

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS HATFIELD, GRIFFIN, ROBERT C. BYRD, AND COOK TOMORROW; AND ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following recognition of the two leaders or their designees, the following Senators be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Senators HATFIELD, GRIFFIN, ROBERT C. BYRD, and COOK; and that following recognition of the aforementioned Senators, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes; at the conclusion of which the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for recognition of the four Senators on tomorrow be revised as follows:

Senators HATFIELD, COOK, GRIFFIN, and ROBERT C. BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock meridian.

After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, or their designees, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated:

Senators HATFIELD, COOK, GRIFFIN, and ROBERT C. BYRD.

After the aforementioned Senators

have been recognized pursuant to other orders previously entered into, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the unfinished business, Senate Resolution 60, to establish a Select Committee of the Senate to conduct an investigation, will be laid before the Senate, and the Senate will resume its consideration thereof. Amendments to that resolution are anticipated. Votes are also expected. Senators may plan their day accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:09 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 6, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Msgr. Richard J. Burke, St. Thomas More Roman Catholic Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Be pleased Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to hear our prayer of praise, adoration, and petition.

We praise You for Your glorious creation, we adore You as our God and Redeemer, we petition You for Your blessings as we deliberate today. Grant us Your help to consider wisely what is according to Your law and what will serve the best interests of all the people. Give us prudence to choose the best means to accomplish peace through justice for all. May we have Your help to listen courageously to the truth, weigh it well and then make our decisions.

Having humbly, honestly, and courageously done our best for the glory of God and the welfare of all men of good will, we beg Your blessing in a particular way for our Senate colleague who is gravely ill. We ask this all in the name of Christ, our Lord. 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 of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 38. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to increase the United States share of allowable

project costs under such act, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 267. An act to abolish the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration; and

S. 518. An act to provide that appointments to the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office Management and Budget shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (title 50, Appendix, United States Code, section 2162(a)(2)), it is the duty of the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to suggest five members of the Committee to be members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

The members selected to serve on this Committee for the 93d Congress in pursuance of this law are as follows: Wright Patman, William A. Barrett, Leonor K. Sullivan, William B. Widnall, and Garry Brown of Michigan.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a), Public Law 92-484, the Chair appoints as members of

the Technology Assessment Board the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DAVIS of Georgia; Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. UDALL of Arizona; Mr. MOSHER, of Ohio; Mr. GUBSER, of California; and Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE WITH THE COMMISSION ON ART AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE U.S. SENATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 92-342, the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1973, the Chair appoints the following Members to serve with the Speaker and with the members of the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the U.S. Senate in supervising the restoration of the Old Senate and Supreme Court Chambers in the Capitol: Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts; Mr. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; and Mr. CEDERBERG, of Michigan.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE FEDERAL COURT APPELLATE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 92-489, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BROOKS, of Texas; Mr. HUNGATE, of Missouri; Mr. HUTCHINSON, of Michigan; and Mr. WIGGINS, of California.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a),

the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MURPHY of New York; Mr. LONG of Maryland; Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio; and Mr. GILMAN, of New York.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of the legislation the gentleman thinks will be coming from the Rules Committee?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I anticipate the Rules Committee will report this afternoon shortly on four different matters: The resolution dealing with the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business; the resolution dealing with the Select Committee on the House Restaurant; the resolution dealing with the Select Committee on Parking on the House side of the Capitol; and an open rule waiving the 3-day rule on the so-called REAP program.

Mr. GROSS. That was to be the next question. If it is reported today, then it would, to that extent, have to be a closed rule waiving the requirement that the report lay over for 3 days.

Mr. BOLLING. In order to comply with the 3-day rule, unless the rule waiving the points of order were passed it would be necessary to bring the legislation up on Thursday rather than tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. That still would not give 3 legislative days.

Mr. BOLLING. My understanding, and I must say I have not checked it myself, is that it would comply with the rule on Thursday but would not on Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER ON THE ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a brief statement about the use of the electronic voting system.

Members now have been using this new voting system for several days. A sufficient number of Members have spoken to the Chair about its use to demonstrate that there is some general misunderstanding, or lack of understanding, about the safeguards which have been built into this system. The Chair would like to stress two points:

First, when a Member inserts his card in a voting station, he should carefully note whether the blue light—that is the light on the far right of the voting station—goes off momentarily and then illuminates. When this light comes on, and

only then, is the mechanism ready to receive the Member's vote. The Member then depresses the appropriate button—yea, nay, or present—before removing his card. When he depresses the button of his choice, that button will also light. It may take a second or two for this voting light to come on. The Member should continue to depress the button until it does illuminate.

Second, having voted in this fashion, a Member can very quickly and simply verify whether or not he is correctly recorded, or is recorded at all, on the roll-call or quorum call then in progress, simply by reinserting his card in the same or any other voting station and observing which button lights. If he has previously voted in the affirmative, for example, the yea button will light to indicate that the computer already has registered his vote.

A Member also can verify his vote by watching the master panel on the wall of the Chamber above the Press Gallery. However, a Member can more accurately check his vote by the procedure just explained.

If a Member has any difficulty with the system, he should of course check with the employees of the House who are positioned at the majority and minority tables next to the monitoring screens.

CIA SHOULD NOT BE TRAINING LOCAL POLICE PERSONNEL

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1972, there appeared in the New York Times an article that 14 New York City policemen have received training by the CIA. The news story indicated that the training of those New York City policemen involved the handling of information files, sometimes called dossiers, on individuals within the United States.

I was surprised to learn that the CIA was involved in such training of domestic police officers. It is my understanding that they are not authorized by statute, indeed barred by statute, from participating in law enforcement activities in the United States.

I wrote to the Director of the CIA, Richard Helms, asking the following questions:

First. How many police officers from local police departments throughout the country have been similarly trained or received instruction of any kind by the CIA within the last 2 years? Please indicate the number of policemen from each city involved.

Second. Describe the kind of training provided by the CIA to those police officers.

Third. What was the cost involved in the training and who paid for it?

Fourth. Does the CIA intend to continue the program of training local police officers?

Fifth. Finally, pursuant to what section of the law is the CIA training local police officers, and for what purpose is the training provided?

On January 23, 1972 I was advised by phone by John Maury of the CIA of the following: that there was no specific law which authorizes the CIA to undertake the training of local police forces but that the CIA believes that the statute which created LEAA indicates an intent that all Federal agencies should assist in law enforcement and crime prevention efforts in America. He also said that training was provided on request of police departments in about a dozen jurisdictions. I have been asked by the CIA to keep the specific locations confidential because the agency pledged this confidentiality to those police departments. I see no valid reason for such a pledge, however. The very fact that this secrecy is involved makes it even more incumbent that the CIA be prohibited from any training of this nature.

Mr. Maury also advised me that the police training provided by the agency dealt with the handling of explosives and foreign weapons, as well as audio control measure techniques. The latter, he told me, involved the detection of wiretaps and bugs in which foreign interests are involved. He went on to say that the training of New York City Police Department personnel in filing, retrieving, and indexing dossier material did not involve an exchange of information but was limited to how such information should be processed.

Mr. Maury informed me of the CIA's authority, as the agency interprets it, to conduct such briefings. I quote from his letter:

"Regarding the Agency's authority to conduct such briefings, the National Security Act of 1947 (P.L. 80-253, as amended) specifically provides that 'the Agency shall have no police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions.' We do not consider that the activities in question violate the letter or spirit of these restrictions. In our judgment, they are entirely consistent with the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351, 42 U.S.C.A. 3701 et seq.). In enacting that law it was the declared policy and purpose of Congress 'to assist State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement at every level by national assistance' and to '... encourage research and development directed toward the improvement of law enforcement and the development of new methods for the prevention and reduction of crime and the detection and apprehension of criminals' (42 U.S.C.A. 3701). By the same law Congress also authorized the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to use available services, equipment, personnel and facilities of the Department of Justice and of 'other civilian or military agencies and instrumentalities' of the Federal Government to carry out its function (42 U.S.C.A. 3756)."

I believe that the matter raised in the news story, my letter to the director, and the telephone conversation, is very serious. What are the limits of CIA involvement in matters of this kind? The very fact that the CIA is carefully exempted from the usually required reports to the Congress—indeed its budget is confidential and not accessible to individual Members—poses a great danger. This is especially true if the CIA activities are conducted, not under a specific statute outlining and limiting its jurisdiction, but rather in response to the

Agency's own unchecked interpretation of the national interest and of a statute dealing with another agency.

I urge the Government Operations Committee to investigate this matter and make certain that CIA activities, insofar as its involvement in the United States is concerned, is carefully outlined. I have submitted to the Committee the names of the forces referred to above to aid in any investigation it may decide to undertake. Undoubtedly local police forces require upgrading and technical assistance, but surely they could receive assistance from other law enforcement agencies.

I am especially concerned that the CIA is involving itself in the handling of dossier material maintained by local law enforcement agencies. Notwithstanding any assurance that their involvement is limited to the techniques of using the material, I believe it to be a bad precedent that they be involved in any way whatsoever with the handling of such material. Far too many files are being collected by law enforcement agencies on citizens in this country and the involvement of the CIA will encourage that collection.

I am appending the New York Times article on this subject to be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1972]

FOURTEEN CITY POLICEMEN GOT CIA TRAINING
(By David Burnham)

Fourteen New York Policemen—including First Deputy Police Commissioner William H. T. Smith and the commander of the department's Intelligence Division—received training from the Central Intelligence Agency in September.

A spokesman for the C.I.A., August Thuermer, confirmed that the 14 New Yorkers had been given training but denied that the agency had regular instruction programs for local police officials.

Mr. Thuermer acknowledged, however, that "there have been a number of occasions when similar courtesies have been extended to police officers from different cities around the country."

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Thuermer said he was not able to determine how many police officials or how many departments had come to the Washington area to receive agency training.

"I doubt very much that they keep that kind of information," he added.

Mr. Thuermer scoffed when asked whether the agency's training of policemen—some of whom are responsible for collecting information about political activists—violated the Congressional legislation that created the C.I.A. to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to national security, "provided that the agency shall have no police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers or internal security functions."

Twelve of the New York policemen—one captain, three lieutenants, five sergeants and three detectives—received four days of training from the C.I.A. in a facility in Arlington, Va., beginning last Sept. 11, according to the Police Department.

Commissioner Smith and Deputy Chief Hugo J. Masini, commander of the Intelligence Division, attended one day's training, on Sept. 13.

Commissioner Smith said during an interview that in connection with the reorganization of the department's intelligence work, "we decided we needed some training in the analysis and handling of large amounts of information."

Mr. Smith said the department had de-

cided that the C.I.A. would be the best place for such training. "They pretty much set this up for us," he explained. "The training was done gratis, only costing us about \$2,500 in transportation and lodging."

Both the International Association of Chiefs of Police, a professional organization that does police efficiency studies and runs training seminars on a variety of law-enforcement subjects, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation said they were not equipped to provide instruction on the storage, retrieval and analysis of intelligence information.

One branch of the Police Department's Intelligence Division, the security investigation section, is the subject of a pending suit in Federal court here. The suit, filed by a group of political activists, charges that the surveillance and infiltration activities of the security section violate "the rights of privacy, free speech and association granted and guaranteed" the plaintiffs "by the United States Constitution."

The present reorganization of the security section—and the part of the Intelligence Division that collects information on organized crime—is being financed by a \$166,630 grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, a branch of the Justice Department. As of Oct. 13, a police roster indicated that there were 365 policemen assigned to the Intelligence Division.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a joint resolution calling upon the President to proclaim April 29, 1973, as a day in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

This is a day that has great significance for us all, Jew and gentile alike. It was on this day that a handful of Jews, starved and terrorized for months by the Nazis, finally struck back. These men and women were looked on by the German oppressors as less than human. It was a well known fact that Jews never fought back, that one could do anything to them with impunity. But these few people, tormented as they were with hunger, disease, every ill that could befall men, were still very much human beings. Their valiant, doomed effort proved that even in the worst of conditions, man's will to survive could overcome anything.

Only a few hundred Jews held off German soldiers and tanks for 3 weeks. They did this with no outside help, even though there were daily radio broadcasts from the ghetto begging for help from the Polish partisans. When the ghetto finally fell to the Germans, it was razed. Nobody knew until after the war what had actually happened there.

World War II has taught us many lessons, most of them lessons we would rather not have learned. The Warsaw ghetto uprising has yet another lesson for us—that man can and will survive even under the most brutal oppression. We dare not forget what happened in the ghetto, not only on the days of the uprising, but throughout its short, black history.

We tend to take our freedom too much for granted these days. It is only when

we look back at history and see people who would rather die than sacrifice their intrinsic worth as human beings that we begin to understand just what our freedom is worth, and the costs we must be willing to bear if we are to preserve those things most precious to us. We may never be asked to die for what we believe in. Yet it is a valuable lesson to us all to remember those who did die for their faith.

We owe those Jews at least our remembrance. And, in remembering, we must say, with all the strength we can muster, "Never again." We must remember, so that such things will never be seen on the face of the earth any more.

GREATER CARE NEEDED IN OVERSEEING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in case it was not noticed, this year when your income tax is made out, the person who makes out that income tax for you must attach his social security number to his name as the person who makes out the return.

For the year of 1974 \$82 billion will be the expenditure on our Federal income maintenance programs. This is the largest expenditure in the Federal budget.

We need to use the same type of care with these expenditures as we do with our income tax returns. Everybody in this country should have a social security number to which his thumbprint is attached, so that we know not only that we get our money's worth, but that we are not paying it out incorrectly.

LONG-TERM GUN CONTROLS URGED

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the other day I introduced legislation which would, in effect, start this country down the road toward prohibiting private possession of handguns.

I would like to quote to the Members today the following statement by criminal court Judge Loran L. Lewis of Pittsburgh, as quoted in a UPI dispatch of February 3d.

He says:

What we are seeing today in this country is a war against society by the criminal element. Hardly a day goes by in Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) that a holdup by a gun doesn't occur.

If society is going to survive against the vicious attacks by these thugs, it must fight back. There is no reason why anyone should own or possess a hand gun, except peace officers and the military.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, JOHN DINGELL,

of Michigan, BOB ECKHARDT, of Texas, and CHARLES CARNEY of Ohio, I am today introducing legislation which would amend the Small Business Act for the purpose of authorizing loans to small businesses for expenditures made necessary in order to comply with safety regulations under the Consumer Product Safety Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, and the Poison Packaging Prevention Act.

The 92d Congress enacted one of the most important pieces of consumer legislation in decades. The Consumer Product Safety Act (Public Law 92-573) establishes a new Federal agency, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to protect the health and safety of American consumers in and around their homes, in recreation, and in other activities.

While it is essential to consider the safety of the consumer, it is also important to consider his pocketbook. The impact of such legislation on small business must not be anticompetitive, particularly in the first few years of operation where some new designs and processes may be necessary to deliver safer products to the public.

Eighty percent of the manufacturers in this country produce 20 percent of the consumer products. These smaller manufacturers may not be as well equipped as their larger competitors to afford the technology and assure the quality control essential to reducing undue risks in consumer products. Small businesses may in some cases face the handicap of added expense to meet safety requirements imposed by Federal law. In its final report to the President and Congress in June 1970, the National Commission on Product Safety made the following recommendation:

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

We recommend that existing programs of the Small Business Administration be expanded to authorize granting long term, low interest loans to assist small businesses in meeting requirements of product safety standards.

Mr. Speaker, a strong consumer product safety program and vigorous economic competition are in the best interest of American consumers. The Consumer Product Safety Act was a major step toward a safer marketplace. The Small Business Act amendments which we are introducing today will help promote a competitive marketplace by assisting small businesses which manufacture and sell consumer products. The authorization figures in the bill are conservative projections based on data furnished by the Small Business Administration.

The text of the legislation is as follows:

H.R. 3842

To amend the Small Business Act to provide loans to small businesses for certain expenditures incurred as a result of complying with the Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972, the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, and the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970

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

7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is amended by—

(1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) inserting after paragraph (7) a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements on an immediate or deferred basis) as the Administrator may determine to be necessary or appropriate to assist any small business concern in effecting additions to or alterations in the equipment, facilities, or methods of operation of such business in order to comply with the provisions of the Consumer Product Safety Act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, and the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970, if the Administrator determines that such concern is likely to suffer substantial economic injury without assistance under this paragraph."

Sec. 2. Section 4(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(c)) is amended by inserting "7(b)(8)," immediately after "7(b)(7)," in paragraph (1)(A) thereof, and by inserting "7(b)(8)," immediately after "7(b)(7)," in paragraph (2)(A) thereof.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act and the amendments made thereby the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; and \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

THE NEW ENGLAND FISHERIES THREATENED WITH OBLIVION

(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, this Nation's fishing industry is in critical condition. We have dropped from second place to sixth in total world fish catch since 1956, trailing Peru, Japan, Red China, Russia, and Norway. Unconscionable exploitation by 14 foreign fleets over the past 12 years has caused a drastic decline in the abundance of fish stocks in the Northwest Atlantic—Georges Banks. Particularly Russian fleets, heavily subsidized by their government and using the most advanced technology and electrical gear, have all but wiped out several of the fish species that had made the Northwest Atlantic one of the most prolific fisheries in the world.

The New England fishing industry has a substantial economic potential for the future of New England and for the future of the whole Nation. It is time for a national commitment to the New England fisheries to save the industry from oblivion.

It is time to initiate a governmental approach to give drastic relief to revive the fishing industry.

It is time for the Federal Government to reaffirm its commitment to the New England fish industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing several pieces of legislation which taken comprehensively will inaugurate a national policy for the fishing industry of the United States.

The legislation I introduce today offers relief from overexploitation of our fish stocks. Time and time again, U.S. fishermen have watched while foreign

fleets deplete vast natural resources with no concern for conservation or preservation of the resources for future generations. Time and time again the U.S. Government has stood idly by and allowed this to happen, in effect, subjugating a viable industry to those of Canadian, Japanese, and Soviet fish interests. Continued delay will only further jeopardize the existence of a valuable natural resource.

The resolution I offer today expresses a national policy of support for the New England fishing industry and for the whole domestic coastal fishing industry in the United States. With this significant resolution, Congress would go on record endorsing the position taken by the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Seabed Committee, that the coastal State has the right to regulate the fish stocks inhabiting the coastal waters off its shores, and that the United States should begin studying the need to implement this coastal zone policy immediately in order to protect our Nation's living resources.

The second measure which I submit today is a bill to amend the Fisherman's Protection Act to reimburse fishermen for damages incurred by foreign vessels.

The fish industry has suffered incalculable losses during the past several years due to changes or conditions in the environment, beyond the industry's control. To improve the economic stability of the fisheries and fishery trade through a sound system of product insurance and indemnity against excessive losses caused by Federal, State, or local health authority action preventing the processing of marketing of fish or fish products, and to provide a comprehensive program of insurance against natural and environmental disasters like red tide, mercury, and storms, I am introducing the Federal Fisheries Environmental and Natural Disaster Assistance Act.

I am also offering an amendment to the Small Business Administration Act to enable the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to make loans up to \$5,000 to cover loss of income or profit to individuals who are self-employed in the fishing industry, and who, as a result of red tide, or any other incident of toxic algae, sustain loss of income or profit on or after September 1, 1972.

The Fisheries Development Act of 1973 is a comprehensive bill of grants and technical assistance to the fisheries industry. I am sponsoring this act today to assist voluntary associations of fishermen processors cooperatives and other organizations and persons engaged in handling fish and fish products. Semi-annual reports must be submitted to the President and Congress on the importation of fisheries products to the United States. These reports must include a profile of quantity and value of the fisheries products imported into the United States during the preceding 6 months, a projection of imports of fish products, a breakdown of frozen and fresh fish import information, and an analysis of the effects of these past and projected imports on the domestic fisheries.

Imports of frozen catch have had dire consequences on the domestic fish in-

dustry. It was a billion-dollar market for importers last year.

Seventy percent of the fish consumed in the United States is imported. In 1970, imports valued more than \$950,000,000, while exports valued only \$85,000,000. Each year, edible fish imports increase. To offset the heavy losses incurred by the domestic fish industry from a large percentage of fish imports, I offer an amendment to the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act of 1954, providing for 100 percent, rather than 30 percent, of duties on fish imports be returned to the domestic fish industry.

Insurance costs for fishing boats each year show a major premium increase. In addition, cost of fishing gear is exorbitant. High tariff rates make fishing gear, nets and electronic equipment twice the cost in the United States for the same purchased in Canada. Low interest-rate loans supported by the Government are needed for repairs and boat upkeep. Bank rates are just too high. For these reasons, I am introducing the Fishing Vessel Insurance and Safety Act to establish safety standards, provide loans to meet these standards and loans to fishermen's cooperatives to buy insurance.

These measures I introduce would give massive aid to revitalize the U.S. fishing industry on both coasts while protecting it from the commercial depredations of subsidized fleets from foreign lands. What I offer today is only the beginning of a national commitment to save the fishing industry from oblivion. But it is an important initial step in heading off the ruinous depletion, principally at the hands of foreigners, of the remaining fish stocks in coastal North Atlantic waters.

APPROACHING CRISIS CONCERNING THE PANAMA CANAL

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been repeated indications of an approaching crisis on the isthmus concerning the Panama Canal that will be dramatized on March 15-21, 1973, during sessions in Panama of the U.N. Security Council of which Aquilino Boyd, a Panamanian radical, will be President.

Accordingly, I propose to address the House of Representatives on the dangers at Panama on Thursday, February 8, and to outline a program for action by our Government.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that on tomorrow, Wednesday, we will call up House Resolution 19, House Resolution 111, and House Resolution 145, for the Committees on Small Business, the House Restaurant, and Parking, respectively, before we call up H.R. 2107, the REAP pro-

gram which has an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

DETERIORATION OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of the U.S. Postal Service has now reached an alarming position.

I am the recipient of many pieces of mail complaint. I have received one petition with over 80 names on it, and I have received over 200 letters in the past 45 days complaining of the horrendous service now being afforded the people of this Nation by the so-called U.S. Postal Service.

I believe it is about time that we begin to look at our domestic affairs and to put our House in order in its proper perspective.

There was a letter mailed to me from my office, a special delivery letter, mailed a week ago last Friday, that arrived the following Tuesday at my home. That was 4 days to get a special delivery letter 135 miles in transit. They did better than that with the pony express, even, out around Wyoming, at one time. I submit to the Members today it is about time the Members of the House begin to take into consideration the needs of the people and to do something about this ridiculous service the Postal Service is now providing.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER LORTON REFORMATORY

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

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will, if enacted, transfer jurisdiction over the Lorton Reformatory, which is located in my district, from the District of Columbia Department of Corrections to the Federal Government. In my opinion, this legislation is essential to correct the problems at this institution.

The administration of Lorton threatens to become a national disgrace. Easy access to narcotics, assaults, and escapes have become commonplace. More than 60 felons escaped from Lorton last year including several who held a Fairfax County family hostage for hours.

Because of these activities and the fact that the current administration at Lorton has been demonstrably ineffective in curbing the growing list of incidents, this institution is causing a very deep concern among residents of northern Virginia who feel they are not safe under the present circumstances.

This concern has been highlighted by resolutions passed by both the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and the Virginia General Assembly requesting that Lorton be transferred to the control of the Federal Government. With the legislation I introduce today, it is my intent to not only comply with these re-

quests, but to still the fears of residents of this area by making Federal control of Lorton a reality.

The bill I am introducing would transfer the responsibility for the supervision of personnel and inmates at Lorton to the Attorney General of the United States. It would provide for a quarterly billing to the District of Columbia by the Attorney General for the cost of the care and custody of inmates convicted for violating laws of the District of Columbia.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will provide for a more effective and a more responsible administration of this institution—action which I believe the public interest not only requires but demands.

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS AND OIL RATIONING

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, because of severe shortages of fuel oil, gasoline, and natural gas, I am joining some of my colleagues in sponsoring bills that would abolish oil import quotas, set up a rationing system to assure Illinois consumers their fair share of imported supplies and end Federal regulation of producers' prices for natural gas sold to interstate pipelines.

President Nixon should be commended for his recent action in suspending fuel oil import quotas until April 30 and increasing crude oil quotas by 65 percent for the rest of the year.

However, these steps do not go far enough in my opinion. Home heating fuels are in dangerously short supply in many parts of the country and critical gasoline shortages are expected by spring. Congress must act now to assure adequate supplies. Enactment of these three bills—H.R. 428, H.R. 2552, and H.R. 2553—will ease the current energy crisis and open the way for more permanent solutions to the problem.

Federal controls over the wellhead price of natural gas have discouraged exploration for new sources and have resulted in higher sales of gas within the producing States at unregulated prices.

Removal of price controls over wellhead prices will help increase the flow to interstate consumers and provide the incentive for producers to explore for new supplies.

DETERIORATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT) called attention to the horrendous condition of our Postal Service. There are scores of horrible examples of shoddy service, late deliveries, and incredible mismanagement which has created chaos in a once-reliable

postal system. I for one have introduced legislation to restore the independent Postal Service to a Federal Post Office Department as it once was.

Every Member of this House can offer many illustrations which dramatize the utter incompetence of the present management of the Postal Service, which has apparently devised hare-brained schemes by high-paid bureaucrats which have thoroughly messed up our mail delivery.

Earl "Buck" Ireson, who owns the Flat Iron Drug Store in Welch, W. Va., has been for many years mailing prescriptions to hundreds of people in the rural areas of McDowell and Mercer Counties. These prescription packages, which are desperately needed by the people who receive them, used to be received without fail the very next day. They now take from 72 hours to a week to be delivered, because the packages containing the prescriptions are trucked many miles away, frequently to be trucked right back to the same town or area where they were originally mailed. When a patient with a heart condition depends on the receipt of nitroglycerin and it fails to arrive, that patient suffers terribly and is at death's door.

This is just one more illustration of the total deterioration of our postal service in this Nation. I have asked an immediate inquiry by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to determine the speediest means to reestablish the old Post Office Department and restore the kind of genuine postal service which the people of this Nation once enjoyed and now deserve.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to join very strongly in the remarks the gentleman has made about the postal system. I have already asked the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct an investigation. I have also asked the General Accounting Office, and they have already initiated the beginning of an investigation nationwide.

I thought at first perhaps it was just in Florida, but after I had made a few statements that had some coverage over the country, I am amazed to find that this postal system is in chaos in every part of the Nation.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. We will find that we will have economic chaos unless we establish the reliability of and some service in the postal system which is supposed to emphasize service more than anything else.

And unfortunately it is simply not true today, and we must straighten that out. I think it is the responsibility of Congress to do it.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 299) relating to the date for the submission of the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Texas give us an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; I shall be very glad to enlighten the gentleman, if I may.

This is the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the Economic Report by the President this year. It is required by law at a certain time.

The President's report was delayed for some time by consent of the committee, and we are asking for additional time to file our report, from March 10, 1973, to March 31, 1973, about two-thirds of a month. We need the time in order to do a good job, and under the law we have to answer the President's economic report and answer each statement or allegation on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I think it will be a good report, and it will be interesting to the Members, regardless of what they believe.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman, this is in answer to the President's economic report to the Nation that was released only a few days ago?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman in his report give some explanation as to why we no longer get estimates of the previous year's total net public and private debt?

The estimates have been discontinued. Now we get 1971 only and have to make our own estimate for 1972 based on the average of the years past.

I would hope that some inquiry would be made as to why there is no estimate of the net public and private debt in the report just released, setting forth the increase from the previous year.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a good question. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman brings it, and I will make sure that is provided by the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's resolution does not require \$200,000 or \$250,000 for further financing the committee, the joint committee, does it?

Mr. PATMAN. It does not have to do with financing; it is just for the continuation. It is for the extension of the time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we do have assurance it will be made at the end of how many days, the extension?

Mr. PATMAN. The extension is from March 10, 1973 to March 31. That is 21 days.

Mr. GROSS. So it will require no additional money?

Mr. PATMAN. No more additional money.

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman recalls, only yesterday we had a resolution providing for a Commission to report along with an additional \$250,000.

Mr. PATMAN. I will assure the gentleman it is nothing like that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 299

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That Public Law 1, Ninety-third Congress, is amended by striking out "March 10, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1973".

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 12]

Abzug	Frey	Mitchell, Md.
Addabbo	Gaydos	Myers
Andrews, N.C.	Gettys	Nedzi
Badillo	Gray	Nichols
Bell	Grover	Patten
Bevill	Guyer	Rangel
Biaggi	Hanley	Riegle
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Brinkley	Harsha	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Harvey	Roy
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Roybal
Carney, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Satterfield
Cederberg	Hollifield	Shibley
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Snyder
Chisholm	Howard	Staggers
Clay	Jarman	Stanton
Conlan	Jones, Ala.	J. William
Corman	Karth	Steed
Davis, Wis.	King	Steiger, Ariz.
Dellums	Kluczyński	Stokes
Dennis	Kuykendall	Teague, Calif.
Dent	Kyros	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	Landrum	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Lujan	Waggonner
Dorn	McKay	Waldie
Dulski	McKinney	Ware
du Pont	Macdonald	Whalen
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Wright
Esch	Martin, Nebr.	Wyder
Eshleman	Mayne	Wyman
Foley	Mink	Yatron
Frelinghuysen	Minshall, Ohio	Young, Fla.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PRESERVE COMPETITION OF SOFT DRINK BOTTLERS

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Trade Commission filed complaints against eight large soft drink companies, its purpose was to break up what it considered monopolistic practices in the industry. Those complaints

charged that the named companies hindered competition by restricting soft drink manufacturers to specific geographical areas.

I contend, however, that the FTC actions will have exactly the reverse effect. A bottler's principal assets are his capital investment in plant and equipment and the value of his exclusive right to use a franchisor's trademark in a given area.

If the FTC prevails, large bottlers like Coca-Cola will simply operate from a few major centers and close their small local franchises. This would mean the elimination of most of the small independent bottlers and the concentration of soft drink manufacturing and distribution in the hands of the giant corporations.

There are today 3,050 soft drink manufacturers in the United States. Of these, all but about 100 meet the criteria of a small business as defined by the Small Business Administration. The capital investment in plants and equipment of these companies well exceeds \$1 billion.

The system under which these companies operate has assured the consumer of uniform quality throughout the nation, whether he buys his soft drink in Seattle, Wash., or Miami, Fla. The system also means that national brands compete for consumer acceptance, even in the smallest communities and most remote areas. For example, at least 17 different brand cola drinks alone compete for a share of the cola market.

I am convinced this system has worked exceptionally well. Bottlers do not view the territorial provision as any kind of limitation on their competitive freedom. Rather, they view it as the only workable way to provide the public with quality soft drinks, good service, and reasonable prices. The present system also is the only possible way by which a small businessman would undertake the extensive risks and responsibilities required in the industry.

The FTC complaints pose a number of threats to the soft drink bottlers. Besides driving many small independents out of business, the complaints—if upheld—would also result in an alarming increase in the economic power of the major grocery chains to control the market in favor of their store brands.

Now, I do not question the integrity of the FTC in filing the complaints. Undoubtedly, the staff is genuinely concerned with promoting the public interest. However, the FTC action ignores many realities and hard facts of the soft drink market.

Sales and service by route delivery has been the traditional marketing method. This requires and has produced intensive competition between bottlers of the different national brands. They compete for the trade of virtually every restaurant, gas station, and other outlet in their territory, and for shelf space in the supermarkets.

Low prices and good service at all retail outlets have been the result. If the exclusive territorial system is abolished, then we will see large volume buyers, such as supermarket chains, choking off the small independent bottlers nearest their major warehouses and distributing their product all over the nation.

The small bottler would be left with small outlets like the "mom and pop" shops, and they will either have to raise prices or go out of business.

Mr. Speaker, five of my colleagues from Washington join me to introduce legislation which will protect the territorial system not only for the 34 bottlers in our State, but for hundreds of others throughout the country. I urge the House to take action quickly on this bill.

AMENDING FEDERAL CIGARETTE LABELING AND ADVERTISING ACT

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act. My first bill would extend the current prohibition against advertising cigarettes on radio and television to what are known as "little cigars."

The second bill would expand the warning that now appears on cigarette packages and advertising to read "Warning: Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer, coronary heart disease, chronic bronchitis, pulmonary emphysema, or other diseases." This warning would also have to appear on packaging and advertising of small cigars if my first bill is enacted.

Unfortunately, since the implementation of the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act which was enacted on April 1, 1970, cigarette smoking has not produced any immediate decrease in the consumption of cigarettes. Heart disease and cancer still remain the foremost fatal diseases among Americans, despite the attempt to alert the public to the health dangers associated with smoking.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give these two bills favorable consideration.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, because I was attending a subcommittee hearing, I missed rollcall vote No. 11, the Highway Beautification Commission amendment. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON— LARGER THAN LIFE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House are today privileged to honor and pay tribute to the memory of the 36th President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, once a Representative in this Chamber, a U.S. Senator, Vice President of the United States and thereafter the leader of this Nation from November 22, 1963 until January 20, 1969 during the tenure of the 88th, 89th and 90th Congresses. President Johnson died suddenly at the age of 64 on January 22, 1973, deeply mourned and universally

respected. My own association with President Johnson goes back over half a century when I was desk mate in the Texas Legislature with his father, Sam Houston Johnson, a rancher and former teacher from Johnson City, Tex. Young Lyndon visited his father frequently at Austin and although he was only 12 years of age he already stood 6 feet tall. He was a serious and purposeful young fellow interested even then in legislative procedures.

Lyndon Johnson's growth and early stature are particularly significant to me in view of the recurrent theme in a number of recent editorials and oral discussions and tributes that, in retrospect, President Johnson looms "larger than life," and I would like to comment on the meaning that can be attached to this widespread observation by knowledgeable people.

For those of us who knew him personally, there was his overwhelming physical presence, his vitality, his dynamic forceful energy, his straight-out eyeball-to-eyeball courage, and forthright, even aggressive demeanor—like a folk hero out of a saga from our frontier days—larger than life, like Davy Crockett or one of the storied martyrs who died at the Alamo. I suspect that for many Americans, Lyndon became a legend during his lifetime because here was a man who believed in America with his whole heart, the America he grew up in, not too far removed from the days of raw rampaging growth when there was no guilt attached to being strong or successful, before it was necessary to think too much about pollution; when the smoke that spewed from chimneys was less noted than the goods delivered to factory loading docks; when, in brief, America was bursting out all over, a great country, when the proudest thing you could imagine was to be a U.S. citizen. I am speaking of Lyndon Johnson the patriot, who could say with an earlier American, and I paraphrase—our country, may she always be in the right, but right or wrong, our country. Yes, Lyndon Johnson was bigger than life.

When the young Johnson departed Texas for his first term in Congress in 1937, he was relatively inexperienced, but he had good advice from his father. It soon became clear, however, that Lyndon could land on his feet like a cat under any circumstances and it was not long before he was considered one of the most able Members of Congress. In fact, stemming from his 11 years as a Representative he grew to love the House as the instrument of government closest to the people, and even when he became a Senator for Texas and then Vice President and President he never lost touch with House Members. It was during these years that he began his close association with Speaker Sam Rayburn, that other giant from Texas who served as Speaker longer than any other man.

It can be said to Lyndon Johnson's credit that there were two great Americans to whom he was particularly devoted, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Sam Rayburn, and from each he learned about our Government, and that its one purpose is service to the people. As a further indication of his special regard for the House, I would like to relate an

incident that occurred a year ago last Christmas when Mrs. Patman and I were weekend guests at the LBJ Ranch. We drove from there to the LBJ Library at Austin and the President used the car telephone to call his daughter, Luci Nugent, and had her meet us at the library with her young son, Lyn. When we got there the President said to his grandson:

Little Lyn, I've asked Mr. Patman to help you be elected to Congress when you grow old enough, and to prepare you to be ready for it, and I want you to go to Congress.

This is a pledge I will certainly keep if I am given the opportunity, and I think the President's wish for Lyn reflects his feeling that the House is closest of all to the people and that there is more pleasure to be derived from helping others than from any other walk of life.

Loving America and being proud of his heritage, Lyndon Johnson would not accept anything less than full citizenship for all the people, and because of him we have laws on the books that mean decent living for the greatest number of people in the history of mankind—his Great Society was more than a slogan, it was a workable "New Deal," the high watermark for the American education system, low-cost housing for the poor, assistance for the underprivileged, health services for the elderly—what has been called a physical and spiritual rebirth for all America. This was the definitive answer to FDR's battle call. You remember President Roosevelt's description of one-third of the Nation as ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed. It is my hope that we will not recede from the high standard of living that LBJ cajoled, schemed, and demanded for the people of this country—the greatest improvement in living conditions in the shortest period of time ever achieved by anyone. Is it possible to do too much good too fast? What ethic can condemn an ambition that is humble for itself and demanding only for others?

A great deal of Lyndon Johnson can be understood in the light of his deep religious feeling. Lyndon Johnson was a churchgoing man—he believed in the existence of a power for good and also that there is a power for evil. He stood foursquare against the forces in this world that would overthrow and pervert our democracy. From the official announcement of the peace agreement for Vietnam released just 3 days after President Johnson's death, I read the following:

Let us be proud of the two and a half million young Americans who served in Vietnam, who served with honor and distinction in one of the most selfless enterprises in the history of nations.

This bears repeating: "One of the most selfless enterprises in the history of nations." It is a point that is too frequently overlooked. There was absolutely no self-interest in our involvement in South Vietnam, and from this standpoint, it is probably the most altruistic of all wars. I quote again from a Washington editorial:

Perhaps when time and distance have restored a little perspective, another generation of Americans will look back and remember that we came to the aid of a small nation

whose freedom was threatened and that, at the cost of much blood and gold, we sustained that freedom. Perhaps with the benefit of hindsight they will recognize that because we fought in Vietnam we did not have to fight in Germany or in Burma.

And perhaps Lyndon Johnson will then be universally praised for his patriotic vision that looked so truly and so far into the future.

The people of this country had only one rival in the affections of President Johnson—his great and abiding love for the members of his family. When he had dark hours there was his wife, Lady Bird, a lovely and truly remarkable life partner to whom this country will ever be in debt for the composure, grace, and charm she brought to her home in the White House, and the splendid rearing of her fine daughters, Lynda and Luci. This strong family atmosphere was a great force for good in this country and served as a shining example for the fifty million other families that constitute this great Nation.

There are many people, and not all of them are Texans, who find there is no need to toll the years for a just appraisal of Lyndon Johnson's service to the Nation. We feel we know him and his accomplishments. We know he was an intensely loyal man, loyal to family and friend, loyal to State and country, a Texan born and bred, true to the land, true to the people.

The editorials and news media continue their thousands of words attempting to define his place in history. I stand by the thoughts I wrote just 4 years ago as L. B. J. left the highest office in the land:

The Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States from November 22, 1963 to January 20, 1969, in my opinion stands among the honored few whose thoughts, words and actions have had a special significance in making this country productive, powerful and preeminent among nations; he shares the mantle of greatness with Presidents Lincoln, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Truman, with whom there is special reason to compare his five difficult years in the Nation's highest office. And I believe that Mrs. Johnson, whom we in East Texas know so well, fully merits the observation by Life Magazine that: 'Quite possibly she is the best First Lady we have ever had.' Last Thursday (January 16, 1969) on the floor of the House of Representatives, as Dean of the Texas Delegation, I was privileged to salute President and Mrs. Johnson, stating my absolute belief that history will accord high honor to their great accomplishments.

LBJ will, I know, in the years ahead work meaningfully in the best interests of the people. And I fully anticipate that Lady Bird will continue to give, particularly to Texans, her fine example and leadership in those special fields of beautification, conservation, and historic preservation which already bear the imprint of her tremendous interest and expert knowledge.

My predictions were borne out by President Johnson's devoted service after leaving the White House, and there can be no doubt that Lady Bird will continue to be an influential and inspirational force for good for many years to come. At this point, I would like to introduce for the RECORD the text of a statement made by Lyndon B. Johnson at Temple, Tex., in September 1972:

AS THE DAYS DWINDLE DOWN

(By Lyndon B. Johnson)

TEMPLE, TEX.—With the coming of September each year, we are reminded, as the song says, that the days are dwindling down to a precious few. By the calendar, we know that soon the green leaves of summer will begin to brown; the chill winds of winter will begin to blow; and—before we are ready for the end to come—the year will be gone.

If we permit our thoughts to dwell upon this perspective, days can become a melancholy season.

As it is with the calendar, so it sometimes seems to be with our country and its system. For there are those among us who would have us believe that America has come to its own September. That our days are dwindling down to a precious few. That the green leaves of our best season are turning brown and will soon be falling to the ground. That before long we will feel the first chill wind of a long American winter—and that our nation's stand as mankind's "last best hope" will be done.

For those who preach this prophecy—and for those who believe it—this period of our affairs can only be a melancholy season. But it is to that mood—and to the perceptions which foster it—that I want to address my remarks today.

Over the course of a long, full and gratifying life, I have seen many Septembers and have known many autumns. In public service—and in private life—I have experienced a full measure of unwelcome winters. Yet melancholy is not a mood which I have ever allowed to weigh for long upon my spirits.

I live—as I have always worked—by the faith that with each passing day, we are always approaching nearer to the beginning of a new springtime. It is by perspective I see our country now.

If I believe anything of this land—if I know anything of its people and their character—I believe and I know that we have not come to and are not approaching America's September.

On the contrary, it is my conviction—a conviction which deepens every day—that this land and its people are quickening with the new life and new potential of what will become the springtime of a new America.

I do not say this merely to offer reassurance in anxious times. Far from it I intend what I say to be taken as a challenge—a challenge to every citizen of every age.

No nation can be more than the visions of its people. Americans cannot be more than we believe ourselves capable of becoming. Thus we are directly challenged to choose between two different perceptions of what we are and what we can make of America itself.

On the one hand, we can choose to guide our course by the light of the bright perceptions—of America the beautiful, America the just, America the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Or, on the other hand, we can choose to move toward the shadows of what some have called "the dark perception" of America the unclean, America the unjust, America the unworthy.

For myself—as, I am sure, for many of you—there is no real choice. I want to open the soul of America to the warm sunlight of faith in itself, faith in the principles and precepts of its birth, faith in the promise and potential of its resources and skills and people. Yet I know that, in these times, that is not easy.

For too long, we have permitted the dark perception to pervade our midst. Day after day, month after month, the portrayal of America as unclean, unjust and unworthy has been ground into the consciousness of our people.

We no longer see the blooming flowers for we are searching for the litter. We no longer celebrate the many fresh triumphs of justice

for we are lingering over the residue of yesterday's shortcomings. We no longer measure the miles we have come toward a more humane, civil and peaceful world for we are too busy calibrating the remaining inches of times we are trying to escape and leave behind.

This is our clear and present challenge.

When we permit these dark perceptions to dominate us, we are allowing our future to be shaped by visions that are small and mean and diminishing to our potential. We are, in simple terms, dooming those who come after us to know what could only be a second-rate America.

This is a future which I am unwilling to accept.

I have devoted my time on this earth to working toward the day when there would be no second-class citizenship in America, no second-quality opportunity, no second-hand justice at home, no second-place status in the world for our ideals and benefits.

I do not intend now that second-rate visions shall set our course toward settling for a second-rate America. That is why I speak as I do now.

All through the pages of history we read the heart-rending stories of those who set out in quest of great goals and discoveries, yet when they were almost to the edge of success, they hesitated—not knowing or understanding how near they were to their aims. Out of that moment of hesitation, all too often they lost forever their opportunity to succeed.

In many respects, that seems to me to be a pattern we ourselves are in danger of repeating.

Over all the years of our nation's existence, we have been setting goals for ourselves and striving tirelessly to reach them. Those goals have been both the slogans and the substance of national affairs for generation after generation.

Full employment. Decent wages. Adequate housing. Education for everyone. Opportunity for all. Good health, good medical care, good hospitals for even the least among us. Above all, equal justice under the law for all our fellow men. America's goals have been simple and basic.

