the college for a decade, raising the value of its plant to \$608,500 and its endowment to \$100,000. Principally for the building program and current expenses, Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Cooper contributed about \$166,000,

mostly during this period. The endowment was increased by gifts from a Rome campaign and the Georgia Baptist Convention. Van Hoose's premature death in 1921 left a void difficult to fill.

During the brief administration of Daniel J. Blocker (1922-1925), the college was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and a swimming pool was built, bringing to completion projects that Van Hoose had long worked to achieve. Under President William D. Purry (1925-1933), the various curricula were made more rigorous, and other meaningful forms of academic accreditation were gained.

As the depression deepened, Paul M. Cousins became president in 1933, serving for fifteen difficult years. While many similar schools were perishing, Shorter College managed to survive. The music department was accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music in 1934. A gymnasium, a president's home, and three faculty apartment buildings were added to the campus in 1947-1948.

Under Charles W. Burts (1948-1953) and George A. Christenberry (1953-1958), young men were admitted as regular students and awarded degrees. Starting in the mid-fifties, dormitory accommodations were provided for them. Liberal arts and music courses were supplemented by growing offerings in education and business administration. Summer school and evening classes, held briefly in the early 1880s, became a regular part of the college calendar. Formed locally in 1883 and nationally in 1924, the General Alumni Association assumed its inclusive name in 1958 and a new name, the Shorter College Alumni Association, in 1972.

During the four decades following the Van Hoose administration, the value of the plant had remained stable at \$608,500, with depreciations cancelling out the additions, and the endowment had grown to \$706,226, in spite of three sizable encroachments to remove operating indebtedness. This increase had been made possible by local canvasses, the General Education Board, the Ford Foundation, Mr. and Mrs. Oakley M. Bishop, and the Georgia Baptist Convention.

In 1958 Randall H. Minor assumed the presidency of Shorter College. Three new structures have been completed: the Library-Administration Building in 1961, valued at \$360,000; the Freshman Dormitory in 1962, valued at \$421,000; and the Walter Pope Binns Student Center in 1968, valued at \$650,000. The Mildred Arnall Peniston Library honors a Shorter alumna. High Acres, valued at \$112,500, was acquired in 1962 as a residence for the president. Housing most of the male students, Greystone Dormitory was purchased in 1964 and is appraised at \$325,000. All five of the buildings constructed in 1911 have been renovated, and new furniture and equipment have been installed. Approximately \$3 million has been expended on capital improvements, of which about one-fourth remains to be paid back on convention-approved loans. The value of the plant has increased eight-fold to more than \$5 million. The endowment has almost tripled, to about \$2 million. Significant gifts have been received from Mrs. Allie Hayes Richardson, the Callaway Foundation, Martin C. and Judson Roberts, and John H. Jackson. The current annual income has quadrupled, to about \$1.3 million.

With 269 full-time students in the fall of 1958, the college has since averaged about 595. Including part-time and summer school students, the yearly total has averaged 820. Negro students have been enrolled, and international students continue to be present. Graduates numbered 43 in 1959, but the total has steadily increased and the thirteen-year average is 96. The faculty has grown from about 35 to 50, salaries have more than doubled, and modest provisions have been made for graduate study and sabbatical leaves. To

the long-standing Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Music degrees have been added several more: the Bachelor of Science degree in Medical Technology, the Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary Education, the Bachelor of Business Administration degree, a Bachelor of Science degree with several additional majors available, and the Bachelor of Music Education and Bachelor of Church Music degrees.

From its inception, the college has been under the direction of a board of trustees, the members of which have been required by charter to be Baptist. After being a self-perpetuating body for three decades, from 1902 to 1914 the board was partially controlled by the Georgia Baptist Convention which elected all new members. For the next twenty-four years the board again became self-perpetuating. In 1938 the Georgia Baptist Convention began to approve new trustees already nominated by the board, after which the board formally elected them. In 1959 the charter was changed and all trustees are named directly by the convention. Even during the years when the college cooperated with but was not controlled by the convention, it frequently received financial aid from that source. Since 1919 the convention has given more than \$3 million for current expenses, building repairs and construction, and endowment held on Shorter's behalf by the Georgia Baptist Foundation.