They have permeated and motivated all our institutions—churches and schools, professions and labor unions and corporations and foundations—as well as our government at every level.

All our American resources and strengths—private and public—have been committed to the effort and we have come very close to success.

Nowhere—over all the globe—have any people, under any other system, come nearer to fulfillment of such aspirations than we have under our system.

Yet, at the very moment we were near to realization, we have allowed our effort to go slack, our momentum to slow and we have entered a season of hesitation.

Why?

Basically, I believe, it is because we have not understood—and still do not fully comprehend—where we are or what we are about.

Whatever may be your own perception of where we are and where we may be heading, let me say for myself that I see little today suggesting that our system is failing—but I see all too much which convincingly argues that by our doubts and hesitation we may be failing the promise and potential of our system.

We are not living in times of collapse. The old is not coming down. Rather, the troubling and torment these days stems from the new trying to rise into place.

With our nation's past efforts, with our long and faithfully kept commitments, with our infinite successes in so many fields, we have brought into being the materials, as it were, with which to construct a new America.

Faced with the task of such great dimen-

sions, we have no time for melancholy. We have no cause for moroseness. We have work to be done—the greatest work any generation of Americans has ever faced. Believing that, I say—let's be on with our labors.

The essentials of a new America—a better America—are all on hand and within our reach. It is our destiny—and, I believe, our duty—to take up our appointed positions and commence the labors that will change what needs change among us.

Our real challenge lies not in suppressing change but utilizing it to vitalize and energize our society. Change is not our enemy. On the contrary, this society has no deadlier danger than refusal to change.

That is what I believe our young Americans are trying—and have been trying—to communicate to us. With their fine young minds, fresh new learning and clear new vision, they are seeing many segments of our society as it needs to be seen and understood.

The most frightening thing that could happen to us today would be for us to close our eyes to new ideas, and to close our ears to those—particularly the young, in whom we have invested so much hope and effort through the years of our existence—who are trying to tell us how they would go about perfecting the visions of America.

It is just such spirit that we honor on this occasion. It is by restoring that spirit to our lives and our nation's life that we can honor our own trust as Americans.

Again, I return to the theme "larger than life," and I accept the thought that Lyndon Johnson was big—as America is big, that Lyndon Johnson was good—as America is good, and that with the help of God, some day our country will be all that he wished it to be.

I would now like to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean, a long-time friend of the late President, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding this time to me.

Where have all the giants gone? In the month of January 1973, America interred two great former Presidents, Harry S. Truman and Lyndon Baines Johnson. Old Glory flies at half-mast for two of the greatest leaders America—and the world—have ever known. But we are not bankrupt—their legacies will enrich this Nation for years to come.

Lyndon Baines Johnson devoted all of his vigor, his vision, his productive years to the service of his country. Having known him intimately as Congressman, Senate majority leader, as Vice President, and as President, I know that Lyndon Baines Johnson lived and breathed in the work rhythm of America. He was the original American. His view of his country was similar to that of the frontiersman which in many respects he was. He had a Southwesterner's unrestricted view of the panorama of his homeland. He challenged America's greatest problems—civil rights, poverty, education, housing, health. All things seemed possible to him. He made them seem possible to much of America, those Americans who gave him his historic election victory in 1964.

America recognized greatness in the President who entered the oval room in the sorrowing, uncertain days which followed the assassination of John F. Kennedy. This country can never be anything but grateful for the perfect manner

in which he carried out the change of command under such terrible duress. Could any man fault his stability, his compassion, his vision? He held the Nation on a steady course; he opened the Johnson era with the burden of melancholy, but also with determination to achieve the goals of an administration of which he had been a part. He branded them as his own, and he breathed life into them.

The plight of the common man lay deep in his understanding. He set out to assure that every American could go to the polls and vote, that every American would be able to find an exit from the pit of poverty, have decent housing, the opportunity to be educated to the limit of his abilities, the means with which to maintain his health and cure his ills, a fighting chance in the marketplace to get a dollar in value for his hard earned paycheck dollar. Lyndon Johnson did not simply talk about the problems of the minorities, the poor, the sick, the elderly, the young uneducated, and the old untrained. He called Congress to the White House: He discussed these problems with us, we exchanged information, we planned programs, we passed them and he signed them into law. Today those statutes are his epitaph. They will endure longer than all the tributes which will be heaped above his bier and written into his obituary.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was a giant-sized President. Where faint-hearted men might have hesitated, he acted, letting the chips fall where they may. He knew that above all things the man in the White House must endure the loneliness, perhaps the blame, of having had the last word.

As his great predecessor, Harry S. Truman, Lyndon Johnson accepted the philosophy that a man who could not bear the heat must get out of the kitchen. They were much alike in their philosophy of government. They were great leaders, born leaders and trained, and while they sought counsel and aid from Government heads and advisers, and called for the confidence and support of the people, they were prepared to make hard decisions based on their own conscience and their own judgment, and particularly their understanding of the philosophy of our Constitution, the commitment and mission of the greatest possible republic on earth.

Lyndon Johnson was the most experienced public servant ever to have occupied the White House. There was no arm of Government, person, program, agency a stranger to him. He could not have begun to set down the entire range of information, insights, and knowledge he had acquired over a lifetime, even in his formative years, of observing and being a part of National Government. He held every high elective office in the land at the Federal level—Congressman, Senator—chosen also by his own party as majority leader of the Senate—Vice President and President.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was without peer in his strength, without peer in his dedication, without peer in his ability to produce solid results, without peer in his determination to make America better

than he found it when he entered 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. The great disappointment of his life, of course, and perhaps the fact which accounts for his early demise as surely as it did those of the returning American servicemen whose loss broke his heart, was his inability to end the war. None can say he did not seek an honorable withdrawal from Indochina with the same diligence that he pursued successfully the great domestic programs with which he is credited. He laid the groundwork for peace before he left the White House. It was his misfortune that the flow of events toward peace did not run their course within his term of office. In the words of Shakespeare:

There is a tide in the affairs of men which when taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

The crest did not come, and the President did not have the opportunity to claim the peace he so assiduously sought. It is comforting to me to know that President Nixon had advised him of the imminent announcement of the truce prior to his death.

No President soared to greater heights in his attainments. Perhaps none stirred such strong feelings both of opposition and support. How could it be otherwise in a period when divisions were springing up on every side, when values were changing, when society and government were under challenge, and all Americans suffered trauma and uncertainty? It was President Johnson's dream to lead a united people in the creation of the Great Society. He certainly left a better society.

I cannot believe other than that the judgment of history will say Lyndon Baines Johnson was one of the greatest most courageous, most American Presidents, of all time.

In a personal vein, may I conclude by saying that President Johnson's death was not only a great national loss. I have had to say "good-bye" to a personal friend with whom I have served and worked for many years, one who has always been on my side in every moment of triumph and difficulty. So has his wonderful wife, Lady Bird. She and her two daughters, Linda and Lucy, will always be numbered among my friends and helpers. To them and their fine husbands and children and to all the host of friends and relatives of the late President, my wife, Mary, and my children, Mary Frances and David, extend our deepest sympathy and love.

Mr. Speaker, among all those who knew and worked with Lyndon Baines Johnson during his long career in the Capitol and in the White House, none was closer to him than former Speaker John W. McCormack of Massachusetts. John W. McCormack was in the House of Representatives every day that Lyndon Johnson served in the House of Representatives. John W. McCormack was a member of the House leadership every day that Lyndon Johnson was a member of the Senate leadership. John W. McCormack was Speaker of the House of Representatives every day during the Presidency of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The Honorable John W. McCormack has made a statement on his friend, his

close coworker, the late President Johnson, and I ask the indulgence of the House to listen to me as I read this statement of our former beloved Speaker:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN MCCORMACK

The recent death of former President Lyndon Baines Johnson took from our midst one of the great Presidents of American history. President Johnson was very kind in his relationships with other people, but he was very firm in performing the duties of his office. He met every responsibility which came his way as a Member of the House of Representatives, a Majority Leader of the Senate, as Vice President and, particularly, as President of the United States.

The sudden and tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy thrust the Presidency, with all its challenges and problems upon Lyndon Johnson. Our people soon recognized that in President Johnson the country had an outstanding leader. During his active term of office, he manifested the great qualities of leadership with which he was possessed.

The eminent role played by our late beloved President in that critical part of the world is history, his firm desire that peace and justice with honor should prevail in the world will insure his place of prominence in history. Time has clearly shown his courageous decision in relation to the crisis in the Dominican Republic was sound and in the national interest of our country. Time will also show his decisions in relation to Viet Nam, and more broadly all of Southeast Asia, including our Far Eastern defenses were sound and, in light of existing circumstances, were consistent with the national interest of the United States.

Lyndon Johnson was not only a great man, he was a good man, with an intense love of all human beings, particularly the poor, the sick, the handicapped, the underprivileged, and those against whom discrimination in any way was directed. He recognized in a most vital way the importance of education.

While he was President over 400 major pieces of legislation recommended by him were enacted into law. These laws make America a stronger nation and a better place in which to live. Laws recommended by President Johnson and enacted into law have favorably affected every phase of life and liberty in this nation. He has enriched the lives of each and every one of us.

President Johnson gave to our country a leadership in thought, action and accomplishment that will always be a monument to his memory.

For many years I enjoyed a very close friendship with President Johnson. I am deeply saddened by his death.

I extend to Mrs. Johnson and to her daughters, Lynda and Lucy and their loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield at this time to the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful that the dean of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) has yielded to me on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, literally millions of words have been written and spoken in recent weeks about the late President Lyndon B. Johnson. For this reason it is extremely difficult to add anything that has not already been said except perhaps on a personal basis, but at this time I do want

to pay my very personal respects to his memory.

There have been 10 Presidents of the United States in my lifetime, and five during the years I have been a Member of Congress. They have all been extremely different personalities, from very different backgrounds, so it is very hard to compare them and it is too early to say how history will finally rate them. About all we can say is that the problems facing the world and this country following World War II have been infinitely greater and more complex than previous Presidents had to deal with in safer and saner times, when we did not have nuclear weapons and instant communications and worldwide commitments.

By any standard President Johnson did his best, as I think all Presidents do, but he became President under especially trying circumstances, perhaps more overwhelming than have faced any Vice President since the previous President Johnson took the oath upon the assassination of President Lincoln. It would be my judgment at this time, Mr. Speaker, that history will undoubtedly record that Lyndon B. Johnson met the test of that difficult period.

My first close contact with Lyndon Johnson as President was when he appointed me and six others in late November of 1963 to what has come to be known as the Warren Commission. He gave Chief Justice Warren and the six others on that commission a responsibility to dig out the facts and to come to conclusions concerning the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy. When our report was concluded, President Johnson commended us for our efforts and thanked each and every member of the Warren Commission for the job that he had assigned us. All of us who had that serious responsibility were grateful for the support he gave us at that time and also after the report was published when many critics were attacking our conclusions.

Time has dimmed the memory of how manfully President Johnson took up the reins of leadership and held a shocked and grief-stricken nation together during those dark hours in late 1963, and he did so despite the reservations of some within his own party as well as others. It is a tribute to him that he retained many key officials from his predecessor's administration as his top advisers.

President Johnson inherited a nasty war which was already unpopular and which he was unable to resolve even at the high price of declining to seek another term in office. As one of the leaders of the "loyal opposition" in Congress during the elected term of President Lyndon Johnson I know firsthand how much anguish the Vietnam War caused him and how desperately he longed for peace under honorable conditions.

Mr. Speaker, a few days before he left office in 1969, I was called to the White House one weekend for what I supposed was another crisis briefing of the bipartisan leadership. Instead, Mr. Speaker, I found myself ushered upstairs to the Lincoln bedroom and alone with Presi-

dent Johnson. We talked for quite awhile casually about many things—our differences as well as our many areas of agreement during the previous 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, it was obvious to me that he seemed to be in no hurry, for once. Before I left, he thanked me for my firm support of his hard decisions as Commander in Chief, and said that while we had had our little differences in the political arena, he wanted to leave Washington without any enemies left behind.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for such an experience with a President I greatly respected, a man I admired, and a friend for whom I learned to have a wonderful affection.

Mr. Speaker, after he returned to Texas, President Lyndon Johnson wrote me on several occasions very warm and very friendly letters, which I shall cherish as mementos of our fine relationship.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat a comment that I heard often during the memorial services for the late President. Most appropriately, people would say as they watched Mrs. Johnson and her family, that any man with such a truly great wife and two such lovely daughters must have contained goodness and greatness in his character. He had both, and many more outstanding characteristics.

He was a complex individual, surely, and certainly a controversial one, but I know he loved his country and his family and his friends.

We are all poorer for his passing.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his remarks.

At this time I desire to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable "Tip" O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I place in the RECORD following my own remarks, the remarks of U.S. Representative J. J. PICKLE.

He made these remarks at the memorial service in the U.S. Capitol for the late President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

As a Member of Congress, I know I express the sentiments of so many of his colleagues when I say that the inspiring words of Mr. PICKLE really moved a mournful nation that particular day.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation deeply mourns the untimely passing of an eminent leader and distinguished American, President Lyndon Johnson. It is with the greatest respect and admiration that I pay tribute today to my former colleague and dear friend.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was a man who clearly placed America first and foremost in his list of priorities, evidenced by his constant hard work and sacrifice even at the expense of his physical well being.

Born of humble origins, he rose to the highest position in our Nation's Government. After attending high school in Johnson City, Lyndon worked for several years before attending Texas State

Teachers College, from which he was graduated in 1930.

Two years later, he came to Washington assisting Representative Richard Kleberg of Texas. From that time until his retirement from public office in 1969, President Johnson continued to serve our Nation with great dedication and purpose. His personal courage and integrity are well known by all who worked with him.

As he moved up the political ladder from Representative to Senate majority leader to President, Lyndon Johnson continued his unrelenting devotion to each succeeding task. For President Johnson, no legislation received too much attention. Diligence and resourcefulness marked Johnson's years in Washington.

Party affiliations were least important among his priorities. He once said:

I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American, a public servant, and a member of my party, in that order always and only.

He was partisan only in the sense of his unswerving devotion to the important and necessary causes which he championed throughout his career: education, medical care, and civil rights. In his own words, he believed that—

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, and until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins . . . emancipation will be a proclamation . . . which falls short of assuring freedom to the free.

And against doctor's orders, Lyndon Baines Johnson made his last public speech calling for a greater national effort to provide equal opportunity for blacks.

President Johnson did not want a good society. He aspired for a great society. In his years as President he did more for the minorities of this country through his great society programs than anyone else in the history of the United States. He was a man who made a vital distinction in assessing the benefits of our national domestic commitments. He asked:

Not how much, but how much good, not only how to create wealth, but how to use it, and not only how fast we are going but where we are going. The great society proposes as the first test of a nation: the quality of its people.

Under his leadership, an extraordinary number of bills aimed at eliminating some of the severe problems crippling our Nation's welfare were passed. Our debt to Lyndon Johnson for his accomplishments on the domestic front has not yet been realized.

And in the realm of foreign affairs, Johnson acted without regard for his own personal ambitions, but in what he believed were the interests of America.

Few men if any desired peace more than Lyndon Johnson. Acting with courage and conviction in an attempt to realize that peace, he was greatly disturbed when he failed. If historians are to judge Lyndon Johnson by his own motto:

A President's hardest task is not to do what is right, but to know what is right.

Then he must be remembered as one of

our greatest Presidents. He saw injustice and tried to right it, and he saw peace and desired to achieve it.

It was ironic that his father, Samuel Johnson, whose ambition it was that his son achieve political prominence, should have died shortly before his son attained that goal. Similarly, it is ironic that President Johnson, who so desired peace, should pass away before his desire could be fulfilled.

The Nation has lost another great leader, and I have lost a dear friend. Mrs. O'Neill joins me in extending our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Johnson and the Johnson family.

The remarks of Mr. PICKLE follow:

REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE J. J. PICKLE DURING MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson and Family, my colleagues and Americans:

Lyndon Baines Johnson was a President for the people. Working for the people came easily and naturally to his Presidency. It was the fulfillment of a career as Texas National Youth Administrator, Congressman, Senator, and Vice President.

When I was elected in 1963 to the 10th Congressional District seat of Texas that Lyndon Johnson filled in 1937, I sought his advice. He gave me one guiding principle: "Congressman, when you vote, just vote for the people."

This was the same principle that guided Lyndon Johnson's public life.

Wherever he served, we were struck by the bigness of this man, his energy, his drive, his ambition, his quest for perfection in all he did and in all he asked us to do.

His demand for the best within us was relentless. He persuaded, cajoled and drove us until we fulfilled potentials we never knew we had. And, when we did our best, he wrapped his long arms around us—for he loved us and he loved to see us and our country at our best.

To those of us who were closest to him from the start, we understood him for we were "his boys." He meant to us what the great Sam Rayburn meant to him and what Franklin Roosevelt meant to both of them.

We could sense even then the reach for greatness deep within this man. We were joined by dozens, then hundreds of young men and women that Lyndon Johnson gathered around him over the course of his public life—not simply to serve him, but to help him achieve his vision of America.

His ambition for himself was as nothing compared to his ambition for America. As hard as he drove America toward this vision, and asked us to work for a Great Society, he gave more of himself to that goal than he ever asked of any of us.

As a young man, he experienced poverty and witnessed discrimination. He learned firsthand about drought and parched earth, about stomachs that weren't full and sores that weren't healed. He brought water and electricity and housing to the Congressional District which he served. As a Congressman, he knew what it was like to be a poor farmer, a working man without a job, a Black or a Mexican-American, and he set about changing life for the disadvantaged among his constituents.

As Senator and Vice-President, he saw that it was just as difficult to be poor or unemployed, or Black or Mexican-American in the big cities of the Northeast and West Coast as it was in Central Texas.

His Presidency changed America for the good, and America will never be the same again.

In 1964, the people gave him the greatest vote of confidence any President has ever re-

ceived in our history. In turn, he voted his Presidency for the people. Medicare became the right of every older American, rather than a dream. He authored the first Elementary and Secondary Act in our nation's history, and the Head Start Program which bears the imprint of Mrs. Johnson so vividly, to give every American child the opportunity to go to school and develop his talents to the fullest. He saw the landscape ravaged by American technology and he moved to clean our air and our water, to protect our land, and to turn the brilliance of that technology to the restoration of our natural environment.

He knew well what that technology could do, for he guided our space program as Senator, Vice-President, and President until America placed the first man on the Moon.

Lyndon Johnson was proudest of his achievements in the field of civil rights:

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, the granddaddy of them all, which opened public accommodations and jobs to all Americans regardless of color; and

The 1968 Fair Housing Act which gives every American regardless of his color, the right to live in any house he can afford.

By his own testimony, Lyndon Johnson's greatest achievement in civil rights was the Voting Rights Act of 1965. As he said shortly before he left the White House:

"It is . . . going to make democracy real. It is going to correct an injustice of decades and centuries. I think it is going to make it possible for this Government to endure, not half slave and half free, but united."

He waged the war he loved—the War on Poverty—with more energy and imagination than all the Presidents who preceded him. He gave even more of himself to his efforts to end the war he hated—the War in Vietnam. Before he left office, he opened the negotiations in Paris which last night culminated in the peace agreement he wanted so much.

However history may judge Lyndon Johnson's foreign policy, that, too, was directed by his desire to help all the people. He saw foreign assistance not as a military program, but as a program to feed and clothe, heal and educate the disadvantaged people of the world. His concern in Southeast Asia was for the people of Vietnam, North as well as South, and he offered the resources of this nation to help rebuild both countries.

He devoted his life "to working toward the day when there would be no second-class citizenship in America, no second-quality opportunity, no second-hand justice at home, no second-place status in the world for our ideals and benefits."

Theodore Roosevelt once said:

"It is far better to dare mighty things and to enjoy your hour of triumph even though it may be checkered occasionally by failure, than to take stock with those poor souls who neither enjoy much nor suffer much because they live in a gray twilight that knows neither victory nor defeat."

Lyndon Johnson never lived in a gray twilight.

He experienced and appreciated the joy of the Democratic process when it served to enrich the lives of the people. And he suffered with the people when that process did not serve them soon or well enough.

His was a time of turbulence because it was a time of dramatic change. But he never saw that change as a time of collapse or deterioration. He put it best himself when he said:

"The old is not coming down. Rather, the troubling of torment of these days stems from the new trying to rise into place."

His closest friend and wisest advisor was his wife. She inspired his concern for our environment. Most of all, Lady Bird Johnson understood her husband and he understood her as few men and women dare hope to un-

derstand and love each other. It is no wonder that their daughters, Lynda Bird and Luci, brought so much credit to their family, and to our country, for they came out of this beautiful bond and were privileged to share in this close and loving relationship.

Lyndon Johnson is a President who came from the land, from the Hill Country of Texas, where sun and rain are the most precious values a man can tie to; and where God's will is seen and felt and gauged by the sky and the wind.

It was from this land that Lyndon Johnson drew his strength. It was from his family that he rekindled the love he gave to his country. And it was from the potential he saw in the people that he drew his vision of America. And he knew—as no other man—that human dignity and economic justice were essential to our people to set them free to achieve that vision.

This was a man who saw his purpose in life and lived his creed:

"Throughout my entire career, I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American, a public servant, and a member of my Party—and in that order."

He saw also his Presidency and his vision of America when he told the Congress and this Nation:

"I do not want to be the President who built empires or sought grandeur or extended dominion."

"I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world."

"I want to be the President who helped to feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of tax-eaters."

"I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who promoted love among the people of all races and all regions and all parties."

"I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth."

And he did all these things. From his new "Vantage Point," the President will rest in his beloved Hill Country, where he has told us his Daddy before him said he wanted to come home. Come home—"where folks know when you're sick and care when you die."

Two hundred million Americans care, Mr. President. We care—and we love you.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Young).

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from Texas, for allowing me this time to speak somewhat out of turn, because I have another committee meeting, of which he is aware.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the 36th President of the United States a great void was left in the country, in the world, and, of course, in the dear family he loved so much.

A void was left with those of us who had the privilege and honor of being somewhat close to him.

The area that I represent in Texas feels especially close to Lyndon Johnson and to his memory. As a youth he worked in a cotton gin down in Robstown, Tex., where he earned a part of the money he needed to get his college education.

Then some years later his first public experience in Washington was gained through his position as administrative assistant to the distinguished Richard M. Kleberg, Congressman from the 14th Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent here now.

So, Mr. Speaker, we all lament more than anybody can say over the passing of this man, which means so much to us. We all feel a great gratification and

pride, in that we know he had the great faculty that wherever he went his presence was felt.

People understood him. People knew him well. Those who knew him well knew him favorably.

I suppose there is no man in the history of this country who has had a greater career in the legislative field than our distinguished friend Lyndon Johnson.

Of course, Presidents do not avoid history. Presidents like Lyndon Johnson make history. When history is written, history will tell what happened.

Time here does not permit me or anyone else, for that matter, to enumerate or to chronicle the many, many great accomplishments of this great American President, this great American individual.

But I must say that particularly in the field of civil justice, in the field of education, and in the field of human dignity this President not only did more than any other President in the history of this country, but in this field of justice and education and dignity he did more than all of the previous Presidents combined.

And by that measure, Mr. Speaker, I will add that Lyndon Johnson in the field of justice and dignity and education did more than any other man in the history of the world.

So it is no wonder, aside from the grave personal feeling of vacancy that we will all have, then, that this country will miss our friend, and it is no wonder that his presence in the world will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose no greater compliment could be paid to anybody than simply to say that our country and our world was better off for his having been in it.

I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mahon).

Mr. MAHON. I thank the dean of the Congress for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to observe the deep feeling which has been apparent in the remarks made here today about Lyndon Johnson. This is not hard to understand. It is all because Lyndon Johnson meant so much to so many of us personally, aside from what he meant to the Nation and to the world.

It is hard to know what one should say about this warm and devoted friend who has left us—this great American. I shall not speak at length. Others will recount many things about this man but we all have so many cherished memories of our association with him over so many years we know not where to start or what to say.

Lyndon Johnson was much beloved but he was much criticized in certain quarters prior to his departure from the White House and thereafter.

All Presidents receive a full measure of criticism. It is often not easy for a public official to deal with criticism. All public officials long to be loved by the people, and certainly Lyndon Johnson yearned for the support and good will, and shall I say, the love of his fellow man. And I must say he had it in large measure.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mahon and I spent a couple of days and nights at the Johnson ranch with the Johnsons in late October of last year. At that time I talked to him about the criticism he suffered and as we talked it became obvious to me that he considered this to be a matter of little consequence. He was not disturbed or embittered. He was most tolerant. It was clear to me that Lyndon Johnson was so convinced he had done the right thing, insofar as he knew the right that he could not be bothered by the criticisms which were made of him.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson knew that he had a place in history. I feel certain that the Members of Congress agree with me that Lyndon Johnson's place in history is secure. He earned it. None of the critics can ever take away from him his shining record of achievement.

Lyndon Johnson had great respect for our institutions and for our system of government. This was nowhere more evident than in the great respect he showed for the Office of the President.

The relations between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party are naturally characterized at times by spirited partisanship. That is our system. But, when President Johnson laid down the responsibility of the Presidency, he did everything he could to provide for a smooth transition and to remove stumbling blocks from the path of his successor. He felt his successor should have the fullest opportunity to address himself to the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency—and no one was as acutely aware of the responsibilities and problems confronting Richard Nixon as was President Johnson. President Johnson was most considerate of his successor and President Nixon extended to him great respect and friendship.

I have heard President Johnson say many times we cannot have but one President at a time. In office President Johnson conducted himself in an exemplary way. When he departed from the Presidency he conducted himself in the most commendatory and gracious manner as a former President.

With pride I join in the salute being given today to his memory. My wife Helen joins me in sentiments of warmest affection for Lady Bird and for his wonderful and talented daughters and loved ones who meant so much to him. They all have our deepest sympathy.

I thank the dean for yielding to me.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. Speaker, there have been but a few men who have changed the history of nations. Lyndon Johnson was one of these men. Certainly he was President of the United States. Thirty-six other men have been President of the United States. We can all probably name no more than six who have greatly influenced the history of the United States. Lyndon Johnson was one of those.

He did not guide our country to independence; he did not expand our boundaries; he did not establish the sov-

eighty of the Federal Government over the States; nor did he lead us into a world war. But he did establish the responsibility of the Federal Government for meeting the needs and the aspirations of our people in their everyday activities.

I was not one who agreed with all of his reforms. He held a somewhat more liberal philosophy than that which I accept. He believed that the Government could and should do for the individual many of those things which to me seem to be both improper and impossible for the Government to achieve. At the same time I never questioned his sincere belief that what he proposed was going to be beneficial to the people whom he loved. There have always been, and there are now, individuals in our Government who have, and do hold, his views relative to the power of Government to change the attitude of individuals, but these officials have never been able to translate their views into action as Lyndon Johnson did.

When he saw suffering he looked to the Government for a cure and in most cases he provided, if not a cure, an improvement, because he was a compassionate man. He was not so concerned with the perpetuation of our form of government as he was with using it to provide immediate relief where he felt a change was needed. And he never refused to take a part of what he felt was needed because he could not get all of what he sought, because he was a practical man.

Lyndon Johnson loved the people of America and he secured for them every benefit which he could grasp. He was a man of great intellect and of great ability, but a still greater heart. He was impatient with those of us who sometimes questioned the method he suggested for giving aid to our people. He was concerned almost entirely with results and he got results. He fed the hungry; he protected the weak; and he gave dignity to those who had been denied recognition. He was willing to sacrifice what some of us felt were important principles of government and of economics. At times he found it necessary to sacrifice his friends when they stood in the way of what he believed to be essential for the American people. But he proved his sincerity through his unhesitating willingness to sacrifice himself for the same causes. He only asked of others what he himself was willing to give.

I think it is clear that Lyndon Johnson would have been reelected by an overwhelming vote had he run for a second full term, and I have no doubt but what he wanted that second term most desperately. But he was convinced that his withdrawal from the Presidency would enhance the possibility of peace in Southeast Asia. He never whimpered. He saw his duty and he did it. He stepped aside. He applied the same harsh rule to his own ambitions that he so often applied to others.

Lyndon Johnson loved his associates and all people of his country. He wanted to be loved in return but it was inevitable that a man with such strong views and such resolute action would make outspoken enemies and indeed his enemies

were vocal. I think Lyndon Johnson overestimated the number of his enemies and I think he was prone to mistakenly include among that category all those who disagreed with his policies. As a matter of fact, he had remarkably few enemies. Most of the American people admired the man and respected him even when they disagreed with him.

To most of the American people, Lyndon Johnson's life was entirely political. They knew him only as a statesman. In this field those who were not blinded by prejudice certainly knew him as one who demanded much and who gave much. "No greater love hath any man than he lay down his life for a friend." Politically, Lyndon Johnson laid down his life for his friends when he refused to run for reelection because he believed by so doing he could save the lives of both American and Vietnamese boys. But Lyndon Johnson was not simply a politician or even simply a statesman. He was one of the greatest politicians that the country has ever known, but he was also a husband, a father, and a citizen of a frontier community. He built a home and reared a family on a remote Texas ranch. He was always just as proud of his home and his family, of his wife, his daughters, and his grandchildren as he was of his achievements as President. He had a right to be, because his was an outstanding family.

We in Texas are proud of all of the Johnson family and, while we in the Texas congressional delegation miss our personal friend, we are fully aware of his great impact on our country and on the lives of our people. But at the same time we share in the pride which his family has and which this Nation has in his accomplishments.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, America has lost a great leader and I have lost a longtime personal friend.

Lyndon Johnson was a man of rare capability, compassion, and understanding, who wanted to be remembered as the President who did the most for the well-being and dignity of our citizens. History will reflect he was a great President and, as time passes, America will become increasingly grateful for all he did.

I have known President Johnson and his lovely wife, Lady Bird, throughout my years in public office. We served together in the Congress and I worked with him to get his programs enacted when he was in the White House.

Some of America's greatest moments in history occurred because Lyndon Johnson was President. All Americans live better because of his concern for people, for equality, for health care for the elderly, for opportunity for the poor, for the sanctity of the American democratic system.

I shall be forever grateful that he was my friend. Although he had the greatest power that man had ever known, he never lost his humanity. He could be abrupt and overbearing when he needed to get things done in a hurry, but he was never petty or mean. He somehow always found time to think of his family, his friends, and those who needed his help.

Just last month, I visited with him in New Orleans and a few weeks before, he had Charlotte, my children, and me

as his guests at the ranch. He seemed to be enjoying the chance he finally had to visit with his family and his friends. He took Jeb and Kate to see his ranch, the cattle, and some of the game he kept there. He thoroughly enjoyed himself and the children returned his warm affection.

I regret that he did not live longer to enjoy this leisure and time to indulge himself in some of the pleasures we take as common but that duty denied him—a quiet family life—undisturbed visits with his wife, children, and grandchildren—time to relax and reflect on his accomplishments.

His lovely wife, Lady Bird, is a most gracious lady and to her and her fine children and grandchildren I extend my deepest sympathy.

I had hoped that he would live another 30 years. Although this could not be, I am grateful that I knew him, I am grateful for his advice and counsel, I am grateful that we had him as our President. Time will honor this man in a way that no amount of public acclaim ever could during his lifetime.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and I now yield to the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable CARL FISHER.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the sadness and lament concerning the death on last January 22 of Lyndon B. Johnson, 36th President of the United States.

It happened that the late President lived much of his life and died at his beloved LBJ Ranch, located in the district in Texas which I represent. That area, through which coursed the beautiful spring-fed Pedernales River, was very much a part of the life of the man whose loss we mourn here today. He loved the verdant hillsides that abound there. It was a source of strength and inspiration for the man who rose from the ranks of humble origin to become the Nation's leader during one of the most turbulent periods in American history.

I recall that during the time he was convalescing from his first heart attack I was invited to visit him and spend the night at the LBJ Ranch. As an indicator of his personal concern for others, after dinner that evening I accompanied him on a visit he made to neighboring homes. He stopped at several places to inquire about the health and well-being of families and express his concern and solicitude. He wanted to know what he might be able to do for them. It will be recalled that he was at that time majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Throughout the time he served in the Congress, as Vice President, as President, and right down to the time of his death, Lyndon Johnson took a very active interest in problems associated with the livestock industry in that area. When I would see him he would often inquire about the current prices of cattle, sheep, and goats. And he would want to know what problems needed the attention of those of us who represented the growers.

It goes without saying that the "Sage of the Pedernales" enjoyed many friendships among those who made their homes in the "LBJ country," as it came to be known. To many he was a pioneer in

terms of progress and achievement in the area of State, national, and world affairs. Shortly after Johnson's death, an admirer, Mrs. Judy Pue of nearby Bandera, wrote this poem to his memory:

FAREWELL, O PIONEER

Across the land a tolling bell
Peals a song of sad farewell.

Each wind-swept hill with cedar head
Nods in grief above his bed.

The liveoaks twist their naked hands
While lonely sheep roam overland.

On the range, the moan of cattle
In the barn an empty saddle.

Farewell, farewell, O Pioneer
Farewell, O mighty friend

Farewell, farewell, O Pioneer
Who loved his fellow-men.

Already assessments are being made of Lyndon B. Johnson's place in history. Perhaps at a later time, with a wider perspective, a better judgment can be formed. As I see it, his handling of the war in Vietnam will loom as a lasting and significant achievement.

Devoted as he was to the cause of human freedom and the freedom and independence of both people and nations, his courageous decisions during the war in Vietnam, tragic though that conflict was, figured in the ultimate outcome of that war. The enemy was defeated and a peace settlement was agreed upon the day following the death of President Johnson.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the life and era of Lyndon Johnson ended.

The last ceremony is over. The last funeral notes, the last salutes, have long since echoed and faded away in the hills of Texas to be lost forever in the winds of time, and he is at rest—and we somehow are amazed, disbelieving that a man of such intensity and restless, endless energy, could ever be at rest.

But social conscience did not die with him, and if he were here, he would be reminding us how much is left undone.

I do not think there was any problem, any injustice, any human need, that escaped his concern or failed to draw his attention. No problem, no human dilemma, no matter how far removed, no matter how intractable, would be too much for him to contend with. If he were standing here today, he would be telling us how high we could reach, how far we had to go, if we only dared and cared enough.

No one who ever knew or met Lyndon Johnson could come away without being impressed; he confounded his enemies and his friends alike; he never faltered or failed; never took the easy way out; and if he fell far, he reached higher than any other man ever dared.

And as he would remind you of things left undone, so will I—not that I have his powers of persuasion, but because we cannot deny nor refuse to recognize those problems and concerns that moved him, and ought to move us. They did not die when he did, nor did they fade away with a change of Government; nor will they.

It is my plan to elaborate further at a subsequent time.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, today we

are honoring the memory of former President Lyndon B. Johnson.

L. B. J. was no ordinary man. Whether one agreed or disagreed with his politics, Johnson was a man of incredible strength and endurance.

He was a master at the science of politics and his record in Congress bears this out. But he may best be remembered for the calm and confident leadership he provided in the time following that tragic day in November 1963 when President Kennedy was shot and killed.

Most of Lyndon Johnson's adult life was spent in service to his country culminating in his being called upon first by circumstances and then by a great majority of voters to serve as President of the United States. Throughout his entire career he worked tirelessly and with great dedication for the good of the country as he perceived it.

While only history can ultimately judge his deeds, those of us who lived in his lifetime honor his memory with the utmost respect.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, history will remember Lyndon Baines Johnson. From the time he assumed the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency, 99 minutes after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, until he left that office in 1969, his administration was studded with monumental decisions and dramatic actions.

It was an administration that spanned an era of turbulence that America will never forget. The mid-1960's saw our country locked in conflict abroad and wrenched apart by violence at home. It was an era where the clarion call for civil rights echoed over the land and the stain of civil disorder spread from coast to coast. It was an era which saw two leaders of our Government murdered—President Kennedy and his brother, Senator Robert Kennedy. It was an era which Americans saw grow bitter and take sides against our involvement in Vietnam. It was an era which would have drained the physical and moral strength of any man and it was Lyndon Johnson's destiny to be the man tested. He was not found wanting.

History, unquestionably, will link President Johnson with Vietnam. His policies regarding the war have been and will be questioned by many people. I believe, however, that his critics, if they be honest and reasonable, will bring peace to that land, to America, and to the world. I deeply regret he did not live to see it happen.

But, if war is to be Lyndon Johnson's footnote on the pages of history, then let history also remember his other wars. Let it remember Lyndon Johnson's war against poverty, his war against the lack of decent housing for poor Americans, his war for expanded educational opportunities for young Americans, and his war for increased medical and health benefits for older Americans.

Let history remember that when President Johnson took office he promised nothing more than to do his best and asked for the help of his people and his God in this quest. Who could promise more?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson was at the same time one of the

most capable, promising, and yet tragic Presidents in American history.

He held the capacity for greatness. When the Great Society programs tackled all of our problems—race, poverty, public education, medical care, and housing—we all felt we were a part of changes that would shake the world.

The tragedy was that these programs withered on the vine. In his years in office President Johnson was obsessed with the war in Vietnam. His tremendous promise for a better world was killed by an unpopular war in a strange land.

I have no doubt that the trials and turmoil of his last years in the White House hastened his death. He will be missed by his many friends in Congress. And, if history is kind, he will be remembered by all Americans for his desire to make our country a better place to live.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, in the untimely passing of the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson, the United States has lost a great man who was deeply respected by his colleagues, his friends, and those he lead and served so devotedly during his Presidency. Just as all Americans shared with Mrs. Johnson and her daughters the warmth and wisdom of their loving husband and father for so many years, we share with them now the sadness they feel.

I was honored to serve in the Congress during the Johnson years, and I will treasure and remember those years for the rest of my life. While the two of us disagreed from time to time, I respected and admired L. B. J. for the firmness of his dedication to the ideals and convictions he believed in. History will record and men will long remember Lyndon Baines Johnson and the Great Society he sought so diligently to create. While his efforts took so much from him, he thought it worthwhile and necessary no matter what the cost.

I can appreciate and understand his wanting to return to the hill country, for I, too, feel a special closeness to a section of the country very similar to the hills and the ranch that he called home. The peacefulness and simplicity of the hills, coupled with the family which meant so much to him and knowledge of the achievement of the peace which had so successfully eluded him, provided L. B. J. with contentment and happiness during his last days; and I am sure he would have wanted it to end in no other way, for finally he had what he wanted most—peace.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of former President Lyndon Johnson less than a month after the death of former President Truman has filled the entire Nation as well as those of us who serve in the Congress with a great sense of sadness. Two devoted public servants have been taken from our midst leaving us with no living former Presidents. Such an occurrence reminds us all of our own mortality and of the fleeting nature of life itself.

The writer of the book of Ecclesiastes reminds us that there "is a season for everything"—a time to be born, weep, laugh, mourn, dance, a time to speak and a time to remain silent, and finally a time to die. It is rather interesting that the

time to die for Presidents Truman and Johnson came so close together because there were great similarities in the terms they served as President. They both served as Vice President and took office upon the death of the President. They both served one elected term and chose not to run for reelection. Both men left office with great controversies surrounding their terms in office.

Lyndon Johnson, like Harry Truman, understood and loved politics, knew how to use power and was not hesitant to make a decision. I did not always agree with President Johnson but I always respected and admired him. Lyndon Johnson's devotion to his principles can be very clearly seen in the decision he made in March of 1968. He believed so strongly that the course he pursued in Vietnam was just that he was willing to give up the opportunity to serve another term as President rather than alter his Vietnam policy. History may judge him right or wrong in this decision if it is ever able to render a clear verdict but it will have to recognize the fact that he made a decision and stuck by it.

One of the tragic aspects of the timing of President Johnson's death is the fact that it came just a few hours before the public announcement of a cease-fire in Vietnam. It is my opinion that no person in America desired to see a just and lasting peace in Vietnam more than Lyndon Johnson.

I can only conclude by saying that another great and dedicated leader has been taken from us and we will miss his presence and his guidance as time passes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of President Lyndon Johnson is not only a great loss to his family and friends, but to the entire Nation and to the world.

Mr. Johnson, who gave more than half of his 64 years in service to his country, assumed the extremely difficult role of President following the abrupt and tragic death of President Kennedy. Throughout his term in office President Johnson, saddled by the additional burden of an unpopular war, proved his ability not only as an outstanding executive but as a staunch, highly respected leader of legislators.

Some solace to those who mourn his death can be found in that Fate was kind enough to have allowed Lyndon Johnson knowledge of the Vietnam cease-fire prior to his death. This welcome news must have been a great comfort to the man who sought so long for peace.

The death of our 36th President, a sad event for our entire Nation, will be brought to mind in the next 30 days by the flying of our Nation's flags at half-mast—a symbolic tribute to Lyndon Baines Johnson and a reminder to all Americans of the earnest and powerful man who served his country faithfully and well in some of her most troubled times.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues. I did not know Lyndon Johnson—either as a Member of this House, as a Senator, or as the President. In fact, there is only one time that I talked with him, but that memory will remain with me as long as I live.

I have read and heard a lot about Lyndon Johnson—the rough edged, hard-riding Lyndon Johnson—the folksy Lyndon Johnson and the unbendingly, patriotic Lyndon Johnson. I have heard about the Lyndon Johnson of civil rights fame and Great Society fame, but the Lyndon Johnson that I know and remember is the one of deep compassion and concern.

Mr. Johnson had been gone from the Presidency for 2 years, from the Senate for 11 years, and this House of Representatives for 23 years. Yet on a cold night in December of 1971, Lyndon Johnson took the time himself to call Birmingham, Ala., to inquire how my boss, the late Congressman Mendel Rivers, was doing. Mr. Rivers had undergone heart surgery. Mr. Johnson told me on the phone that night:

I just wanted to call and see if everything is all right. I hope you don't mind if we keep calling the next few days.

Then he went on to explain:

You see, Mr. Rivers is an old friend of mine from our days together in the House.

Every day for the next few days, either he or Mrs. Johnson would call and get a report on the Congressman's condition. This touching tribute to an old friend told me all I ever have to know about Lyndon Johnson. Here was true compassion—away from the glare of publicity—genuine concern for an old friendship. That is the mark of a true leader and man. One who can relate to the everyday problems of his fellow man. One who can take the time to care about a friendship kept.

Mr. Speaker, I express the thanks of a grateful Nation, that Lyndon Johnson was the right man for the right time. Lyndon Johnson gave this country a heritage that will be well remembered in the history books tomorrow. Thousands of Americans today—and millions in the future—will live better because Lyndon Johnson was a caring President. Lyndon Johnson was many things to many people, but he was above all a very human being—and while this Nation today mourns the death of our 36th President, we can feel thankful indeed that a man like Lyndon Johnson occupied the residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. We can be thankful that Lyndon Johnson was on hand to step in and lead the American people through one of the most trying times of our history.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with four great Presidents. Of the four, I probably spent more time in the presence of the late President Johnson than any of the others. My memory of those experiences will not soon fade.

Lyndon B. Johnson was a strong man in every respect. He was a natural-born leader. He was a leader in the House; a leader in the Senate; and he certainly lead our Nation with strength and ability. Our country has been fortunate indeed to have such leaders at the ready in time of crisis.

I wish he could have lived to have seen this agonizing war come to its end. Certainly he did everything within his enormous power to extricate this country from her morass—but to no avail.

Finally with calm resolve, the President, who loved his country more than the prestige of being its leader, chose to refuse certain reelection in an effort to restore peace. History will probably recall that his action did indeed cause peace to be possible.

The late President should go down in history as one of our great Presidents. A grateful Nation says goodbye.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and sorrow that I reflect upon the untimely passing away of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States.

Of all the leaders of our country during these momentous times, I have known him, and worked with him, the longest: First, when we were both Members of the House, with offices in the Cannon Building; then when he became Senator; later, when he ascended to the Vice Presidency; and, finally, when he became the Chief Executive of our Government.

It was a long association, and one which I shall always treasure. For although President Johnson may have made some mistakes, he was also a great man who came from the Congress, who loved it, and who knew how to work with it for the benefit of our Nation.

During his tenure as Senate majority leader, and as the President of the United States, our country had made more difficult and far-reaching decisions than probably during any other comparable period in our history.

Most of those decisions will affect the character of this country, and the condition of life of the American people, for decades to come.

And they will affect them for the better.

For Lyndon Baines Johnson has done more than any other single man to bring about a profound change in the relationship between the Government and the people of the United States—a change which made the Government an active champion of the right to equal opportunity, and a better standard of life, for all Americans.

Some people may tend to forget this, and to judge President Johnson's stewardship of the highest office in this land by our tragic military involvement in Vietnam.

I believe that history will be much more objective, and kinder, in this respect.

I believe that history will show that the initiatives which he undertook in the field of foreign policy, whether they were based on sound or on questionable advice, did not come from a narrow motive but were intended to strengthen the cause of freedom, and of peace, in the world.

Moreover, history will show that in a time of crisis, President Johnson had the courage to make the most difficult decision of all: to reverse himself, and to renounce the office of the Presidency, for the sake of reaching peace.

Nearly 5 years later, as he rests in his beloved Texas soil, the results of that momentous decision are at hand: a ceasefire has been signed in Vietnam and, hopefully, the cause of peace in Indochina is gaining momentum.

It is sad indeed that the man who

turned our involvement in the direction of peace is not here to see the fruition of his hopes.

The singular courage which President Johnson displayed in March of 1968 was characteristic of his approach to the basic and controversial issues of our age.

Time and again, he withstood public rancor and abuse, risking his political career for the sake of the poor, the forgotten, and the dispossessed.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as a Representative of a district which has experienced its share of sorrow and hardship, I have admired his compassion for the less fortunate at home and abroad; his deep sense of fairness and justice; and his full commitment to the highest principles for which the United States has stood for nearly two centuries.

These parts of his record, these outstanding achievements, shall serve as the finest testament that any President could leave to his countrymen.

We are fortunate that Lyndon B. Johnson lived in our time; and we sorrow at his passing.

To Mrs. Johnson, and to the members of our late President's family, Mrs. Morgan and I wish to extend our sincerest condolences.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, there was a man among us. And now he is gone.

He stood taller, reached wider, worked and fought harder, talked and cajoled and persuaded and listened better than the rest.

His thoughts, his ideas, his plans were greater and more generous than most. And his energy, his pounding, driving energy, it was as the strength of ten.

And there were those—some in admiration, some in mockery—who said he was larger than life.

And now he is gone. His body lies in the ground, in unaccustomed stillness. His mind, his heart, his energy no longer churn with thoughts, feelings, and action. He is at rest.

But even in death, he stands tall. And now there are many—all in admiration, none in mockery—who say he is larger than life.

For Lyndon Johnson has not left the company of his fellow Americans. His life was too big to be circumscribed by a day of birth at one end and a day of death at the other. His life and his spirit live on not just in our memory, but in the real world he did so much to build and in the millions of men and women who inhabit his structure.

Other Presidents gave us the words of emancipation and the promise of reconstruction. Lyndon Johnson gave us its reality.

Other Presidents gave us the hope of health protection and better education. Lyndon Johnson gave us its actuality.

Other Presidents gave us eloquence and agendas. Lyndon Johnson gave us hospitals, and houses, and national parks, and schools, and roads, and better cities, and dignity in our old age and opportunity in our youth.

And when we partake in any of these promises he made into reality, he shall live on in us.

He was an alchemist of dreams, trans-

muting the fragile stuff on which dreams are made into the tough, pragmatic substance of which Federal law and Federal policy is built. It may not be perfect but you can see it, touch it, use it, test it, live with it or improve it.

These are two sentences of Lyndon Johnson's that I shall never forget. They are plain words rather than poetry. But, how moving they were when he said them and how timely they are now. And both reflect what was really his favorite pronouns—not "I" and "me," but "us" and "we."

"Let us continue." He said that when he assumed the leadership of this Nation.

"We shall overcome." He said that when he assumed the role of its conscience.

And now he is gone. And we are left to carry on. But we are not alone. We are not without him.

For he is the rock upon which we shall build a greater society.

Let us continue. And surely we shall overcome.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss Lyndon Johnson probably more than we realize today.

Those of us who knew him and worked with him and supported him will miss his vision, his compassion, his legislative intuition and skills that moved ideas into reality.

But even more, our citizens will miss him—the poor, the sick, the old, the disadvantaged—all of those who had a friend as President who was determined to do what he could to turn the vast resources of our country toward doing what is right for the people.

I only wish that the tribute of today, the vast outpouring of recognition of the man he was, of the things he achieved, could have been expressed in his lifetime.

Harry Truman, who left the Presidency some 20 years before his death, benefited from the study and evaluation and finally, the general recognition that he indeed was one of our great Presidents.

I have no doubt that 20 years from now the scholars and historians who evaluate the Johnson years will give him the highest marks as a man and as a leader during most trying times.

President Johnson confronted the critical and fast-moving events of his day with the determination to make the decisions that would serve the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

I am glad that I was able to support him during these critical years and I remember with pride his letting me know on more than one occasion that I was one of those he could depend on and rely on.

Mrs. Johnson and I will miss him. We extend our affection and best wishes to his family.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in this tribute. While anything I could say at this point would be redundant because our Speaker, majority leader, minority leader, and members of the Texas delegation have already most appropriately expressed the feeling of Americans. However, I also

want to take this occasion to announce that I am today introducing a bill to designate the Interstate Highway System as the Rayburn-Johnson Highway System. These great leaders were responsible for devising a method and a means for building this system which is almost completed and links all of the United States today.

There were many proposals under which most of the money would have gone for interest payments, and periodic infusions of money followed by slow-downs would have amounted to a no-plan plan. But these great leaders, Sam Rayburn as Speaker of the House and Lyndon Johnson as leader of the Senate, saw the need and in a great exercise of leadership devised a successful plan for accomplishing the objective, using the resources of the Federal and State Governments as well as great private expertise. Both great leaders have now passed on and I think it is most appropriate at this time that the system be named the Rayburn-Johnson Highway System.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the dean of the House of Representatives for securing this time on the House floor today for himself and other Members to pay tribute to our former colleague and departed President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

During the 79th Congress, which was my second term, I served on the Naval Affairs Committee with Congressman Lyndon Johnson. I became acquainted with him as a co-member of this committee and have always admired his ability, not only as a legislator but also his great service in the U.S. Senate, particularly as leader of the Senate. Lyndon Johnson's leadership in the Senate was outstanding. His ability as legislative leader was recognized by all Members of that body, as well as Members of the House. He was a master in the art of legislative compromise which resulted in the passage of many legislative bills for the benefit of humanity and the Nation.

At the 1960 Democratic Convention, when John F. Kennedy was nominated, he greatly aided the Democratic ticket nationally by becoming a candidate for Vice President which resulted in a great Democratic victory throughout the Nation.

After the unfortunate tragedy to President Kennedy, at Dallas, Tex., Vice President Johnson was sworn in as President and carried on the various programs which President Kennedy had sponsored during his 1½ years as our Executive and he enacted many additional legislative programs. He exhibited the same outstanding ability as an Executive that he displayed as a legislative leader of the Senate.

During his almost two terms as President of the United States, he accomplished more than any President in history with the possible exception of President Franklin Roosevelt in successfully placing upon the Federal statute books more progressive legislation than any President in the history of our country.

The Civil Rights legislation which had been debated, postponed, stalled, fili-

bustered, and neglected for generations was enacted into law through the extraordinary persuasion and finesse of Lyndon Johnson. Housing legislation, social security expansion, medicare, health, rural, and labor bills were enacted and expanded during his regime in the White House.

His patriotism and dedication to his country and his sense of sincerity and responsibility toward all segments of our citizenry was unquestioned. I, along with other members of congressional committees was invited to the White House by President Johnson to participate in his ceremonies of signing many important bills for the benefit of the impoverished and the middle- and low-income population of the United States.

Lyndon Johnson was a common man who could occupy the highest office in the world with dignity, ability, and not lose the common touch because he as a youngster and student in grade school, high school and college mingled with all stratas of society in his native Texas. Even as President of the United States when meeting friends in the White House or at State functions he always had time to stop and converse and greet old-time friends from all segments of life.

The Nation for generations to come will be enriched and benefited by the long public service of Lyndon Baines Johnson through his sagacity and foresight in fighting for principles that would be beneficial to all segments of our Nation's population.

When President Johnson's casket was flown to Washington and placed in the rotunda of the Capitol tens of thousands of his adoring public marched by and paid tribute to his memory during the afternoon and night after the ceremonial tribute. I wish to join with all our citizens in extending this farewell tribute to a great leader and extend sympathy to his wife, family, and relatives in their bereavement.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1952 when the Democrats had a fine candidate for President of the United States in Gov. Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, the attacks on President Harry S. Truman had become so bitter and mean that those who were masterminding the Stevenson campaign decided to make a particular point of disassociating the Stevenson candidacy from the Truman administration, on the assumption that Mr. Truman was an unpopular President. But regardless of what was being said about him at the time by his political enemies, President Truman had deeply impressed the American people with his sincerity and his compassion and his courage, and as the years went by history more and more accorded him the greatness he had earned in office. Had he run for reelection in 1952, I am sure he would have won.

And if Lyndon B. Johnson had run for reelection in 1968, I am sure he would have won, too, despite the attacks which were then being made upon him and his administration. For he, like Truman, had had the courage to fight for the kind of legislation which the people of the United States wanted and needed, and his achievements in the fields of health, safety, consumer protection, economic

opportunity, civil rights, natural resource development, transportation, conservation, and economic expansion were of such vast scope that it will take us years to appreciate their real significance.

His decision not to run for reelection reflected his consuming desire to find a way to terminate the tragic war in Vietnam, since his own efforts in this respect had succeeded only in bringing the Paris peace talks into existence but with no prospect at that time of any agreement. So he relinquished an office in which he was a superb practitioner of the art and science of government—an office he filled with great distinction and effectiveness—in the hope that his stepping down would enable his successor to achieve the peace which eluded him. The bitterness over the war so clouded the political atmosphere of 1968 that to many articulate Americans, Lyndon Johnson was a failure as a President and a man to be vilified. But the outpouring of genuine grief which marked his premature death demonstrated the deep regard in which he was held as a President and as a man by the millions upon millions of Americans of every race, creed, color, and economic station who recognized the tangible results of his unprecedented achievements as a President of and by and for the people. Presidents Truman and Johnson had much in common in that respect.

A few days before President Johnson left office, an attempt was made to bring into focus the remarkable achievements of "The Johnson Years" in a book presented to President Johnson at a dinner in New York City on January 13, 1969. I felt deeply honored to be the only Member of Congress to contribute to this presentation volume. My assignment was to discuss in a few short paragraphs the contributions made by the Johnson Presidency to the protection of the American consumer.

Now, in looking over that volume of capsule evaluations of the Johnson Presidency; by a score or so of prominent Americans who were closely associated with Johnson administration objectives but including many who were not a part of the Federal Government themselves, I am struck by the incisiveness of the judgments expressed 4 years ago as to what his great achievements really were.

TRIBUTE BY JAMES MAC GREGOR BURNS

The historian, James MacGregor Burns of Williams College, summed up the stature of the man in this overview of the Johnson Presidency which began the volume:

OVERVIEW

(By James MacGregor Burns)

Last winter I stepped out onto the balcony of the White House in the company of the President of the United States. In the distance the figure of Thomas Jefferson gleamed like a jewel in his marble pantheon—and I thought of the greatness of the first Democratic President of the United States and of the littleness of some of those who attacked him. We were standing on "Truman's balcony"—and I remembered the absurd criticism by those who were dead set against any kind of change, whether of architecture or of policy.

History has a way of siphoning into oblivion the petty and the irrelevant and of measuring up the real stature of a man. His-

tory does not supply one final verdict but many assessments. Those assessments add up to as final a judgment as a man can receive on earth.

Some historians will remember Lyndon B. Johnson as the man who declared total war on poverty, deprivation, disease, and ignorance—and who threw himself, day and night, into the leadership of that battle with every ounce of energy he possessed.

Other historians will remember him as the man who—like Jackson and Wilson and Truman—suffered criticism because he stuck to the course that he believed was right; a man who endured attacks with the patience and tolerance of a Lincoln; and as a man who risked the consensus he cherished because he put duty and conscience over an easy popularity.

Still other historians will remember him as the man from the South and from the Senate who made a personal and political commitment to full opportunity for black Americans—a commitment that stamped him as truly the President of all the people and a symbol of hope for the whole nation.

Students of government, like myself, will remember Lyndon Johnson for a further and special reason. He was the first President to recognize fully that our basic social ills are so rooted in encrusted attitudes and stubborn social structures that no single solution or dramatic crusade will solve them; the first President to see clearly that only a total attack across the widest front, with every possible weapon, would bring a breakthrough; and the first President to propose basic institutional changes to make a total attack possible.

No one defined the problem better than the President himself: "Our democracy cannot remain static, a prisoner to the past . . . Government itself has the continuing obligation—second to no other—to keep the machinery of public participation functioning smoothly and to improve it where necessary so that democracy remains a vital and vibrant institution."

OTHER CONTRIBUTORS TO THE "JOHNSON YEARS"

Mr. Speaker, there followed then a series of summarizations of Johnson administration achievements in many different fields, accompanied by a list of landmark laws enacted at President Johnson's request and with his vigorous participation.

Those who contributed short chapters for the presentation volume and their affiliations at the time were:

Foreign Affairs—McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation; National Defense—Robert S. McNamara, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; The Economy—Walter Heller, University of Minnesota; Civil Rights—Ralph Ellison; Poverty—Carl B. Stokes, Mayor of Cleveland; Education—John W. Gardner, Chairman, the Urban Coalition; Health—Michael E. DeBakey, Baylor College of Medicine; Housing and Urban Development—Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman of the board, Kaiser Industries Corp.; Farming and Rural America—Herschel D. Newsom, past master of the National Grange; Older Americans—Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Transportation—Ben W. Heineman, president, Northwest Industries, Inc.; Law and Justice—Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1949–67; Excellence in Government—Kermit Gordon, President, the Brookings Institution; Federal State Partnership—Nelson A. Rockefeller,

Governor of New York; Business Government Partnership—Henry Ford II, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co.; Labor Government Partnership—George Meany, President of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Quality of the Environment—Laurance S. Rockefeller, Chairman, Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty;

Protecting the Consumer—LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Member of Congress, chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Committee on Banking and Currency; Space—James E. Webb, former Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; The Arts and Humanities—Roger L. Stevens, Chairman, National Council of the Arts.

A FEW OF THE LANDMARK JOHNSON LAWS

Mr. Speaker, the mere listing in this book of the remarkable laws and administrative actions taken during the Johnson years in the White House in each of these fields is almost overpowering. Included among the consumer protection listings are:

The Truth in Securities Act of 1965; the Traffic and Highway Safety Act of 1966; the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966; the Child Protection Act of 1966; the Flammable Fabric Amendment of 1967; the Product Safety Commission Act of 1967; the Fire and Safety Research Act of 1967; the Truth in Lending Act of 1968; the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act of 1968; the Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968; the Hazardous Radiation Act of 1968; and establishment of consumer representation in the White House and Justice Department.

Many, many more consumer measures are listed under other headings in the volume, such as medicare, the food stamp program, the Water Quality and Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Acts, innovative new housing programs, the Law Enforcement Assistance and the Safe Streets Acts, and numerous others. The Johnson record in office matches or exceeds that of any other administration in the history of our Nation in working effectively for the well-being of all citizens.

President Johnson not only built upon the accomplishments of such illustrious predecessors as Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy but blazed new paths in many areas of economic improvement and the health of the American people.

LAWS IN WHICH ALL AMERICANS CAN TAKE PRIDE

In the consumer field particularly, President Johnson was outstandingly successful. In my tribute to his administration's consumer record, in my contribution to the book presented to him on January 13, 1969, I stated:

From the standpoint of the well-being of the American people as consumers, the past five years have been the most dramatic and productive in our entire history. And the credit for this remarkable change in the consumer's long-neglected status belongs entirely to President Lyndon B. Johnson. The results will stand always as a tribute to his deep concern for people, and his determination to assure a better, safer, healthier, happier life for all Americans.

From his first days in the White House, President Johnson initiated a drive for far-

reaching and long-needed consumer laws which was as effective as it was unrelenting. Furthermore, through establishment of the White House office of Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, he brought the Voice of the Consumer into the highest councils of government. To this office, he named first Esther Peterson and then Betty Furness, dynamic women of outstanding ability, who succeeded in creating throughout the Federal Government, and in the States as well, a new sense of public agency awareness of government's obligations to consumers.

As one who has made consumer causes my main concern in the Congress, I am convinced that without President Johnson's wholehearted leadership in this field, the impressive catalogue of landmark consumer laws of the past five years could never have been achieved. These are laws in which all Americans can take pride.

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always treasure the inscription in the volume he sent to me, thanking me for helping to "give the consumer a voice." Had it not been for the vigor with which he galvanized his entire administration into support of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 and other measures which I sponsored which were bitterly opposed at the time, I know they would never have become law, or would have been so watered down as to be virtually nothing more than shells.

Franklin D. Roosevelt once said the American people had a "rendezvous with destiny." Lyndon B. Johnson exemplified that concept in his untiring drive to make this a better country for every citizen. We and those who come after us will all be in his debt for the achievements of his Presidency.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and with Americans everywhere in mourning the loss of a great American President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, whose passing on January 22 came within a month of the death of another great President, Harry S. Truman, on December 26, 1972.

Both former Presidents will long be remembered for the role they played in providing medical care for the needy in America; President Truman for his proposal of a medical aid program to the Congress in 1949 and President Johnson, who fought for the enactment of medicare by the Congress and signed it into law in 1965 with President Truman by his side.

Historians of the future cannot escape linking the names of these two former great Presidents, Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson, to the epoch leadership they played in placing the first meaningful civil rights law on the statute books since President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation one century earlier.

Harry S. Truman, as President, had the courage to propose civil rights to the Congress in 1948; and Lyndon B. Johnson, as Senate majority leader, floor managed the first voting rights legislation onto the lawbooks in 1957, and as President saw the fulfillment of that goal by signing the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson was

indeed one of America's great public servants, as a congressional secretary, as a Member of this House, as a Senator from Texas and Senate majority leader, as Vice President and President of the United States. All of his years in Washington were devoted to helping the poor, the sick, the uneducated, the oppressed, and those whom society had forgotten or ignored. His public life was filled with controversy because he was a man of decision, and a man who cared.

One of Lyndon B. Johnson's close friends and confidants on the Washington scene for many years, former Supreme Court Associate Justice Abe Fortas, summed it up eloquently when he said of the former President:

Above all, let us remember that he was a large man, of enormous strength and intense dedication. He was a man alive, vital, eager, restless, warm and passionate. He was America. He was America's frontier, without which America is just another tired, retreating society, headed towards mankind's end and not towards the fulfillment of its dreams.

Let us not lose our way. Let us honor him by continuing the ascent which he began.

Mr. Speaker, the ascent to which former Justice Fortas refers reads like a litany of Lyndon Baines Johnson's legislative accomplishments: civil rights, medicare, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Higher Education Act, Older Americans Act, the War on Poverty, the Immigration Act abolishing discriminatory national origins quota system, Mental Health, Heart, Cancer, and Stroke Acts, housing programs and model cities, the Water and Air Pollution Acts, the Truth in Packaging Act, Auto and Highway Safety Acts, Child Protection Act, minimum wage and social security liberalization, increased veterans benefits and a new GI Education Act, the Wholesome Meat Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Age Discrimination Act, Vocational Training Act, and the Library Services and Construction Act.

President Nixon aptly said in his tribute that President Johnson's concept of the American dream was no catch phrase to Lyndon Baines Johnson:

He believed in America—in what America could mean to all of its citizens and what America could mean to the world. In the service of that faith, he gave himself completely.

Mr. Speaker, the many accomplishments of Lyndon Baines Johnson speak for themselves.

It must have been gratifying for him to know before his untimely death that in the 4 short years since he left the White House, his long-sought quest for peace in Southeast Asia was coming to fruition as a result of the Paris peace talks he initiated; and that his fellow countrymen were favorably viewing his Presidency with a new perspective as one of enlightenment, progress, and compassion for less-fortunate Americans.

As we mourn the passing of this physically large and dynamic leader of unshakeable courage, we are grateful for the life God gave him and for the useful purposes to which he channeled his every breath and ounce of energy for the benefit of his fellow man. I join my colleagues in offering profound sympathy on behalf of myself and the citizens of the Second

Congressional District of Massachusetts to President Johnson's beloved wife, Lady Bird, and to their daughters, Lynda and Luci, in their great hour of sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my tribute at this time editorials from the Springfield, Mass., Daily News of January 23, and the Boston Globe of January 24, and former Justice Fortas' tribute to President Johnson in the New York Times of January 25, 1973:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Jan. 23, 1973]

LYNDON JOHNSON FOUGHT FOR RIGHTS

It is fitting that, in his last public speech little more than a month ago, Lyndon Baines Johnson spoke out once more for civil rights—the area of human need in which the 36th President of the United States made his greatest contribution to our society.

Pictures of that civil rights symposium at the LBJ Library in Austin gave the initial impression that Mr. Johnson had aged suddenly—faster than his 64 years should allow. But the lasting impression was that the passage of time and withdrawal from public life had not dimmed Mr. Johnson's abiding passion for equal rights for his fellow Americans.

He spoke softly but with deep conviction as he appealed for a unified effort to advance new civil rights programs and told opposing factions at that symposium: "We shall overcome!"

Indeed, the tall Texan with the Southern drawl and the down-to-earth manner did overcome. If the time was ripe in the mid-1960s for passage of the first meaningful civil rights legislation in America's history, it is to President Johnson's great credit that he was the unifying and moving force responsible for getting this historic legislation through Congress.

Mr. Johnson's social legislation, the outgrowth of his Great Society policies, was unquestionably the distinguishing feature of his administration—just as, in contrast, the war in Vietnam was his political albatross.

Without Vietnam, history would, most likely, rank Mr. Johnson as one of America's greatest Presidents. Despite Vietnam, historians will, in assessing his White House years, have to consider that Mr. Johnson's record of legislative accomplishment in Congress is unequalled in recent times.

Lyndon Johnson was a consummate politician. No President was more adept at maneuvering Congress into doing his bidding—a mastery of the high political art of compromise developed in his days as a congressman and senator and refined during his eight years as Senate majority leader.

Unfortunately, Mr. Johnson's skills in behind-the-scenes political maneuvering were not translated to his public image. He was not a good public speaker. And it was easy to let the recited speeches and the Texas drawl divert attention from the significance of his message, and even obscure his deep sense of dedication to the achievement of a better society for all Americans.

Lyndon Johnson developed his political skills early on. It seemed that politics and LBJ were a natural combination. In contrast to Harry S. Truman who labored for years in the political vineyards before achieving recognition and success, Lyndon Johnson first appeared on the Washington scene, as a secretary to a congressman, at age 23. He became a congressman before he was 30 and advanced to the U.S. Senate slightly more than a decade later. He was only 46 when he was chosen by his colleagues for the most prestigious and powerful Senate job, majority leader.

But if his early political brilliance and his legislative accomplishment as Democratic leader in the Senate eminently qualified him for advancement to the presidency, this advancement came under tragic circum-

stances—the assassination in Dallas of President John F. Kennedy on Nov. 22, 1963.

Again, it is to Mr. Johnson's credit that, recognizing the depth of the nation's loss and the very painful transition of power in the White House, he devoted his efforts, first, to carrying on President Kennedy's unfinished programs.

Lyndon Johnson will be remembered for many things during his five years and two months as President. He fashioned his own Great Society. He instituted a national War on Poverty. He carried on the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, and put the full weight of the federal government behind an effort to improve the lot of millions of Americans who had never before been given the opportunity for better schools, better housing, participation in the election process, and, in fact, equal rights in all areas of American life.

On July 2, 1964, President Johnson signed the civil rights bill—opening up to blacks all hotels, motels, restaurants and other businesses serving the public. This historic law also guaranteed equal job opportunities for all.

But, LBJ will also be remembered as the President who got America deeper and deeper into an increasingly unpopular war in Vietnam and, try as he might, could not get us out.

Under mounting criticism and attack, even from his own Democratic party, Mr. Johnson did not seek re-election to a second full term, opting instead to devote his final months in office to efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam.

This peace never came. And it will remain a paradox of history that this man who labored so hard and so successfully to advance human and humane causes at home was, to reverse the saying, a prophet without honor in Vietnam. He was a man of peace who was hailed for his concern for the needs of Americans, and, simultaneously, a man of war—reviled by many for his hard-line war policies in a distant land.

History may record that this skilled politician's greatest triumph was his smashing election victory over Sen. Barry M. Goldwater in 1964. And history will doubtless point to his summit meeting at Glassboro in 1967 with Russian Premier Kosygin as a highpoint of the Johnson presidential years.

But, the thought persists that the finest hour for Lyndon Baines Johnson came last Dec. 12 in that civil rights symposium in Austin when—his shoulders stooped, his hair graying, and his steps almost hesitating—he returned to the rostrum to mediate a civil rights dispute and appeal for a cause in which he believed so deeply and so sincerely.

Americans and the entire world are shocked by President Johnson's sudden and premature death at age 64.

We mourn his passing. And we pay tribute to this man who fought so courageously and untiringly for civil rights, and for a better America.

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 24, 1973]

L. B. J.—WE SHALL OVERCOME

The entire nation has reason to mourn the death of Lyndon B. Johnson, which has come so soon after the passing of our only other former President, Harry S. Truman.

We say this notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Johnson presided over the most unpopular war in American history, the one about which President Nixon addressed the nation last night.

But there was also another Lyndon Johnson. He played a leading role—and we were surprised to find no reference to it in the pages of print about him yesterday—in keeping us out of war in Vietnam back in April of 1954. He was Senate Majority Leader then, and John Foster Dulles called eight congressional leaders before Adm. Arthur W. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and told him President Eisenhower wanted

a joint resolution permitting air and naval attacks.

Johnson vigorously opposed it, and we stayed out of war for seven or eight more years. Then, tragically, it came. He did not start it, but might have stopped it. To his great credit he did finally stare down his generals in March of 1968 and refuse the massive reinforcement of US troops they were seeking.

By then he had lost the majority that in 1964 had given him what still stands today after President Nixon's recent landslide as the largest percentage of the popular vote ever given to a presidential candidate. And by the time of his decision not to run again, he had accomplished much with the support that vote gave him in Congress.

It was this other Lyndon Johnson who, even before that, persuaded Congress to enact in 1964 the most meaningful Civil Rights Law in a century. And there were other major accomplishments of his campaign for a "Great Society," such as laws giving massive Federal aid to our schools, medical care for the aged and funds for his war on poverty.

He tried to mix the two wars, and they wouldn't mix, any more than guns and butter. This was his tragedy.

Yet there is great hope for the country in much of what he said and did. And surely one of the best farewell addresses was his impromptu speech only last Dec. 12, before a heated audience in Austin, Texas:

"I believe that the essence of government lies with unceasing concern for . . . every individual . . . regardless of color, creed, ancestry, sex or age. . . . To be black, I believe—to one who is black or brown—is to be proud, to be worthy, to be honorable. But to be black in a white society is not to stand on level ground. While the races may stand side by side, whites stand on history's mountain and blacks stand in history's hollow. . . . We must get down to the business of trying to stand black and white on level ground."

It was a most moving speech right down to his very last sentence and very last words: "And if our efforts continue, if our will is strong, if our hearts are right and if courage remains our constant companion then, my fellow Americans, I am confident we shall overcome."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1973]

HE WAS AMERICA

(By Abe Fortas)¹

WASHINGTON.—Let us remember Lyndon Johnson's greatness. Let us remember his love for people. To him, people were not statistics. Each of them was a warm, real, living human being, endowed with the spark of immortality. He could not believe that any of them was less deserving than any other of dignity, of compassion, of a position in the world of mankind.

Let us remember the totality of his dedication to his role, unsparing and unflagging.

Let us remember the fullness of his understanding of his nation, of its roots, its meaning, its mission. Let us remember that he was determined that his nation should fulfill and not frustrate its destiny.

Let us remember that it was he who, risking constituency and traditional friends, vowed faithfulness to the impossible dreams of President Kennedy; and that it was he who made them come true.

Let us remember that he led and drove the nation to a new plateau of humanity; that it was Lyndon Johnson who breathed life and vitality into the mutilated body of our Constitution's noble principles; that it was he who destroyed the ideological ghetto left by

slavery's habits; that it was he who insisted that twenty million black people, too, are entitled to a jury of their peers, to a vote, and to equality of opportunity; that it was he who marshalled the nation's forces in an assault upon a disgraceful poverty; that it was he who committed the nation to the cure of illness and the cause of health; that it was he who dedicated the nation's resources to providing education for all.

Lyndon Johnson transformed his nation. He saw to it that the forgotten people of the New Deal, the blacks and abjectly poor, are no longer forgotten—and this is Lyndon Johnson's achievement.

Let us remember his sad, heartbreaking words about the misery of Vietnam which he inherited: "Peace has eluded me." He sought peace, not victory, in Vietnam; and when the successive application of force did not bring the enemy to the peace table, he gave himself to the cause. In March of 1968 he sacrificed his career and his future, as an earnest of good faith, to further the cause of peace. It was this, as much as any other event, that marked the beginning of the long and agonizing road to an agreement in Vietnam.

Above all, let us remember that he was a large man, of enormous strength and intense dedication. He was a man alive, vital, eager, restless, warm and passionate. He was America. He was America's frontier, without which America is just another tired, retreating society, headed towards mankind's end and not towards the fulfillment of its dreams.

Let us not lose our way. Let us honor him by continuing the ascent which he began.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, like multitudes of people throughout the world, I was deeply saddened by the untimely death of former President Lyndon B. Johnson.

As Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President of the United States, his name will long be remembered for the numerous legislative proposals which were enacted because of his dedication and skill.

Lyndon Johnson was pre-eminently a legislator. As a protégé of the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, he learned the legislative process thoroughly, and developed a unique and exceptional ability to guide complex and difficult proposals through the Congress.

For some years, Mr. Johnson, as Senate majority leader, and Mr. Sam, as Speaker of the House, performed as a legislative team whose effectiveness is unlikely to ever be surpassed.

Lyndon Johnson was a man of the people. He rose from humble origins to become President of the United States, a position which the people of this Nation have entrusted to only 36 others.

During his Presidency he worked day and night with dynamic intensity to make America a better place in which to live. He was particularly concerned about civil rights, education, public health, and improving conditions for the poor. He was a man of great compassion, who was devoted to improving the condition of our less fortunate citizens.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him and working with him will long cherish our association and friendship.

Texas has lost a favorite son. The United States has lost a great leader and a devoted public servant.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnson, and their two daughters, Lynda and Lucy.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yes, I served under L. B. J.—I, along with many of my distinguished colleagues here in this Chamber today. I knew him, however, not only as my President, but also as my friend. He, himself, told me so, during the 1964 Presidential campaign, while driving with me through my home town of Newark, N.J. "I can tell what's in a man's heart," our 36th President would often say, "by looking straight into his eyes." "And you," he said, "I'm looking at you straight, right here," pointing a finger directly at my nose and right between my eyes—"I can tell that you are my friend."

President Lyndon Johnson had a way of saying something which really got through to us. He had a way of making one feel really close, of really drawing one in. He sought loyalty, and at the same time, he gave loyalty. As a great leader, he had the ability to bring together other leaders, to work out together his blueprint to overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice, which had been plaguing, for too long, his people. His style, his nature, his character was strong, intense, tempestuous, earthy. He was a mover and a doer. In a sense, he was overwhelming—so electric, so extremely powerful, yet so compassionate and so filled with great visions and great dreams.

I remember him telephoning in 1966 to congratulate me upon the successful passage of his Open Housing bill in the House. "Pete, this is Lyndon," he said, "Lyndon" . . . No matter when I would come to the White House, he would always make it a point to stop, to introduce me to whomever he was with, and to ask me to come along with him for awhile. I often recall his declaration that first he was a citizen of the world, a human being, then he was an American, and finally he was a Democrat—all in that order. His ability to make each of us feel very special, to make each of us feel we had a most important part to play in the progress of our world, was indeed a most remarkable gift.

On Wednesday, January 24, Haynes Johnson shared his impressions of our late President, with the readers of the Washington Post. Because the "Recollections" of Haynes Johnson touch deeply the hearts of all of us who knew L. B. J. over these many years and because the experience of this author could easily have been our experience had we lunched with President Johnson along with the rest of the Post press corps that Tuesday, April 7, 1970, I would like to enter, at this time, Haynes Johnson's remarks into the body of this Record:

RECOLLECTIONS

(By Haynes Johnson)

Perhaps the most poignant aspect of Lyndon Johnson's death is that this most public man, who was in his element when surrounded by cheering crowds, died alone, calling for help.

His wife, who had stood by him in every crisis and on whom he relied so much, was away. His daughters, grandchildren, cronies and friends whom he loved to regale with his inimitable stories were absent.

He reached for a phone in his bedroom at 3:50 p.m., we are told, and asked for the head of his Secret Service detail. The agent was in a car at the time, so another agent answered

¹Abe Fortas was a close friend of President Johnson and an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

the call. Mr. Johnson asked him to come immediately to the bedroom without saying why.

When the agents arrived, they found the 36th President lying on the floor next to his bed, apparently dead.

His death came quietly, in lonely seclusion, after a stormy life played out so largely in public view.

It is that vibrant life that Washington is recalling today as Lyndon Johnson's body is borne back to the Capitol he once dominated.

While memories are fresh, and before the stories pale, let one last recollection be recorded. It is an account of the last time many of us at The Washington Post saw Lyndon Johnson.

He came to lunch that Tuesday, April 7, 1970. Nearly five hours later he left us all drained, fascinated, enthralled and full of questions that never could be answered or resolved.

Probably none of us present that day could successfully capture or reconstruct all the moods, the language, the mobile expressions or the specific points made. It was, at the least, a virtuoso performance. He was soft, sarcastic, crisp, commanding, anecdotal, colorful—and in the end confounding as always.

Lyndon Johnson was telling us his story, and speaking to his place in history. He was a salesman, and the ex-President came prepared with the goods in the form of stacks of papers marked Top Secret and Top Secret Sensitive. Over and over, he read from the various memoranda, letters and other documents to back up his positions.

In retrospect what was most memorable about his performance was not what he said about the war or other aspects of his presidency. It was the two sides of Lyndon Johnson displayed that day that made the most lasting impression.

It was a subdued, somber Lyndon Johnson who first appeared. He had only recently recovered from a stay in a San Antonio hospital, where he had been admitted suffering from chest pains, and his initial conversation was all about his health. He had aged dramatically.

"He came in a little after 12:30" Richard Harwood wrote immediately after the long luncheon, "looking less tall, less bulky than I had remembered him. His hair was almost completely white and was growing long in the back in the old-fashioned Southern senator style, the way Mendel Rivers wears it."

"His illness showed in his face, I thought, and from the side his skin had the yellowish-gray look you find on extremely sick men. His hands were mottled with crimson blotches; there was a scab on the back of one finger and lots of freckles, all of which brought images of an old man."

Lyndon Johnson's own manner reinforced the impression. He seemed tired, withdrawn, quiet, and appeared preoccupied with problems of his health. He was on a diet of 850 calories a day, he said, and he was getting back his strength gradually. There had been quite a bit of pain this time, he said. His trouble really had begun the previous spring when he was working on his ranch.

He liked to get out and take his exercise, he went on slowly. One day he was laying lengths of pipe, lifting and placing them in the mud. Suddenly he became short of breath and began to experience slight pains in his chest. He remembered stopping his work without realizing quite why.

For nearly the next hour at the luncheon, he continued in the same vein. He was the elder statesman, above partisanship.

There was none of the old remembered Johnson fire and flash, none of the earthy anecdotes about men and events. He would not comment on Richard Nixon. He preferred to speak philosophically, it seemed, to talk about the memoirs on which he was working each day, to reflect on the higher problems of the presidency (he favored a single

six-year term, and he didn't think being a lame-duck President necessarily reduced a chief executive's power).

But gradually his manner and mood changed. He began talking about Vietnam, and suddenly he was more vigorous and assertive. He folded and unfolded his napkin, began leaning forward, rocking back and forth in his chair, speaking first softly and then loudly. Now he was, clearly, LBJ.

To quote Harwood's recollections—one of many we all composed that day—"As he talked he seemed to take on another appearance. The pallor and signs of sickness went away and all of a sudden you were sitting with a vigorous, commanding, strong man whose mind was so clear, so well-organized, so quick that you instantly became aware of the power of his personality, of the ability to dominate and persuade and overwhelm."

Much of what he said that day about Vietnam has since appeared in his book. But what was most fascinating was not what he said about the war and other problems, but how he said it.

LBJ was overpowering. He thumped on the table, moved back and forth vigorously, grimaced, licked his lips, gestured with his arms, slumped back into his seat, switched from a sharp to a soft story, and kept the conversation going from the moment he sat down at the dining table until hours later when his wife called The Post and sent in a note reminding him he should come home and rest.

As he reminisced, going back into his childhood and then on through his entire political career, he became more colloquial and more Texan. His Daddy used to whip him with a razor strop, he said, and "It hurt him more than it hurt me. But that's the kind of thing you have to do in a family." In a way, it was the same as being President: there were certain things you had to do that were unpopular, but you did them for the public benefit.

His language, and phrases, were picturesque:

"So I took a cold belly buster . . ."

"Anyone who's smart enough to pour water from a boot . . ."

"And Dick Russell said, 'I've been to the duck blind with the man. I know him. I may not agree with him on everything, but he's a good man, he cares for the people, and he'll try to do what's right (referring to his plans to nominate his friend, Judge Homer Thornberry of Texas, to the Supreme Court).'"

"Those Laotians can't stop anybody. They just stand around throwing water at each other . . ."

"MacArthur pinned a medal on me for heroism. It looks good on my chest"—here, he fingered the Silver Star citation in his coat lapel—"but it's a good thing they couldn't see what that flight did to my pants."

"Now, I don't want you good people to have a heart attack here at this good table eating this good food. And if any of you has heart trouble, you better take nitroglycerine now, because the first person to urge me to halt the bombing was Walt Rostow . . ."

He mentioned his wife, Lady Bird, and said, "She always knew how to handle me." Then he told how he had decided, in advance of the 1964 Democratic convention, that he was going to announce publicly that he would not be a candidate that year. But Bird, he said, talked him out of it. She told him she knew he would like to leave the White House, but that he would miss being where things were happening, and where he had a chance to accomplish everything he had worked for in 30 years of politics.

But that wasn't why he should run, he said she told him. "It would make it seem as though you were running away. Your friends would hang their heads in shame, your enemies would dance and rejoice."

He recalled a story from his early days as a young Texas congressman. Elliott Roosevelt, the President's son, came to him on behalf of electrical power interests in Texas, he said. This was at a time when LBJ was fighting the power companies there.

"I always liked Elliott," he said. "He was a good boy. But they'd got to him, and so he came down there to see me and asked me to ease up on them."

"He said he had talked with his Daddy and his Daddy wanted him to tell me that he agreed. So I said, 'All right, I'll do that, Elliott. But before I do, I want you to do one thing for me. I want you to go back to your Daddy and tell him I'll do it if he wants me to, but ask him to write me a letter, in his own hand, saying what he wants, and then sign it.' Well, I could see Elliott wasn't expecting that. I'd kind of roughed him up. So he said, 'Why do you want father to write you a letter? I've already seen him, and he wants you to do this.'"

"And I told him, 'Well, Elliott, it's this way: when I do what your Daddy wants and I come back to Texas they're going to run me out of the state. Now the nearest border is 150 miles away and that's over the bridge to Mexico. And I figure I can get to that bridge before they get me, and when I'm half way over, and on the Mexican side, I want to be able to turn around and stop and hold up that letter showing the signature of Franklin Delano Roosevelt so everyone can read it. Like this.'"

He held up an imaginary piece of paper, relishing the role he was playing and the laughter it inspired.

LBJ was full of such performances. He acted out various roles. He mimicked people: Clark Clifford sitting up straight and dignified like this (he sat up very straight and very solemnly in his chair and folded his arms over his chest); Hubert Humphrey and HHH's reaction to the news LBJ was going to renounce the presidency in 1968: "I told him not to go off to Mexico, but I guess he didn't believe me." LBJ gave a "hee-hee-hee-hee" rendition to show how silly Humphrey thought the idea.

Finally, after nearly five hours, Lady Bird's note was sent into the dining room asking him to come home. Lyndon Johnson became serious. "I want you to know," he said, "no matter how we differ about things, I feel I am at the table of friends, and I want to thank you for letting me come and visit with you."

Here he was, he went on, in the twilight of his years, among good friends. He had one more story to tell. It was one Sam Rayburn used to tell about a small Texas town.

Once, when Rayburn was just beginning as a politician, everyone important in that town had turned him down when he was looking for a place to spend the night—the banker, the newspaper editor, the judge. Finally a little old blacksmith said he would be glad to take Rayburn in for the night. Years later, after Rayburn had become famous and powerful, he came back to that town. Everyone clamored for him, the banker, the newspaper editor, the judge. They all wanted the honor of his staying with them.

No, Rayburn told each to his face, he didn't want to stay with them. But was that little old blacksmith still there. Yes, he was. Bring him to me, Rayburn commanded. When the blacksmith came, Rayburn told him: "Jeeter, I'd like to spend the night at your house if you'll have me." The blacksmith did, and kept Rayburn up all night talking. When Rayburn said he had to go to sleep, for he had a busy day ahead of him, tears welled up in the blacksmith's eyes.

"Mr. Sam, I'd just like to talk to you all night."

And that, Lyndon Baines Johnson said, was the way he felt about his friends at The Post.

There were some bitter-end Johnson critics among those of us around that dining table, but when LBJ stood up to begin shaking each person's hand to say good-bye we all spontaneously burst into applause. Some of us had tears in our eyes.

We thought we might never see his likes again. And perhaps we were right.

Mr. Johnson stated:

The problem of an American President is not the problem of doing what's right. The President's problem is knowing what's right.

President Johnson felt he had "so much to preserve, so much to protect and so much to believe in." "I love this country," he would often say. And, all who heard his words were affected by this sincerity and this love. He wrote, as we well know, one of the greatest chapters of social legislation in our history. Now that the chapter has been written, it is left in our hands to breathe life into his words. In the *Choices We Face*, written by L. B. J. after he had left the White House, he reminded us:

None of what we have achieved is self executing. Programs that express commitment to people must be funded. An education act cannot teach a single child. A housing act cannot give shelter to a single family, nor can a manpower act provide a single job, nor can a civil rights act give one human being the dignity and respect he deserves. The real test of our commitment is whether we are willing to achieve over a period of years what those acts only promise. The certain fact is that there is no turning back. No closing that door. We can weather our troubles now because the kind of America we seek is right and because the alternative, denying just hopes and risking a divided and hostile nation is intolerable.

Thus, President Lyndon Baines Johnson, in these words, let us know that he knew what was right. Ours is now the task to keep these promises, to make his vision of the Great Society live. For if his legacy of social, economic, and racial justice is to have any real meaning and any great effect on the people of this Nation, ours is now the task to do what is right.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about a great President who left us recently, the 36th President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Every American will carry in his own mind's eye his personal reminiscences of the Johnson Presidency. To me, the quality that marked the Johnson Presidency more than any other was a passionate concern for the little people of America. I am firmly convinced that Lyndon Johnson will be regarded by history as one of the great domestic Presidents of all time. True, some of the programs pushed by President Johnson have had administrative problems, but those programs defined the Nation's purpose to make available to all Americans opportunities which have not been equally shared in the past.