"A Century of Service" is to be celebrated in 1972-1973. At that time Shorter will honor its past, with its thirty-three hundred graduates, while also looking toward its "Second Hundred Years." Its stance is eloquently expressed by an inscription in the Walter Pope Binns Student Center: "Shorter College is grateful for all friends who have been a part of her glorious history—and for those whose vision and interest point to a greater future."

#### AN EXCELLENT JOB OF DIPLOMACY

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, in its January 27, 1973, edition, commended Dr. Henry Kissinger for his skill, tenacity, and patience in achieving a Vietnam peace agreement.

The editorial cites the difficult assignment Dr. Kissinger faced. He had to disentangle the United States without abandoning our allies. At the same time, he had to negotiate with a party determined to win both a military and political victory. Dr. Kissinger's numerous abilities as a diplomat are described.

At this time, I would like to introduce the editorial into the RECORD:

#### AN EXCELLENT JOB OF DIPLOMACY

High congratulations are in order for Dr. Henry Kissinger.

Four years ago he was given by his President one of the most difficult of assignments possible.

He was told to disentangle the United States from the Vietnam war without abandoning the faction in Vietnam which had been sustained by that American commitment.

It would have been easy enough for the U.S. just to go. But that would not have satisfied the President's requirement for "peace with honor." To go without concern for what would happen afterwards to the government of President Thieu in Saigon, or to the people there who have supported that government, was not deemed by the President to be acceptable in the U.S.

Yet the government and people of North Vietnam have been fighting for 28 years to gain control of South Vietnam. They have never renounced the goal. They kept their eyes and their efforts fixed upon it with a degree of tenacity and dedication which has few parallels if any in all history.

Dr. Kissinger was expected, indeed required, to reconcile the will to victory in the North with the will to disentanglement in Washington without abandoning the cause of noncommunism in the process. Many deemed it an impossible assignment. The assumption that it could not be done was implicit in the entirely different approach of candidate George McGovern during the recent presidential campaign in the U.S. He proposed simply to get out without any regard for what would happen after the withdrawal to people in South Vietnam.

This impossible assignment was accepted, and executed.

True, no one can say at this moment what will be the ultimate fate of noncommunism in South Vietnam or the people who are committed to that cause. We do not know now whether they will grow stronger and be able to sustain their cause indefinitely, or be worn down by the techniques which will be brought to bear on them by the tenacious will of those to the north of them.

But we do know that Dr. Kissinger has worked out a compromise within which the non-Communists have about as good a chance of defending their cause as did the people of South Korea when the war there was ended. The cause is not hopeless. There is to be no immediate bloodbath.

This is the most that could possibly be hoped for. It is a lot more than most outsiders expected.

To appreciate fully the accomplishment it is important to notice the outline of how it was done. Dr. Kissinger approached his task with enormous patience. He understood that with declining American military power in the area he would have to find his answer through Moscow and Peking. He could not hope to succeed in his assignment so long as both Moscow and Peking were determined to support Hanoi to the full, as they were during the Lyndon Johnson years.

So Dr. Kissinger set about giving Peking and Moscow reasons for tempering their support of Hanoi. He went first to Peking. He persuaded the Chinese that the U.S. intended to reduce its military role in Asia, not seek to overthrow the regime. He made it clear that the U.S. was not acting in collusion with Russia to China's danger.

Next Dr. Kissinger approached the Russians to discover what they might want from the U.S. They too were prepared to do business, once they saw President Nixon go to China.

In the end Mr. Nixon was able to mount a military offensive against Hanoi's supply lines without anything more than pro forma protest from Peking and Moscow.

This was seeking a solution through diplomacy. What war could not do diplomacy did—when patience and wisdom had first reshaped the framework of the problem.