I think the one sentence which best sums up the Johnson administration in domestic affairs was uttered by one of Lyndon Johnson's political heroes President Franklin D. Roosevelt who said in 1936:

Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

Lyndon Johnson's record shows that he remembered that statement. Let us hope that as we go about our work in this next session of Congress we will remember them as well.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson will undoubtedly be recorded in history as one of our truly great Presidents. More than any other President, he advanced the causes of civil rights and aid to the poor and down-trodden. During his administration, older Americans saw medicare become a reality to save them from crushing medical expenses. Headstart gave disadvantaged preschool children a chance to compete with others on a more nearly equal basis. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 bears monumental witness to President Johnson's concern that all young Americans be afforded the chance to learn.

His proudest accomplishments were in the field of civil rights, where he fought for the enactment of law after law—the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fair Housing Act of 1968—all calculated to eradicate what he called "an injustice of decades and centuries."

Mr. Speaker, the name of Lyndon B. Johnson will always have a special meaning for Hawaii and its people, for without his leadership in the U.S. Senate when he was majority leader, Hawaii's bid for statehood would not have succeeded when it did. The East-West Center on the University of Hawaii campus will stand as a special living monument to President Johnson for it was he who almost single-handedly enacted legislation for its creation after being convinced of its desirability by Hawaii's then Delegate to Congress, John A. Burns.

As I stood at his graveside at the L. B. J. Ranch in Texas, listening to the singing of the Battle Hymn of the Republic, I recalled my accompanying President Johnson on his first visit to Hawaii on Air Force One as President. He was so grateful to the people of the Island State for having given him one of the greatest pluralities of all the 50 States in the 1964 election, that he kept repeating to me, "Sparky, I love your people." I kept responding, "They all love you too, Mr. President." The people of Hawaii loved Lyndon Johnson and will miss him dearly. As one who was fortunate enough to experience the warmth of his friendship, I feel the emptiness which follows the loss of a dear friend.

All America will miss Lyndon Johnson. His irresistible manner, his commitment to equality for all Americans, his personal anguish over a war that eventually caused him to step down in order to bring peace, make him a man deserving of admiration and praise.

At Temple, Tex., last September 16, Mr. Johnson delivered a speech that may stand as his final farewell to the Nation he served—a deeply moving reaffirmation of faith. The following article from the January 23, 1973, Honolulu Star-Bulletin is adapted from that speech and I believe my colleagues will find it inspiring.

To Lady Bird Johnson and other members of the Johnson family, I extend my deepest condolences. They can be sure

that their personal loss is shared by millions of people around the world.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Jan. 23, 1973]

AS THE DAYS DWINDLE DOWN

(NOTE.—At Temple, Tex., last Sept. 16 Lyndon Johnson delivered a speech that may stand as his final farewell to this nation—a deeply moving reaffirmation of faith. The following article is adapted from it.)

TEMPLE, TEX.—With the coming of September each year, we are reminded, as the song says, that the days are dwindling down to a precious few. By the calendar, we know that soon the green leaves of summer will begin to brown; the chill winds of winter will begin to blow; and—before we are ready for the end to come the year will be gone.

If we permit our thoughts to dwell upon this perspective, these days can become a melancholy season.

As it is with the calendar, so it sometimes seems to be with our country and its system. For there are those among us who would have us believe that America has come to its own September. That our days are dwindling down to a precious few. That the green leaves of our best season are turning brown and will soon be falling to the ground. That before long we will feel the first chill wind of a long American winter—and that our nation's stand as mankind's "last best hope" will be done.

For those who preach this prophecy—and for those who believe it—this period of our affairs can only be a melancholy season. But it is to that mood—and to the perceptions which foster it—that I want to address my remarks today.

Over the course of a long, full and gratifying life, I have seen many Septembers and have known many autumns. In public service—and in private life—I have experienced a full measure of unwelcome winters. Yet melancholy is not a mood which I have ever allowed to weigh for long upon my spirits.

I live—as I have always worked—by the faith that with each passing day, we are always approaching nearer to the beginning of a new springtime. It is by that perspective I see our country now.

If I believe anything of this land—if I know anything of its people and their character—I believe and I know that we have not come to and are not approaching America's September.

On the contrary, it is my conviction—a conviction which deepens every day—that this land and its people are quickening with the new life and new potential of what will become the springtime of a new America.

I do not say this merely to offer reassurance in anxious times. Far from it, I intend what I say to be taken as a challenge—a challenge to every citizen of every age.

No nation can be more than the visions of its people. Americans cannot be more than we believe ourselves capable of becoming. Thus we are directly challenged to choose between two very different perceptions of what we are and what we can make of America itself.

On the one hand, we can choose to guide our course by the light of the bright perceptions—of America the beautiful, America the just, America the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Or, on the other hand, we can choose to move toward the shadows of what some have called "the dark perception" of America the unclear, America the unjust, America the unworthy.

For myself—as, I am sure, for many of you—there is no real choice. I want to open the soul of America to the warm sunlight of faith in itself, faith in the principles and precepts of its birth, faith in the promise and potential of its resources and skills and people. Yet I know that, in these times, this is not easy.

For too long, we have permitted the dark perception to pervade our midst. Day after day, month after month, the portrayal of America as unclean, unjust and unworthy has been ground into the consciousness of our people.

We no longer see the blooming flowers for we are searching for the litter. We no longer celebrate the many fresh triumphs of justice for we are lingering over the residue of yesterday's shortcomings. We no longer measure the miles we have come toward a more humane, civil and peaceful world for we are too busy calibrating the remaining inches of times we are trying to escape and leave behind.

This is our clear and present challenge.

When we permit these dark perceptions to dominate us, we are allowing our future to be shaped by visions that are small and mean and diminishing to our potential. We are, in simple terms, dooming those who come after us to know what could only be a second-rate America.

This is a future which I am unwilling to accept.

I have devoted my time on this earth to working toward the day when there would be no second-class citizenship in America, no second-quality opportunity, no second-hand justice at home, no second-place status in the world for our ideals and benefits.

I do not intend now that second-rate visions shall set our course toward settling for a second-rate America. That is why I speak as I do now.

All through the pages of history we read the heart-rending stories of those who set out in quest of great goals and discoveries, yet when they were almost to the edge of success, they hesitated—not knowing or understanding how near they were to their aims. Out of that moment of hesitation, all too often they lost forever their opportunity to succeed.

In many respects, that seems to me to be a pattern we ourselves are in danger of repeating.

Over all the years of our nation's existence, we have been setting goals for ourselves and striving tirelessly to reach them. Those goals have been both the slogans and the substance of national affairs for generation after generation.

Full employment. Decent wages. Adequate housing. Education for everyone. Opportunity for all. Good health, good medical care, good hospitals for even the least among us. Above all, equal justice under the law for all our fellow men. America's goals have been simple and basic.

They have permeated and motivated all our institutions—churches and schools, professions and labor unions and corporations and foundations—as well as our government at every level.

All our American resources and strengths—private and public—have been committed to the effort and we have come very close to success.

Nowhere—over all the globe—have any people, under any other system, come nearer to fulfillment of such aspirations than we have under our system.

Yet, at the very moment we were near to realization, we have allowed our effort to go slack, our momentum to slow and we have entered a season of hesitation.

Why?

Basically, I believe, it is because we have not understood—and still do not fully comprehend—where we are or what we are about.

Whatever may be your own perception of where we are and where we may be heading, let me say for myself that I see little today suggesting that our system is failing—but I see all too much which convincingly argues that by our doubts and hesitation we may be failing the promise and potential of our system.

We are not living in times of collapse. The

old is not coming down. Rather, the troubling and torment these days stem from the new trying to rise into place.

With our nation's past efforts, with our long and faithfully kept commitments with our infinite successes in so many fields, we have brought into being the materials, as it were, with which to construct a new America.

Faced with the task of such great dimensions, we have no time for melancholy. We have no cause for moroseness. We have work to be done—the greatest work any generation of Americans has ever faced. Believing that, I say—let's be on with our labors.

The essentials of a new America—a better America—are all on hand and within our reach. It is our destiny—and, I believe, our duty—to take up our appointed positions and commence the labors that will change what needs change among us.

Our real challenge lies not in suppressing change but utilizing it to vitalize and energize our society. Change is not our enemy. On the contrary, this society has no deadlier danger than refusal to change.

This is what I believe our young Americans are trying—and have been trying—to communicate to us. With their fine young minds, fresh new learning and clear new vision, they are seeing many segments of our society as it needs to be seen and understood.

The most frightening thing that could happen to us today would be for us to close our eyes to new ideas, and to close our ears to those—particularly the young, in whom we have invested so much hope and effort through the years of our existence—who are trying to tell us how they would go about perfecting the visions of America.

It is just such spirit that we honor on this occasion. It is by restoring that spirit to our lives and our nation's life that we can honor our own trust as Americans.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been deeply saddened by the death of our former leader and President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

We knew him not only as President—in his words—"of all the people," but also as a friend. No man worked harder for the causes he believed in than Lyndon Johnson. His major accomplishments were in the fields of civil rights and antipoverty programs, and his triumphant battle to secure a greater measure of justice for all Americans regardless of race, color, or ethnic origin, will live on as testimony to the greatness of the man.

He was a friend of labor, and he never lost sight of the needs of America's working men and women. He fought for a higher minimum wage so that the workers of our Nation might better share in the fruits of their labor. He saw the need for new health programs and he signed into law the program known as medicare.

Mr. Johnson called the 89th Congress "the fabulous 89th," because during that time some 86 administration measures were passed and sent to the White House for his signature. These measures were indicative of the man, Lyndon Baines Johnson, for they were destined to have far-reaching and beneficial effects on the whole quality of life in America.

It is difficult to take the measure of such a giant among men, or to express our feelings about him, in mere words. Perhaps the best way to describe Lyndon Johnson is by means of the words he himself spoke at his inauguration in 1965:

We aspire to nothing that belongs to others. We seek no dominion over our fellowman, but man's dominion over tyranny and misery.

He now belongs to the ages. But surely history, with its widened perspective and wisdom, will accord him a place as one of our greatest Presidents.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson was a many-faceted man. No words will be able to pin him down—no descriptions will aptly fit the man who served his country publicly for 41 years. He was a superior congressional leader and an able Chief Executive.

History will be kinder to Lyndon Johnson than many of his contemporaries were. His label as a warmonger will be exchanged for that of a man who was caught by circumstances in a superhuman situation. Vietnam will fade as Johnson is remembered as a President of the people—of all the people.

Where Lyndon Johnson was cursed for his foreign intanglements, he will be praised for his domestic achievements and legislative skill. He took the half-completed concepts of previous administrations and turned them into realities for the underprivileged. He was the champion of the minorities—a fighter who did battle for those people who could not fight for themselves.

Above all, Lyndon Baines Johnson was a Texan. A man of drive, compassion, insight, determination, and pride. Those of us who are Texans share a special sense of loss with his passing. But we can be proud that we come from the same background and heritage. We will miss him.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow in the passing of our late President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Lyndon Johnson was a dedicated public servant, having served in many official capacities in his lifetime, the ultimate of which was the Presidency.

He had a deep love for his country, a patriot in the deep sense of the word. He adhered assiduously to plans and programs which he felt would advance the best interests of America, and he had a passion for providing opportunities for the physically and economically poor to lift themselves above their adversities.

Mr. Johnson was a big man physically, built in the standard of men of the frontier period of this country's history. In addition to this, he was highly active and very deliberate in his pursuit of what he judged right. He was also very compassionate, for it is reported that during some dark days of the Vietnam conflict, he brooded in the quiet of his White House quarters, mourning the loss of lives in Vietnam.

Lyndon Johnson met with fortitude the challenges that confronted him in the Presidency. His presence will be missed, but there can be no denying that in his absence, he will leave an impressive mark on American history.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the Lyndon Johnson span in the history of the United States holds so many fond remembrances among those privileged to know him well—there is so much can be said about this great Texan—so many things a person remembers so vividly about the leadership that was part of

him—but the first impressions that came to me after we lost Lyndon Johnson I wrote in my weekly newsletter which I introduce here so that all who knew him may share these thoughts conveyed to my south Texas constituency:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Lyndon Johnson had a special place in his heart for South Texas. As U.S. Senator and as President, he visited our area often and he knew our people, knew their problems and hopes and needs. His lifelong concern for the poor and disadvantaged grew out of his knowledge, which he began to acquire as a young school teacher in Cotulla. As State Administrator of the National Youth Administration during the economic depression of the 1930s, he came face to face with the anxieties of young people who wanted and needed jobs when few jobs were to be had. As Congressman, Senator, Vice President and President, he remembered and he cared.

MY PERSONAL FRIEND

Lyndon Johnson had many friends in South Texas, and I am proud that I was among them—I and members of my family. Memories flood my mind. For some time he kept on his desk in the White House a little ceramic Beagle puppy given to him by my children. When I first came to Washington as a member of Congress and attended a reception at the White House, as I reached the President in the receiving line he threw his long arms around me in a bear hug and yelled, "Kika." I never felt more warmly welcomed in my life, and I shall always treasure the picture sent from the White House recording that event.

When the people of South Texas staged a great Appreciation Day for me on September 21, 1971 (a date I shall never forget), LBJ was there to be welcomed by thousands of folks who knew him as their friend. He was at his best—in great good humor, laughing, talking informally, clearly enjoying himself. And in speaking of me, he said something that I will always cherish in my mind and heart—that Kika de la Garza is "a man who has never forgotten his beginnings." All my life I will be proud of that tribute from a man who certainly never forgot his beginnings and who carried into the highest office in our land the attributes of character that had been formed in his early life in the Hill Country of Texas.

After I entered Congress, the President time and again was helpful to me in my efforts to give the best possible service to the 15th Congressional District.

I recall that after Hurricane Beulah had devastated much of our area and LBJ had personally come down for a personal inspection I was having trouble with the Federal bureaucracy about disaster relief. The Farmers Home Administration and the Small Business Administration were tossing the ball back and forth, each claiming the other was the agency responsible for extending help to the victims of the hurricane.

Being invited to a reception at the White House, I prepared a memorandum outlining the situation. Against all precedent, so I am told, I passed the memo to the President when he greeted me at the reception. LBJ did not tell me that this kind of thing simply was not done. No, he glanced at my memo, then handed it over to his trusted aide, Marvin Watson, and said, "Whatever Kika asks here, have it done."

The logjam was promptly broken to the benefit of South Texas.

I miss my friend, our friend, South Texas' friend.

AN INTERNATIONAL LEADER

Persons far more skilled with the written word than I have set down their appraisals of the former President. In passing, it is interesting to note that many persons now see Lyndon Johnson's presidency in a different

light from that they focused upon it in his lifetime. The Eastern press was rarely able to get rid of its prejudices in viewing LBJ the President. It was frequently unfair, often malicious.

The fact remains, and I believe history will bear me out, that Lyndon Johnson exerted outstanding leadership not only in the nation but in the world as well. For the past week, newspapers and television commentators have been listing the great accomplishments of his Administration. Even with the U. S. caught up in a cruel war during most of the time he was President, he was able to get through Congress a large crop of constructive legislation. Much of it was designed to improve the lives of the disinherited and dispossessed of our land.

LBJ was preeminently a man of the people in the tradition of other great Presidents. He loved America and Americans and his life was devoted to their service. His place in history is assured. His place in the hearts of his friends is secure and everlasting. And those friendly hearts are today warm with sympathy for Lady Bird Johnson, a great lady indeed, and her two fine daughters. May God give them solace and our never ending gratitude for the many times they unselfishly shared LBJ with us.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I join in this tribute to Lyndon B. Johnson, the Nation's 36th President who I am certain will go down in history as an architect of far-reaching social legislation for the people of the United States.

It is indeed unfortunate that efforts are being made to dismantle some of his Great Society programs that have proven their worth. We need to keep them alive for the benefit of the poor, the downtrodden, and minorities.

While I was not a Member of this body while President Johnson was in the White House or the Congress, I followed his career closely. He was a strong and able majority leader of the Senate and an equally strong and able Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, Lyndon B. Johnson understood, better than most, the legislative process. And he used this know-how with a Texan's flare and forthrightness to persuade others to understand and follow his compassion for civil rights, poverty, and health laws. He was a true man of the people.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the most singular and appealing characteristics of President Johnson was his robust involvement in life. When such a person leaves us, it is particularly depressing because he contributed so much to our own sense of vitality and interest in the world around us. His energy was infectious and though he sometimes stirred our anger, he never, never bored us.

He was genuine in his desire to alleviate the burdens of poverty, in his commitment to education and in his commitment to make real the promises of our Constitution to millions of black Americans. It would be hypocritical of me to leave the impression that I agreed with all his policies, for neither I nor many others did. But his goals were worthy and in his essential humanness and courage, his disposition to dare greatly, accepting both risks and responsibilities, he represented the American character as perhaps few other Chief Executives in modern times have because he embodied the essence of the American character:

plainspoken in the homespun accents of rural America, hard-working, hard-bargaining, possessed of visions and dreams for America and her potential for greatness that more erudite and polished statesmen would shrink from articulating, let alone, as he did, consciously strive to attain.

No brief assessment is possible. He was "larger than life." With my fellow citizens, I mourn his passing with especially poignant regret at this moment when the dawn of an era of peace—peace such as he earnestly believed his personal efforts would lead to—has at least begun to shed a glimmer over a nation and a world.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this day of mass communication, as we grow somewhat callous to the sad news that floods broadcasts and newspapers, platitudes for passing statesmen become more and more meaningless. There is, of course, still some initial shock, but after that we tend to be numb as we await the next hero's death. Yesterday's hero is as readily forgotten as yesterday's headline.

I doubt if this will be the fate of Lyndon Baines Johnson. The memory of him will not fade from this earth or into the remote pages of history books. His image lends itself to the most resplendent of platitudes.

On Capitol Hill, Lyndon Johnson will long be remembered for his leadership as a Representative, Senator, Vice President, and President of the United States. It is a widely accepted fact that he was among the most effective legislators ever to serve. But this is not where his immortality will carry its greatest weight.

What Mr. Johnson did for the United States and the world will be fully realized only as we mature in the ways of history and begin to reflect with an objective eye; however, some glimpse of the basis for his real immortality can be comprehended even now.

While at times accused of turning the country increasingly outward, President Johnson urged upon this Nation a seriously needed time of introspection and internal repairs. He dared to challenge problems as old and as complex as man himself.

Making wise use of the power of the country's highest office, he attacked poverty; not only the poverty of material want, but the poverty of mind and spirit which lingered stubbornly throughout this Nation.

He did not totally eradicate it, but he did begin an erosion of that poverty, an erosion which is still gaining momentum today. If we allow this momentum to take its natural course, the Nation and the world will truly be the Great Society for which Mr. Johnson so anxiously yearned.

The poverty of material want was stormed through President Johnson's war on it, a war that, if nothing else, made America aware of the hungry and poor millions still living in our Nation during the jet age. He showed people that starvation and malnutrition were not phenomena of the outside world alone. It was a problem existing right here at home. And not only did the President make us aware, he acted. In the historic 89th Congress, he drove through

welfare reforms and programs that filled us with fresh hope and astonishment at their sweeping scope.

The poverties of mind and spirit were pressed into retreat by Mr. Johnson's bold leadership in the cause of human rights. A southerner, he dared beckon Americans to support the black man's struggle for equality. "We shall overcome," he cried, and the Nation thundered forward with dynamic reforms in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the firmer foundations of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which followed.

President Johnson saw to it that his Justice Department made every effort to uphold that legislation. It was a frustrating battle against a disease deeply imbedded in the attitudes of far too many Americans. Yet the President continued to fight. Courageously, he appointed a black man to the Supreme Court and another as the top official in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A former schoolteacher, he encouraged higher education and held students dear to his heart. He clamored to achieve the American ideal of an education for all, and held to the belief that better education would mean a greater people.

Clearly conscious of the generations to come and the welfare of all, he formed cabinet departments to deal with the problems of our burgeoning cities.

And he did not abandon America's forgotten generation over 65. Its greatest advocate, he guided medicare in its thrust through Congress.

Zealously, Lyndon Johnson sought to rid this Nation and the world of all their ills. His campaigns against the poverties of spirit, mind, and material want were all carried out with a dedication to all he thought was right and just.

He was a man with a vision, a compassionate man who loved all the peoples of the world, not as children under his wing, but as brothers and sisters, individuals all. And, perhaps, his greatest frustration was his inability to use his office to make them all eternally happy.

Yet, through all the frustration, he remained in the forefront, carrying the burdens of the world on his broad shoulders. He caused us to pause and reflect. He offered us hope. He convinced us that there was a way to find happiness on this planet.

He taught us to question, too, suggesting to us, "Let us reason together."

And now he rests, and we continue to run, seeking for all our people the happiness that he envisioned. We will go on.

And as we strive for these goals and struggle in the face of seemingly endless dead ends, we will recall Lyndon Baines Johnson; we will recall his strivings and frustrations.

He will always be with us.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the deaths of Presidents Truman and Johnson coming so close upon one another were a shock to the Nation. The sudden death of Lyndon Johnson was particularly sad, as his vision of what America should be is needed now more than ever.

It is fitting that we should pay tribute to him in the House of Representatives where he began his long career of public

service. It was a career marked by triumph and by criticism, by the closest of election victories and later by the greatest presidential landslide in our history. President Johnson was a giant of a man, a man of passionate conviction, a strong and dominating leader. Like all such men, his life was one of controversy. The closing years of his public career were overshadowed by the tragedy of the war in Vietnam. It was this war which made him give up public office—a personal abdication made in the search of peace. Now at last, the dark night of that war seems to be lifting. It is a bitter irony that he did not live to see the signing of the cease-fire agreement.

The death of a man who was so much a part of our lives for so long brings us up short. The anger and the passions of the past are burnt away, and we can look at the whole man as he was.

Taking office in the worst of circumstances, upon the death of President Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson brought to the Presidency a vision of America as the "Great Society" which it should be; he brought a deep human concern for the people who make up America. To him they were not a "silent majority," but living human beings whose hopes and fears he understood.

President Johnson will have many memorials, but his greatest monument will be the human programs enacted under his leadership—civil rights, the war on poverty, and Federal aid to education. These are the deeds for which he would wish to be remembered, and for which history will remember him. As the Johnson years recede into the past, it is this commitment to humanity which will stand out.

Lyndon Johnson was a man of Texas, a homeland he loved and from whence he drew his strength. But much as he loved Texas, he was not a regional or parochial man. He was the President of all Americans, and he strove to bring us together, to join with one another in the fight for a better life for every citizen. He asked us to care for the poor, the deprived, for those who only needed a chance to prove their own worth. He asked us to provide a society with careers open to the talents of everybody.

It was moving to hear at his funeral ceremonies the wonderful hymn, based on an old spiritual, "In Christ, There Is No East or West. In Him, No North or South." For Lyndon Johnson there was no east or west or north or south, but only the United States of America seeking to become the great society of which its founders had dreamt. He, and we, have not achieved that society. But in Lyndon Johnson, his family, and his countrymen, can point with pride to a man who in his life as a public servant tried to build an America that would match our dreams and hopes. In the history of this Nation, President Johnson will rank as one of our great Presidents.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the news that former President Lyndon B. Johnson is dead in Texas brings sadness to those who love this country. For in a unique way, larger than life, he seemed to embody the traditions, the robust frontier vigor, and the determination to

move ahead that have characterized the development of the American Nation.

Leadership was as natural to Lyndon Johnson as breathing and eating are to ordinary men. Within his heart he carried a generator that propelled him forward with the drive of a torpedo boat. For him, idleness and reasonless pause were simply intolerable. When there were things to be done—and he constantly saw things to be done—he wanted to be up and doing them.

We are still only 4 years removed from his Presidency, and that is far too close to see it in the perspective of history. The vapors of emotion, personal involvement, and political differences distort the image of the man and of his stewardship. But personally, I have little doubt as to the ultimate historical judgment on Lyndon Johnson as President—one of the great humanitarian statesmen of all time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think of him merely as President. He was truly a man of the Congress. He cut his legislative teeth in this very Chamber, and he went on to become a master of the Senate. In the 184 years since the first Congress met in 1789, until these days when the 93d Congress is organizing itself, Lyndon Johnson has had few, if any, peers as an American legislator.

He felt at home in the Congress, and he relished a kind of brotherhood with those with whom he served here, a closeness that did not fade when destiny removed him from the legislative to the executive branches of Government.

Books have been written, and will continue to be written, giving minute details of his activities as a legislative leader, and I need not recite those accomplishments to Members who know them well.

Lyndon Johnson loved the Presidency. But I have a feeling that, if it were his to choose, the accolade he would like most would be to have his portrait hang here in the Capitol as one of the great U.S. Senators of all time; and I hope the other body will shortly see that such an honor is bestowed.

In these brief remarks, I could not possibly cover, or even list, all of the accomplishments of his tenure as President. The scope is as broad as the universe.

But, Mr. Speaker, I like to think of Lyndon Johnson as the Education President. During his time in the White House, and as a result of his leadership, this Nation made decisions and initiated action that will be felt in education for many generations to come.

Perhaps chief among these was the decision to move ahead with the massive Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. That was the act in which we were finally able to cut the knot that had hampered our efforts to involve the Federal Government in the financing of childhood education. Title I of that great landmark legislation was based upon the Johnson determination that no child in America, no matter what the income level of his parents, no matter what the color of his skin, should be deprived of a good education.

That act has paid untold dividends to

the Nation in the few short years it has been in operation, and its potential for the future is unlimited.

I can think of no more fitting memorial to Lyndon Johnson than to see that this act is extended and its funding provisions strengthened this year, so that we can move ahead with the work already begun.

The roll is long and overpowering. The Higher Education Act of 1965. The Higher Education Facilities Act. The landmark amendments to the Vocational Education Act. The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. The revitalizing of the Library Services and Construction Act. The Adult Education Act of 1966. The great program of education for handicapped children in title VI of ESEA. These are but a few, but they suggest the enormous scope of the work done in the field of education during Lyndon Johnson's time in the White House.

Those were great years. May their greatness be repeated for our children.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in tribute to the late President Lyndon B. Johnson. All of us who had an opportunity to be acquainted with him must share in some measure the loss which is felt throughout our Nation at this hour—and which is felt so deeply within the family circle characterized by close and sensitive ties.

Mr. Speaker, I feel fortunate that I enjoyed a personal as well as a social contact with President Johnson. This contact was enhanced when my constituent, Pat Nugent, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Nugent of Waukegan, Ill., became the husband of Luci Johnson. I was privileged to be one of the few Members of this House who attended the wedding and White House reception for Pat Nugent and Luci Johnson at that time. In addition to his parents, many of Pat Nugent's relatives and friends from the Waukegan area were in Washington for the occasion and were entertained at my home as part of the nuptial activities.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the personal and social relationship which President Johnson had with many Members of the Congress, his intimate contacts on subjects of official business are unsurpassed in modern history. His personal interest in the Congress and his individual efforts in securing support of measures which he proposed account in large part for the enormous success which he had in the enactment of domestic legislation.

I was privileged to take an active part in the revision of our immigration laws which President Johnson dramatized in a bill-signing ceremony in New York with the Statue of Liberty as a backdrop. It was also my privilege to support actively the Voting Rights Act of 1964, which resulted in expanding the voting franchise to millions of black Americans—and has resulted in the large increase in black officeholders particularly in our Southern States.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of recounting the legislative and other related events with which I associated President Lyndon Johnson, and which come to mind at this time. Instead, I

prefer to recall the times when President Johnson and his family occupied the White House. Their warm hospitality and outgoing and friendly behavior, as the First Family of our Nation, endeared them in a very personal way to Democrats and Republicans alike. It is the personable, friendly, compassionate Lyndon Johnson whom I recall in this hour of reflection. And it is to his immediate family that I extend this expression of great respect and deepest sympathy—to Lady Bird Johnson, to Pat and Luci Nugent and to Lynda and Chuck Robb. My wife, Doris, joins in these sentiments.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as we eulogize the late Lyndon B. Johnson, a sense of humility pervades this great Chamber. Certainly it will be difficult for us to capture in words the awesome qualities of Lyndon Johnson, both as a man and as a President.

These Halls of Congress have seen few men as powerful and effective as Lyndon Johnson. He was, in the truest sense, a parliamentary master. His legislative genius was read quickly by his Senate colleagues, who choose him as their party leader while only a freshman Senator. From that moment, he would shape the course of our country for years to come.

Lyndon Johnson assumed the Presidency under tragic circumstances. Those of us who sat in this chamber in 1963 will not forget his moving address to a stunned nation. His primary motivation was to provide continuity and leadership to a country whose President had been struck down. His own words were "let us continue" and he mustered all the powers of his office and of his own being to accomplish that task. What he did accomplish was extraordinary—in education, housing, medical care, environmental protection, and civil rights. In this final category, in particular, Lyndon Johnson is credited with accomplishing what perhaps no other man could. The four landmark civil rights laws that bear his signature, including the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, have become his most lasting memorial.

The Vietnam war was an agonizing experience and, in this pause for tribute, it is not comforting to think of that costly conflict in relation to Lyndon Johnson. History did not make its final judgment in his own lifetime. But in death, even his sharpest critics gave thanks for all the good he had done.

Lyndon Johnson's tenure as President coincided with my early years of service in the House. He was unusually accessible to Members of Congress, regardless of their seniority or political party. I met with him on many occasions and came to know him well. He was a kind and considerate man and I cherish having known him and his remarkable wife, Lady Bird.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been saddened in the past 6 weeks over the death of two of our former Presidents, Harry S. Truman and Lyndon Baines Johnson. President Johnson was a man whose whole life was devoted to public service. He began his career as a teacher in his home State of Texas. He was elected to the Congress of the United

States and then elected to serve a larger constituency as a Senator from the State of Texas. He served as Vice President to the late John F. Kennedy and no one will forget the difficult burden that was placed upon him when President Kennedy died so tragically at the hands of an assassin.

President Johnson was a man of courage and a man of stature. He was above all a man who had the great burden of this Nation's leadership thrust upon him and he accepted that burden. I extend to his beloved widow and his two fine daughters my own deep personal sympathy for the loss of the man who was outstandingly a splendid husband and father.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to compliment my good friend and colleague in the well, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE), for the eloquent eulogy which he delivered during memorial services in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, at 5:33 p.m. eastern standard time on Monday, January 22, 1973, the stout heart of this great American ceased to beat. The mortal life of America's 36th President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, had ended where it began in his beloved Texas hill country from which he drew his indomitable strength.

All America was deeply shocked and saddened by the sudden and untimely death of President Johnson. This great President translated the dreams of a generation of political leaders into an administration of action that will be remembered in history as one of our most exciting eras of achievement.

President Johnson believed in America; in America's dedication and ability to provide justice for all, in America's role as a world leader, and most importantly, he believed in the people of America. His hopes and dreams for these people will only be fully appreciated in the years to come.

Lyndon Johnson more than any man understood the legislative processes of the Congress. He understood the committee system and the intricacies of congressional interaction—the work of Congress. He worked closely with the departments and agencies of Government to achieve his goals and objectives. He believed in education—and much landmark education legislation was enacted during his administration. He believed in assuring the elderly of adequate medical care—and Medicare was enacted. He believed in assisting rural and urban areas in coping with their problems—and legislation to assist small towns, rural and metropolitan areas was enacted which has provided much assistance throughout America. He believed in helping the "little man" and he championed increased incomes for the working people throughout the United States. He had great respect for those who defended this Nation on the world's battlefields—and in veterans' circles throughout our great land, his administration was referred to as "the era of the veteran."

It was my great personal privilege to be associated with Lyndon Johnson, beginning in the 80th Congress. He became

one of the outstanding leaders of the Senate and he worked in great harmony with President Eisenhower to help keep America strong and vigilant. I had the pleasure of campaigning with him in 1960 and later in 1964 with his lovely wife, Lady Bird. As we stand here today to eulogize President Johnson, so do all Americans. The black people throughout my congressional district believe Lyndon Johnson did more than any President since Abraham Lincoln to eliminate the hardships and inequities which this great minority of our society experienced.

Mr. Speaker, America will always be grateful for Lyndon Johnson's strength that enabled him to impart to America a strong sense of continuity and national purpose in the dark days following the tragedy that elevated him into the White House in 1963. Lyndon Johnson spent his life in service to his fellow man. From his early years as a schoolteacher, through his Presidential years and later as an elder statesman, he worked to help humanity. Few men were as aptly suited for this task as Lyndon Baines Johnson, and history will note that few men have ever met the task so well. The years will be lonely without him.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Johnson, her two daughters, the grandchildren and other members of the family upon their great personal loss.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am certain history will record Lyndon Baines Johnson as one of America's great men and great Presidents. A man of humble beginning, who never forgot that beginning, even though he attained the highest honor that the people of the United States can bestow upon an individual, that of President of the United States.

History will surely record that he was a most able legislator and legislative leader without peer; that he was dedicated to the best interests of our Nation and our people, rising above political party and ideology if need be. And, if history is fairly and accurately written, will depict him as the man he was, full of compassion and understanding for his fellow man; dedicated to the principles upon which this Nation was founded, the principles of equality and justice.

The legislative record during his years as Senate leader and the legislative accomplishments by the Congress during his term of office as our 36th President will ever stand as a monument to him; to his earnest and sincere desire to improve the quality of life and standard of living for the people of our Nation.

I truly believe that of Lyndon Baines Johnson it can be said, he was a giant among men; he not only dreamed of what should be but ardently sought to make those dreams real.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with so many of my colleagues in the Congress, as well as national leaders and statesmen the world over, to pay tribute to the memory of President Lyndon Baines Johnson and to offer our sympathy to his wife, children, and grandchildren.

As one looks back over President Johnson's political career—his service in both

the Senate and the House, his key role as Senate majority leader, his vigorous Vice Presidency, and, of course, his assumption of the Presidency on that tragic day in November almost a decade ago—one cannot help but stand in awe at the accomplishments of this great leader.

I was fortunate to know the President and despite our differences on the war in Vietnam, came to value him as a close friend. He fought hard to gain approval of his programs and he devoted his energies constantly to attain the ideal of freedom for all—a concept upon which this country was founded.

It undoubtedly took rare political courage for President Johnson to advocate his Great Society programs. When he was first assessed as a potential President, few people would have guessed that he would be responsible for the broadest series of landmark-pioneering social welfare and civil rights legislation ever enacted in a single President's term of office. The various civil rights acts, Federal aid to education, the Voting Rights Act, and other laws passed during his years in the White House have irrevocably altered the social order of this Nation.

President Nixon in announcing the ceasefire agreement in Vietnam said that none would have wanted this peace more than President Johnson. I think that he also wanted the domestic tranquility that our Constitution calls for in its Preamble. Lyndon Johnson spent his entire political life fighting for peace in America based on freedom and equality for all people in this Nation. When we finally reach that goal, historians will record that President Lyndon Johnson made a monumentally important contribution toward its achievement.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, the tributes which we are offering today to our late President, Lyndon Johnson, will not add to, or take from his stature as a great President and leader.

The impact of his dynamic vision has resulted in significant historical accomplishments which words can only recall. What we speak now more nearly reflects the effect his life had upon us who remain.

Let us be counted among those who are dedicated to those ideals of personal dignity and justice which characterized his contributions as our President.

He was a good man and a great leader of our country. Once he decided a course of action was right, he pursued it full speed ahead.

He translated many of our Nation's highest ideal into reality.

History will write final judgments on the basis of events which have yet to unfold—but we know he spoke and acted according to what he believed was best for the people of this land which he loved and served.

All of us must feel less secure because of his passing, for we no longer have the benefit of his counsel to inspire us to deeper humanity and to warn us of perils which may not be seen from any other vantage point.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation and the world mourns the passing of former President Lyndon Baines Johnson, this House of Representatives is

filled with memories of a great legislator, an outstanding President and above all, a loyal American. Many of us in this Chamber were privileged to know President Johnson and to work with him and under his leadership. We join the millions of mourners around the world whose thoughts this week are concentrated on the life of this man from Texas.

President Johnson's career of public service was long and filled with excitement and activity. He knew the inner workings of the U.S. Congress as few others ever did and he never wavered in his respect for Congress as an institution and as an equal branch of Government.

President Johnson was a giant among men who have been at the forefront of the fight for social progress. It will probably take decades before this Nation fully realizes the extent to which President Johnson so changed the face of every day life in this country. He was truly a man of vision—a man with a dream. His blueprint for a Great Society may not have been perfect, but it was an imaginative, bold plan for action which proved that Government need not be idle, passive or helpless in the face of national problems. The Great Society was brought closer by his progressive leadership and millions of Americans have benefited from social programs such as medicare, aid to education, and the war against poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has lost a statesman who symbolized the political knowledge and expertise which we in Washington strive to equal. His understanding of the country and the feelings of the people was the cornerstone of his success in educating and leading the American public. He understood the people of Texas as well as the Eastern Establishment and he worked to mold a vast consensus which could move the status quo and bring about social change.

I shall always remember President Johnson as a man who caused more real change, true social reform, in a few years than I have seen in Washington or the Nation over the past generation. It is understandable that history will need many more years to evaluate the Johnson years, but we can make a more immediate evaluation of the man. He was a great American President and a fascinating and compassionate human being. I join my colleagues in extending personal sympathies to Mrs. Johnson and the family of our late President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that we gather here today in recognition of the late President Lyndon Johnson. The Nation has lost the last of its former Presidents, and a truly great leader.

Perhaps more than any other President since Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Johnson moved social justice further. He was a man of conviction, and fearless and resolute in his pursuit of what he believed in.

The Great Society was his goal; the beneficiaries were to be all Americans, but in particular the poor, the old and the disadvantaged. During his terms in office the Nation saw the creation of medicare, the war on poverty, the Higher

Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The war that tore apart America has ended. Let us hope that history will be able to look beyond the tragic circumstances of the war and judge President Johnson in the light of his other far-reaching programs which have given so much to all Americans.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, fate decreed that Lyndon B. Johnson would serve in this Nation's highest office in one of the most turbulent periods in our history. It was a time of unrest, a time of violence, and yet it was a time when we made significant advances to eliminate many of the causes of those very problems of the future.

It is not incumbent upon me to judge his record. It has been too short a period and that will be for history to determine.

Yet, my personal observation is that Lyndon Johnson was a man who really cared about his fellow man. It was his lot to lead this Nation at the time of our greatest involvement in Vietnam, and it turned out to be the greatest tragedy for a man of peace.

In that pursuit, this Nation was misled. He had great support at the outset, but that support immediately dwindled the moment that it was no longer the popular thing to do. I know he felt stunned at the rapid turn of events, but he never shirked his responsibility.

If Lyndon Johnson had had his way, he would have liked to have presided over this Nation in a time of peace, a time when he could have spent all of his boundless energies in pursuit of solutions to social problems in the mold of the man he greatly admired, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Lyndon Johnson was the finest steward to succeed a fallen leader in history. He tried to complete the dream of John F. Kennedy, and then he started to fulfill a few of his own.

This Nation is going to be richer for that service. Time is needed for us to reflect on what he stood for, what he tried to do, and what he really accomplished.

It is unfortunate that there was not enough time between his term of office and his death for some perspective to be shown to that record.

He had some of that Harry S. Truman presence about the Office of the Presidency. Mr. Truman was to live to see his name placed in the pantheon of heroes before he fell. Lyndon Johnson was not to be granted that privilege.

One of the things I liked so much about Mr. Johnson was the manner in which he treated Dwight D. Eisenhower. These acts on the part of Mr. Johnson were personal and deeply appreciated by the Eisenhowers and President Nixon.

Lyndon Johnson would probably agree with me that in Lady Bird Johnson, we had one of our finest First Ladies. Whatever the trial, whatever the tribulation, she was the rock that held fast.

Once he said that while others had often failed him, Lady Bird had never done so. It would have pleased him to know that the Johnson women did not fail him in death.

The quiet dignity of Mrs. Johnson greeting those who came to pay their re-

spect was a moving experience. She is a great lady.

We have lost a leader. I do not dwell on the fantastic record he established in the Senate of these United States. I do not labor over the war nor the legislative accomplishments of his Presidency.

To me, the most memorable phrase he ever uttered is that it is easier to try to do right than it is to know what is right.

As I look out my window at the Capitol and see the flag at half-mast, I know that I cannot say today how history will judge him. But for those of us who had a chance to know him, we know full well that this was a man whose prayer and purpose was to do right.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Johnson is a deep personal loss to the Nation. In domestic affairs, he was a great leader, a great American, and a great human being.

He was an energetic and mercurial man. But his goal was constant. He was fervently dedicated to the betterment of his country and its people. He said:

This is the richest and most powerful country which ever occupied this globe. The might of past empires is little compared to ours. But I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion.

I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world.

I want to be the President who helped to feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of tax-eaters.

I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election.

I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who promoted love among the people of all races, all regions, and all parties.

Lyndon Johnson helped. He knew poverty firsthand, and he tried to eradicate it. His first full-time job was teaching and he never forgot the need for education. He loved the land of his birth and he fought to rid the air and streams of pollution.

By habit and birth Mr. Johnson was a man of Congress. To him the essence of government was the passage of legislation and the purpose of legislation was to insure equal justice, opportunity, and civil rights for all Americans. Under Lyndon Johnson's stewardship America made rapid progress toward these goals.

He was a big man. He knew power and he knew how to use it. But, of all his Texas-style excesses, one was by far the most abundant—his compassion and his appreciation for the dignity of man.

President Johnson was a doer. He worked hard, spoke to hundreds of people every day and steered through the Congress dozens of important bills. His legacy is his legislation. Civil rights, medicare, aid to education, voting rights, immigration reform, model cities programs, rent subsidies, minimum wage hikes, anti-pollution programs, anti-poverty programs, and consumer protection.

But, Lyndon Johnson did more than legislate to make the Government a government for, of, and by the people. He listened too. On a wall in his Senate office hung his father's adage, "When you're talkin', you ain't learnin' nothin'."

He tried valiantly to heal the wounds

of the Nation. Rather than amputate a segment of society he wanted to bring us all together. His goal was reconstruction "with justice for all and malice toward none." His Nation's problems were his personal heartaches.

More than anything else Lyndon Johnson cared for people. He will be missed.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I join our colleagues in mourning the sudden and untimely death of our former President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Although President Johnson had a history of heart trouble, he worked tirelessly and unendingly for what he believed was best for America. In the finest sense of the word, Lyndon Johnson was one of the most political men of our time. Yet, he voluntarily ended his career in an effort to achieve the peace we all so desperately wanted.

His accomplishments in domestic programs were numerous and brilliantly achieved. He turned his dream of a Great Society into specific actions on civil rights, medicare, housing, job opportunities, special education for the disadvantaged, parks and recreation areas for all our citizens, and a thousand other improvements for our country.

Probably no leader in our history cared so much and did so much for the achievement of civil rights and the equal opportunity for all citizens than Lyndon Johnson. This was one of his primary concerns in Congress, as Vice President and as President. It continued to be one of his major interests even after he left the White House.

One of his last public appearances, made against the advice of his doctors, was a civil rights symposium, in which he insisted on participating.

One of the most tragic aspects of his death is that it comes so close to the time when it finally appears that we may realize the peace in Southeast Asia over which he agonized. It was President Johnson who, after giving up his own career to remove any doubts whatsoever about his effort, first brought the North and South Vietnamese, the Vietcong, and the United States together at the conference table.

We will all miss having the benefit of his wise and willing counsel. Had he lived, he would have continued to contribute much to our Nation. Lyndon Johnson has earned a high place in history.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Lyndon Johnson was a friend of mine. We served together when he was a Member of the House; we worked together on legislation when he was a majority leader in the U.S. Senate; and we joined together when he was President to create new programs in the fields of labor, health, education, and welfare.

On that terrible day in Dallas nearly a decade ago when John Fitzgerald Kennedy was assassinated, this man of courage, commitment, and compassion vowed that we should continue, and we did.

Lyndon Johnson made the dreams of John Kennedy into reality. For this alone, we should mourn him. But more than that Lyndon Johnson made the dreams of the poor and the sick and the aged and the minorities a reality, too.

Medicare, Federal aid to education,

better housing, conservation including the battle against pollution, Head Start, the Job Corps, model cities, Appalachia, and civil rights are among the programs that exist today, because Lyndon Johnson got behind them with his consummate legislative skill and made them into law.

I have known a lot of fine legislators in my time, but Lyndon Johnson was a master legislative technician, the best I ever knew. He seemed to be able to make the impossible—possible. Lyndon Johnson was a man who never forgot how it felt to be poor, who never forgot the need for a good education, who never forgot that the mission of government is to do for the people that which they cannot do for themselves.

History shall judge him, of course, but I am sure its verdict will cause us to mourn him even more.

With the passing in December of Harry Truman and the death on January 22 of Lyndon Johnson, this Nation for the first time in many years now has no living former Presidents. It gives one a sad and empty feeling.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. Speaker, he said:

To reach for the moon is a risk, but it is a risk we must take.

Lyndon B. Johnson was a President who never hesitated to take every possible risk in an effort to help his fellow man. While the risk of Vietnam proved his nemesis, the ones he took on other fronts of American society—health, housing, education, and equal opportunity—brought bountiful rewards to us all.

Believing that America must continue the Revolution of 1776, he worked uncompromisingly to secure independence for all through equal rights and equal opportunity. He literally wrote the chapter on civil rights, feeling rightly that an end to discrimination in America would prove our greatest strength both at home and abroad.

Never one to forget his humble origins and the deep impressions he received as a teacher in a rural school, Lyndon Baines Johnson thought that "the classroom—not the trench—is the frontier of freedom now and forevermore." And from his belief that "it is in the soil of ignorance that poverty is planted," he worked tirelessly both as U.S. Senate majority leader and as President to secure equal education for all.

His achievements in education and civil rights were monumental. A great believer in the democratic system, his vision of America was one of great compassion and humanity. And, from his years of top-level experience in the House and Senate, he became a masterful and pragmatic politician, understanding that "if you're in politics and you can't tell when you walk into a room who's for you and who's against you, then you're in the wrong line of work." Indeed, his keen acumen about politics enabled him not only to initiate but to work effectively with Congress in passing a truly great legislative program.

But the lingering war in Southeast Asia cast the shadow which obscured his domestic accomplishments. Ironically, his

death was to occur on the very eve of the negotiated settlement to which he had devoted the last few years of his Presidency. A lion of a President, Lyndon B. Johnson had great courage in electing to forgo a second term in the belief that only by exempting himself from candidacy could he keep the Vietnam conflict from evolving into a political issue.

So, in remembering Lyndon Baines Johnson, let us not dwell upon his tragedy, but rather on his great love for this country and its people and his overriding concern for their welfare.

My deepest condolences go out to Lady Bird Johnson, undisputedly a magnificent First Lady, and to the lovely and valiant Johnson daughters. The support of his loyal and devoted family got Lyndon Johnson through many a dark night, and I know that his towering memory will give his family a similar strength in the difficult and sad days ahead.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Lyndon B. Johnson, 36th President of the United States.

I had the honor of knowing Lyndon Johnson personally and supported him in all of his major domestic legislative undertakings. I joined with the President in these efforts, not only because he was the leader of our party, but because I considered these efforts to be just and right.

I shall always remember Lyndon Johnson as a humble human being. Yet, along with his humility, he possessed tremendous courage and the ability to get things done. President Johnson was a great man, because he tried. He faced problems head-on, and tried to solve them fairly with dispatch, and with compassion. Because of his energy and conviction, he was amazingly successful.

Lyndon Johnson was President at a time in the history of our Republic when great social and technological changes were compelling us all to change our patterns of thinking. Since Mr. Johnson was bigger than life in everything he did, he was the catalyst which forced us all to reevaluate the way we think about ourselves and our country. President Johnson was a great leader and a great American. His death is a tremendous loss to our Nation.

Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to President Johnson's wife and family during this most difficult of times.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of former President Lyndon B. Johnson leaves a void in the lives of all Americans in general and in many of us in particular.

Indeed, he was a public servant of the first magnitude, as well as a formidable legislator. His ability to bring Members of both Houses together to support important legislation was phenomenal. He truly was the President of all the people of all the States and though they differed on innumerable occasions, he could and did meld them into majorities to both support and pass major milestones in legislation.

He was a modern Horatio Alger in that this truly self-made man came from the most humble of economic beginnings. He rose to become a Member of the

House of Representatives, the leader of the Senate, Vice President of the United States, and a powerful President, filling out the unexpired term of our martyred President John F. Kennedy and then he was elected in one of history's greatest votes of confidence, by a trusting electorate.

Much of his proposed legislation, although controversial at the moment, was passed and signed into law. Former President Johnson was a man years ahead of his time.

He was a man of purpose, who believed in the theory that a purpose is a fantasy unless acted upon to its fullest.

The American people naturally will always differ in their individual assessments of all people and all things, including their evaluation of President Johnson's policies. Since freedom of thought and speech is a fundamental right, no one questions their process, but time will prove he was a man of charity and a man who loved his fellow man.

No one will ever charge him with not wanting peace in the world at large, but in Indochina most of all. He inherited, to some extent, this war so far away, yet he tried for peace under every sincere procedure known by both his staff and his office.

My deepest sympathies go out to his family. May their knowledge of our heartfelt loss soften the blow they have received.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 30 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the life, character, and public service of the late President Lyndon B. Johnson.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness, yet great respect, that I again take this opportunity to mark the passing of our late President, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Courage, compassion, concern, strength, unselfishness, and honesty, and above all a dedication to get the job done, mark the best qualities of Lyndon B. Johnson.

To his countrymen and to the world he came to symbolize the potential of mankind and of a nation.

With superb natural skills as a politician, legislator, and public official he had one consuming drive in life—a fierce desire that our ideas, programs, and action serve all the men and women of this Nation.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to have the privilege of addressing the House of Representatives. Normally a freshman steps into the well for his maiden speech with the hopes of swaying the Nation on some great issue. My mission today will be to console the Nation on the loss of a great man.

Unlike most of my colleagues, I did not know President Johnson personally. I never had the privilege of experiencing his warm handshake or receiving one of his friendly slaps on the back.

Like the majority of this Nation's citizens, I knew President Johnson from his career in Government service, a career that took him through both Houses of the Federal Government and into the Presidency.

A citizen forms an attachment for his leader in the same manner that he forms attachments for his immediate family. Our President is closely associated to our father. In our immediate families we often disagree with our father, and even temporarily have squabbles with him. But we maintain our respect and our feeling of warmth.

Our citizen attachment to President Johnson and his long years of Government service followed these same patterns.

During his lifetime, for example, many of us called him conservative; many of us called him progressive; there were even a few of us who called him radical. But there are a few things that all the people of my district know to be true. He was great; he was Texan; and we loved him. Therefore, we, as citizens, feel the same sense of loss as that of his immediate family.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the man who probably did more for America than anyone since Franklin Roosevelt has passed away. Lyndon Baines Johnson, 36th President of the United States devoted his life to the service of his country. He was a schoolteacher, a congressional secretary, and then he was appointed by his idol, President Franklin Roosevelt, to head up a program in Texas that would make it possible for young people to work part time, go to school, or to learn a trade.

It was my privilege to join him when he was Director of the National Youth Administration in Texas.

I knew him as a young idealist who drove himself from daylight till dark to try to do more for the young people of Texas than could be done elsewhere. It was from this position that he was elected to Congress. He was an inspiration to me from the day I met him until his death.

He quickly became the protege of Speaker Sam Rayburn and one of the favorites of President Roosevelt. He earned his spurs early in Congress when he was selected in his third term to head

up the Democratic congressional campaign. Not only did he hold the House for the Democrats, he increased their membership.

As a Senator, he was equally outstanding and became majority leader of the Senate. Throughout his legislative career his philosophy was contained in the biblical exhortation, "Come now, and let us reason together." During this time he was without peers in his ability to find a basis for agreement among disagreeing Members.

As President, Lyndon Johnson passed more landmark legislation to help the underprivileged than any President we have ever known. He was saddled with a war he did not start and could not end. His tremendous success in other fields led most Americans to believe he could do anything he wanted to do, and, therefore, they were critical of the fact he did not end the war.

Lyndon Johnson was a great man—great in stature, great in heart and great in ideals for his beloved country. Surely America has lost one of her great leaders, and I have lost one of the greatest friends I ever had.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnson, Linda Bird and Luci, their husbands and children.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS).

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Congressman PICKLE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on January 24 in the rotunda of our Capitol, a solemn and impressive memorial ceremony was held as the body of President Lyndon B. Johnson was brought in to lie in state as a last farewell tribute to him, the President, who had served so long and well in this building as a Member of both Houses of Congress.

As Mrs. Johnson and the President's family gathered there with Members of the House and Senate, with President and Mrs. Nixon, and with friends and former Cabinet members of the Johnson administration, a magnificent eulogy was delivered by President Johnson's Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, now professor of international law at the University of Georgia in my home town of Athens, Ga. Mr. Rusk had the privilege of being selected to make this memorial speech from among all the friends and official family of the Johnson times.

The only other address delivered was a fine personal tribute delivered by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. J. J. PICKLE, President Johnson's own Congressman.

In order to preserve the memorial speech of Secretary Rusk because of its sentiments and also as a part of the historical events of our era, under permission previously obtained I insert the eulogy in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS MADE BY DEAN RUSK AT A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

JANUARY 24, 1973.

A home on the bank of the Pedernales in the beautiful hill country of Texas, surrounded by his beloved family and the friends with whom he so fully shared his warm and generous spirit—

A home in this place where we are gathered today, in the Congress, which was his life

for so long, filled with friendships enlivened by that political debate which is the lifeblood of a free society, but friendships cemented by the common task of insuring that the public business somehow would go forward at the end of the day.

A home for more than five years at the summit of responsibility, of responsibility and not necessarily of power—for he, as other Presidents, understood that many expectations and demands were addressed to him which were beyond his constitutional reach or, indeed, beyond the reach of our nation in a world community where we might persuade but cannot command. These were years of awesome burdens, but burdens lightened by the fine intelligence and the natural grace and the personal devotion of the First Lady who was always at his side.

And now he returns to the Pedernales to a home among the immortals, that goodly company of men and women whom we shall forever cherish because they were concerned about those matters which barred the path to our becoming what we have in us to become. More than a thousand years ago, in a simpler and more robust age, perhaps we might have known him as Lyndon the Liberator, for he was determined to free our people in body, mind and spirit.

A few strokes of the brush can not portray this man to whom we offer our affection and respect today. As for me, I would begin with his deep compassion for his fellowman, a compassion which was shared by the Congress and resulted in the most extraordinary legislative season in our history.

Who can forget that remarkable evening of March 15, 1965, when President Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress on voting rights and other civil rights? It was perhaps his finest single message.

You will remember that, after recalling his days as a teacher of poor Mexican-American children back in 1928, he said, "It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of those students and to help people like them all over the country."

And then, with eyes which bored into the conscience of all who heard him, he said, "But now I do have that chance, and I'll let you in on a secret—I mean to use it. And I hope you will use it with me."

And then he went on to disclose in a very frank way what some of his deepest hopes were. Congressman Pickle has already quoted those hopes. One may give these ideas any name or epithet one might choose. They did not evolve out of some empty intellectual exercise. They were not the product of shrewd political calculation. His colleagues knew them as a volcanic eruption from the innermost being of his soul when the responsibility for leadership finally became his own.

Many have said that Lyndon Johnson was demanding upon his colleagues and personal staff. Indeed he was. And demanding upon the Congress and the American people and many a foreign leader as well. But he was most demanding upon himself and stubbornly resisted the admonitions of his associates to slow down. There was so much to do, and there was so little time in which to get it done.

President Johnson sometimes deprecated his own background in foreign affairs. Actually he brought great talents and a rich experience to this aspect of the Presidency in November 1963. As Senate Majority Leader throughout much of the Eisenhower years, he was necessarily and deeply involved in the widest range of legislation affecting foreign and defense policy.

When he became Vice President, President Kennedy asked him frequently to make foreign visits and consult with foreign leaders on matters of major importance—not merely a tourist's visit.

He absorbed briefings in a most expert

fashion, and with a powerful intellect went directly to the heart of the issues under discussion. And as many present know, he was always formidable in negotiation or persuasion.

He had a special ability, perhaps learned in the Senate, to begin his consideration of a problem by putting himself in the other fellow's shoes, in an attempt to understand which answers might be possible.

He had a personal code of relations among political leaders which did not permit him or his colleagues to engage in personal vilification aimed at foreign leaders, however deep the disagreement might appear to be.

Today's writers are inclined to discuss Lyndon Johnson almost solely in terms of Viet-Nam, and such questions as whether he did too much or too little in that tragic struggle. The historian will take a broader view and weigh such things as the Consular and Civil Air Agreements with the Soviet Union, the Non-proliferation Treaty, our space treaties, his East-West trade bill, the beginnings of the SALT talks, and many other initiatives aimed at building the peace.

He had a very special and affectionate feeling for the nations of the western hemisphere. He used to say to us, "This hemisphere is where we live, this is our home, these are our neighbors. We must start with our own neighborhood."

Mr. President, last evening your made some moving remarks about President Johnson in your brief address to the American people. We congratulate you on the substance of that address and give you our best wishes for the weeks and months ahead. I mention two points which you made about Lyndon Johnson. That President Johnson was a man of peace and would have welcomed the peace which seems now to be opening up in Southeast Asia. How true. And he would, indeed, have joined you, Mr. President, in paying tribute to those millions of gallant and dedicated men in uniform whose service and sacrifice opened the way for the peace which is before us.

In his last State of the Union Message to the Congress, his final sentence was, "But I believe that at least it will be said that we tried." Ah, yes, he tried, with reckless disregard for his own life.

And then, in the final chapter of his book, when he was reflecting upon how it looked to him as he returned to that ranch which he loved so much, his final sentence was, "And I knew also that I had given it everything that was in me."

As time passes, the world will increasingly acknowledge that the "everything" that was in him was a very great deal, and that men and women all over the earth are forever in his debt.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

The President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, was close to the people of Georgia and close to my district because his family came from our county in Georgia and went from there to an adjacent county and then from there to Texas. We felt especially close to Lyndon Johnson because of the leadership he had given when the county needed that leadership. We felt close to President Johnson because of his friendship for our late beloved Senator Richard B. Russell. Senator Russell and Senator Johnson at that time were the two great powers of influence in the Senate of the United States. We also felt very close to President Johnson because of the heart he showed when young Bobby Russell, one of the associate justices of our supreme court died. Bobby had been up

here as a page in the Senate, and President Johnson, the President of the United States, put down his busy schedule and came down to Georgia to attend the funeral of Bobby Russell in Winder, Ga.

So it is with appreciation that I come here at this time and thank the gentleman for letting me participate in these memorial speeches for President Johnson. Again I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert the text of the eulogy delivered by the Honorable W. Marvin Watson, former Postmaster General of the United States and a former member of President Johnson's staff. His speech was a moving and inspirational message for all Americans. The eulogy follows:

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON—EULOGY BY
HON. W. MARVIN WATSON

He was ours, and we loved him beyond any telling of it.

We shared his victories and his defeats.

In victory he taught us to be magnanimous—in defeat he taught us to be without hate—to learn—to rally—to accept the challenge and to try again.

He believed that good men together could accomplish anything, even the most impossible of dreams. No matter who his opponent, he constantly sought to find that touchstone within the soul of every man which, if discovered, would release the impulse for honest and fair solution. Hate was never in this man's heart.

Each of you has your own memories of this man who served for 37 years in this city. I had the honor of being with him through the final four years of his Presidency—in those great moments of triumph when the American people endorsed him so strongly—in those magnificent hours when he stood before the Congress of the United States and led the way to the passage of laws long overdue that would lead to justice long denied—and in that darkening twilight when, as a man seeking peace, he was forced to continue a bitter war to honor our country's commitment to a small, far-off ally.

I watched the gray come into his hair.

I saw each deep line etch itself into his face as he gave all at his command to lead our country through the turmoil which surged around us.

I watched him as he used his great gift of persuasion to convince a Southern Senator that the time had come for the Civil Rights Act—I watched him formulate, secure passage and sign into law the most comprehensive legislative program in education, housing, conservation and health of any President in history—I watched him in the Situation Room at the time of crisis during the Six Day War when only his ability, his knowledge, and his sheer courage helped to keep that conflict from erupting into a wider confrontation.

I sat with him through those long nights as he endured the agony of Vietnam, as he sought the key to peace, and as he waited for word of men whom he had ordered into battle. Each was a human being to him, not a statistic; each was a name linked with wives and parents and children—he cared for people, not for numbers.

So desperately did he want a just and lasting peace—so much did he want us to reason together—so much did he yearn that man's goodness would triumph over man's evil—so often as friend turned to political foe, did he nod with sad understanding and pray that in the years to come, the sacrifices he was making would be worthy of the American people and serve ultimately as a firm platform on which to build a better world.

And through it all, I saw him earnestly seek God's wisdom for his decisions, for this was a man with a strong belief in the Almighty.

President Nixon, as you so eloquently stated in your message informing Congress of President Johnson's death, it was his "noble and difficult destiny to lead America through a long, dark night of necessity at home and abroad." If he could have chosen other circumstances in which to be President, perhaps he would have. But, America has a capacity to call forth the leadership it must have in those hours of its greatest need. We had Abraham Lincoln when he was needed. We had Franklin Roosevelt when he was needed. History will record that in the seventh decade of the 20th century, America had Lyndon Johnson when he was needed.

When you remember him, remember him please for two things—his devotion to his country—and his restraint.

So often in his Presidency, dissension escalated into violence. Yet always, no matter how critical the situation, his inner faith in the people came to the fore and his restraint in the uses of power permitted the people to confront each situation and overcome it utilizing the inherent rights of free men.

Those of us who loved him take comfort in the knowledge that before he died, he could see the dawn of domestic tranquility and of foreign peace which he gave so much of his great heart to bring about. The structure of peace which President Nixon, with great distinction and determination, is building in the world today will rest upon a foundation laid in loneliness and stubborn courage by Lyndon Johnson.

This man's restless, searching heart began to give out long before January 22nd. He gave so much of himself to so many that it is wondrous that God, in His grace, granted him four years to enjoy his retirement in the hill country he so deeply treasured.

Not for him the easy way.

Not for him any halfway measures.

He was a tall man of giant character, and when he committed himself, he committed himself totally. And he asked his countrymen to do the same.

He asked those who had much to be concerned for those who had least.

He asked us to live up to our national promise.

He asked us to be worthy of our heritage. He asked us to be true to ourselves.

But, he never asked more than he was willing to give—and what he gave was good enough to confirm and advance the progress of the nation he served.

Lyndon Johnson loved a woman, and she was his greatest joy and his greatest comfort. He loved his children and his grandchildren and to see them together was a heart-warming experience, for it transcended normal family devotion.

And coupled with that he loved each of us, sometimes with wry amusement at our failures, often with sharp words at our imperfections, but always with a sweeping and generous understanding of our frailties. The dimensions of this man were vast.

He is gone from us now—and this afternoon we shall take him home and he will be forever a part of the hill country.

Last September, I had the opportunity to be with him when he spoke of America and of the future.

He knew then that he might not see another autumn, but this was not a man who welcomed or needed sympathy.

Years from now, when historians appraise him, his speech that day could serve as the cornerstone of their research—for it reflected the true Lyndon Johnson. He gave much of himself to it, and it might well be his epitaph. He said:

"With the coming of September, each year, we are reminded as the song says, that the days are dwindling down to a precious few—"

the green leaves of summer will begin to brown—the chill winds of winter will begin to blow—and before we are ready for the end to come, the year will be gone.

"As it is with the calendar, so it sometimes seems to be with our country and our system. For there are those among us who would have us believe that America has come to its own September—and that our nation's span as mankind's last best hope will be done."

President Johnson continued:

"But I live by the faith that with each passing day we are always approaching nearer to the beginning of a new springtime and it is by that perspective that I see our country now.

"No nation can be more than the visions of its people. America cannot be more than we believe ourselves capable of becoming.

"I want to open the soul of America to the warm sunlight of faith in itself . . . faith in the principles and precepts of its birth . . . and faith in the promise and potential of its people."

That was Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States of America. The years will be lonely without him.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the remarks by the Honorable John B. Connally, former Treasurer of the United States, which was a eulogy delivered at the graveside at the LBJ Ranch. Mr. Connally was one of the young men who joined the President's staff in the late 1930's and was "one of his boys" and has given a life of dedication and devotion to the President.

[From the Austin Statesman, Jan. 26, 1973]
"HOW CAN A FEW WORDS EULOGIZE A MAN SUCH AS HE?"

(By Hon. JOHN B. CONNALLY)

We lay to rest here a man whose whole life embodied the spirit and hope of America.

How can a few words eulogize a man such as he?

Not in a purely personal way, although President and Mrs. Johnson had a profound effect on my life, on Nellie's and the lives of our children, just as they had on the lives of many of you within the sound of my voice.

Not in a dispassionate way, because none who knew him could speak dispassionately of him.

And not in words of great elegance and adornment, simply because he would not have wanted that.

Lyndon Johnson spoke plainly all of his life. He spoke to the hearts of people. The wellspring of this thought and words and deeds was always the fundamental character of the plain people he loved and whose dreams and aspirations he tried so hard to bring to reality.

Eloquent praise and heartfelt words of sympathy have poured forth since last Monday afternoon when we learned this great heart had stilled. The world has a fallen leader and owes him much honor.

But I feel today it is these plain people he loved—the silent people—who mourn him the most.

He gave them all he had for forty years. He gave them his incredible energy, his matchless legislative mind, and his restless devotion to the ideal that his country's grasp should always exceed its reach . . . that nothing was impossible where there was a determined will.

He was one of them. He never forgot it, and they will never forget him.

Lyndon Johnson was one of three presidents to be born in this century. But this hill country in 1908 was not much different from the frontier his father and mother had known.

The comforts and amenities were few, the

educational opportunities were determined by the quality of a single teacher or a handful of teachers, and man's fortunes were dictated by the amount of rain or the heat of the sun or the coldness of the north wind.

Yet a child's dreams could be as wide as the sky and his future as green as the winter oats, because this, after all, was America.

Lyndon Johnson made his dreams come true because he saw the real opportunity of this land and this political system into which he was born. He never doubted he could do it, because he always knew he could work harder than anyone else, sustain his dedication longer than anyone else and renew his spirit more completely than anyone else no matter how serious the setback or even the defeat.

Thus he rose from these limited beginnings to the zenith of power, and as he so often said with a mixture of awe and pride, "I guess I've come a long way for a boy from Johnson City, Texas."

But with all of his strengths, Lyndon Johnson cannot be viewed as a man above men, a mythical hero conquering all before him.

In a sense, his life was one of opposites—of conflicting forces within him trying to emerge supreme.

The product of simple rural surroundings he was thrust by his own ambition into an urbane and complicated world.

Born into a Southwestern, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon heritage, he found his native values challenged constantly in the political and social climate which enveloped him.

Reared and educated without benefit of a more worldly existence, he thirsted for the knowledge that would propel him to the heights in the life he chose for himself.

Some criticized him for being unlettered and unsophisticated when in truth he was incredibly wise and incredibly sophisticated in ways his critics never understood, perhaps because he always dealt not with things as they should have been, but as they were.

He dealt with basic human qualities and basic human reactions.

He was uninhibited by hypocrisy or false pride. He was not afraid to let his feelings show.

It is said that in some ways he was an insecure man. Of course he was. He knew he was not endowed with the kingly virtues of always being right; he tried merely to do his best to discover what was right.

He recognized his own shortcomings far more than many of his detractors recognized theirs. He never hesitated to ask for help and he understood better than most the meaning of loyalty and mutual affection among friends and associates.

The same insecurities existed in Lyndon Johnson that exist in all of us. His strengths and his weaknesses were universally human qualities, shared by people everywhere who have also dreamed of the mountaintop, each in his own way.

President Johnson cared for people, no matter where they lived in this world or their color or their heritage.

He showed this in public ways too numerous to list. What is more important, he showed it in private ways when the world was not looking.

Not long ago he visited the ranch of a friend in Mexico and discovered a small rural schoolhouse for children in the depths of poverty.

When he returned to Austin he and Mrs. Johnson gathered dozens of small wind-up toys, medicine, clothing and other items for those children, and when he went back to Mexico he took those things with him and he had his own Christmas celebration with those children.

So we have the vision of a former president of the United States, perhaps down on his knees, surrounded by youngsters from another land, whose language he did not speak, demonstrating for them how to wind up a 25-cent toy.

Somehow, I think that's how Lyndon Johnson would like best for us to remember him.

The tens of thousands who have filed past his bier and the tens of millions who mourn him from afar—these are the people who understand who he was and what he was and how he thought, because he was one of them.

I think they would know of his frustrations of leadership, his impatience, the occasional temper, sometimes the sharp tongue, but always the overriding courage and determination of this complex man.

Surely they would know of his anguish over sending men to war when all he wanted was peace and prosperity and freedom. It seems ironic on this day that his predecessors began the war in Southeast Asia and his successor ended it. It was his fate to be the bridge over the intervening chasm of conflict that swept this country and the world. But he accepted that role without flinching, and no one would be happier today, no one would be more appreciative of the beginnings of peace and the president who achieved it, than the president who worked so long and so unselfishly for the tranquility that eluded him.

It is fashionable among some to refer to Lyndon Johnson as a tragic president.

But I believe history will describe his presidency as tragic only in the sense that it began through tragedy, for his service was not one of tragedy but one of triumph.

It was a triumph for the poor, a triumph for the oppressed, a triumph for social justice and a triumph for mankind's never-ending quest for freedom.

Along this stream and under these trees he loved he will now rest.

He first saw light here. He last felt life here. May he now find peace here.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL).

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to memorialize Lyndon Johnson.

It is fitting that we do so in this Chamber where Mr. Johnson first came 42 years ago.

He knew the Congress as no man ever will. First as a doorman to this room, then as assistant to his Congressman, next as Congressman, and as we so well know, as Senator, Vice President, and President.

The Nation has lost a great leader. The poor, the black, the aged, the sick have lost a champion. I have lost a friend.

Most of us here today supported Lyndon Johnson at one time or another. I am proud to have supported him often, and willingly, both domestically and in foreign affairs.

This man's legislative accomplishments were legion. Ideas and social programs that had languished in the Congress for years were placed on the books during his 5 crowded years in office.

And we could do his memory no greater disservice at this time than to allow the systematic dismantling of his social visions and accomplishments.

Medical care for the elderly and the poor had been discussed since the first days of social security. They now have it. We must not take it away.

Rights of the minorities to be treated fairly were discussed since the days of the Civil War. They now have many rights; they will have more, until we all are truly treated equally. We must not take it away.

Aid to education was a dream of many.

Lyndon Johnson made it a reality in a series of landmark educational measures. We must not take it away.

The training and opportunity for jobs has long been a national necessity. Lyndon Johnson made it a source of national pride. We must not resort to callous economic programs whose victims are those whose greatest need is a fair chance at a productive job.

A strong and vital nation, with pride and performance on its commitments was Lyndon Johnson's goal. We must not become a weak and impotent nation. He would not have allowed it.

These, and many, many more were the goals and dreams and accomplishments of Lyndon Johnson—for himself, perhaps, but really for the people of this Nation.

For he loved the people. When he worked for education, he thought of the individual children who were denied an equal choice. When he worked for voting rights, he thought of the citizen who was denied his rightful voice in government. When he worked for social security and medicare and jobs, he thought not of great programs, but of the individual who had to be given his fair chance, but was denied.

Lyndon Johnson's life touched every American. The improvements he dreamed of and fought for and accomplished will be his living monument.

He once said:

I have devoted my time on this earth to working toward the day when there would be no second-class citizenship in America, no second-quality opportunity, no second-hand justice at home, no second-place status in the world for our ideals and benefits.

As I joined his family and friends on his burial day in his beloved Texas hill country, my thoughts turned to how few of us have such great goals and how fewer still accomplish any of them.

He did it all.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I approach this, my first speech as a Member of this body, with mixed emotions. On the one hand, I am very honored to be able to pay tribute to the man, Lyndon B. Johnson, who gave me and scores of other young men and women in the United States an opportunity to serve this country and who also renewed in us a dedication and love for this country.

It also is a sad occasion, because by our tributes we acknowledge that the wisdom, and wit of Lyndon Johnson, and the love which Lyndon Johnson had for America must rest as a part of our history.

I feel I had a somewhat special relationship with President Johnson, which at times extended to employer-employee; at times to man to man; father-son and President-citizen. Particularly during the last 4 years of his Presidency, as a member of his White House staff, I had a rare opportunity to observe this human being who happened to be our President, from early in the morning in the President's bedroom, when he

went over the casualty reports and the situation reports worldwide and in Vietnam, to late at night when he usually left the troubles of the Presidency sometime around midnight or thereafter.

I had the opportunity to observe this human being in many moments of pressure and in many times of relaxation. My admiration for him as a private person and as a public being only grew with exposure. He was a genuine, warm, decent man for whom I will always have profound fondness, respect and love.

I remember Lyndon Johnson for many things, because he was a man who cared, not in the abstract, but a man who cared for people in human terms. He did not measure his Presidency, nor did he measure his life, by the pieces of legislation which he passed. He measured it by what that legislation and what his works did for people. He had landmark legislation, which this Congress helped him pass, in the field of education. But he did not put it in terms of, "Here is a piece of legislation." He put it in terms of Mexican-American children he had taught as a young man. He put it in terms of an opportunity for all the children of this country, regardless of their backgrounds, to have a chance to get the tools to do for themselves, to share the full opportunities of this country.

He did not look upon his great legislation that he passed in the field of health care, such as Medicare, as just another bill the historians will look at. I remember in Beaumont, Texas, one time in a nursing home, when a lady looked up to him and said, "Mr. President, you have given me pride, you have given me dignity," and that is what he wanted to give his fellow human beings.

He demanded excellence both of himself and of those around him. In many of those long days in the White House, we would be exhausted at the midnight hour from the demands that he had placed on the staff. When you went home, you really realized what he had done for you. He had allowed you to push yourself beyond the capabilities and the abilities that you thought you had, into that pursuit of excellence which he demanded of himself and of the country.

He wanted peace probably more than any single thing. I think that was the single, most important reason why he chose not to run for re-election in 1968.

He loved this country and he loved those who built the country, the constructors, and not those who tore it down. Those people he could not understand.

He was a private man and yet he belonged to the public. He was a humorous man. He was a forgiving man. He was an understanding man.

I remember his wit. One Saturday evening after a particularly long week in which he was going back to the mansion for a private dinner. He invited a particular Member of Congress, who had been vocally critical of him, to have dinner with him and his family. A member of his family said:

Why would you do that? He is your enemy, he is saying all those nasty things about you. Why don't you enjoy dinner with your family?

And he replied:

If I did not have dinner with my enemies, I might be dining alone.

He was a witty man. He was an understanding man. He was a man who loved the power of political office, and mostly what that power would do for the country.

I remember the night before President Nixon was inaugurated in 1968. Mr. Johnson had a group of the special assistants and their families in the yellow oval room of the White House, and in what was a most moving experience he recalled the history of America that he had personally participated in. He encouraged all of us to try to be bipartisan in our support of those who would lead us in our lifetimes.

He did have a special relationship with and a special feeling for the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point some comments from an essay by John Steinbeck which bear upon what America does about its Presidents and what it feels toward its Presidents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The relationship of Americans to their President is a matter of amazement to foreigners. Of course we respect the Office and admire the man who can fill it, but at the same time we inherently fear and suspect power. We are proud of the President, and we blame him for things he did not do. We are related to the President in a close and almost family sense; we inspect his every move and mood with suspicion. We insist that the President be cautious in speech, guarded in action, immaculate in his private and public life; and in spite of these imposed pressures we are avidly curious about the man hidden behind the formal public image we have created. We have made a tough but unwritten code of conduct for him, and the slightest deviation brings forth a torrent of accusations and abuse.

The President must be greater than anyone else, but not better than anyone else. We subject him and his family to close and constant scrutiny and denounce them for things that we ourselves do everyday. A Presidential slip of the tongue, a slight error in judgment—social, political or ethical—can raise a storm of protest. We give the President more work than a man can do, more responsibility than a man can take, more pressure than a man can bear. We abuse him often and rarely praise him. We wear him out, use him up, eat him up. And with all this, Americans have a love for the President that goes beyond loyalty or party or nationality; he is ours, and we exercise the right to destroy him.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. As has been said during these tributes to Lyndon Johnson, Mr. Johnson learned about Government from two men—Speaker Sam Rayburn and President Franklin Roosevelt. He was generous with this knowledge, and gave me a rare opportunity to learn. I am pleased to see that former Congressman Ed Edmondson from whom I also learned so much is in the Chamber today to pay his respects to our mutual friend, Mr. Johnson, and the Johnson family. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just point to another essay I read which stated that in America we honor our mediocre Presidents during their lifetimes and we honor our

great Presidents after they have departed.

I feel, on behalf of myself and my wife Olivia and all those who had the privilege of working with President Johnson, that the honors due him for his greatness and his contributions to this country and to his friends are just now beginning to come home. We will miss him very deeply.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks. He was one of those men who worked at the White House and who put in long, dedicated hours carrying out the wishes and the ambitions of the President, and doing so in a loyal and dedicated manner. His own dedication has meant a lot to America. I know that his remarks will be appreciated by the family and by all those who know what he has meant to the President and to this Nation.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Lyndon B. Johnson diminished the lives of every American involved with mankind.

He was a great man and a great President of the United States. Historians may regard that judgment as premature. But those of us who felt the power of his compassion and were the beneficiaries of his legislative prowess and effectiveness cannot await the historian's judgment. We know now and see clearly that the fact of Lyndon B. Johnson's life and work stripped the Federal Government of its neutrality and made it the actor on behalf of America's old, poor, and black citizens.

The depth of Lyndon B. Johnson's concern for people cannot be quantified. It was big and all encompassing. Old men straightened their stooped backs because he lived. Little children dared look forward to intellectual achievement because he lived.

Black Americans became excited about a future of opportunity, hope, justice and dignity during his Presidency. Lyndon B. Johnson reminded this country shortly before his death that the problem of being black in a white society remains and that the problem of unequal opportunity cannot be overcome until unequal history is overcome. He wanted America to get on with the business of removing the vestiges of racial discrimination wherever found.

The record of the Johnson Presidency provides us with real and hard evidence of his commitment to equality for all men. There is no need to repeat it here for a quick glance at the laws of the United States enacted from 1963 through 1968 provide an authentic account.

The legacy of Lyndon B. Johnson is a legacy of hope for defenseless Americans—a hope born in the decade of the sixties—a hope which must not be allowed to die in the decade of the seventies.

Lyndon B. Johnson left us a legacy of courage and commitment.

Let us today resolve to protect and defend this inheritance. He was counting on us and we must not let him down.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for her remarks. She knows personally of the great compassion and courage of President Johnson.

As Speaker ALBERT had said earlier, the acts passed in the field of civil rights, the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, will be President Johnson's epitaph and will be remembered long after we are gone, and they will live through the ages.

I am grateful for the remarks the gentleman has made to us.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as is always the case when a great man dies, journalists during the past 2 weeks have been recounting the incidents and events, large and small, that help us understand Lyndon Johnson as a distinguished lawmaker, as a President, and as a man.

Since my tenure in Congress coincided in part with Lyndon Johnson's service in the Senate and later in the White House, I came to know him fairly well. He was my friend, a truly monumental person, and a man whom I believe history will treat far better than some of his contemporaries have treated him.

It would be folly to try to paint even a rough word portrait of Lyndon Johnson in these few minutes, because he was above all an enormously complex man. There are, however, little scraps of recollection that give illuminating insights into at least certain phases of his personality, his hopes, and his dreams.

My first exposure to Lyndon Johnson date back to 1941. Senator Morris Sheppard of Texas had died and there was a special election to fill his vacancy in the Senate. Lyndon Johnson, then a young Congressman from central Texas, sought the post. For most Texans, it was the first we had heard of this driving, thrusting personality who was to loom so large in the history of our State and of our Nation.

Mr. Johnson was not successful in that bid for higher office. He barely missed winning election to the Senate that year. My most memorable recollection of him at the time was his publicly stated promise, those few fateful months before Pearl Harbor, that if it ever became necessary to send American boys overseas in a foreign war, Lyndon Johnson would leave his seat in the U.S. Senate and go with them.

When Pearl Harbor came—in the words of President Roosevelt, "A day that will live in infamy"—Congressman Johnson made good his promise. Of all Members of the House and Senate, he was the first to enlist in the service of his country. He left the Halls of Congress and accompanied members of my generation to the South Pacific where he participated in combat action against the Japanese, earning the Silver Star for gallantry.

For some who find it easy to attribute selfish motives to every deed of decency and kindness, Lyndon Johnson's championing of the oppressed and the dis-

possessed may have seemed nothing more than "politics." Those who knew him as a person know better. I recall from the days immediately following the hostilities of World War II an occurrence in which the body of a Mexican-American boy was returned and he was denied burial by the bigoted rules which governed his hometown cemetery in south Texas. It was Lyndon Johnson who pointedly and publicly exposed the barrenness of the blind and unthinking prejudice of that community when he arranged for the body of that young man to be buried with honors at Arlington National Cemetery. With Lyndon Johnson, it was not "politics." It was conviction.

One small incident took place on an airplane en route to Texas only a year or so after he had recovered from his first heart attack in 1955. As the plane droned westward from Washington, Mr. Johnson and I talked about the racial unrest that was then festering in Texas. Because of his work in behalf of civil rights legislation, Senator Johnson was being accused in some quarters of being a turncoat—a traitor to the Southern cause—a tool of the NAACP. One fellow who had been listening to the conversation asked the Senator what he was going to do about this accusation. This fellow asked:

Don't you think you will have to deny it?

I will never forget Mr. Johnson's reply. He said:

No, I'm not going to demagogue on that issue. If I have to prove that I hate Negroes in order to win, then I'll just not win.

He told us there was a Negro girl who brought him coffee in the majority leader's office every morning. He said,

I'm not going to have to look away when she comes in for being ashamed of something I've said.

Then, recalling his battle to recover from the heart attack, he told me:

When I lay in that hospital bed I thought of a lot of things. A man doesn't occupy this earth forever. I don't know when I'll die, and I hope it won't be soon. But I'm not going to die with that on my conscience.

A man indeed does not occupy this earth forever. When death struck Lyndon Johnson in the privacy of his bedroom all his friends could be certain that his conscience was not haunted by anything he had failed to do in the field of human rights.

Lyndon B. Johnson was a big man and he moved on a big stage. He was big in compassion for his fellow man, and big in his ambitions for the betterment of our Nation.

He wanted to wipe out poverty, to end racial injustice, to conquer space, to establish a genuine and lasting peace in Southeast Asia—and he wanted to do them all at once.

The wonder is not that he failed to accomplish all of his goals. The wonder is that he was able to accomplish so many of them.

Lyndon Johnson was above all a generous man. He was impulsively generous on occasion with his friends, and often more generous than many ever realized in his appraisal and personal treatment of political foes.

More than this, he was generous with

himself. Abundantly, almost wantonly, he spilled out his time and effort and energy. In the days of his Presidency, it was almost as though he were haunted by the limitations of time. There was so much to be done, and so little time in which to accomplish it.

Some who were closer to Mr. Johnson than I in the last few months of his life have expressed privately the feeling that he may have had a premonition of death. I have no knowledge of that nor any reliable insight. But I recall with vivid clarity the last conversation I had with Mr. Johnson. We were having lunch in his suite in the library which was his endowment to the University of Texas. The former President was relaxed. He spoke with pride of his family, his children and grandchildren, the opportunities for service that had come his way, the relative comfort and material abundance which had been his privilege. And then, almost as in a self-pronounced benediction, he said, "I am content."

Many have called Lyndon Johnson the greatest legislative leader in our history. He was a great politician, no one can deny that, but he was also a great humanitarian with a deep compassion and respect for his fellow man.

He did more than the country ever realized or appreciated and accomplished less than his own dreams. He wanted a "Great Society" but unlike so many who want to improve the country, he devoted a lifetime to doing something about it. For Lyndon Johnson the "Great Society" was not just a dream; it was a way of life.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the passing of a mighty man and a great leader. Of this there is no doubt.

The people of my State knew him and loved him and remembered him with great warmth and admiration as a result of his many visits to our State, not in behalf of himself, but always to fight the good fight for his party and his country and to acclaim the good works of our own U.S. Senators, the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney and our incumbent Senator GALE W. McGEE.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting remarks in memory of our late President than the words of Bernie Horton, editor of the Wyoming Eagle, recalling the tremendous assistance that great man gave to the Nation and to Wyoming's public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent, if I may, that my remarks be followed by the editorial of the Wyoming Eagle of January 23, 1973.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Wyoming has lost another friend.

His name: Lyndon B. Johnson, 36th President of the United States. Mr. Johnson died yesterday of a heart attack.

Many Wyomingites may remember Lyndon Johnson when he came to Cheyenne in 1952 to deliver a free-swinging political speech in behalf of his long-time friend, the late Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

Others may remember him in 1958, when he told Wyomingites that, if they elected

Gale W. McGee to the United States Senate, he, as majority leader in the Senate, would see to it that McGee would be appointed to the powerful Senate Appropriations committee. McGee was elected and he was appointed to the appropriations committee the day he walked into the Senate.

Some of us will remember talking to Lyndon Johnson in Los Angeles, in 1960 when he was running for President. He ended up as running mate to the late President John F. Kennedy, and much of the credit for their victory was due to his efforts.

Lyndon Johnson came to Cheyenne again, in July, 1963, to speak at a giant appreciation dinner in honor of Wyoming's senior Senator McGee. More than 1,250 persons from all over Wyoming turned out for the occasion.

On that day, Mr. Johnson granted this writer an exclusive interview, perhaps the last exclusive interview he was to grant for many years. He was Vice President, at the time, and a few months later he was to become President following the tragic events that transpired in Dallas, Tex.

Lyndon Johnson even rode in the Cheyenne Frontier Days parade, one year. Remember him? Cowboy hat and all perched on the back of a stagecoach?

Some may have thought differently.

But we thought Lyndon Johnson was one of the most approachable, down-to-earth men we have ever interviewed.

He answered our questions with candor and sincerity. It seemed to us that, even as Vice President, he was dedicated to making this a greater nation—a nation with concern for all.

President Johnson was scheduled to return to Cheyenne on Nov. 4, 1966, but was forced to cancel because of a serious illness.

Some Wyoming Democrats may remember Lyndon Johnson when he was nominated at the 34th National Democratic Convention at Atlantic City, Aug. 24-27, 1964.

Some, who are interested in politics, will remember his landslide victory that year. He won 486 electoral votes to only 52 for his opponent.

Some may remember the vast number of social and economic reforms he brought about as President, especially during the months immediately following the death of President Kennedy.

But we strongly suspect that millions of Americans, including the citizens of Wyoming, may remember most vividly the address Lyndon B. Johnson gave on a Sunday evening, March 31, 1968.

At the very close of a 30-minute speech on Vietnam, during which he announced he was ordering an immediate and unilateral scaling down of American bombing of North Vietnam as "the first step in what I hope will be a series of mutual moves toward peace," Mr. Johnson declared:

"I shall not seek and I will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your President."

That was his way of underscoring the United States' sincerity in seeking to end the war in Vietnam. It eventually was to bring the communists to the conference table. Few times in history has a President, or any other leader of a major international power, placed the welfare of his nation and the struggle for the ideal of peace so clearly and dramatically ahead of his own political ambitions.