There are many lessons from this which all of us will be pondering in the time ahead and to which we will return in this space. For the moment we just want to thank Dr. Kissinger for his skill, his tenacity, and his patience and at the same time offer him a little human commiseration. There is no other assignment waiting for him of comparable difficulty. Anything else, after this, will seem like anticlimax. We just hope that he won't be bored in the days ahead.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CAREY of New York (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) for Monday, February 5, on account of illness in family.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) for Monday, February 5, through Thursday, February 8, 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAFALIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WINN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. TALCOTT, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DE LUGO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WON PAT, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KOCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAFALIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. ERLBORN.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. LOTT.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLARK.



Mr. MOAKLEY.  
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
 Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.  
 Mr. WALDIE in five instances.  
 Mr. REES in two instances.  
 Mr. DULSKI in six instances.  
 Mr. MINISH.  
 Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON in 10 instances.  
 Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.  
 Mr. BOLLING in three instances.  
 Mr. OBEY in six instances.  
 Mr. KOCH in five instances.  
 Mr. DINGELL.  
 Mr. STOKES in two instances.  
 Mr. MILLS of Arkansas.  
 Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.  
 Mr. McSPADDEN.  
 Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.  
 Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.  
 Mr. FRASER in five instances.  
 Mr. PICKLE in 10 instances.  
 Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.  
 Mr. FULTON.  
 Mr. VANIK in two instances.  
 Mr. FLOOD in two instances.  
 Mr. FAUNTROY in 10 instances.  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) and to include extraneous material:)  
 Mr. BLATNIK in three instances.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.  
 Mr. RODINO.  
 Mr. HUNGATE.  
 Mr. RUNNELS.

#### SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 261. An act to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments for four additional years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 606. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 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:

342. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, involving the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Appropriations.

343. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmit-

ting a report on assistance-related expenditures for Laos during the second quarter of fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 602 of Public Law 92-436; to the Committee on Armed Services.

344. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize equalization of the retired or retainer pay of certain members and former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

345. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Personnel Policy), transmitting a supplemental report on present and former employees of the Department of Defense who are now or have previously been employed by certain defense contractors, pursuant to section 410(d) of Public Law 91-121 (50 U.S.C. 1436(d)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

346. A letter from the Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, transmitting a report for the quarter ended December 31, 1972, on Federal financial contributions to States for civil defense equipment and facilities, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. App. 2281(i); to the Committee on Armed Services.

347. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the President's Commission on Productivity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

348. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 404 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

349. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

350. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Trustees, Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, transmitting the Board's Second Annual Report, covering fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

351. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia transmitting the Commission's 59th Annual Report, covering calendar year 1971, pursuant to section 8 of the act of March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

352. A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting notice of proposed rules respecting the family contribution schedule for Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, pursuant to section 411(a)(3)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

353. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on assistance-related funds obligated for Cambodia during the second quarter of fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 655(f) of Public Law 92-226; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

354. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of various international agreements, other than treaties, which have been entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92-403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the scope of specialized or technical services provided to State or local governments by NASA during calendar year 1972, pursuant to section 304 of Public Law 90-577; to the Committee on Government Operations.

356. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report concerning the effectiveness of cigarette labeling and current practices and methods of cigarette advertising and promotion, together with various recommendations for legislation, pursuant to section 8(b) of the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

357. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 38th Annual Report, covering fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

358. A letter from the President, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation for calendar year 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

359. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting the rules of evidence of the U.S. courts and magistrates, amendments and further amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 and 2075 and 18 U.S.C. 3402, 3771, and 3772, together with the report of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 93-46); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

360. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

361. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1154(d)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

362. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1182 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Judiciary.

363. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Act [8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(6)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

364. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1254 (c)(1)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

365. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1254 (c)(1)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

366. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens under the authority contained in section 13 (b) of the act of September 11, 1957, pursu-

ant to section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

367. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, transmitting a report on positions in the Department of Justice in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

368. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on positions in the FBI during 1972 in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

369. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a report on civilian positions in the Department of Defense in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 during calendar year 1972, and a report for the same period on scientific and professional positions involved in research and development activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

370. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report on a Civil Service Commission position in grade GS-18, which has been established "in addition to the number of positions authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5108(a)", and a position established by Public Law 92-392, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

371. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting reports for calendar year 1972 containing summaries of actions taken (1) under the numerical limitations of 5 U.S.C. 5108(a) (quota positions), (2) outside the numerical limitations of 5 U.S.C. 5108(a) (nonquota positions), and (3) regarding Administrative Law Judge positions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114 and 1305; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

372. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

373. A letter from the Federal Cochairman, New England Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Report for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

374. A letter from the Federal and State Cochairmen, Ozarks Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Report for 1972, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

375. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a study of Federal programs for manpower services for the disadvantaged in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Feb. 1, 1973, the following report was filed on Feb. 2, 1973]

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 123. Joint resolution to amend section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 establishing the Commission on Highway Beautification; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-4). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted Feb. 5, 1973]

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2107. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program (Rept. No. 93-6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3577. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Pursuant to section 712(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 the following report is filed]

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Twenty-second Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production (Rept. No. 93-5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 3577. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 3578. A bill to provide for a final termination of U.S. military involvement in Indochina and the termination of all U.S. military assistance to the nations of Indochina and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 3579. 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.

H.R. 3580. 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.

H.R. 3581. 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. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BAPALIS, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H.R. 3582. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DORN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HEL-

STOSKI, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HICKS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. ICHORD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3583. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LITTON, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCSPADEN, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MELCHER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RABICK, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 3585. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THONE, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TREEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYATT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota):

H.R. 3586. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 3587. A bill to appropriate \$135 million for carrying out bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself and Mr. CASEY of Texas):

H.R. 3588. 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.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3589. A bill to amend the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for cancellation of student loans for service in mental hospitals and schools for the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS,



Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3590. A bill to pay grants to students enrolled in psychology, sociology, or social work in institutions of higher education to encourage their part-time employment and clinical training in certain hospitals for mental rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 3591. A bill to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3592. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resources protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3593. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.R. 3594. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 3595. A bill to protect the free flow of information to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3596. A bill to extend the time within which assurances of local cooperation must be provided on a portion of the Texas City and vicinity, Texas, flood control project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3597. A bill to terminate all price-support programs for tobacco beginning with the 1974 crop of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3598. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances to certain members of the uniformed services in connection with leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3599. A bill to amend section 700 of chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for showing disrespect for the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 3600. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce", approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3601. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to benefits shall continue through the month of his death (except where the continuation of such entitlement and the consequent delay in the payment of survivor benefits would reduce the total amount payable to the family); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 3602. 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. CAMP:

H.R. 3603. A bill to amend section 219 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide that certain persons displaced prior to January 2, 1971, by the Kaw Lake project of the Army Corps of Engineers may receive assistance under sections 202, 203, and 204 of such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3604. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. MCPADDEN, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 3605. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3606. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Ponca Indians of Oklahoma and Nebraska in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 322 and 324, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 3607. 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. COLLIER:

H.R. 3608. A bill to sanction the establishment of profit-sharing plans for employees of tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. BEARD, and Mr. GUYER):

H.R. 3609. 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. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3610. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. CASEY of Texas):

H.R. 3611. A bill to prohibit the sale of Saturday night special handguns in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 3612. 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. DENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 3613. 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. DENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BURLISON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. GRAY, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. LITTON, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STAG-

TERS, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H.R. 3614. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3615. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENHOLM (for himself and Mr. BERGLAND):

H.R. 3616. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a water bank program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 3617. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3618. A bill for the establishment of a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3619. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL):

H.R. 3620. A bill to establish the Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ERLNBORN:

H.R. 3621. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the program of assistance for population research and voluntary family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HUDNUT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3622. A bill to provide adjustment assistance to prisoners-of-war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr.

YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 3623. A bill to provide adjustment assistance to prisoners-of-war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3624. 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. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.R. 3625. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 with respect to eligibility for relocation assistance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 3626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the taxpayer a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and certain other expenses paid in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. QUITE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 3627. A bill relative to the oil import program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3628. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3629. A bill to amend section 832(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3630. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3631. A bill to provide benefits to certain survivors of members of the uniformed services and law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements in owner-occupied residential property and to eliminate the property depreciation allowances for certain nonowner occupied rental property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 3633. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (to the outer limits of the Continental Shelf) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 3634. 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. 3635. 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. HALEY:

H.R. 3636. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that renewal licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station may be issued for a term of 5 years and to establish certain standards for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcasting licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 3637. A bill to provide for a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a proposed Ohio River National Parkway in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3638. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to apply numerical limitations on total lawful admissions to all immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REUSS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 3639. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 with respect to the exclusion of agricultural commodities from export controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself,

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. KYROS, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 3640. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 with respect to the exclusion of agricultural commodities from export controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 3641. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3642. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3643. A bill to provide for a study and investigation to assess the extent of the damage done to the environment of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia as the result of the operations of the Armed Forces of the United States in such countries, and to consider plans for effectively rectifying such damage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3644. 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. HENDERSON:

H.R. 3645. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HICKS (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. SISK, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 3646. A bill to amend the Telecasting of Sports Contests Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 3647. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions, to lower certain age limits from 21 years to 18, and to eliminate certain recordkeeping provisions with respect to ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3648. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder and to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which these deductions will cease to be made from benefits based on such individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3649. 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. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr.

HORTON, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. NIX, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3650. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 3651. 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. HOSMER:

H.R. 3652. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to review certain requirements for the project for Anaheim Bay, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 3653. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3654. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for

himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RUTH, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina):



H.R. 3655. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FULTON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KING, Mr. LITTON, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas):

H.R. 3656. 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. JONES of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. McLOHAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. ROY, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEED, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. PREYER):

H.R. 3657. 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 Miss JORDAN:

H.R. 3658. 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. KAZEN:

H.R. 3659. 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. LEHMAN:

H.R. 3660. 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. LUJAN (for himself and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 3661. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands within the Vermejo Ranch, New Mexico and Colorado, for addition to the national forest system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDADDE:

H.R. 3662. A bill to authorize pilot field research programs for the control of agricultural and forest pests by integrated biological-cultural methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3663. A bill to establish more effective community planning and development programs (and expand the related provisions of existing programs) with particular emphasis upon assistance to small communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3664. A bill to amend section 161 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to utilize a portion of the funds for homemaking and consumer education programs to assist the elderly; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3665. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize design standards for schoolbuses and to require the establishment of certain standards for schoolbuses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3666. A bill to require that all schoolbuses be equipped with seat belts for passengers and seat backs of sufficient height to prevent injury to passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3667. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3668. A bill to protect hobbyists against the reproduction or manufacture of imitation hobby items and to provide additional protections for American hobbyists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3669. A bill to promote research and development of drugs and chemical compounds for use in the cure, prevention, or treatment of heroin addiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3670. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, to establish an emergency Federal economic assistance program, to authorize the President to declare areas of the Nation which meet certain economic and employment criteria to be economic disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3671. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38 of the United States Code to restore entitlement to educational benefits to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3672. 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. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. LOTT):