Among other things, President Johnson may go down in history as the President who gave up his own political future in favor of national unity and a sincere hope for peace.—Bernie Horton, Editor.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of a commentary by Nicholas von Hoffman entitled "A Big, Big Man," which article appeared in the Washington Post edition of January 24, 1973:

A BIG, BIG MAN

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Ah, Lyndon, you're not cold yet and they're calling you great. That's what happens when one politician dies: The rest of them call him great, but, Lyndon, you deserve better than patriotic hagiography. You were better than the eulogistic junk they're saying at the memorial services.

Lyndon, you got your teeth into us and we got our teeth into you. Those five years of you in the White House were a barroom brawl, and, just four years ago almost to the day, when we staggered out of the saloon, dusty and bloody, we didn't hate you anymore. We understood better how you got us into Vietnam than how Nixon got us out and we liked you more, you cussed, cussing, bull-headed, impossible, roaring, wild coot.

You had your credibility gaps and your silent, sullennesses, but we read you. Oh, man, Lyndon, did we know you! You were the best and the worst of ourselves, the personification of our national deliriums. You were always so completely, so absolutely you. Kennedy had Pablo Casals to play for him, Nixon's got Pat Boone to pray for him, but you, Lyndon, you had Country Joe and the Fish singing songs soaked in four-letter words at you.

They're not bringing it up at your funeral, but you had a famous dirty mouth. By most accounts the only man in the history of the White House who could cuss better than you was Andrew Jackson. We on the outside knew how to make obscenity a tool of eloquence, too. We could recognize you, not as a Great American, but as an American man. But you did your own hating and your own cussing, not like these stiffies they've got in there now who import Sinatra and the dregs of Las Vegas to call people filthy names for them.

That wasn't your style, Lyndon. You let it all hang out; but then, man, even when we hated you most, we knew you at least had something. Your dogs had names and you pulled their ears. No official court photograph animal for you to have its picture taken as you asked the mutt's name. Sure, you could be gross. Getting your picture taken in the hospital bed, pulling up your pj's so we could all see the scar on your belly, and they still whisper around Washington that you used to receive ambassadors from foreign countries stepping out of the shower bath nipped as a jay bird, as they say where you came from.

And, still you kept your dignity. Maybe because everything you did, good, bad, indifferent or just funny, was so big. You were Andy Jackson's boy. Immoderate and big. No rein on yourself. They say even after the second heart attack you couldn't bring yourself to quit smoking.

Lyndon you were immoderate, and greedy. You outdid all the rest of us hungry Americans for reaching out and grabbing, fingers always stretched for grasping, but now they're saying after your death that you divided America, left her all split and bleeding. It is true that if ever a man had a reach which exceeded his grasp, it was you, you wicked old devil, but you redeemed this country even while dropping us, plopl, in the middle of the Vietnam Big Muddy.

You fought our Second Civil War and carried out our Second Reconstruction. The credit has gone to John Kennedy but he doesn't deserve it. He had the speechwriters to say fair, promising things, while he and his brother appointed racist judges to the federal bench. Lyndon, it isn't fair to you that Jack Kennedy's picture should be tacked up on the walls of so many poor black homes, Kennedy who regarded blacks as but another pressure group to be tricked or placated.

But some of us remember. Some of us who were in a room in the public housing project across the street from Brown's Chapel in

Selma, Ala., that night you talked to a joint session of Congress in your rich, half-southern accent and we saw you on TV say to them, "We shall overcome." Lyndon, you did your best to overcome. Where Jack Kennedy reacted with official indifference to what happened to black people, you shook and threatened the federal bureaucracy from the FBI to the Department of Agriculture to make them redeem the pledge of equal protection.

Much of what you started is being abandoned, discarded and attacked, and much of it ought to be. You were so impulsive. You tried to solve social problems like a drunken hardware wholesaler trying to snag girls in a Paris nightclub. You drank so much of the social betterment bubbly the nation woke up with a hangover, but God bless you for it. Every right-living nation ought to go on that kind of a drunk every so often, and even if you went about it the wrong way, you got us thinking about what we should be doing. Your Medicare and Medicaid aren't exactly winners, but thanks to you our people will have the health protection.

You were a big 'un, Lyndon. We're going to miss you, you old booger, and we're going to know, regardless of official proclamations, you deserve better than to be saluted, left at half-mast and forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time the texts of speeches delivered on the campus of the University of Texas on January 25, 1973, as follows: the remarks by Mr. Dick Benson, the student president of the University of Texas at Austin; the remarks of the Dr. Stephen H. Spurr, president of the University of Texas; and the remarks of the Honorable Charles Alan Wright, chairman of the faculty senate of the University of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks were given before a large audience at the university, the university which houses the L. B. J. papers, and I am pleased to have them inserted at this particular point:

SPEECH BY DICK BENSON

(Student President at the University of Texas at Austin)

Within the confines of statehood, diplomacy and politics there exists a nearly infinite variability of approach. The subtle weave or events, ideals, information and mankind is so enormously complex and chaotic as to defy definitive analysis of exact description. Approach, or method, becomes then a matter of projection—of arraying the chaos of the world out there to conform with inner assumptions, drives and goals. Of this, Lyndon Johnson was a master—he carried his milieu both within and without and the strength of his world demanded the attention of those around him—extending outwards to encompass the population of an entire nation.

For those who demand absolutes, politics is a hard road to travel. Those who survive it, like President Johnson, are able to endure the void, the chaos, they have the force of will to create from nothing a field of endeavor and inhabit it.

Johnsonian politics besides being earthy and regional was primarily composed of people—inordinately human, the content and structure of his epoch were made up of distinct personalities—in itself, a great contribution. Government exists of and by men only—we not only man, but also create its machinery. To understand this takes sometimes, a substantial leap of faith by those hard-pressed by the system. A personal man as president is a friend or enemy—a person and a personality—infinite more distinct and valuable than the programmed blandness of the scientifically determined and unobjectionable middle of the road.

Composed as they are of human thoughts, I am recently impressed by the ability of events to elude the grasp and manipulation of man himself. Surely, when faced with that situation, leadership acquires a whole new kind of loneliness.

Sometimes intention and event do not coincide and we are often not justified in exacting personal judgments on situations well beyond our comprehension. History in total is not the conscious product of any one man's mind. President Johnson's intentions were impeccable in his own moral frame. His life and works were not egotistical but rather the natural extension of an audacious and challenging existence.

I met and knew him briefly for a total of some four to five hours spread over two occasions, but those impressions confirm these thoughts. His preoccupations primarily concerned the problems of race, hunger and education. With two others, I first encountered President Johnson in the front yard of his ranch. During the ensuing conversation he was asked this question: assuming the apparent goodwill and intelligence of most of the world's leaders, why did war, strife and famine girdle the planet? He was perplexed and could not produce a simple answer but to him it was an issue to consider and not one to be written off as simply beyond man's comprehension—he wanted and tried to understand what probably no person in the world does understand. Presumptuous and in the style of the President but necessary—very necessary for those who care to sustain the terribly tenuous state of peace.

President Johnson, just because of his style, would never have selected this statement to end a speech of his own but the Poet Rilke also seems to have known the magnitude of what it is to create a historical world and live in its consequences:

"These things that live on departure understand when you praise them: fleeting, they look for rescue through something in us, the most fleeting of all. Want us to change them entirely within our invisible hearts, into . . . endlessly, into ourselves. Whosoever we are."

SPEECH BY STEPHEN H. SPURR

(President, the University of Texas at Austin)

All of the proper things have been said about LBJ by those most qualified to say them: his largeness of character, his mastery of the art of politics, his leading role in the betterment of American education, and his deep commitment to enlarging the opportunities of ethnic minorities. I can speak personally only of his last year and a half and only of his relationship to our University.

President Johnson was fond of telling how he was shamed into going to Southwest Texas State by his parents, and how he was taken in there warmly, and how he came to maturity and ambition through his college experience. His gratitude to his alma mater was great, and his commitment to higher education derived from this crucial turn in his own life.

The University of Texas was, of course, his wife's alma mater. Here he was persuaded to place his presidential papers, and here he gave his blessing and support to having a new and special School of Public Affairs established in his name.

In my dealings with him, I found him deeply respectful of the University community, strongly supportive of our efforts to build a better university, and careful not to intrude in any way on our academic processes. When I came to campus he told me that he respected the presidency of the University as he did the presidency of the country; that he'd never offer advice, but that he'd give it if asked; and that he would never intrude himself on campus but that he was available if wanted. When I hesitantly asked if he would open the Congress of Black Pro-

fessionals in Higher Education, he countered with the offer to give a major speech if I wanted him to—and he did—although he had to get up at 4:00 in the morning to keep his promise, and although the strain of the effort may have contributed to the heart attack he suffered two days later.

I shall remember best, however, his final moment at the recent civil rights symposium. We knew a disruption was planned, but President Johnson would not be deterred. He mounted slowly and painfully to the podium, and stopped to swallow a nitroglycerin pill to ease the pain before giving his closing remarks. When an uninvited speaker tried to force his way through the secret service to the platform to serve his demands, we could see the President come to life. He seemed literally to grow in stature, to glow, and to fill the room. With one gesture he called off the guards and with another he took the black minister to his bosom. Giving the podium to the speaker, he listened patiently and then delivered a calming, folksy, and wise discourse that left us all—black and white, conformists and dissenter alike, knowing that we had been for a moment in the presence of true greatness. That is how I shall remember him.

SPEECH BY CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT

(Chairman of the Faculty Senate, the University of Texas at Austin)

Members of an academic community have reason to be grateful for the life and career of Lyndon Johnson. He was devoted to the cause of education and did much that will be of permanent benefit to higher education generally and to this University in particular. President Spurr will address himself to some of these things. Rather than duplicate what he will say, I would like to reflect with you briefly on the great office that President Johnson occupied for more than five years.

In my judgment the most significant original contribution the Framers of our Constitution made to the science of government was in Article II, in which they vested all executive power "in a President of the United States of America." Unlike some of the other novel concepts of the Framers, such as federalism, which have not been much copied elsewhere, their concept of a single officer who is both head of state and head of government and who is chosen by the people for a limited term has been widely adopted throughout the world and has been immensely successful in our own country.

In Moussorgsky's opera, "Boris Gudonov," there is a great aria in which Tsar Boris sings "Mine is the highest power." A 17th Century Tsar of All the Russias had great power—but his power was puny compared to that exercised by a President of the United States. The very existence of civilization on this planet may turn on his wisdom, his good sense, his coolness, and his courage, as he makes hard decisions in international crises in which a nuclear holocaust is a possibility. The President must also several times a day bear the heavy responsibility of resolving issues that are less dramatic but that will have great impact, for good or ill, on "domestic Tranquillity" and "the general Welfare." What Chief Justice Vinson described as "the broad executive power granted by Article II to an officer on duty 365 days a year" gives the President considerable room to shape the future course of our nation.

This awesome power is vested in one man. When Congress or the Supreme Court act, the responsibility is shared among those who are in the majority. When the President acts, he acts alone. He can and does listen to wise advisers, but only he can make the decision. In President Truman's phrase, "The buck stops here."

We choose our President in hotly fought elections. His margin of victory may be sweeping, as was President Johnson's in

1964, or very thin, as was that of the ticket on which he was chosen Vice President in 1960. But from the moment he takes office, he is President, not of a party, but of all the people. The hopes and aspirations all of us have for our country are wrapped up in one lonely man who has sworn that he "will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Mark well the phrase, "to the best of my Ability." The Framers made the President, within the area assigned to him, omnipotent, but they could not make him omniscient. Given the complexity of the issues with which he must deal, it is hardly surprising that every President in our history has made some decisions that, with the benefit of hindsight, were wrong and others that caused great controversy when they were made and that can only finally be appraised in the long judgment of history. President Johnson was no exception. But we were reminded in the ceremony yesterday in the Capitol rotunda that President Johnson closed his final State of the Union message by expressing his hope that it could be said of his administration, "We tried." He closed his memoirs by saying "I gave it all I had." That is all that the Constitution requires. It is all that a free people can properly ask of their chief executive.

The Framers lived in a time of emperors and kings, hereditary monarchs who still exercised significant power. It is a tribute to their genius that they could conceive of an officer more powerful than the mightiest king, yet answerable to the humblest citizen. It is a tribute to that representative product of the sturdy democratic traditions of the Texas Hill Country whom we remember today that he was able to meet the demands of that great office so tragically thrust upon him. All of us, whether we be Republican or Democrat, integrationist or segregationist, hawk or dove, must be grateful for President Johnson's service to our country and for his conscientious effort, through five extraordinarily difficult years, to provide, to the best of his ability, wise leadership for the country he loved so well.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert an article by the Honorable Horace Busby, who formerly was a member of President Johnson's staff, and who indeed came to Washington in the early 1940's to become a member of his staff at that time. The article is entitled "This Country Isn't Over the Hill" . . . Then L. B. J. Was Gone."

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 28, 1973]
"THIS COUNTRY ISN'T OVER THE HILL" . . .
THEN L. B. J. WAS GONE

(By Horace Busby)

On Sunday, Dec. 31, 1972, at my home in the Washington suburbs, I was awakened early in the morning by the telephone. When I answered, a Secret Service agent at the LBJ Ranch in Texas announced: "President Johnson is calling."

Over 25 years, countless days had begun in much the same way, for me and for all other former assistants from the early years whom Lyndon Johnson liked to call "my boys." Whatever his office—congressman, senator, Vice President or President—he was awake at dawn, thinking out his strategies to surmount what others deemed insurmountable.

Once his plans were set, he reached for the telephone and, oblivious to the hour, began launching his characteristic counter-attack on the approaching day. The pattern lingered on in retirement.

If the call was typical, his manner on this

morning was not. He did not banter casually. Speaking crisply and, it seemed, rather hurriedly, he went directly to his point.

"I've called," he said, "about two things." Out of old habit, I picked up a pencil and prepared to take notes. He did not continue. I heard him lay down the telephone—I assumed on the medicine table beside his bed—and there were sounds of glasses clinking and water being poured. A minute or more passed before he spoke again.

"I'm swallowing these nitroglycerine pills," he said matter-of-factly, "like a goldfish gulping crackers."

Of late, his health had become an increasing concern. While he did not always take kindly to inquiries about that subject, I ventured a question anyway, asking how he had been feeling.

"Just fair," he replied. "I'm trying to get in better shape so the doctors will let me go to Mexico next month and rest up in the sun. But it's not good."

The answer was unexpected. Only the previous day, news accounts reported President and Mrs. Johnson's attendance at memorial services in Austin for 16 teenagers from the city who died in a holiday traffic tragedy. I had assumed his presence at those services meant his health must be improved.

When I began mentioning the news reports, however, he immediately bridled. He apparently suspected that I meant to reproach him—as others around him had been doing in recent weeks—for attending too many funerals, each of which seemed to take a deep emotional toll. He cut my comment short.

"Now, Buzz," he said firmly, "you've got to understand those families all live in south Austin."

In the context of his career, that was explanation enough. Since 1937, when he first ran for Congress, Lyndon Johnson had never fully come to terms with Austin's proud old family elite—"the better people," as they were known in the class-conscious New Deal era—who lived in the palatial homes of north Austin.

They resented him politically and were contemptuous of him socially: He was born wrong, schooled wrong, had wrong friends, wrong interests and wrong style. But across the river, in the modest homes of south Austin, where the "little people" lived, he always had the votes.

That schism marked the man from the beginning to the end of his public life. While the fires within him had long been banked, now an ember began to glow hot inside.

"Those people," he said with sudden intensity, "are my people. When nobody else was with me, they stood by me. When they hurt, I hurt. Nothing"—he repeated the word twice more—"is ever going to keep me away from them in times like they're going through."

I said no more about funerals.

After a moment, he turned the conversation, raising the subject of the Vietnam cease-fire negotiations.

"I think they've about got it," he said, "or they will have it soon. I just pray to God they can make it stick."

He continued on, repeating concerns he frequently expressed for what might happen next in other Asian lands. Although his comments were not optimistic, he was talking now about national concerns and his mood brightened noticeably and the horizons of the conversation expanded to Congress, the new Cabinet appointments, economic policy.

"Be sure," he told me, "to meet Barbara Jordan." The newly elected black congresswoman from Texas greatly impressed him. "She's one of the best to go up the pike from down here in a long time," he said.

Other such directions came tumbling out as he went along. There were two editorial page articles in recent issues of the Washington Post and he wanted me to read, "think

about," and send him a memorandum of comment.

He would like to have any statistics I could find about black voting in the 1972 national elections. The indicated low turnout of both blacks and 18-year-olds was, he thought, "a damn disgrace." When he returned from Mexico in March, he added, "we've got to get some smart people together and try to figure out something to change that before the next election."

In this mood, he skipped to another pet project. He was trying, he reported, to raise \$1 million to fund a guest lectureship program at the Johnson Library in Austin. But he was dissatisfied with the current "crop" of lecturers touring the campus circuit.

"Some of those faces," he said, "are getting pretty old and tiresome. Their needs have been stuck for 10 years. Aren't there any new and exciting thinkers?"

I began suggesting some Washington figures, but he interrupted. "Hell," he said, "nobody there has enough charisma to fill a small phone booth, except Kissinger, and he's always some place else."

I laughed, of course, at this flash of his typical humor, and he ran through a list of other names, offering similar succinct comments on each. Then, serious again, he added another assignment.

"While I'm gone," he said, "talk to some good people up there and get some names of lecturers who can really shake up things. These kids on campus aren't fired up like they ought to be."

This talk reminded him of another campus matter. He had been invited, he reported, to deliver the commencement address at the University of Virginia when his son-in-law, Charles Robb, received his law degree this spring.

"That's an old school, a fine school," he commented, "and I want to make the best speech of my life. Remember," he went on, "when Thomas Jefferson wrote his own epitaph, he asked that his tombstone say he was founder of the University of Virginia."

The mood was upbeat, even soaring. This had become a typical early morning Lyndon Johnson conversation. Abruptly, though, he left the telephone once again as he had done at the beginning of the call. When he resumed, nothing was said to explain the interruption, but he returned to his opening remark.

"One of the things I wanted to say," he began, "is that I am very pleased with what we've been able to accomplish these last four or five months."

This had special significance. Over most of his period in retirement, Lyndon Johnson had severely restricted activities that might thrust him back into the public eye. Invitations to speak, lecture or contribute articles to periodicals were rejected without being considered.

"Whatever I say," he had argued, "they'll twist it around to say that I'm criticizing the President. I'm not mad at anybody. I don't want to fight with anybody. The only way to stay out of scrapes is to stay where I belong on the ranch."

Family and friends, though, believed this isolation worked against his health. For more than 30 years, Lyndon Johnson lived with and thrived on the tension and trauma at the center of national affairs. He was farther away from that milieu now than at any time since he was 21 years old.

With some conspiracy and much complicity, various associates began working together after his spring heart attack, edging him back toward a more active public role. He continued to resist through the summer. At the start of September, however, he abruptly changed, for what reason I do not know.

He accepted an invitation to speak at the Scott and White Clinic in Temple, Tex. From the ranch, he called me in Washington and asked if I could come down and work with him on what he wanted to say.

"I would like to get some things off my chest," he explained.

When I arrived at the ranch, he almost seemed to be waiting at the door. I was hardly inside before he picked up a favorite cap and headed outside, saying, "Come on, we need to take a long ride."

For hours we rode together over the ranch, a Secret Service agent trailing behind. He said nothing about the speech. Instead, he reviewed in minute detail—more, I thought, for his interest than mine—his systematic effort "to get things in order for Bird and the girls."

Family business properties were being disposed of, the ranch itself was being deeded to the government for public use, other relatives for whom he felt responsibility were being moved into appropriate career opportunities.

The ride continued through the morning and into early afternoon. Reluctantly, it appeared, he said he had to return to the house. "If I don't get my oxygen and my sleep," he explained, "I begin to feel it in my chest."

At his request, I followed him into the bedroom. He changed into pajamas, spent a few minutes adjusting the oxygen controls and finally slipped under the covers. Holding the oxygen mask in one hand, he began "dictating" what he wanted to say, gesturing as he did so with the other hand.

"This country isn't over the hill," he said. "We aren't on the skids. This is a just country. It's a beautiful country. All this moaning and complaining isn't true, isn't right and it isn't leadership."

He went on at exceptional length, stopping only when he felt, as he described it, "a little pinching" in his chest. Then he turned out the light and I went away to compose the first draft.

When I sat at the typewriter, I knew I had received two messages that morning—one was Lyndon Johnson's message about the country, the other was a distinct message about himself.

The best speeches—or, at least, the best lines in speech texts—usually compose themselves. The message about himself composed the first lines of this text.

"With the coming of September each year, we are reminded, as the song says, that the days are dwindling down to a precious few. By the calendar, we know that soon the green leaves of summer will begin to brown; the chill winds of winter will begin to blow; and—before we are ready for the end to come—the year will be gone."

It was late that night before Lyndon Johnson read the draft. He pencilled through it extensively, far more than usual, and he read it aloud—to me, to Mrs. Johnson, to the ranch foreman.

When we were alone in the office, he read the first lines aloud for still another time. "That's just right," he said. "That's just the way I wanted it."

On that December morning, three weeks ago, it was this speech—if not those lines—that was uppermost in his mind.

"As I look back on it," he said, "I think it was that Temple speech that turned things around. I think the things needed to be said and you just wouldn't believe how kind people are in their letters about it."

This time, though, his mood was not melancholy. Things had turned around. He wanted, he said, to get "really active this year."

"After the inauguration," he explained, "we'll have four years behind us and I think I can speak up a little more. I've got some programs up there they are kicking around and I'd like to go more places and see more people again."

It was very good news. Whatever concerns had formed during portions of the conversation seemed to be meaningless. After a

month in the sun, he would be eager to go to work once more.

He paused in his conversation. "I told you I had two things to tell you," he said, "but I can't seem to remember the other." He lingered over it a bit longer, then dismissed it: "It'll come to me later."

That was all. "Thank you for everything," he said, and he was gone.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson was a generous man. Those of us who have worked closely with him all these years know that he had an immense heart that overflowed with gratitude when good things were done for him or for his programs.

Though he drove his staff hard, he never asked them to put in long or short hours, but rather to "get the job done." He matched their hours with double time because he was totally committed to accomplishing whatever task was before him. Many times when the pressure was intense to get the job accomplished, the President would pause to highly compliment his staff members or to hug them or to otherwise bestow gifts upon them. He realized that his efforts would amount to nothing if he did not have a dedicated and loyal group of people working for him.

It is true that he sometimes used sharp words and kindly scolded some of his staff of friends, but it was always a justifiable apprehension.

The story is legend, however, that he always returned that dedication and that kindness ten-thousand fold. His close friends knew that for every act of kindness given to President Johnson or to his family or program, it would be returned many times over because he would literally shower his gratitude and affection on them.

I was once a Capitol policeman here assisting Mrs. Johnson when the President went to the far reaches of the South Pacific in World War II. Because I had one job as a member of his staff and another job as a Capitol policeman, he knew that I was putting in long hours. It had to be done at that time and all of us were glad to make sacrifices. After his return from the service and in all the years thereafter, he constantly referred to the fact that he would never forget that I would come to the Capitol and hold two jobs just to help run the congressional office. In meetings large and small, he has bestowed thanks and credit to me for that early dedication. He never forgot his early or old friends.

Anyone who reads the RECORD and might study these remarks will know that there are thousands upon thousands of instances where the President has individually bestowed upon his friends his love and affections and blessings.

Some people tend to picture President Johnson as a hard-driving, forceful juggernaut of a man who swept toward his destiny with unrelenting fervor. It is true that he knew that he must apply himself and he did so with all of his body and soul. But the other side of Lyndon Johnson is that he was warm and compassionate. There were times when he would be so overwhelmed with acts of kindness that he would be in tears himself. When he could help a young student or a child achieve some special considera-

tion, that seemed to pump new spirit into his soul and he would walk on a cloud for hours or days at a time.

If he heard of someone on his staff were having illness or difficulty, he would not make a phone call or write a letter, but instead would see that an airplane was made available to fly him or a member of his family to Mayo Clinic if need be. If a dear friend was being married, he would drive or fly hundreds of miles if he could. Or if a close friend was to be buried, he tried to go personally to pay his last respects.

Few people realize how much money he would bestow on his family or his staff or his friends when he wanted them to make a special trip or wanted them to have relaxation or entertainment.

Some of the most pleasant evenings spent in this lifetime by countless friends have been those times when we could visit individually in the quiet of the evening reminiscing and recalling the good and hard times. The President could tell country stories with a strong and forceful point and it was at these moments he was perhaps at his best. He was warm and considerate and had such a keen insight into human nature that his recollections would be so much like people that the person listening could actually visualize and enjoy an America marching forward into the years.

Mr. Speaker, the constant theme of President Johnson's service is the essential fact that he worked for the people. Having been raised in the hard, dry, caliche country of central Texas and having to scrape out an education and a living, President Johnson always knew that there were a lot of people who needed help.

When he became a Congressman and later a Senator and then President, he never lost sight of the fact that government was an instrument to help people who could not help themselves. He visualized government as a means of providing essentials to the downtrodden and underprivileged so that they might have hope and faith in their government. He sincerely believed that government was for the people, and he used that power perhaps more than any President we have had. Some say that he was a "populist" President and perhaps the last of the populist-type of Presidents. If "populist" means that government is supposed to do things for people, then that is an apt description of President Johnson.

President Johnson was the great persuader. He was America. He was big, robust, driving, doing, living, loving, daring, but doing great things during his life. He was easily the most colorful, lovable man of our times, although a controversial man at times. But he was a big man, generous to a fault, who loved his friends whom he had around him at all times.

Lyndon Johnson never ate alone at his dinner table, friends always shared his blessing.

He gave his life to public service.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, I would like to join my

colleague from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN in paying tribute to our late President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

With the passing of any prominent public figure, the American tradition for eulogy and ceremony has become so commonplace as to have taken away much of its original meaning. It has been the custom to overly salute those who have passed on and hail their achievements far beyond their worth.

As a result of the American penchant for canonization, it is often difficult to truly evaluate the real man—his achievements and his shortcomings. But in the case of Lyndon Baines Johnson, we are indeed fortunate to have a yardstick with which few can dispute. For, although he has been eulogized by friend and foe alike, it is the latter that holds the true key.

As columnist Kenneth Auchincloss said in *Newsweek*:

Death withheld from him the favors it has granted other Presidents; that extra measure of devotion that falls to those who die in office, such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt, or the benevolent respect accorded those, such as Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman who outlive the memory of all but their most ardent enemies. Lyndon Johnson died with many of his old foes still arrayed against him, and his place in history far from clear.

Thus, Lyndon Johnson must be viewed without the tragedy that has so often muted criticism, or the time which so often mitigated it.

But, as a longtime friend and admirer of the late President, I am indeed heartened to see so many of those who opposed him or his policies during his life identify so strongly with him now. I think particularly of the youth of our Nation. A generation of young people who matured in the controversial sixties—a generation that saw their President as a symbol of the war they did not like and did not understand. This generation can now identify with the man for they can see him as he really was. They can now see the one quality above all others, that Lyndon Johnson possessed. They realize that even when they disagreed with him, he was doing what he thought was best. That even when they disagreed with him, he was himself. And, they respect that. In a time when national leaders are looked upon as aloof and having a disdain for the common man, our young people can look to the days of Lyndon Johnson and remember, whether he was with you or against you, you knew it—for this man did not walk the fence.

As this young generation of the sixties turns into the leaders of the seventies and the eighties, they will remember the Lyndon Johnson of the civil rights and the voting rights. But even when they think that war, I am sure they will remember the night in March of 1968 when Lyndon Johnson was big enough to relinquish what he had worked a lifetime to achieve. All this, in the mere hope that it would bring that frustrating conflict to a quicker close. No man would have hailed the announcement that peace was indeed at hand more than the President who had passed on but a day earlier.

My memory of Lyndon Johnson will

always be that of the man as a doer. When he took charge, the reins were in firm control. He was a very decisive person who knew how to get the job done.

It is well known that the dreams of John F. Kennedy were the programs of Lyndon Johnson. In my opinion, his record of social legislation is unsurpassed by any President in this century in its sweeping impact on so many phases of American society. The right of the poor, and the right of the elderly to decent health care, were not rights until Lyndon Johnson pushed his medicare and medicaid through Congress in the mid-1960's. And the rights of minorities to buy a home where they choose or the right to vote for their public officials did not become realities until Lyndon Johnson's Civil Rights and Voting Rights Act of 1964 and 1965.

Thus, it is a unique tribute to the man that he will not have to wait for years to pass before history will look kindly on him. He does not need us to build monuments to him, for he has left his own. For, it is a rare man whose opponents will look back upon his achievements and say he has guaranteed the rights and bettered the opportunities of generations of Americans yet unborn. Lyndon Baines Johnson was such a rare man.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson will be remembered in history for his effective leadership for voting rights and other programs to improve opportunities for blacks. As no President since Lincoln, Lyndon Johnson exerted the full leadership of his office to advance the equality of all Americans. Like Lincoln, his efforts in the field of civil rights, as in Vietnam policy, divided the Nation deeply. The years of his presidency were scarred with bloody protest marches, riots, and public outcries against moving too far, too fast on behalf of human rights. Like Lincoln, Lyndon Johnson kept the faith. To use his own earthy phrase, he "hunkered down" when the protests of some whites beat down over his head. Unswervingly he stuck to the guiding principle that gave birth to this Nation, that all men are created equal.

This achievement, so true to the spirit of America, will be honored even when time dims the memory of Vietnam.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson dominated the legislative landscape in his lifetime as he will command a quarter century of historians' writings.

When I came to Congress in 1947 he was already a driving force in the Senate. Even then, his rise seemed fore-ordained, from majority leader of that body, to Vice President, to the most powerful office in the land.

And he, of all Presidents, was as big as the office.

He charted the most far-reaching record of achievement in American history, both as Senator and as President. Like the man himself, his legislative accomplishments are larger than life, and have changed forever the course of the Nation's history.

Driven by compassion for the least fortunate; convinced that America would not work in theory or practice until

every citizen was brought into the great consensus he sought, he put the full force of his energy and determination behind creation of the Great Society as he did behind the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of the following year.

He asked more of us than we dreamed we had; and forced, cajoled and persuaded the 88th, 89th and 90th Congresses to join him in history.

Lyndon Johnson was a vibrant, vital man of boundless energy, intolerant only of those whose involvement in the world was circumscribed by a shrug. He drove himself relentlessly, and demanded the same total dedication and commitment from those around him.

But beneath the rough exterior I knew him as a kind, compassionate, humanitarian person. His instincts were correct; the love of country that put them into action was real. If the results of some of the Great Society promises have not fulfilled our expectations, it is incumbent upon us to put them right.

The Nation has lost a great leader, the land has lost a giant. History has gained a man who will grow with time as his record is measured against passing generations whose lot is immeasurably improved by his years in the Senate and White House.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Johnson shouldered a heavy responsibility during his term of office, and it has been duly noted by many Members this afternoon that his untimely death can well be traced to the pressure that he felt in the White House.

We remember him not only as the 36th President, but also as a House and Senate Member and a leader during his days in the legislative branch.

It is unfortunate that so much of the review of his career centers around the controversy of the Vietnam period. President Johnson was an imaginative President, and an imaginative Member of the House and Senate. Certainly, the success he achieved in politics and government was the result of his determination, the hard work that he put into his assignments, and his willingness to shoulder great responsibility.

His loss, coming so soon after that of former President Truman, deprives our Nation of the wise counsel that a respected senior statesman can give. He will be missed in that sense. He deserves the respect and appreciation of all Americans for the steadfast fashion with which he faced his awesome responsibilities.

On behalf of Mrs. Derwinski and myself, I express to Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson and the other members of the Johnson family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing the sorrow we all feel in mourning the untimely death of former President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Throughout his long career in public service, Lyndon Johnson served the Nation with distinction—as Congressman, as Senator, as Vice President and as President. As floor leader of the Senate and later as 36th President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson was a man of action, a man who put less stock in rhe-

toric than in accomplishment. His deep love of the Congress and his keen understanding of the legislative process enabled him to shape his dreams into realities. As President, Lyndon Johnson recommended 200 major measures to the Congress. Of these, 181 were passed into law. Let us look at some of these accomplishments for a moment:

1964, Passage of the Civil Rights Act.

1964, Passage of the Economic Opportunity Act.

1965, Passage of the Voting Rights Act.

1965, Passage of the Social Security Amendments.

1965, Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

1965, Passage of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

1966, Passage of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act.

President Lyndon Johnson started more programs for social progress than any other Chief Executive in our history. He sought to care for the sick through medicare and medicaid; he sought to make life more tolerable for the elderly through increases in social security; he sought to educate the young through tripling money for schools; he sought to provide equal rights and dignity for all men with legislation that advanced the cause of civil rights more significantly than any measure since the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, it is politically fashionable these days to belittle the accomplishments of these Great Society programs. One reads in the press, and one hears from this administration, that these programs, although noble in inspiration, did not really help people. One reads that these programs raised the hopes of the downtrodden without answering their needs. I do not agree. All one has to do is to think of the pride of a black American who, after two centuries of disenfranchisement, votes for the first time. All one has to do is think of the relief of a sick old man who finally receives hospital care; all one has to do is think of the feeling of accomplishment of a Job Corpsman who has just received his first paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson had his faults, but his sentiments were the right ones. Perhaps nowhere are his basic beliefs stated more clearly than in a speech he delivered to a joint session of Congress on March 15, 1965. In that speech he said:

I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world. I want to be the President who helped to feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of tax eaters.

I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election.

I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who promoted love among the people of all races and all religions and all parties.

I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth.

The tragedy of Lyndon Johnson's death is that he died before a ceasefire in Vietnam had been announced. But, in so many other areas, what President Johnson wanted he achieved. Lyndon Johnson wanted, more than anything else, to help people—especially the poor, the sick, the oppressed—those people too weak to help themselves. When future historians look back at this era, I believe Lyndon Johnson will be remembered as he would want.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, former President Lyndon B. Johnson was an imposing figure on the world's landscape throughout the decade of the 1960's. From modest origins he became a congressional aide, a Congressman, a Senator, an effective Senate majority leader, Vice President of this Nation and, in the tragic aftermath of President John Kennedy's death, President by succession and again by virtue of his genuine landslide victory in 1964.

Lyndon Johnson brought to full fruition the work of the Roosevelt era, promoting the civil rights of the disenfranchised and the poor, working for the economic, educational, housing, and health advancement of all Americans through Federal action. It is fashionable now, of course, to note the disappointment and the expense that have followed in the wake of the ambitious variety of Federal programs begun or dramatically enlarged under Lyndon Johnson. It is said that programs and Federal money could not buy education, health, or security; neither could they guarantee good housing or outlaw discrimination.

Such a mood of examination should not neglect to note, however, the accomplishments of Lyndon Johnson as a legislative leader and as President. The enormous positive accomplishments of the programs passed in that era and implemented through the past decade should not be disregarded.

Lyndon Johnson's dreams for the Nation were large and ambitious, and his accomplishments as a man matched his dreams. He led this Nation into a time of unparalleled government efforts to improve the lives of all Americans. Medicare, civil rights legislation, voting rights laws, medical research programs and aid to education—all of these are lasting tributes to the man and his dreams. As an architect, planning the Great Society in America, Lyndon Johnson was humane and compassionate; as the builder of an ideal Nation, his energies and skills seemed to have no limit. For those efforts and for the legacy he leaves in a more humane and concerned government, we are all in his debt.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of our 36th President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, was a tragedy for most of the world. But nowhere was this tragedy felt more deeply than by the poor and minority Americans for whom L. B. J. showed unparalleled concern.

Despite his failure to achieve the peace he longed for in Vietnam, he will live in history as the President who stood with Abraham Lincoln in his concern for the position of the black man in America. While some of his foreign policy decisions may be open to criticism, few Presidents have done as much for those people here in America who needed help the most.

The day that Lyndon Johnson an-

nounced that he would not again seek the office of the Presidency, he said:

I have not done near enough.

But in the field of civil rights, few men could have done more.

Lyndon Johnson believed in the principle of equality for all Americans. As a teacher of Mexican Americans in his native Texas, he had seen the damage done by discrimination. He knew, as only someone who has observed it can know, the harm that is inflicted by bigotry and injustice.

Six years before he was to become President, Lyndon Johnson, as majority leader of the Senate, led the struggle against an attempted filibuster and succeeded in obtaining the passage of the first Federal civil rights bill since Reconstruction. His efforts, more than anyone else in the national leadership, were responsible for the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. There were those who complained that this act was not enough, and Lyndon Johnson agreed. But it was a beginning, and it was necessary to begin somewhere.

In the first few weeks after that tragic day of President Kennedy's death in 1963, those of us who did not know Lyndon Johnson were looking for an indication of what type of President he would become. To a joint session of Congress he said:

Let us continue.

He would soon prove that a person's sense of justice need not have any relation to his birthplace.

It was through the efforts of President Lyndon Johnson that the most significant piece of civil rights legislation in our history was enacted, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This act called for an end to prejudice in not only the areas of employment and public accommodations, but also prohibited discrimination in federally assisted programs.

Yet it was Lyndon Johnson who realized that the job was not completed, that millions of black Americans were still denied their birthright in this democracy, the right to vote. He came to Congress in 1965 and had the courage to say, "we shall overcome" while the eyes of the Nation were on Selma, Ala. His desire to let all the people have a voice in our Government resulted in the Voting Rights Act of that same year. The act removed literacy tests and other discriminatory procedures as criteria for registering to vote.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the smile on the face of a Job Corpsman who has just received his first job, the expression of happiness displayed by the mother of a Head Start child, and the pride seen in a black American who after 100 years of disenfranchisement votes for the first time—all serve as the greatest memorial to the man from Texas—Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The untimely loss of this great President of the "Little People" is deeply felt by us all. The fact that he rose from the reactionary Southern resistance to the challenges of change—to become the greatest innovator of social change in modern America indeed marks the true greatness of President Johnson.

Lyndon Johnson was a unique man, a

rare man who realized that the force of freedom is a never ceasing and unstoppable force. He was a southerner, but yet refused as President to be bound by the tragedies of sectional hatred and regional perceptions.

There have been and will continue to be many comparisons made between President Johnson and his colleague in the Presidency, Abraham Lincoln. Many of these comparisons are valid. But a quality which Mr. Johnson possessed singularly was the ability to do what was right on the sole grounds that it was right.

His administration should not be remembered for the great amount of social legislation it produced and initiated as law. But rather it should be remembered, not in the annals of history, but in the lives of our people as having served as an agent of freedom's mission and a commander in this Nation's war with itself.

While it is customary to mark the passing of our national leaders with tribute and praise—Lyndon Johnson authorized his own tribute by his steadfast determination to take his high office to the people and thereby allow them to govern. This tribute now serves and shall forever serve as a measuring stick for all of those who shall hold the Presidency of this land.

Most importantly, it allowed Federal marshals to supervise registering and voting procedures in those counties where the Attorney General deemed it necessary.

Despite the success of his efforts to obtain legislation that guaranteed the constitutional rights denied to black Americans and other minorities throughout American history, President Johnson had the wisdom to realize that the long, hard journey toward equality had not ended because these rights were won, but had just begun. He realized that it does a man no good to win the right to eat in the restaurant or sleep in the hotel of his choice if his economic condition prohibits him from affording the meal or the room. So Lyndon Johnson conceived the Great Society programs to wage war on poverty, and in so doing provided hope and a means out of the depressing cycle of poverty for thousands who before knew no hope and felt that their Government did not care. The Economic Opportunity Act and the other programs of the Great Society such as Medicare and Federal aid to education are tributes to Lyndon Johnson's compassion for his fellow man.

It was during Lyndon Johnson's administration that for the first time, blacks were appointed to important posts in the Federal Government. Because of Lyndon Johnson, a black man now sits on this Nation's highest court.

In 1968, Lyndon Johnson signed into law two more important pieces of legislation: a Jury Selection Act and a Fair Housing Act.

In 1963, speaking at Gettysburg, Pa., 100 years after Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Vice President Johnson said:

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation not ful-

filled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

We would all do well to remember his words.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, there have been many inspiring statements written about Lyndon B. Johnson. One of the finest statements was the editorial written by Dick West who is the editorial director for the Dallas Morning News. This excellent editorial has some plain-spoken facts about our great plain-spoken President. President Johnson was a man of action and it is interesting to see the comments from West about Lyndon Johnson in action. Many times it has been said that Lyndon B. Johnson was the most colorful personality in the history of Texas. Dick West in the News describes some of these characteristics.

L. B. J.: HIS INFLUENCES AND TALENTS

(By Dick West)

AUSTIN.—Two questions went through my mind as I filed past the flag-draped casket holding the body of former President Lyndon B. Johnson: Who and what were the great influences in his life? And what talents or qualities did this complex man, who roamed the Pedernales and ruled on the Potomac, use to the fullest?

As to influences: You have to start with Lady Bird, whom he loved deeply but who has talents of her own which helped him greatly: "Sometimes I feel like a bald eagle," he told me once at the ranch as we rode around in his Continental "I am too aggressive. I want to soar too high. Bird, bless her, has a way of bringing me back to earth."

You include next his parents. His father "worked the laziness out of me," Johnson recalled. "He would yell out from the kitchen and tell me to get out of bed—that every boy in town had a head start on me. He was a taskmaster. He taught me the value of attending to details—and, brother that came in handy about 40 years later when I sat in the President's office. He was big on the meaning of responsibility. Once he said, 'Son, you'll never know what it means to be a father until you are a father.'"

While Johnson's father stressed perspiration, his mother lent inspiration.

It was she who made him get an education, who channeled his muscle, energy and drive into higher spheres of endeavor. "I guess if it hadn't been for her," he confided. "I would have been just a clerk in the Highway Department. My daddy made me get up and go. But she was the spark who first got me to thinking where to go."

And then there was the late Speaker Sam Rayburn of Bonham. In the living room at the ranch, there used to be a big picture of Mr. Sam, and Johnson loved to sit under it in his favorite chair. He would lean way back in it as he philosophized and talked gently—then lunge forward, arms out wide, as he made a telling point.

Mr. Sam taught him the parliamentary process on Capitol Hill. Mr. Sam taught him how to line up votes in the Senate. Mr. Sam, when Lyndon got down in the dumps, "got me up again." Mr. Sam took him off one day and said, "Lyndon, you've got to get a thicker hide. You let too many little things bother you. This is a rough place to operate. It'll drive you crazy if you let it—and you are by nature sensitive and lovable, striving in a place where you at times can't be sensitive and lovable. There are a lot of s.o.b.'s who'll cut your insides out if you let them."

There was Alvin Wirtz, attorney and Texas state senator in the late 1930s. "Many men have been my teachers, but one stands out above the rest—Alvin Wirtz. He taught me the most about the one element in politics that matters the most—the people."

Johnson and Wirtz once met with some private utility executives in an effort to persuade the larger companies to extend power to small farmers in rural areas. At one point, LBJ got mad and told one of the utility presidents to "go to hell."

Wirtz took him off to the side. "Listen, Lyndon, I've been in this business a long time. You felt like a hero talking that way in front of your consumer friends, but your speech broke up the meeting. It left us back where we started. If I have learned anything in all these years, it is this: You can tell a man to go to hell, but you can't make him go."

As to talents and qualities, the two in my opinion which contributed the most to Johnson's success were a tremendous reservoir of energy and an uncanny knack of persuasion. He was born with the first; he developed the latter.

He once admitted that the margin he had over other men was his capacity to work harder than they do. He waked up around 7:30 in the White House, worked two hours in bed, entered the oval office in the west wing around 10. After a swim, lunch and nap, he began a "second day" at 4:30 in the afternoon and often labored until midnight—maybe later if he had to attend some official function.

When Johnson decided on a political career, the private business world lost the greatest salesman in history. He talked, argued and persuaded his way into the Senate's top leadership. In his earlier years he would become angry and impatient; later he learned the wisdom and art of reasoning without being unreasonable.

One time at a social function he met Sen. Frank Church of Idaho, who had just made a bitter speech against Johnson's Vietnam venture.

"Frank," he said, "that speech wasn't a bit helpful."

"I'm sorry, Mr. President, the headlines exaggerated what I said."

"Frank, the headlines are all that people read."

"But, Mr. President, I didn't go any farther than Walter Lippmann."

"Well, Frank," the President shot back, "the next time you need money to build a dam in Idaho, you'd better see Lippmann."

The last time I visited the former president at the ranch, I noticed he had mellowed. He was more reflective, he was calmer, definitely more complacent and philosophical about disappointments and frictions of the past.

As I got in the car to head for Dallas, he stuck his head in the window for a final farewell.

"Your paper has been rough on me at times in the past," he commented in a tone of forgive-and-forget. Then he lowered his head, grinned and quipped: "And you know, there were times I had it coming."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to honor the memory of our distinguished 36th President and one of the most powerful legislators ever to labor under the dome of the Capitol, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Lyndon Johnson in many respects seemed larger than life. He was a big man, an imposing man, a man who reflected the size and greatness of his beloved home State of Texas.

He was born near Johnson City, Tex., in 1908. After graduating from Southwest State Teachers College in 1930, he got a job teaching school. But the role of an educator is not the one that Lyndon Johnson chose to play for a lifetime. Rather, a career of public service as an elected representative of the people called him.

He came to Washington in late 1931 and here he remained until 1968. He left a mark on this city, in this Chamber where he served from 1937 to 1948, in the Senate where he distinguished himself as majority leader, and in the White House where he planned for a Great Society for all Americans.

My fondest memories of Lyndon Johnson will always be of his leadership in the area of civil rights. We worked together, taking the great strides toward achieving equality of opportunity for all people.

He told us, in a joint session of the Congress that "We Shall Overcome" and led us to passage of landmark civil rights legislation.

Although he presided over a divided Nation in his last months in office, I believe it is important to remember his unifying plea, "Let us continue" as this country stood numb and profoundly grieved at the death of a young and vigorous President.

Finally, it was the war in Vietnam that led to Lyndon Johnson's decision in 1968 not to seek, once again, the highest office in the land. He may certainly be considered one of the casualties of that tragic conflict.

The awesome responsibilities of the Presidency put a great strain on the heart, even a heart as big as Lyndon Johnson's. On January 22, with the knowledge imparted to him by President Nixon that the Vietnam war was, at last and mercifully, over, Lyndon Johnson died at his ranch in Texas.

I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of this dynamic legislator, industrious chief executive and eminent elder statesman. I extend my deepest sympathy to his remarkable wife, Lady Bird, and his entire family.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, it is still hard for all us to realize that Lyndon Johnson is no longer here. And in truth, in the measures for which he was responsible which are changing for the better the lives of so many, he will always be here.

He is widely recognized as the outstanding legislative craftsman of our time, the greatest majority leader of the Senate ever. Never before has a single individual had impact like his not just at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue but both.

President Johnson was one of the truly great Chief Executives our country has had. If only he could have lived another 10 years. He deserved time to enjoy the retirement he had earned, and time to see how, with the test of the years, people will value his efforts ever more, as happened with President Truman before him.

Others more eloquent will describe his achievements. I want to say a few words of my own experience with the man whom I am privileged to have had as friend.

In 1935, when I first came to Washington as assistant to Congressman P. L. Gassaway of Oklahoma, the New Deal was at its flood tide. One of the first people with whom I became acquainted was Lyndon Johnson, who shortly became assistant to Congressman Richard Kleberg

of Texas. Those were days of frantic legislative activity. But at that time each House Member had a staff of only two, and the Capitol Hill community had not grown too big for people to generally be acquainted. President Johnson and I came from similar agrarian southwestern backgrounds. We were born only about 200 miles apart in central Texas, although my own family soon moved to Oklahoma.

We had an organization on the Hill then called the Little Congress, and Lyndon Johnson was elected as its President, with me among his supporters.

Lyndon Johnson was always mindful of people, thoughtful, interested in individuals. Of course, he could lose his temper, as everyone knows, but that was in his zeal for action and was quickly submerged in his basic kindness.

He remembered the little things as well as the big ones. Even in his White House years he could and did remember to call his birthday greetings to me and others. He was never too self-important to pay due notice to staff people, on the Hill and elsewhere, to let them know that he knew about and valued their work. If genius is an infinite capacity for detail, he had it.

We developed a sentimental attachment. Even after he went back to Texas he never failed on election night to use his fabled ability to reach anyone on earth by telephone, and he would always find me and get the results of my campaign direct.

As chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee I saw a good deal of him during the White House years. And my appreciation of his stature consistently grew.

One of the incidents I remember best occurred when I sat on a White House meeting during the crisis following the seizure of the *Pueblo*. The crew of 81 was held by the North Koreans.

Someone urged a hard-line, drastic military response despite the threat that would involve to the lives of the crew. In effect, he said:

It's only 81 men, and the honor of our Nation is at stake.

The President almost ran across the room in his anger to shake his fist at that man and said:

Don't you ever say that to me. I would crawl on my belly before I'd give up the life of one of those men. If we do not cherish the life of one man we have lost everything that counts.

Subsequently, he did what was necessary to bring those men back.

One of my fondest memories of him is of the time in 1960 when he flew to my home town, Shawnee, Okla., to speak during the climatic period of the presidential campaign. He had spoken many times that day, traveling all the way from Washington State to Oklahoma and going on to Texas the same evening. He was tired, but he gave that crowd everything he had. The response was terrific, and he threw away his prepared text for 15 minutes of impromptu delivery. Those who were present would not forget it. It was the greatest political rally ever for our town. In a front page editorial January 24, Ross Porter, Pub-

lisher of the Shawnee News-Star, recalled it:

SHAWNEE REMEMBERS L. B. J.

The sudden death of former President Lyndon B. Johnson, Monday, in his beloved Texas ranch home may have saddened the world, but it solemnly shocked a multitude of friends in his neighboring Oklahoma.

LBJ was a good neighbor to Oklahoma and many of his closest longtime friends here, for almost four decades, had learned to depend upon his friendship and loyalty and they cordially reciprocated in typical Sooner fashion. LBJ never forgot that.

Here is one example. When the Kennedy-Johnson ticket ran into trouble late in October 1960, LBJ, the vice-presidential candidate who had campaigned the entire country, was so exhausted and distressed after a California trip that he was ready to "throw in the towel" and return to the Texas ranch. He had made a commitment however, to speak for his political friends in Shawnee, Oklahoma.

With stark political defeat staring at the ticket, he none the less would honor that speaking commitment, even though in a small Oklahoma town.

Arriving at Shawnee airport, from the west coast after dark, on a rainy Thursday night, LBJ discovered what he always later recalled as, "the turning point in the campaign came at Shawnee, I knew then we could win the election."

A very large motorcade met him at the airport and paraded to the Municipal Auditorium, where an overflow crowd of 3,000, wildly cheered almost everything he said.

He returned to the Texas ranch that night a happier man, more convinced of victory by the Shawnee reception. Ten days later the ticket won over Richard Nixon, by the smallest victory—which required several days to officially determine the outcome, that Kennedy and Johnson had indeed won the election.

About three years later, Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas and Lyndon Baines Johnson became President of the United States for the next five years.

President Richard Nixon, who talked frequently with LBJ, will miss his experienced judgment and wise counseling in the gigantic tasks which confront each president of the United States.

Lyndon Johnson always remembered Shawnee and Shawnee will always remember that friendly hard working country boy neighbor from Texas, whom we all called, "LBJ."

He really was "something else," and we believe, history will say so.—R.P.

Among the best tributes that I have seen was one from a University of Oklahoma student, Randy Splaingard, night editor of the Oklahoma Daily, who wrote this, in part, about the reaction there to the news of his death:

EULOGY TO LYNDON JOHNSON

"About Johnson? Wasn't that something?" We talked about it a few minutes—about his greatness as a humanitarian, a world leader, a vibrant down-to-earth man who will go down in history as one of America's great-ests.

"Anyone who ever visited his presidential library in Austin can't help but realize how great he was," I said.

"By the way, have you heard they've been having some trouble with that building? The marble's cracking, I think," she said.

"You know, think how symbolic it would be if they would label those cracks 'Vietnam.' There it would stand—an eight-story monument of fine marble, one of the most impressive buildings in the world, marred by cracks, as only the war in Vietnam marred his five years in office," I thought out loud.

It was nearing 7:30 p.m. and "Maude"

again came on at her worst. Soon it was time to return to work and put out a front page.

News of his death was still coming over the wire sporadically, squeezed between the Supreme Court's abortion ruling and the progress of the Paris peace talks.

I sat down to a blank front-page dummy. "Johnson gets the top of the page," I thought, "It can be no other way."

I sat there trying to busy myself. I could do little until an adequate story on Johnson came over the wire. Finally, more than an hour later, it did—and I went to work.

Steve Howland, assistant managing editor, had located a couple of pictures of Johnson for my use. A symbolic double black box was drawn on the dummy sheet, the story was fitted, and the picture sized.

It was time to write a headline. "How do you summarize Lyndon Johnson's life in 28 letters?" I thought. I sat back and reminisced a short while.

I thought of that dark rainy Friday in November 1963 when sixth-grade classes were proceeding as usual in my Catholic elementary school in Collinsville, Ill. The parish priest suddenly entered the room, and solemnly said, "Let's all kneel down and pray. The President's been shot and killed."

And I remembered watching television with the rest of my family for three continuous days. I remembered the end of Johnson's somber statement upon first arriving in Washington, D.C. as President—"I ask your help, and God's."

I remembered hearing of the violence in Selma, Ala., and seeing the picture of Johnson shaking hands with Dr. Martin Luther King upon signing the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

"Dr. King wasn't the only one who had a dream," I thought.

I recalled writing a letter to him soon after that and receiving a warm one from him in return, along with a five-by-nine black and white portrait of his family. Of course it was a stock letter with a stamped signature, but nevertheless I was impressed.

He was the President.

I remembered his presidential address when for the first time he referred to the "police action" in Vietnam as a "war." As a 13-year-old, I naively thought, "It'll all be over by the time I'm draft age."

I recalled reading letters in Ann Landers' column from persons enraged with the President's treatment of his dogs.

I remembered my grandparents' Social Security increases, and their registering for Medicare. I remembered someone calling him "education's best friend."

And I remember "I am not seeking and will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your President."

So how do you sum it all up in 28 letters?

"Well," I thought, "you use his phrase—'Great Society.' That will be his most lasting gift to this country."

And so the headline was quickly formed—"Great Society President dies."

That seemed to say it all.

I finished the rest of the front page, and approved the others to appear in the next morning's issue. I left Copeland Hall near midnight—about two hours later than usual. But then, it wasn't an ordinary night.

As I walked through the parking lot to my house, I noticed its stillness. Not a car passed along Elm as I made my two minute jaunt.

And I remember thinking, "Let the world stand still for a moment."

Lyndon Johnson was dead, and I felt a little less human because of it.

RANDY SPLAINGARD.

Another perceptive evaluation came from Jack Reese, executive editor of the Norman Transcript:

COME, LET US . . .

Every President lives, the late Lyndon Baines Johnson told Congress in 1969, not only with what is, but with what has been and what could be.

Within the framework of these circumstances and the varied personalities of the leadership at his disposal, he sees the hope of a better America, a world at peace, a country aware of its own destiny.

He was reminding the men and women with whom he had had such long association as a legislative leader that the great events of any Presidency are shaped by many forces, controlled and uncontrolled.

Strong Presidents, it has been observed, "store up trouble for themselves and their successors."

This is what happened to President Johnson, and not solely because of Vietnam, the high price tag which has been attached to a distinguished career in government.

Not many can forget that sad day in November 1963 when a nation, stunned by incredible events, focused its eyes on a new leader, one uniquely equipped by legislative experience, tutored by masters of the political game.

President Johnson's ascendancy to power came at one of the moments in history which had been building for at least two decades. The tragedy of the Kennedy assassination served as a kind of catalyst to great hopes.

The unusually active 89th Congress, elected with Mr. Johnson in 1964, proceeded to approve legislation that had been stalled for as long as 20 years.

Major laws enacted in 1965 included medical care for the aged under Social Security; aid to primary and secondary schools; immigration reform; protection of Negro voting rights; excise-tax reduction; aid to urban areas, and others.

This burst of activity in a single session led seasoned Washington observers to compare the 89th Congress with the 73rd Congress of 1933-34 (the first two years of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration) and the 63rd Congress of 1913-14 (the first two years of the Woodrow Wilson administration).

The second session of the 89th Congress was notably less productive than the first. And the 90th Congress displayed outright hostility to presidential proposals, even though both houses were controlled by the President's party.

Mr. Johnson's experience was far from unique. Every activist president has been accused of being domineering; most have been succeeded by men who took a more cautious approach to the exercise of executive power. Thus, Lincoln was succeeded by Grant; T. R. Roosevelt by Taft; Wilson by Harding; Truman by Eisenhower.

The split within the Democratic party which rejected Mr. Johnson had started in the early 1950s when he was the overseer of a Senate which did not reflect in its geographical and ideological makeup the national Democratic party. Forces outside and inside his own party moved Mr. Johnson along a historical path which led to the Presidency.

President Johnson was an enigma to many. He, indeed, listened to his own drummer. Some who observed him claimed that he had neither deep commitment nor firm philosophy in his handling of domestic or foreign affairs and that he was guided by a kind of frenzy to prove himself as a great President.

Be that as it may, but we believe he did have a firm commitment to his dream of a Great Society, one which it may be said a hundred years from now, that "by working together we helped to make our country more just, more just for all of its people, as well as to insure and guarantee the blessings of liberty for all of our posterity."

That is what President Johnson hoped

for—but be believed that future historians, for whatever other judgment they might make, would agree that he tried—and tried hard.

It was my honor to be a member of the House delegation to the graveside services at the Johnson family cemetery there across the Pedernales River from Stonewall. He is back there for good now in the hill country whose name will always be linked with his—under the vast dominating sky of the Southwest that can almost command you to look into infinity. The dark, twisting beauty of the live oaks is there, and the little river with its stones and its turtles. His birthplace is only a few hundred feet away. This is the setting that produced Lyndon Johnson, and from many others, similar yet always different, throughout the land has come the spirit that has made our country.

He was confident that the turmoil of our times is not just the decline of the old but the turbulent birth of the new. With some of his strength of will and devotion, we can try to do as he did and help make that true. He met his measure of success, that people will live a little better for his having been here.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, today we honor a man who was our friend, our leader, our inspired and determined President. He lived with energy and dedication throughout his life. Every American shares in the heritage he left, his performance in this House, in the Senate, in the White House. We share the loss with his devoted wife and family; we share the pride that our lives were touched by his.

I choose first to say that he was a friend because that word meant so much to him. He never used it lightly; it was for him a term of approval and appreciation. He knew that he marched in the vanguard of his company, but he never felt that he marched alone. And he was grateful for the friendship of others.

I do not need to recite the contributions of his leadership, the progressive legislation that he guided to enactment, the compassion of his achievements. History records them, and I am sure that history will record him as one of the most able Presidents of our Nation. And I shall never forget his relentless effort to do what was best, how time and again he said:

It isn't hard to do what's right; what's hard is knowing what is right to do.

He was fortunate to have a great lady as his wife and constant counselor. Mrs. Johnson served the Nation as well as her husband as, time after time, he labored to know what was right to do. It is recorded that on the night of March 31, 1968, when he startled the world by announcing he would not seek reelection, Mrs. Johnson was the first to speak to him as that television address ended. She said three words: "Nobly done, darling." How much those words say about Lyndon and Lady Bird Johnson.

So as we said farewell to him for the last time, the men and women who spoke and sang at the services, here at the Capitol and in the National City Chris-

tian Church as well as at the family burial plot, lifted their voices for all of us. We shared together a grief relieved by pride that our lives had been touched by Lyndon Johnson.

None was more touching than words quoted at the church by W. Marvin Watson, friend and aide to the late President. They were words spoken by Lyndon Johnson himself last September, at the 75th anniversary observance of the Scott and White Hospital in Temple, Tex. As Marvin Watson said last week, the words might well be Lyndon Johnson's epitaph. President Johnson said:

With the coming of September each year, we are reminded, as the song says, that the days are dwindling down to a precious few . . . the green leaves of summer will begin to brown . . . the chill winds of winter will begin to blow . . . and before we are ready for the year to end, the year will be gone.

As it is with the calendar, so it sometimes seems to be with our country and our system. For there are those among us who would have us believe that America has come to its own September . . . and that our nation's span as mankind's last best hope will be done.

President Johnson continued:

But I live by the faith that with each passing day we are always approaching nearer to the beginning of a new springtime and it is by that perspective that I see our country now.

No nation can be more than the visions of its people. America cannot be more than we believe ourselves capable of becoming.

I want to open the soul of America to the warm sunlight of faith in itself . . . faith in the principles and precepts of its birth . . . and faith in the promise and potential of its people.

So spoke Lyndon Johnson. And Mr. Watson concluded:

That was Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States of America. The years will be lonely without him.

I cannot disagree, but I must add that the years of his leadership, his calling us to action, will live on. Each of us, in a small way, must keep the faith of Lyndon Johnson. We may strive to do better; he would not have wanted us to do less.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed ironic that Lyndon Baines Johnson, who in life was a veritable lightning rod for controversy and criticism, should in death evoke such a widespread and spontaneous sense of national loss and grief.

In the Presidency, as well as in the Congress, Lyndon Johnson was a wielder of power, a strong, larger-than-life figure, who made no apologies about his determination to get his own way.

The American people, in their great wisdom, are wary of the powerful. This no doubt accounts for the fact that President Johnson's style, during his years in the White House, made him a popular target for criticism.

Yet in the retrospect, which comes untimely in the wake of death, the Nation more fully grasps the measure of Lyndon Johnson's greatness. It is true that he was a man greatly enamored of power. But, the power of Lyndon Johnson was the power of getting things done.

It was not the power of brute force, so much as it was the power to strike a positive compromise, the power to forge a legislative solution to problems deemed impossible of solution by lesser men.

But, most significant of all, in our memories of Lyndon Johnson as a man of power, is the fact that he wielded his greatest power for the sake of the powerless. The mark of President Johnson's greatness is his record of accomplishments in behalf of the poor, the sick, the aged and the disenfranchised.

The nature of political power is such that, all too often, those who are strongest and most influential are best able to command the attention of Government.

At the peak of his political power, Lyndon Johnson turned his attention and opened his ears to the needs of our weakest and least influential citizens.

That explains the long lines of saddened citizens who waited hours in the cold to pay their respects when President Johnson's body was laid in state in this Capitol.

And, it explains why the only truly fitting memorial which this Congress can pay to President Johnson is to do our utmost to see that his programs for the poor and the needy are perfected and continued and brought to full fruition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in mourning the death of a great leader. Lyndon Johnson understood intimately the potential for leadership vested in the Office of the Presidency. Never was that understanding more clearly demonstrated than in his commitment to securing civil rights for all Americans.

Lyndon Johnson knew that the fear and suspicion which divided black from white, poor from rich, uneducated from educated, would not easily be overcome. But he knew also that the President could provide the leadership necessary to mend such divisions.

Shortly before his death in an interview with Walter Cronkite, Lyndon Johnson spoke of the responsibilities he had faced. He said:

When I became President, and realized that I was the leader of the country and that I was the President of all the people and all the people were looking to me to correct the inequalities, inequities and injustices and there was something that I could do about it, I concluded that now that I had the power, I was going to use it every way I could.

Johnson used his power well. During the 6 years of his administration, Lyndon Johnson produced 440 pieces of major legislation, the largest portion of which was aimed at eradicating social injustice.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fair Housing Act of 1968, these were laws which opened the way to equal rights for millions of Americans. Yet, these laws were not enacted without significant opposition. For years, discrimination against nonwhites had become a way of life in both the North and the South. Lyndon Johnson took it upon himself to reverse the trends of that discrimination.

I remember sitting in this great hall

when President Johnson came to address a joint session of Congress in March 1965. He came that night to speak to us of what he called the American promise. That promise, he told us, rested on the right of every American "to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others." At issue was the right to vote for millions of Americans who had been disenfranchised solely because of the color of their skin. Lyndon Johnson appealed in that speech to the best instincts of Americans. He told us what was right, and he told us as legislators what would be expected of us.

The civil rights laws of the 1960's brought about change. Coupled with legislation in health, education, and public employment, those civil rights laws spelled progress for many disadvantaged minorities.

That progress was sometimes slow and painful, but there was always the reassurance that the President of the United States had committed the resources of the Nation to seeing to it that the goal of equality would be attained.

For the last 2 years, I have served as chairman of the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee in the House Judiciary. During that time, I have come to know well the impact of our civil rights laws. And I have come to appreciate, too, how crucial is the role which Presidential leadership plays in the enforcement of those laws. Lyndon Johnson understood that prejudices were not easily given up, but he had faith in the American people's sense of justice. That faith led us out of the shadow of our own fears.

I can think of no more fitting epitaph for Lyndon Johnson than what he said of his own goals:

I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world. I want to be the President who helped feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of taxpayers.

I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election.

I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who promoted love among the people of all races and all regions and all parties.

Mr. Johnson, you were such a President.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon B. Johnson was a man unique in our time. From frontier obscurity he rose to international prominence. As President of the United States during one of the most trying periods in our national history, he magnified both his name and his office.

The man from Texas established a new brand that the world will not forget. LBJ was not just a brand for ranch identification. Lyndon Johnson put that brand on legislation that brought light to millions who had lived in darkness. That brand brought new freedom, new opportunity, and new identity to minorities who had all too long dwelt in the valley of despair.

LBJ was a hallmark in American political life. It stood for a man who stood for many innovations for people. Yes, it cost him something. Yes, it likely shortened his life. Yes, it carried with it the thorns of frustration, the sting of rebuke, and placed him all too often

on an island of loneliness. Lyndon Johnson was a tall man. History says he was the second tallest of all our Presidents. But Mr. Johnson was tall in the saddle, tall on human rights, tall in bluntness, tall in action, and tall in courage. There is an empty saddle in the old corral, but LBJ is enshrined where generations unborn may see and know—in the hearts of those he loved, and in the garden of American remembrance.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in this House in expressing my sorrow, regret, and deep sense of loss at the death of our very beloved late President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I had the privilege of knowing him first as a U.S. Senator, second as Vice President, and, finally, as President. But I am proudest of having had the privilege of knowing him as a great, thoughtful, and compassionate citizen of the United States.

Many of you have known him much longer, so I cannot add to those memories. But, I would like to talk, just for a moment, of Lyndon Johnson the great human being—the man who cared. To do this, I repeat a personal incident.

A very few days after President John F. Kennedy's death, when Lyndon Johnson, the new President, must have been at his busiest, my mother passed away. I, with members of my family, had left for the West for her funeral when the White House called my office and asked for me. My secretary who answered presumed that it was a White House staff member speaking and explained that I had already left. The voice on the telephone said, "This is Lyndon Johnson. I wanted to express my personal sympathy." Needless to say my secretary was astonished and astounded and said later, "The President himself cared."

I returned from my mother's funeral a few days before Christmas and, like other House Members who were then working on the Russian wheat problem late into the Christmas season, received the gracious invitation to the White House for coffee and fruit cake. Because of the circumstances, I did not quite feel like a social affair and called the White House. They were most gracious.

Two months later President and Mrs. Johnson had one of their delightful, informal parties for House Members. During the course of the evening the President talked with me and his first words were:

I can't begin to tell you how deeply I sympathize with you on the loss of your mother. It was my mother who shaped my life and I shall miss her forever.

While this is a simple personal experience, it shows the great quality and depth of Lyndon Johnson's compassion for human beings. This is but one example among the undoubted thousands of times he remembered and cared for people and their problems. He cared not just for Members of Congress, but all people—the black, the white, the tired, the sick, and the poor.

A budget may now seek to erase Lyndon Johnson. But no budget nor legislation can ever erase the compassionate

understanding which began Head Start, VISTA volunteers, Community Action programs, medicare, kindergartens, aid to education, and art and beauty for the many. Within millions of homes in America there is some memory that Lyndon Johnson passed their way with a message of hope and understanding for their circumstances and problems.

I also salute his courageous and gracious wife who worked and continues to work to make this Nation reflect the beauty which is inherently America at her best.

Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues, I join you in sending my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnson and her family. I feel privileged and grateful to have shared a part of the unforgettable Johnson years.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today the flags over the Capitol are flying at half-mast in memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States.

We have all participated in ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol and at the National City Christian Church here in Washington, and have heard the beautiful and eloquent eulogies of our colleague, Congressman J. J. PICKLE, from Texas; the Honorable Dean Rusk, who served with President Johnson as Secretary of State; Mr. Marvin Watson, the President's close associate and assistant in the White House; and the Rev. Dr. George R. Davis, pastor of the National City Christian Church, which President Johnson attended while in Washington.

These and other tributes and editorials on his passing were moving and beautiful. I should like to take this opportunity of adding my own tribute to this great man and close friend who served the Nation so faithfully and well—both in the Congress and in the White House.

Certainly I was shocked and saddened by the news of the passing of Lyndon B. Johnson. He was my personal friend and I felt extremely close to him.

Lyndon Johnson had the greatest legislative record of any President I have known—legislation passed during his administration has been compared to the famous "90 days" of President Franklin Roosevelt's administration as he responded to the challenge of the depression.

Lyndon Johnson more than any man I have known understood the legislative processes of the Congress. He understood the committee system and the intricacies of congressional interaction—the work of Congress.

His legislative success was a compound of this knowledge, his awareness of the Nation's problems, and his determination to attack these problems with all the force he could muster with the aid of Congress.

Although it may appear fashionable in some quarters to cast aspersions on the Federal career service, President Johnson was a Federal career man and he worked with the departments and agencies of Government to achieve his goals and objectives.

He believed in education—and much

landmark education legislation was enacted during his administration.

He believed in assuring the elderly of adequate medical care—and the medicare legislation he sponsored has provided this assurance as a matter of right to the poor and needy.

He believed in helping the "little man" directly—rather than in the "trickle-down theory"—and legislation which he championed has increased the incomes of the working people throughout America.

He believed in assisting rural and urban areas in coping with their problems—and legislation to assist small towns, rural areas and metropolitan areas has provided much assistance throughout America.

President Johnson's list of legislative accomplishments defies definition and comparison.

He thought big—like the man he was and the State of Texas, the State of his origin. And he was a dynamo as he translated his thoughts and dreams into action and reality.

As the first southern President since the Civil War, he accomplished more to assure equal rights for all Americans than any President since Abraham Lincoln.

Lyndon Johnson had the common touch—a sensitivity for people. He loved people and identified with them. He wanted all Americans to share in the good life.

As he once remarked:

I believe every American has something to say and under our system a right to an audience.

I believe achievement of the full potential of our resources—physical and human—is the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we regard as inalienable.

I recall that on one occasion during a campaign swing through Tennessee in 1964 on leaving the airport at Nashville, the President, rather than heading directly for the city chose to detour to greet people who were crowded behind a fence hoping to catch a glimpse of him.

I also recall that as we were returning to the airport after a hard day of campaigning, I pointed out an important constituent among the throngs along the highway. I suggested that he wave to this friend but instead he ordered the driver to stop the car, then bounced out and went over to this constituent, shaking his hand and giving him a warm and enthusiastic greeting.

This was the personal style of campaigning that President Johnson loved and that was his trademark—and he made a lifelong friend and supporter of the man he stopped to greet.

While President Johnson was in office, I was invited to the White House frequently to participate in bill-signing ceremonies or for receptions, dinners and briefings.

Following his retirement from the Presidency, we corresponded on occasion and he obviously enjoyed maintaining his contacts with old friends in Congress.

Upon leaving the White House in January of 1969, he wrote to me a warm personal letter in which he said:

In this, my last week in office, I am stirred by memories of old battles—and old friends who stood at my side throughout them all. You are one of those friends.

My admiration and affection for you will never diminish.

I thank you and I salute you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I value and treasure this letter among my most prized mementos.

Although President Johnson, when he left the Presidency, had had a number of heart attacks—the first when he was majority leader of the Senate—we, his friends, had hoped that, with the burdens of the Presidency off his shoulders, he would live a long life in retirement.

He lived a full, rewarding life and his work had been completed. His achievements and accomplishments are now history. The Vietnam conflict which he worked to end is drawing to a close.

His administration will stand in history as a monument to social and domestic progress at home and to a strong defense of freedom abroad.

I was deeply saddened by the passing of this great friend, and my wife Ann joins me in expressing our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Johnson—Lady Bird—and other members of the family in their loss and bereavement.

Because of the high regard and respect of my colleagues and the American people for this great President, I place in the *RECORD* herewith copies of editorial eulogies from the Washington Post and Washington Star-News.

The editorial eulogies follow:

[From the Evening Star and the Washington Daily News, Jan. 23, 1973]

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

He was six-foot-three and everything about him—his ability his high sense of national purpose, his towering rage—seemed somehow slightly larger than life. Now he is gone at the age of 64, the second former President to die within a month.

The very memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson, thrust into the presidency by an assassin's bullet, is so freighted with partisan feeling that it must remain for another generation of Americans, immunized by time from the contagion of emotion to assess fairly the man and to judge impartially his presidency.

When that day comes, when the Vietnam conflict—like the Spanish Civil War which stirred the conscience of another generation—has become an issue to bring the flush of passion only to the cheeks of old men, we believe that the man from the Pedernales will be counted among this country's near-great presidents.

Historians will record that the first Southern president since Reconstruction engineered the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 (the first in more than 80 years), outlawing racial discrimination in public facilities, employment and union membership and giving the attorney general new powers to enforce Negro voting rights and to step up the pace of school desegregation. They will remember that, while he committed large numbers of U.S. troops to a conflict on the Asian mainland, he kept us out of nuclear war. This and much else in the fields of civil rights, housing and health did Johnson, who was perhaps the most consummate politician in modern American history, make part and parcel of our children's heritage.

And yet, at the last, he failed—or believed himself to have failed—withdrawing himself from contention in the 1968 election, leav-

ing the country and his party weary and divided.

The roots of that failure are manifold and difficult to trace. Was it, as he insisted, too close to Appomattox for the country as a whole to accept and appreciate a Southern president, to believe in his vision of "the Great Society"? Was it inevitable, in a rising tide of bitterness and disaffection, that John F. Kennedy's successor should be struck down by the tumbling ruins of Camelot? Did he simply fail to gauge correctly the mood of the country when he vowed to nail that Vietnam coonskin to the wall? Was there some fatal and concealed flaw in his character which prevented him from dealing effectively with the burgeoning crisis of the races?

A little of each of these factors perhaps, contributed to the downfall and bitterness of a man whose personality so vividly reflected the brashness, drive, optimism, and acquisitiveness of his native state. Those good qualities and those defects which he brought to the presidency, in fact, may well have been the inevitable outgrowth of his state and regional heritage.

When time cools the passions of the moment, it will be remembered that he served his state and country, as congressman, senator, vice president and President for 31 consecutive years, and that if he did well by Lyndon Johnson, dying a multimillionaire, he also tried to do well (and often succeeded) by Texas and the United States.

To a certain extent the measure of statesmen can be calculated by the passions they arouse among their contemporaries. Churchill and De Gaulle, for instance, were nothing if not controversial. In this respect, the hostility of his foes makes the big Texan look like tall timber indeed among the scrub growth which forested much of the political hills of America in our times.

Lyndon Johnson was a big man and a big President.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1973]

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

The public lifetime of Lyndon Baines Johnson spanned almost four decades. It was a period marked not just by the development of certain powerful currents in American thought, but also by an eventful reappraisal of where those currents had led. Thus, much which had been considered desirable, necessary and even holy in Mr. Johnson's political youth had fallen into disrepute by the time that he left office. "Internationalism" had come to be known as "interventionism" by many, its painful and costly effects haunting the nation in a seemingly unending war. And the vital and generous impulses that had animated Mr. Johnson's commitment to domestic legislation from the New Deal through the Great Society had come to be seen by many as obsolete and outworn habits of mind which caused as many troubles as they cured. At the airport sendoff that January day in 1969, when Lyndon Johnson's homebound plane vanished into the clouds, his longtime friends and colleagues were left with more than an eerie feeling of the suddenness and totality with which power is relinquished in this country. The summary departure of this man who had been the larger-than-life center of ambition and authority in government for five years, also seemed symbolically to end a self-contained chapter in the nation's political development.

It was an era characterized both domestically and in foreign policy terms by an assumption of responsibility—national responsibility—for the welfare of the poor, the rights of the mistreated, the fairness of the way in which we distribute our wealth and the general well-being and stability of countries all over the world. Of Mr. Johnson's participation in all this—as a Congressman,

Senator, Vice President, and President—it must be said that his impact was so profound that there is hardly a case in which the nation was either blessed or victimized by this particular 20th century passion for responsibility for which Lyndon Johnson himself was not largely responsible. Like indifferent lovers for fractious offspring, a nation can often take things for granted or seem only to notice when it has been wronged. The death of Mr. Johnson may serve momentarily to pull us back from these perspectives, to remind us that much which we now expect from our government and our society as a matter of course—black voting rights, care for our elderly and our ill—came to us very recently and largely by courtesy of Lyndon Johnson.

The simple, inescapable fact is that he cared—and that it showed. Being in all ways larger than life-sized, he cared about a lot of things: his own political fortunes, his image, and his place in history, for of course he was vain. But he was consistent; all of his appetites were kingsized. So he cared about people with the same enormous intensity. In fact, a fair case can be made that one set of appetites fed on the other; he struggled and wheeled and hammered and cajoled for political power because he yearned powerfully to do great and good things and that is what he wanted the power for.

This was at once the strength and the weakness of Lyndon Johnson, for while this tremendous force was more often than not irresistible over the years, both as Senate Majority Leader and President, it was, like everything about the man, very often excessive. It could bend the political process to his will, and to good effect. But it could also bear down too hard, so that the system cracked under his weight. A master at the instrumentality of events, he could use a Selma or an assassination to lever a civil rights law or a gun control bill through Congress. But he could also use a minor gunboat skirmish in the Gulf of Tonkin to produce a resolution from Congress giving overwhelming support to a war effort whose true nature was never revealed in terms which could be expected to prepare either the Congress or the public for the sacrifice that both would later be expected to accept.

Neither Lyndon Johnson's memory nor his place in history, we would hope, is going to turn entirely, or even primarily on the war that grew out of that resolution; for Vietnam there is blame enough for all concerned, over four administrations and a good number of Congresses. Confined and carried along by earlier commitments, counseled by the men recruited by his predecessors, unchecked by Congress, Mr. Johnson plunged on, oversteering, over-promising, over-hoping, over-reaching. But if his time in office marked the big Vietnam escalation, it also will be remembered for the fact that he, by implication and by painfully difficult decision, moved toward the end of his term to acknowledge a great miscalculation—widely shared in, let it be said—which is not something incumbent Presidents are given to doing. Reluctantly, grudgingly, but effectively, he turned the war effort around, abandoning "graduated response" as the method of choice, and bequeathed to his successor a greater opportunity than he himself inherited to move toward disengagement and a re-definition of the mission in realistic terms.

When Harry Truman died a few weeks ago at the age of 88, he died the beneficiary of a gift Lyndon Johnson was not to receive: 20 years had passed since the embattled and much maligned Mr. Truman had held office so that time and change and hindsight vastly altered the view people had of him. Mr. Johnson was never lucky in this regard. His each and every achievement from his Senate years on seemed to be followed or accompanied by some series of events that spoiled

the glory of the moment. Still, we do not share the notion, now being advanced (sometimes with bitterness) of how unfair it was that he rarely received the recognition he deserved in his lifetime for the good and also great things he did—or that the criticism of his handling of the war unfairly overshadowed all the rest. He would, we suspect, have a wryly humorous view of all this—much as he craved to be well-loved and well-remembered—because he was too shrewd, not to say cynical a student of human and political nature not to have been amused by these efforts by those who served him badly from time to time to revise the record in his (and their) favor. Lyndon Johnson must have known that he did not need to be helped into history.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today the country mourns the death of a great leader and a great American President.

In this hour of Lyndon Johnson's passing, let us put aside the disagreement that many of us had with him over Vietnam. He was a man with great courage and fortitude, a man who did what he thought was right, misguided though some of his decisions may have been.

At home Lyndon Johnson had the courage and compassion to grapple with some of the most difficult problems of our times: poverty and racial discrimination. He did not retreat from these challenges; indeed, he pursued them with great vision and determination. History will most fondly remember Lyndon Johnson for his civil rights legislation and for the commitment the Federal Government made under his leadership to improving the quality of life for all Americans.

Lyndon Johnson was a big man in every regard: in stature, in energy, in vision, in capacity, and in compassion. He was a man who embodied almost every human quality in such magnitude that he will be remembered not only for what he did but for the man he was and the dimensions of his leadership.

We all remember the many pictures of the man in the Oval Office who often looked tired and haggard. But, that craggy face reassured us that a man was in the White House who knew and cared about what was going on in the Federal Government and in the country.

It is tragic that Lyndon Johnson should have died before the signing of a peace accord settling the Vietnam conflict that through the months of his administration had become so personally consuming and finally his political nemesis.

Within the past month we have lost two great men our country has known. Let this be a period in which we reaffirm our resolve to meet the ideals on which our country was founded.

Mr. Speaker, in remembering President Johnson today, my sympathy goes to Lady Bird, Lynda, and Luci and the rest of the Johnson family who gave him such support and comfort during his years in Washington and in his retirement.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is both tragic and ironic that former President Lyndon B. Johnson passed away yesterday, on the eve of peace in Vietnam. It was during his administration that the United States brought power to bear on the North Vietnamese in an effort to

bring them to the bargaining table. It was during President Johnson's administration that Paris became the center of attention when it was announced that peace talks would begin.

One could not help but feel while watching the news last night that it was ironical that the Majestic Hotel in Paris was being prepared for the signing of the peace treaty ending the conflict in Vietnam. It was in this same hotel, in that very room shown last night, that the first hurdle to clear in the talks was the seating arrangement. This was just the first of many frustrations President Johnson would suffer in bargaining with the North.

He was indeed a casualty of the war. Because of his efforts to deal with the Communists and the war with a strong hand, he was snubbed by his own party at the convention in 1968. But now, in retrospect, he, more than anyone else at the time, knew the best way to deal with his adversaries was through strength not weakness.

The war reached its fullest fury under Johnson, but it was he, and he alone who had to assume the consequences of difficult decisions, decisions which can only be made by the Commander in Chief.

History may yet prove him right. Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1973, at 5:33 p.m., death took from us Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States, almost 4 years to the day from the time he left the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I have already conveyed to Mrs. Johnson my own personal condolences in which Mrs. Daniels joins with me. In addition, I would like to publicly convey the deep and profound sorrow of the people of Hudson County, N.J., at the passing of this towering figure.

Few men dominated the age in which they lived as Lyndon Baines Johnson. In every sense of the word he gravitated toward center stage in every forum in which he performed—as a Member of this House, the Senate, as Vice President, and as President. It is cliché to say that he was larger than life, but no other expression describes his relationship with the world in which he lived.

The tragedy of the Vietnam war has largely obscured the record of Lyndon Johnson in domestic affairs, but historians placing events in context will, I am sure, judge the accomplishments of the 89th Congress as the great monument to Lyndon Johnson. All of us who served in this body during the years 1965 and 1966 will never forget the nature and kind of leadership supplied by the White House.

It is perhaps a little ironic, but there were few places where Lyndon Johnson—the man of the arid plains of south-central Texas—was loved more than in my own Hudson County, N.J. But our people loved him for what he did for the poor, the urban, the black, the Spanish, and all Americans who needed help. His 5 years in the White House raised a new hope for millions, and those millions weep today for their champion.

Benjamin Disraeli once wrote that—
The spirit of the age is the thing that a great man changes.

Lyndon Johnson viewed in this light met the test of greatness for he, more than any other man of our time, or any time, led the fight for freedom for black Americans. A product of the segregated Southland, he fought to extend the franchise to millions of black Americans. Through his championship of the great Civil Right Acts of the 1960's, black Americans were led out of peonage and brought into the mainstream of American life. Truly, he changed the spirit of the age.

Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson now moves from the contemporary stage to the historical and I know that history will view him as one of the great men of the century. I know that we shall not see his like again. May Almighty God bless Lyndon Baines Johnson and may perpetual light shine upon him.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, observation of history suggests that all great leaders have had much in common. It seems to me that former President Lyndon Johnson had an amalgam of characteristics exhibited in many of our modern day statesmen, both in and out of government.

It is not surprising that this appears to be the case since he virtually grew up under the tutelage of such men as Franklin Roosevelt, Sam Rayburn, John Nance Garner, and others who directed the affairs of this Nation during times of change and under varied circumstances which occurred during the formative period of President Johnson's political life.

As Lyndon Johnson became a national legislator, first as a Member of this U.S. House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate, he, too, left an imprint on events of that time. Later, as Vice President and then as President, he led this Nation with the great energy and ambition with which he was so greatly endowed.

There were differences of opinion on issues, which are bound to occur between men, but his devotion to what he believed was always something anyone could admire.

I prefer to remember his strong unyielding conviction that this Nation must be strong in its ability to defend itself and to ally those nations who sought our assistance in maintaining their independence.

The ability to anticipate events and shape policy accordingly was always an amazing performance by President Johnson. He had vision, he had dreams, and he had the courage to institute actions to bring them to the greatest possible fruition.

As is the case of all great public figures, only time will make it possible to fully appraise the leadership he gave this Nation. This seems to be a characteristic of our Nation as a people but one thing is already proved, and that is that he was a leader.

I join my colleagues in extending sympathy and condolence to Lady Bird and the other members of the Johnson family and hope that they may have the greatest possible comfort with the passing of the shortest time. They can, of course, do so in the knowledge of the great service

he rendered and the type of husband and father he was to them.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, America is blessed not only with the quality of her institutions, but with the quality of the men who guide her destiny. My dear friend, Lyndon Baines Johnson, was truly a man who knew what America needed and he gave his all to fulfill the hopes and aspirations of millions of Americans.

The congressional district I represent in southern Illinois is a much better place today because this great President had compassion for our needs and put his broad shoulder to the wheel in helping us build a greater southern Illinois. He signed bills providing for better housing, better health care with new hospitals and nursing homes, economic development programs that are now providing thousands of new jobs, clean air and clean water, millions of dollars to provide retraining and a greater educational program from Head Start to postgraduate courses at our great Southern Illinois University, lakes and recreational facilities, superhighways, medicare, social security benefits, and many other benefits too numerous to mention. Yes, Mr. Speaker, when we were fighting desperately to locate the most modern Federal penitentiary in the world at Marion, Ill., Lyndon Johnson ignored pressure from all sides and stood with us in guiding this important legislation through the Senate after it had passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation will not only mourn the absence of Lyndon Johnson, but we shall miss his clear and penetrating judgments. Lyndon Johnson had a real understanding, love and warmth for his family and his fellow man. I think when the history books are written concerning his long period of service in the Congress and in the Presidency, his sterling character, personality, and dedication will rank with the greatest Presidents of all time.

Mr. Speaker, when I saw Mrs. Johnson standing in the rotunda at the service, all I could say was—

I am sorry. You have my sympathy.

I wanted to say more but I am sure I speak for everyone in the Nation when I say that we were all saddened beyond words at the passing of such a great leader. Lyndon Johnson was "our kind of people," never too busy to give attention to the ignored; to those in despair, he gave hope; to those in need, he gave help; to the minorities and black, he gave equalization.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is gone but he has left behind a legacy and a challenge to us. His good works will stand as a lasting memorial that will be much taller than any monument we could erect.