H.R. 3673. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3674. A bill to amend the Freedom of Information Act to provide that news persons shall not be required to disclose the sources of their information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 3675. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949 as amended to establish a support price for milk for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1973, and to provide for adjustments in the support price of milk during its marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. BLATNIK, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 3676. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 3677. A bill to repeal section 15 of the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964, to remove certain limitations on the amount of grant assistance which may be available in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 3678. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to the computation of payments for the production of cotton in any drought year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3679. A bill to provide greater assurance of Federal fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3680. A bill to change the fiscal year of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3681. A bill to facilitate equipment interchange between and among the several modes of transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3682. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to provide that proposed changes in postal rates and classes shall be submitted to Congress and shall be ineffective if either House disapproves such changes by three-fifths vote, to repeal the authorization for temporary postal rates and classes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the valuation of a decedent's interest in a ranch, farm, or closely held business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 3684. A bill to authorize the President to establish a system to ration fuel oil among civilian users in order to provide for an equitable distribution of fuel oil in areas of shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 3685. A bill: Deregulation of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3686. A bill to establish treatment and rehabilitation programs for drug dependent members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3687. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Sickle Cell Anemia Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3688. A bill to regulate the interstate trafficking and sale of hypodermic needles and syringes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3689. A bill to provide for the constitutional conduct of the Federal Government as it relates to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3690. A bill to establish minimum prisoner treatment standards for prisons in the United States, and to create an agency to hear complaints arising from alleged infractions of such standards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 3691. A bill to stabilize rents in States having low rental vacancy rates; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. ARZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 3692. A bill to implement the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr.

REES, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3693. A bill to implement the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3694. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3695. A bill to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial administration and for other purposes; to the Commission on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 3696. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3697. A bill to provide adequate mental health care and psychiatric care to all Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 3698. A bill to amend the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 to extend for 1 year (through the fiscal year 1974), at current levels, the authorization of funds for carrying out such act (including the special employment assistance program); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 3699. A bill to prohibit sonic booms by civil aircraft within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 3700. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAWKINS, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H.R. 3701. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, and Mr. FOUNTAIN):

H.R. 3702. A bill to require that certain processed or packaged consumer products be labeled with certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3703. A bill to require that certain processed or packaged consumer products be

labeled with certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 3704. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require certain labeling to assist the consumer in purchases of packaged perishable or semiperishable foods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require certain labeling to assist the consumer in purchases of packaged perishable or semiperishable foods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3706. A bill to provide for the development of a uniform system of quality grades for consumer food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3707. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on certain package goods to contain the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, and distributor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3709. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to stabilize the

retail prices of meat for a period of 45 days at the November 1972 retail levels and to require the President to submit to the Congress a plan for insuring an adequate meat supply for U.S. consumers reasonable meat prices and a fair return on invested capital to farmers, food processors, and food retailers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3710. A bill to repeal the meat quota provisions of Public Law 88-482; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3711. A bill to require that durable consumer products be labeled as to durability and performance life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mrs. GRASSO, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3712. A bill to require that certain durable products be prominently labeled as to date of manufacture and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3713. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to make sales promotion games unfair methods of competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3714. A bill to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of government by providing Federal cooperation and assistance in the establishment and strengthening of State and local offices of consumer protection; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3715. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase immigration from Western Hemisphere nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



H.R. 3716. A bill to provide that certain aliens illegally in the United States may have their status adjusted to that of permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3717. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for certain documentation before the issuance of social security account numbers to aliens and citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H.R. 3718. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 3719. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percentum of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WAGGONER, and Mr. DORN):

H.R. 3720. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3721. A bill to amend section 921 of title 18 of the United States Code to add a definition of "convicted"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3722. A bill to define the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KING, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. QUOTE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3723. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products produced or sold under contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3724. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 3725. A bill to protect the public's right to know; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD (for himself, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE):

H.R. 3726. 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.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3727. A bill to provide that compensation received by an individual from the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disability shall not be taken into account as income so as to prevent his occupancy of Government-sponsored housing (or so as to increase the rent which he would otherwise be required to pay); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3728. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain activities in time of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3730. A bill to impose certain safeguards on investigations carried out by Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3731. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 3732. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3733. A bill to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to assume control of overseas war memorials erected by private persons and non-Federal and foreign agencies, and to demolish such war memorials in certain instances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3734. A bill to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interest of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3735. A bill to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3736. A bill to amend section 3101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the proceeds of any policy of U.S. Government Life Insurance, National Service Life Insurance, Servicemen's Group Life Insurance, or Veterans' Group Life Insurance shall not be included in the computation of the gross value of the insured's estate for Federal estate tax or State inheritance tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3737. 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. 3738. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of special health care coverage for retarded or handicapped dependents of certain members of the Armed Forces after the retirement of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3739. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3740. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 3741. A bill to protect confidential sources of the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARE:

H.R. 3742. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3743. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 3744. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 3745. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide that increases in social security benefits, railroad retirement benefits, and cost-of-living adjustments of civil service retirement annuities shall be disregarded under certain circumstances in determining eligibility for or the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation for dependent parents of veterans and non-service-connected pension for veterans and widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 3746. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3747. A bill to protect collectors of antique glassware and china against the manufacture in the United States or the importation of imitations of such glassware; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to provide certain persons with procedures for applying to the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3749. A bill to establish annual import quotas on certain textile and footwear articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 3750. 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. ABDNOR:

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to honor American war dead in Vietnam by flying the flag at half staff from February 27 to March 27, 1973; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEARD:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to open admissions to public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit the imposition and carrying out of the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 289. 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. DELANEY:

H.J. Res. 290. 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. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 292. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. FULTON, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. STEELMAN):

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LUGO (for himself and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the participation of Guam and the Virgin Islands in the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution to establish a temporary commission to study the relationship between drug addiction and crime and make recommendations for the control of such addiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution establishing expenditure priorities between care for American war dead, American prisoners of war, American veterans and the reconstruction of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week of June of each year as National Autistic Children's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 298. 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. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim March 21, the vernal equinox, of each year as Earth Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. HANNA):

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to require a court impact statement in each report of legislation from a committee of either House of Congress to that House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUBER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. WYLLIE):

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to require a court impact statement in each report of legislation from a committee of either House of Congress to that House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of remarks of tribute to the late President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 184. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and each Delegate to the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY):

H. Res. 185. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries on any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 3, rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 186. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services pursuant to H. Res. 185; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 187. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

21. By the SPEAKER:

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to funding of the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the formula for the distribution of Federal funds to educational programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

23. Also, Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Committee on House Administration.

24. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

25. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the highway trust fund; to the Committee on Public Works.

26. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to continuing the provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 so as to maintain programs of the Economic Development Administration and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.R. 3751. A bill for the relief of James E. Fry, Junior, and Margaret E. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Carlo Bassanini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Ippolita Maffei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3754. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bruna Turni and Miss Graziella Turni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Richard B. Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3756. A bill for the relief of Jerry P. Tomcal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (by request):

H.R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Isabel Eugenia Serrane Macias Ferrier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3759. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ana Maria de Lima Sousa Raposo and her two children, Paulo and Carlos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3760. A bill for the relief of Anna I. Duisberg, sole heir of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 3761. A bill for the relief of Joyce Ann Farrior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 3762. A bill for the relief of Ruben Miguel Mastrapa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio:

H.R. 3763. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ardito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3764. A bill for the relief of Azucena Castillo-Artavia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3765. A bill for the relief of Gloria Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3766. A bill for the relief of Calogero Mallia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3767. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Tyrone Magsino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3768. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. Marcello Veron Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H.R. 3769. A bill for the relief of H. Dixon Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMMS:

H.R. 3770. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenient Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3771. A bill for the relief Mr and Mrs. Sidney Dutchin and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 3772. A bill for the relief of Edward R. Davies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 3773. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy retired, to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

36. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ray Lake, and others, Troy, Mo., relative to amending the Judiciary and Judicial Procedure Act of 1948, to provide protection for law enforcement officers sued for damages in Federal court resulting from the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. Also, petition of Frank M. Meyer, Blandford, Mass., relative to the creation of Federal justices of the peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.