The entire Gray family, my congressional staff, and the people of the 24th Congressional District of Illinois join me in extending deepest sympathy and prayers to Mrs. Johnson, the daughters, and their families. We thank them for sending this giant of a man our way.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, few men in history have seen fortune and circumstance elevate them to the heights of power and responsibility as did the late

Lyndon Baines Johnson only to suffer the tragedies which fate can impose.

And yet I am convinced that this Nation has never had a political leader or President who was more dedicated to the improvement of the life of all our people, particularly those among us who have been in one way or another disadvantaged, or more personally dedicated to the search for world peace.

That Lyndon Johnson suffered reverses and made mistakes in pursuit of these noble goals cannot be denied. Yet his accomplishments were legion and many will survive him as a living memorial to all that is good in America and to the worthy greatness to which we justly aspire.

He now belongs to history and it is for the future to judge him. Yet there are millions of Americans today whose lives are somewhat richer and fuller because of the labors of Lyndon B. Johnson. For these persons he is justly a great figure.

I am confident that history will regard President Johnson highly as a man of great courage who was driven by worthy compulsion to make the great American dream a reality for all Americans and as a man who guided this Nation into a war of tragic consequence not in search of vain glory but in the quest for peace.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, remembering as I do the force and vitality of Lyndon Johnson of some 5 or 6 years ago, it is difficult to believe that he is dead. He was a tower of strength, as majority leader in the Senate for so many years and, then, if the greatness of a President can be measured in terms of success in engineering his programs through an often-reluctant Congress, he was surely one of the greatest of our modern-day Presidents.

Mr. Johnson and I often disagreed, but I always saw him as a sincere advocate of America's "little people," and particularly of America's poor and disadvantaged. He constantly wanted to move our Nation forward and his Great Society programs for doing so—no matter how controversial some of the same still are—stand as a landmark of Presidential concern.

The tragedy of Vietnam became—and remains—his own personal tragedy. One has to wonder how much that tragedy shortened his life, even as it shortened his political career.

The loss of our only two, surviving ex-Presidents within the span of 1 month is a cruel blow to the Nation. It points up again, I think—no matter how late now to consider it—the necessity for our finding some way to continue to use their experience, perhaps as members "emeritus" of the Senate, after they leave office. I hope we will give our attention to that need—as a memorial of sorts to both Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are deeply saddened by the sudden death of our beloved former President, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Those of us who were his colleagues during Lyndon Johnson's long and distinguished service in the Congress have special reason to mourn his loss. His fellow Members of Congress knew well his great legislative ability, his leadership,

and most of all, his tremendous personal qualities.

Lyndon Johnson's accomplishments during several decades of public service loom large on the rich tapestry of American history which he helped to fashion. As a Member of Congress, he raised the legislative branch to a pinnacle of power and influence that it has not achieved since. As President, he received the greatest electoral mandate in history. As an American, he captured the support and admiration of perhaps more of our people than any other recent leader.

President Johnson won this widespread respect because he was truly a man of the people. More than anything else, he envisioned government as a helping hand for the poor, the sick, the hungry, and the needy. He saw Federal programs as providing the means, through education of the individual, job training, and providing equality of opportunity, whereby the people could be given the means of helping themselves. His Great Society, and the programs to achieve it, were based on a respect for individualism and personal achievement.

To attempt to list even his major accomplishments in a brief manner is a certain injustice, but Lyndon Johnson is perhaps best known for such landmark programs as the war on poverty, the 1964 Civil Rights Act which covered public accommodations, hiring practices, and voting rights, the medicare program for our older citizens, and our most important education bills such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which was the first general school assistance law in U.S. history. Among other portions of his legislative program was the bill creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1965; the Immigration Act of 1965 which eliminated the national origins quota system; the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967; the Truth in Lending Act of 1968; the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964; the Wilderness Act of 1964; the 1968 Civil Rights Act which prohibited discrimination in the sale or rental of housing; and the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. This is a legacy of governmental achievement which would be exceedingly difficult to emulate.

It was incongruous, to say the least, that this man who so believed in human worth should have become involved in a war so little understood by his countrymen. President Johnson did not start the war, nor was he able to end it. I am convinced that he sought with all his heart to stop the conflict, but this goal proved as elusive as the social uplift for which he so valiantly strived. More because of the war than anything else, our country was unable to muster the resources required to achieve the ambitious and imaginative program mapped out by President Johnson to achieve his domestic ends.

Let history record that here was a man of destiny denied, a figure of epic proportions whose hopes for all mankind were stymied by concerns that go deep into our culture and heritage. It was not enough to reach for the stars, when our roots remained in a clay that was all ours, and seen as indisputably superior to all

else. In this, Lyndon Johnson fell victim to a national pride that would not accept a lesser role on the world stage, even at the price of abandoning the dream which made us best.

Let the future spell out the lesson of this paradox. For now, it is enough to know that in Lyndon Johnson we had a President who embodied the conflicts so inherent in our own society, and whose achievements may be measured by his unprecedented attempt to make it great.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the country has lost a great leader in the passing of President Lyndon Johnson. I served with him in Congress and always found the door open at the White House while he was there. He used to phone me at home in the evening and talk with me about matters before the country and we have corresponded since his retirement. So this great loss to the country and to the world is a keen loss to me personally. History will properly list him as one of our greatest Presidents.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, it is with more than a heavy heart that I learned about the death of former President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

In the course of less than a month this country has lost two of the greatest leaders that it has ever had. Without a doubt, Lyndon Johnson worked harder than most men alive to help all minorities attain their rightful equality. Added to this is the fact that he had more compassion and more understanding than the other leaders of this country, especially at a time when compassion and understanding were needed and very necessary. It is not as though he listened like many politicians at the time did; he acted. He worked to present a positive program to the people; something not to placate them, but something constructive, positive.

Lyndon Johnson was a man who came up through the ranks, so to speak. He started as a teacher in Texas, something he was exceptionally proud of. He was elected to the House of Representatives in Washington. It was there that he learned the ins and outs of politics as we have come to know it today. He left the House for the Senate where he was an effective Senator, whip, and majority leader, always with the people in mind. From the Senate to a sectionally balanced ticket headed by John Kennedy and, after that tragedy, to the Presidency.

One of the characteristics of Mr. Johnson all the way through his political career was that he worked, and those around him felt the aura of this constant work.

In one of the small ironies of his life, it should be noted that one of the last things that he did was to have the Conference on Civil Rights in Texas as his Presidential papers on that subject were opened up to the scrutiny of scholars. There are very few national leaders that I know of who could lay claim to the title of leader in the field of civil rights; Mr. Johnson could, but I never recall him doing it.

His Great Society program was a constructive response to the needs of his fellow man. The Civil Rights Act of 1964

and the Voting Rights Act were enacted, because President Johnson was firmly committed to equality and because this President was committed to action where there was inequality. He was a man who used the Presidency to exercise the moral leadership in time of crisis.

Mr. Johnson was humble in origin, and he was strong in will and spirit. He will be missed by those who love people; those who care about people. He was a man whose wisdom and knowledge will be sorely missed in this country and around the world. He understood the needs of the people and did his utmost to meet these needs. A great leader and a great person—we all will miss this uncommon man and great President.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of Lyndon Baines Johnson takes from us a man who spent a lifetime seeking the American dream for all people. A man of boundless energy, talent, and persistence Lyndon Johnson dreamed big dreams for the American people and devoted his public career toward the realization of a great society.

In many ways Lyndon Johnson was larger than life. Big of frame, deep of mind, Lyndon Johnson came out of Texas like a duster, full of frontier restlessness and energy. Powerful, assertive, and determined Lyndon Johnson saw to it that more progressive legislation was enacted during his Presidency than any President in American history.

Education, human rights, economic development are but several of the legislative enactments that Lyndon Johnson saw fashioned into law. Benefiting the American people these legislative programs epitomized Lyndon Johnson's belief that the Government should work for the people.

My association with Lyndon Johnson goes back to the days when he served as Speaker of the Little Congress, an organization of congressional aides devoted to the realization of the New Deal legislative process and worked long and hard for the goals of his idol, Franklin D. Roosevelt. From that day until the day of his death, Lyndon Johnson never lost sight of his main objective: utilize the full powers and resources of the Government for the people of America.

It was my pleasure to serve in the Congress with him as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and later as a Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Few men have ever come to the Presidency with as much training as Lyndon Johnson. Legislative aide, governmental official, Member of the House of Representatives, Member of the Senate, Senate majority leader, and Vice President, Lyndon Johnson was a proven political leader. He understood how the political process could be used effectively for the development of enlightened public policy. No man personalized the Presidency more than Lyndon Johnson.

An era has passed with Lyndon Johnson's death. Though caught in the cruel wash of the Vietnam war, it was Lyndon Johnson who started the Paris peace talks. His devotion to the cause of peace stood second to none. He removed himself from politics in the belief that it, his

action, would give peace a chance to work. Ironically, his death came as the cease-fire agreement in Vietnam emerged. Fortunately, he was aware of the coming peace before his death.

In death Lyndon Johnson will remain big as he did in life. His career, his spirit, his endless quest for peace and fulfillment will remain forever etched in the American memory of great Presidents. A great patriot who loved his country and was not ashamed to show it Lyndon Johnson gave his life to a cause he believed in: The right of human dignity for all Americans.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the man we honor in this special order once served in this House. Lyndon Baines Johnson described himself as "a child of Congress."

I would like to believe that it was, in part, because he was "a child of Congress" that he rose above the circumstances of his birth, as we must, expanding himself beyond his parochial, Texas-centered concerns.

But whether or not his service in the Congress aided President Johnson in overcoming, it is clear that he did. Born and raised in Texas, Mr. Johnson went on to shepherd through the Congress more civil rights legislation than any President who served before or after him.

Those of us who were Members of the 89th Congress saw for ourselves that his efforts were not limited to civil rights measures, but included other landmark social welfare laws also aimed at benefiting the entire Nation. But to me, and to many other Americans, President Johnson's effort to end what he described as "the one huge wrong of the American Nation"—the denial of black America's civil rights—is his greatest contribution to this Nation.

In the 10 green volumes containing the public papers of President Johnson, there are innumerable evidences of the President's commitment to equal treatment for all Americans, of his concern for those Americans who for whatever the reason need their Government's help if they are to share fully the benefits of American society.

His belief was not that every American problem could be solved in Washington—this was and is an impossible task. But President Johnson did recognize that many ills of our society would persist and grow worse if left unattended. Some local and State governments either could not or would not address some of these problems—civil rights was only the most obvious example.

The President knew that the fundamental problems of poverty and color in our society do not evaporate—except in the observer's mind—if they are ignored. They become more complex and concentrated and more difficult for future generations—our children's—to ameliorate or solve.

And President Johnson did not believe we could solve our problems by throwing dollars at them. But he knew that problems are not solved without effort. And this effort always requires human and material resources if it is to succeed.

President Johnson's ideas evolved, Dean Rusk pointed out during services

for the President at the Capitol, from "a volcanic eruption from the innermost being of his soul." These eruptions could lead to error though only good was intended. But the eruptions in behalf of the domestic well-being of the American people were sound and well directed. Just as important, for the President was above all human and fallible, and no one contends his actions were always without error, the President gave to the poor and less affluent of this country a sense that he was committed to progress for all—and they saw evidences of the progress.

He used his national pulpit to assure the afflicted. While he was himself a major beneficiary of the American social and economic system and an unashamed advocate of the free enterprise system, he did not concern himself only with those who share in the benefits of the status quo. He recognized that many still wait in line.

In closing I want to quote briefly from President Johnson's June 4, 1965, commencement address at Howard University: "To Fulfill These Rights." His words still have relevance 8 years after they were delivered and they bear repeating and demand action if we are to progress as a nation.

But, more importantly, on this occasion, by illustrating President Johnson's commitment to progress for the least advantaged in our society, these words record again his hopes for every member of our society:

"TO FULFILL THESE RIGHTS": COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY, JUNE 4, 1965

This graduating class at Howard University is witness to the indomitable determination of the Negro American to win his way in American life . . . But for the great majority of Negro Americans—the poor, the unemployed, the uprooted, and the dispossessed—there is a much grimmer story. They still, as we meet here tonight, are another nation. Despite the court orders and the laws, despite the legislative victories and the speeches, for them the walls are rising and the gulf is widening . . . There is no single easy answer to all of these problems.

Jobs are a part of the answer . . . Decent homes in decent surroundings and a chance to learn—an equal chance to learn—are part of the answer.

Welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together are part of the answer.

Care for the sick is part of the answer.

An understanding heart by all Americans is another big part of the answer . . . But there are other answers that are still to be found . . . [I]t is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation, and, in so doing, to find America for ourselves, with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom.

All it will take is for all of us to understand what this country is and what this country must become . . .

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the death of Lyndon Baines Johnson leaves a considerable void to all who knew him. President Johnson, as has been said many times in the past few weeks, was a giant of a man, a larger-than-life figure we will always remember.

Lyndon Johnson was perhaps the ulti-

mate creature of Congress, with a better understanding of the workings of Government and the uses of power than any other man in recent history. When Mr. Johnson was Senate majority leader and Sam Rayburn was Speaker of the House, Congress played a more proper role in our "checks and balances" system. His departure, I think, was a factor in and of itself in the decline of Congress.

President Johnson was a massive man who when he made a mistake it was massive and who when he moved to correct a wrong he gave it all he had. Millions of Americans benefit directly from the hundreds of laws he pushed through Congress. His vigorous efforts on behalf of his measures was a major factor in Congress' passage and implementation of them.

It is tragic that many remembrances of President Johnson have dwelt on his role in the Vietnam war. He did make the decisions, based on the advice of his expert advisers, which did involve us more in the conflict. But he took every action—including the sacrifice of his own political career in March 1968—in the hope of achieving a just peace. President Nixon rightly spoke of Mr. Johnson's dedication to peace during his speech announcing the settlement in Southeast Asia.

What will stand as more of a tribute will be his efforts on behalf of the disadvantaged. As Senate majority leader, as Vice President, and then as President, he performed valiantly to erase the barriers condemning many of our fellow citizens to second-class citizenship. History books will, I am sure, list his accomplishments along with Mr. Lincoln's in discussions of the fight for justice, equality, and opportunity for all Americans.

I shall always remember fondly President Johnson. Mrs. Steiger and I both shall treasure the opportunities made available to us in our first 2 years in Congress to be at the White House with the President and his family. Most especially, Mrs. Steiger joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnson, to Lynda and Chuck Robb, and all the other members of the Johnson family.

Lyndon Johnson cared—and cared deeply—for his fellowman. And he put this concern into action. His example is a legacy for the ages.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation now mourns the passing of another President, Lyndon Johnson. We will miss the wisdom and perspective he shared with us, and the absence of his presence is a loss we cannot measure but which we will surely feel.

His early life knew hardship and struggle, and his political upbringing was steeped in rural populism, the Great Depression and the New Deal. From these early experiences, Lyndon Johnson developed a natural and powerful concern for the weak and the poor. Despite their differences in personality and style, I am struck by the similarities I see in the lives of Lyndon Johnson and Harry Truman and the passing of an era their deaths represent. In their passing we

may have seen the last of our Presidents who lived and practiced what they learned in that singular and decisive period of American history.

Lyndon Johnson saw politics as the art of compromise and the possible. Being the man he was—forceful, strong, fervent—he realized accomplishments others would not have been able to achieve. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were turning points in our Nation's commitment to provide justice and opportunity for all its people.

The impact that legislation has had is staggering; yet equality remains a goal and not a reality. Lyndon Johnson's dedication to this struggle is underscored in one of his last public statements in December at the civil rights symposium at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library in Austin. At that time he concluded his impromptu remarks with the following:

We know there is injustice. We know there is intolerance. We know there is discrimination and hate and suspicion, and we know there is division among us.

But there is a larger truth. We have proved that great progress is possible. We know how much still remains to be done. And if our efforts continue, if our will is strong, if our hearts are right, and if courage remains our constant companion, then, my fellow Americans, I am confident we shall overcome.

The Johnson years told us much about ourselves and our Nation. Their successes and failures will be instructive as we continue to grapple with the persisting problems of society. We will learn from the mistakes of those years, but let us never forget the achievements Lyndon Johnson won for all the American people.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak of the achievements of the late President Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson was the first President under which I served in the House and as such retains a special place in my memories. Shortly after my appointment to the Committee on Education and Labor in 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of that year.

President Johnson's key role in passage of this first Federal aid school bill made apparent to me his sincerity and dedication as a friend of education. In that same congressional landmark year, the hand of President Johnson helped mightily in approval of Medicare, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

I think President Johnson's place in history is assured by his support of vital social legislation and the creative work by the 89th Congress that cast his and our ideals into legislation.

Above all else, his role in civil rights deserves praise. President Johnson recognized division by race in this Nation as a potentially destructive force. His efforts to abrogate this force are best illustrated by strong support of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

These and the earlier human rights bills he supported may eventually make possible a viable society in this Nation.

His foresight into the consequences of remaining a separate but unequal so-

ciety, combined with his leadership and understanding of the legislative process, resulted in an opening of doors that was long overdue. It is fitting that his last major address was to a gathering concerned with human rights.

If all our human problems were not overcome in Lyndon Johnson's lifetime, it was not for lack of his trying.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American people have witnessed a most remarkable month—first with the passing of former President Harry S. Truman on December 26, followed by the reinauguration of President Richard Nixon on January 20, and now again with the passing of another former President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

January was a month of mixed emotions—Americans both celebrated and mourned. We looked with anticipation to the future and yet paused to contemplate the past.

Lyndon B. Johnson was no ordinary man. Regardless of whether one agreed or disagreed with his policies, Johnson was a man of incredible strength and endurance. His steadfastness which was often a target for his detractors nevertheless gave Americans a sense of security and continuity during a time so wrought by strife and emotion.

Although ascending to the Presidency through an act of fate not expected or awaited, Lyndon B. Johnson carved his own record, and set into motion the most comprehensive domestic legislative program in history. Lyndon B. Johnson, a fellow Texan and political protege of the immortal Sam Rayburn, will have a place in history. We today are too close in time as his contemporaries to truly measure the significance of his presence upon the course of national and world affairs.

But Lyndon B. Johnson can never be doubted in his great faith in the American system. To all citizens, regardless of political party, he beckoned to the call of a task yet unfinished. And of that work which is good, he said, "Let us continue."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Lyndon Baines Johnson, 36th President of the United States.

I had the honor of serving under President Johnson from the time he assumed the office until March of 1963. At that time I was the U.S. Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. One of Mr. Johnson's first acts as President was to come to the United Nations and address the General Assembly. This was a way of expressing his great interest in and support for the U.N., as well as a method of assuring the world of the continuity of U.S. foreign policy following the tragic death of President Kennedy.

I also had the great privilege of being a Member of the Congress during the 89th and 90th Congresses. There is no doubt that the record of domestic legislation written during those years, especially in 1965, in response to the leadership of President Johnson was one of the most remarkable in the history of the Nation.

President Johnson knew how to get

action out of the Congress. He was unfailingly courteous, hospitable, and friendly, but he was also a hard taskmaster. He never let up in his efforts to press the Congress for constructive action.

While I differed with President Johnson in regard to his Vietnam policies, I never had any doubt that he was acting as he believed to be in the best interests of the country.

I cannot conclude these remarks without paying a brief tribute to Mrs. Johnson. She was—and is—an inspiration to all of us. Her dignity, her friendliness, and her intense interest in many important programs, especially the beautification of our country, were truly remarkable. We all extend to her and her family our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, all Americans feel a sadness and sense of loss at the sudden death of former President Lyndon Johnson. More than any President in recent times he had a deep faith in—and concern for—working people. His strong emphasis on human problem solving gave the country leadership and direction. While his Vietnam war policies were regrettable—his full commitment to equality and human rights was a source of national inspiration.

Above all, Lyndon Johnson was a human being—a man who loved his fellow man—and I feel his loss in a personal way. I am proud to have known him—and to have served 2 years in Congress while he was President. My prayers and thoughts are with his family.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound sadness over the loss of a great leader and an indomitable fighter for the rights of man that I rise to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Since I came to this body, in 1959, it has been my privilege to serve under four Presidents. None of them executed the duties of his office with greater passion and persuasion than Lyndon Johnson. He battled untiringly for those causes in which he believed—the causes of civil rights, education, full employment, and the rest—and because of his leadership, we made the greatest strides toward these goals that have been made in our lifetime.

It was my privilege to serve as a soldier in Lyndon Johnson's army during the great legislative struggle that culminated in the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The President was not content merely to issue a manifesto concerning the urgent need for this legislation which would give the franchise to American citizens long denied their rights, because of the color of their skin. He was not content merely to exhort his troops to do battle in the cause of simple justice. Instead, he fought side by side with us throughout the battle in the halls of this great national legislature. All of us who participated in this struggle can be proud of what we accomplished in enactment of the Voting Rights Act. But all of us who participated in that struggle are also aware that victory well might have eluded our grasp, had it not been for Lyndon Johnson's efforts.

It is particularly timely, Mr. Speaker, to recall the working partnership which existed between President Johnson and the Congress—in this and other legislative milestones which were placed along the road to a greater society during his stewardship in the White House. We could wish today for the same kind of interaction between the legislative and executive branches.

It is a tragedy of history that the Johnson administration was marred by the fact that we became more deeply involved in a war in Southeast Asia which was, to a large extent, President Johnson's legacy from his two predecessors in the White House, and a war, in turn, which raged on for 4 long years after Lyndon Johnson retired to private life. It is a tragedy, because that war and its consequences, both at home and abroad, have diverted the people's attention from Lyndon Johnson's role as the great activist in the White House.

President Johnson was a man with faith in America and with a dream about what its people could accomplish. Not content with merely dreaming, he dared to make those dreams come true—and our lawbooks now are studded with landmarks to his challenge to the American people, and to their response to that challenge to their greatness and their better nature. It is my hope, and one I believe is shared by the majority in this body and the majority of the American people, that those great social programs of the Johnson years not be dismantled now.

Mr. Speaker, history will vindicate the memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson. I believe it will stamp him as one of the great Presidents of this century—a man who was truly a partner with the people, and with their elected representatives, in achieving progress toward a better society. I hope we will live to see other Presidents with his cooperative spirit, and with his concern, his compassion, and his capacity for social progress.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson was an extraordinary man. I think it might be fitting today to relate one of the stories that appeared in the Washington Post the day after this great man passed away. It was a story told by Mr. James Rowe, who had been one of Mr. Johnson's friends through the years, and he related the story of a phone call that the then Congressman Johnson made. He called home and talked to Mrs. Zephyr Wright, his cook. He told her that he was having five guests in for dinner, and she had to fix five good steaks, and that he would be there in about an hour. And before she could tell him that she did not have any red coupons, which were necessary during those days of food rationing, he had already hung up. Zephyr then called Mrs. John Connally and told her that she had to have some red coupons; that the Congressman said he was going to bring five folks home for dinner, and she did not have any coupons, and could she borrow some from Mrs. Connally? Mrs. Connally said:

Zephyr, I don't have any red coupons, and if I did I wouldn't give them to Lyndon because that man has got to learn that he is just like anybody else.

And Zephyr said:

Yes'm. I know, Mrs. Connally. I know he is just like anyone else, and you know that he is just like anyone else, but he doesn't know it, and I'm not going to be the one to tell him.

Mr. Speaker, this extraordinary man has given his life to Americans. Our country will be improved for ages to come because of the goodness and the dedication of this great man from the hill country of central Texas. We do appreciate his great service. We love him and his family, and we are proud to join today in tributes which, in just a small measure, might be an expression of appreciation for the good things he has done for America, and for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include the following editorials on the life and character of the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Austin Statesman, Jan. 26, 1973]

MINISTER SAYS HE LEARNED COURAGE, FAITH FROM L. B. J.

(By Harry Provence)

WASHINGTON.—"Lyndon my servant is dead, now therefore arise . . ."

So did Lyndon Baines Johnson's minister, Dr. George R. Davis, paraphrase Joshua 1, Jehovah's command to Moses' successor, in the final Washington tribute to the former president Thursday morning in National City Christian Church.

"Lyndon Johnson was my minister," Dr. Davis told the crowd that packed his house of worship and overflowed all around Thomas Circle in the heart of the nation's capital.

"He taught me grace under pressure, courage, faith . . . he showed me how religion can be a part of daily life . . ."

Dr. Davis recalled two examples of Lyndon Johnson's leadership, the first when he took over the presidency after the assassination of John F. Kennedy and the second when he handed over the office to Richard Nixon. Never has there been a more graceful transfer of power in our history, Dr. Davis said.

. . . mourners, including President and Mrs. Nixon, to "arise to the tasks set before us by Lyndon B. Johnson."

Mr. Johnson was an honorable elder of National City Christian Church and a frequent worshipper at its services. "I know I shall see Lyndon Johnson again in heaven," said the minister.

Marvin Watson, business executive, former postmaster general and one-time White House assistant to LBJ, eulogized the memory of the 36th President of the United States:

"We shared his victories and his defeats.

"In victory he taught us to be magnanimous . . . in defeat taught us to be without hate . . . to learn . . . to rally . . . to accept the challenge and try again.

"He believed that good men together could accomplish anything, even the most impossible of dreams. No matter who his opponent, he constantly sought to find that touchstone within the soul of every man which, if discovered, would release the impulse for honest and fair solution. Hate was never in this man's heart," said Marvin Watson.

The former White House aide recalled that "I watched him formulate secure passage and sign into law the most comprehensive legislative program in education, housing and conservation and health of any presi-

dent in history . . . I watched him in the situation room at the time of crisis during the six days war when only his ability, his knowledge and his sheer courage helped to keep that conflict from erupting into a wider confrontation . . ."

Watson echoed the theme sounded Wednesday by Rep. J. J. Pickle in the ceremony in the Capitol rotunda: "He was a tall man of giant character, and when he committed himself, he committed himself totally. And he asked his countrymen to do the same.

"Those of us who loved him take comfort in the knowledge that before he died, he could see the dawn of domestic tranquility and of foreign peace which he gave so much of his great heart to bring about. The structure of peace which President Nixon, with great distinction and determination, is building in the world today will rest upon a foundation laid in loneliness and stubborn courage by Lyndon Johnson," Watson said.

The gray stone church began to fill an hour before the 10 a.m. funeral service. Admission was by invitation and the crowd overflowed the pews to line the walls on three sides in metal chairs.

Bright television lights made the floral wreaths and sprays more vivid, the flag over Mr. Johnson's casket glow, the cerise and white vestments of the 50-voice church choir glisten.

Leontyne Price, world's premier coloratura soprano, arrived from Los Angeles, where she had given a concert the evening before and thrilled the crowd with her singing of "Take My Hand, Precious Lord" and "Onward, Christian Soldiers." The latter selection was one requested by LBJ in a conversation months ago with Mrs. Johnson.

The choir presented "The Church's One Foundation," "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God," with the congregation joining in that hymn. The concluding anthem was "Once to Every Man and Nation."

Loudspeakers carried the words and music of the service to the several thousands of citizens standing behind security barriers in the vicinity of the church. A bright sun softened the temperature which had dropped far below freezing during the night.

The small balcony in the vaulted church bulged with reporters, cameramen and a tangle of wires, switchboards and other gear needed to serve the television network crews. It was a scene of quiet confusion upstairs.

Two Red Cross vans came to the church to serve coffee and chocolate and cookies to the relays of metropolitan policemen, reporters and armed service sentries who took up their stations at daybreak.

The Red Cross volunteers had been on duty all night attending to the needs of men, women and children who shivered in line outside the Capitol awaiting their turns to walk past the casket of the former president. Several of the children suffering from the cold were taken to nearby hospitals by Red Cross workers, they reported. Numerous adults in the night-long vigil required first aid from the bitter temperature, the Red Cross ladies said.

At the conclusion of the funeral in the church, the same servicemen who had acted as pallbearers from the time the Johnson cortege reached Washington bore the casket to a funeral coach for the motorcade to Andrews Air Force Base. As they carried the casket up the aisle, Mrs. Johnson on the arm of retired Maj. Gen. James Cross of Austin led the mourners in a slow walk behind the body of LBJ. Again Mrs. Johnson paused to shake hands with President and Mrs. Nixon and to blow a kiss to the first lady.

From Andrews AFB the Johnson funeral party flew to the LBJ Ranch for burial services in the Johnson family cemetery on the banks of the Pedernales River.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 24, 1973]

LARGER THAN LIFE, L. B. J. RETAINED HUMANITY

(By Max Frankel)

NEW YORK.—He was larger than life, almost a caricature of the Texas caricature that he could never shake, but he never lost his humanity because with Lyndon Johnson, everything was really personal.

The war that overwhelmed his years in the White House was personal—a test of endurance against Ho Chi Minh, which he acknowledged having lost in the end, no matter who actually won the spoils of battle.

The Great Society was personal, because a lackluster education in his own life had saved him from shiftlessness and he deemed learning of any kind to be forever more the way to get ahead in this world.

The civil rights laws that he wanted as his monument were, in the end, highly personal, because they were drawn on the testimony of his Negro cook and her humiliations whenever she traveled without reliable food or lodging between Washington and the Texas ranch.

And even politics, the business in which he excelled and in which he took such great pride, was to him only a personal, face-to-face thing. If he had talked George Meany into acquiescence on a point, he thought he had won over all of American labor. If he had conquered Richard Russell on a budget matter, he thought he had won over the Southland.

In this fashion, he had been able to encompass every issue and every center of power in his years as majority leader of the Senate. But from the White House, even his huge reach fell short and his incredibly hard work and keen mind felt often overwhelmed.

REPLACING THE PRINCE

Insecure, despite his size and force, LBJ felt from the moment of John Kennedy's death in Dallas that the nation would never accept his Southern speech and rural manners as a replacement for the slain prince.

So he clung to the Kennedy men and boasted of their Ph.D. degrees and he was afraid, even after his landslide election in 1964, to bring his own men to the capital.

And he could not comprehend, to the moment of death, how so many Kennedy partisans around the country could turn against him because of a war in which he felt he had taken the counsel of his predecessor's cabinet and aides.

So he took it personally. He thought he saw a plot to promote yet another Kennedy and he thought he saw his fate as being merely the caretaker between two Kennedy administrations and he hated the thought and all who made it seem so real.

VINDICATION

In his own mind, he felt certain that history would bring vindication. Historians would see, he thought:

A southerner, who brought the blacks to the ultimate legal equality—with their own seat on the Supreme Court and a court that ruled in their cause.

A conservative kept alive in politics by conservative votes for Texas interests, who made the war on poverty an elaborate concern of the federal government.

A wartime leader who was governed to the end by respect and occasionally even compassion for his "enemy," who really wanted to extend the Great Society to the Mekong River and who systematically refused to whip the nation into an anti-Communist frenzy.

A backwoods boy of modest learning, who gave what seemed to him the disrespectful establishment figures of the East the scope and mandate for great social works.

That is how he also saw himself. He confronted antagonists to the end, always hoping that reason and short ideals and long

conversations—really monologues—could find a compromise for every conflict.

Although overcome by a bitter war and the hatreds that it spawned throughout the country, Lyndon Johnson remained a man who hated conflict and who feared confrontation for himself and his country.

He made the joint chiefs of staff testify in writing that he should really stand the siege of Khe Sanh.

He made all his diplomatic advisers commit themselves in writing to the advice that he really go to meet Soviet Premier Kosygin at Glasboro, N.J.

He weaned from his wife, Lady Bird, a written recommendation that he ride into battle against Barry Goldwater in 1964 and that he should buck the battle for re-election in 1968. He never really did want to stand alone.

"Well," he said to a newsmen on the morning after his surprise announcement of intended retirement in 1968, "do you still believe in the First Amendment?" He thought free speech and free assembly had destroyed him but he went on to confess that he believed in the First Amendment.

He wanted everyone with him all the time and when they weren't, it broke his heart.

[From the San Antonio Express, Jan. 25, 1973]

L. B. J. WORKED HARD FOR PEACE (By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—It is unfortunate that Lyndon Baines Johnson didn't live long enough to see the end of the Vietnam war which he had tried so hard to get.

For Johnson came into office as the 36th President of the United States when the military involvement of this country in Vietnam had already been instituted during the administrations of Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower and Truman.

Lyndon Johnson's efforts to make peace in Vietnam were continuous, though he found it necessary to increase American forces from about 15,000 when he took office in 1963 to more than 500,000 when he left the White House in January 1969.

President Johnson had halted the bombing of North Vietnam in 1968, when "peace talks" were begun. The country was surprised at his announcement on March 31, 1968, that he would not seek or accept re-nomination. His hope was that some progress might be achieved toward a peace settlement during the rest of his term, but it turned out that the North Vietnamese were not negotiating seriously.

Johnson got the support of Congress in 1964 when two United States destroyers were attacked by North Vietnamese torpedo boats in the Gulf of Tonkin. Immediate retaliatory action was taken, and Congress answered the President's call for war powers by passing a resolution giving him authority "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."

President Johnson offered as early as September 1967 to stop all bombing of North Vietnam if this would "lead promptly to productive discussion." But North Vietnam refused.

Looking back over at least ten years of war in Vietnam, it will be found that the United States was honoring its commitments made in the Southeast Asia Treaty, which was ratified by the Senate in 1955. The Vietnam issue was regarded by the chief executives in three administrations as the fulfillment of the pledge to help nations of Southeast Asia which were victims of aggression.

Nevertheless, Johnson was under frequent criticism from "antiwar" groups and from members of Congress who left the pressure to terminate the draft and relieve hundreds of thousands of young men from having to go into military service.

While Lyndon Johnson made every effort to obtain a settlement with the North Vietnamese, the Communist side in the war was adamant. Military aid to North Vietnam from Red China and the Soviet Union was substantial from the start.

If Lyndon Johnson could have lived to read the text of the agreement which will be signed and to learn of the plans for the return of prisoners and withdrawal of all American forces, it would have been one of the most satisfying moments of his life. When peace is achieved, the record will show that he worked hard to attain that goal.

People forget what happened only a few years ago. Many of them, especially the "antiwar" groups, seem not to remember that the Vietnam war was not started under President Nixon. Nor do they realize that he has been carrying out the obligations of the United States in the treaty of 1955 to protect sovereignty of a small nation.

The "antiwar" movement seems to be based upon objections to all war no matter what the consequences are and what the risks would be if aggressors are allowed to grab territory and deny millions of people their rights in freedom.

While there have been many eulogies for Lyndon Johnson, his handling of the Vietnam war, especially as he strove to stop the bloodshed, will be regarded as a demonstration not only of his dedication to peace but of his loyalty to the cause which brought the United States into the Vietnam conflict.

The huge sacrifices made will always remain an exhibition of the humanitarianism of the United States.

[From the San Antonio Express, Jan. 25, 1973]

L. B. J.: GLORY, TRAGEDY (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—Both the glory and the tragedy of Lyndon Johnson was that he believed utterly in the romantic tradition of America.

He believed in the Congress and the church, in that order; in Main Street and Wall Street, in the competitive state and in the welfare state—in all of it part of the time and some of it all of the time: All the dreams and realities and myths, from Horatio Alger to Lord Keynes, no matter how contradictory.

In other words, he was a symbol of this confusing time in America—a little nearer to the old spirit of Frederick Jackson Turner's American frontier than most of his fellow countrymen, but also a little nearer to the folks who had been left behind when the frontier and battle moved to the cities.

Johnson was not only sure of the greatness and supremacy of his country, but of his own ability to persuade the Congress after the death of John Kennedy, that it must pass his Civil Rights Bill of 1964 and his Equal Voting Rights Act of 1965, and prove that the Congress was equal to the promises of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These are his monuments.

In Washington, he knew every card in the deck, but in the world, he didn't. He knew very little about Vietnam.

He was very close to Gen. Eisenhower. When Ike was president and Johnson was the Democratic majority leader of the Senate, Johnson never opposed him on foreign affairs. We fight at home, Lyndon said, but when we go overseas, he's my president.

And yet, one of the very odd things in this tragedy of human and political relations, is that President Johnson after he got into the White House, paid little or no heed to Gen. Eisenhower's judgment on Vietnam.

Eisenhower's views about Vietnam were well known in Washington at that time. Johnson had heard them all years before when Vice President Nixon, Secretary of

State John Foster Dulles, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Radford, had argued for American intervention in Vietnam during the French crisis at Dien Bien Phu.

Ike said then, what he wrote in his book later, that the political situation in Saigon was weak and confused, and that, without strong political and popular support, American intervention was unwise.

"Willingness to fight for freedom, no matter where the battle may be," Ike wrote, "has always been characteristic of our people, but the conditions then prevailing in Indochina were such as to make unilateral intervention nothing less than sheer folly."

Johnson wasn't thinking about President Eisenhower, much as he admired him, when President Kennedy was assassinated. If the evidence of his own book is accurate, he wasn't even thinking about himself.

Certainly he was not concentrating on changing the whole policy. He was focusing on the death of Kennedy, on carrying on Kennedy's policies, on political loyalty, as he saw it, so he plunged deeper into the war, and it destroyed him in the end.

The journalists tried to deal with all this at the time, and even at Johnson's death, but it is beyond us. Like Kennedy and Nixon, he is a subject for a great psychological American novel.

But Johnson was different. He left a broken record, triumphant at home and tragic in Vietnam, and like most presidents, his policies will be judged by the historians.

The difference is that Lyndon Johnson was a great talker, one of the last of the old southern and frontier storytellers of the age.

He didn't leave the real story in his documents in his library at the University of Texas, but in the memories of his friends, companions and political adversaries in Washington.

He loved the camera. No president collected more photographs of himself and his visitors than Johnson, but the tape recorder was really the instrument he should have used.

For he gave himself to his visitors, and historians will never be able to sort out the glory and the tragedy, unless they somehow manage to collect the stories, listen to the tape recorders and forget the television, which was his downfall, and somehow hear him talking endlessly about his problems, his cunning contrivances, his feeling for the Congress, his love of his country, and particularly his affection for his lovely and remarkable wife, and his hardscrabble land in Texas.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 1, 1973]

L. B. J. RECALLED AS VISIONARY (By Carl Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—How shall I remember LBJ?

I think of a man I had scarcely met, poking his index finger against my chest one sultry day in Saigon in 1961 and saying: "Mr. Roe-ann, you don't know me. But one of these days you're gonna discover that I'm a goddamn sight more liberal than most of these so-called liberals you've been cottoning up to."

And I shall remember that when the public mood turned mean and ugly in America and lesser liberals ran with the mob, Lyndon Johnson remained true to his decent convictions.

I shall remember LBJ as a man driven to success, a man who didn't know how to take it easy, whether ordered to by his doctor or begged to by the Secret Service.

There was that incredibly hot day in some unbelievably dusty villages on the outskirts of Agra, India, when he kept whispering to me: "Stay close to me—right by shoulder." He was nurturing the illusion that I was some kind of expert on India just because I had written a book about it!

PUMP TALK

I gasped as I tried to stay near him as he plowed through the grasping crowds. As I wiped my sweaty forehead with the front of my hand and my parched lips with the back of it, I asked myself: "Is this a man who has suffered a massive heart attack?"

When the pace slowed to a hotel room and a cool scotch, all Johnson wanted to talk about was the cheap water pumps (he thought they were Fairbanks-Morse) that he used to know as a boy in Texas. He wondered why the hell the U.S. couldn't get some of them into India so the people in these villages could have water.

I remember his telephone call on March 15, 1965, asking if I would sit with his wife and daughters while he delivered his address on the Voting Rights Act to a joint session of Congress. That was the speech—the last touches written by him on the way to the Capitol as he cursed the slowness of his speechwriters—in which he startled millions of Americans by using the emotional slogan, "We shall overcome."

And after that speech I remember sitting with him in his living quarters as the White House operator fanned out long distance calls all over the land.

"How did I do?" Johnson kept asking. He was a man who meant it when he talked about bringing Americans together, healing the nation's wounds, making this a land of equal opportunity. He wanted so badly to be reassured that what he had done that night was courageous, and good for all America.

Yet, I remember Lyndon B. Johnson as one of the most complicated men I ever met. He could seem petty, even mean, about trifling things and then display the broadest vision about the human needs of men and nations.

Johnson was at heart a sentimentalist—the kind of man who would weep in San Antonio during the 1964 campaign when an aged black man stood in the back of a pickup truck at a shopping center and said: "I'm a black man, born two blocks from this spot. I never dreamed I'd live to see the day when a Mexican congressman (Henry B. Gonzalez) would introduce me so I could ask you to vote for a white Texan for President."

And Johnson would dismiss his tears with the comment that "a man ain't worth a god-dam if he can't cry at the right time."

I always felt that a lot of Johnson's toughness, even ruthlessness, was part of his effort to hide his sentimentality.

I felt that he waded deeper into Vietnam, and for a longer time than his instincts and intellect dictated, because he never wanted the Joint Chiefs of Staff to think they had a sentimental sissy in the White House. He seemed to want to say to Gen. Curtis LeMay: "I don't puff a 1-foot cigar, but I'm as tough as you are."

IRONY, TRAGEDY

There is special irony and tragedy in the coincidence that the war that killed Johnson politically should be grinding to a close just as the fates snuffed out his life completely.

There is double irony in the fact that he died on the eve of a White House campaign to erase much of the "Great Society" whose foundation Johnson built.

We have had our truce in the war on poverty; we have our moratoriums on federal subsidies for housing for the poor and middle classes; we have had vetoes of education bills and public works projects. We are told not to ask what government can do for us, but what we can do for ourselves.

There will be more of this. But not in four years nor 40 will they erase all that Lyndon Johnson did to change this society—not any more than they have been able to erase the mark of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Maybe it's a little girl sleeping in a nightgown that won't go up in flames at the

slightest spark—because Johnson believed in consumer protection; maybe it's a "hillbilly" girl who in June will become the first of her family ever to graduate from college—because Johnson insisted that higher education be put within reach of all; maybe it's a black family, walking into a motel in Mississippi tonight where in years past they would have been chased away—because Johnson wanted a public accommodations act sincerely enough to browbeat Congress into passing it.

When the Vietnam war and the passions around it become but memories, millions of Americans will look anew at what has been happening inside America this past decade. And they will adjudge Lyndon Johnson a great president.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 6, 1973]

A HISTORIC MOMENT IN AUSTIN

(Speech by Hon. J. J. PICKLE of Texas in the House of Representatives, January 6, 1973)

MR. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on December 11 and 12 of last year, a truly remarkable and prestigious gathering was held at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library in Austin, Tex.

These were the days of the Civil Rights Symposium, marking the opening of the papers dealing with civil rights of President Lyndon Johnson's administration.

I was fortunate enough to attend the symposium. The meeting was a meeting of leaders—strong leaders of a good cause.

During the 2 days, one figure dominated the mood, dominated the resurgence of commitment to create a society of equal opportunity.

This man was President Lyndon Johnson. It is appropriate that the last issue of Life of December 29, 1972, carried the best account of those 2 days in Texas.

In his last column on the Presidency for Life, Hugh Sidey caught superbly the moment—its dignity and vitality.

ONE MORE CALL TO REASON TOGETHER

(By Hugh Sidey)

Lyndon Johnson savors each day for its meaning and joy, his battered heart frequently sending out signals of pain to let him know that it can't keep up. In the past year he has finally adjusted to this twilight world, melting off about 20 pounds, carrying a pouch full of nitroglycerin tablets and holding that restless soul of his in check. Well, almost in check.

Several months ago, when Johnson and his staff began planning symposiums for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library at the University of Texas, it was Johnson himself who insisted on a session dealing with civil rights.

So a fortnight ago they came by jet and auto and bus through an ice storm to be in Austin with "the President" again, one of the few times in the last four years that the men and women who carried the civil rights banner for two decades had assembled. There were some new faces among them, but the focus was on men like Hubert Humphrey, Roy Wilkins, Clarence Mitchell and former Chief Justice Earl Warren. They showed up with more wrinkles than they used to have, more gray hair and a lot more discouragement. From the beginning of the two-day meeting it was plain that civil rights no longer had a clear national leader. Nor could anyone perceive any sympathy for the cause in the White House.

L.B.J. put on his tan rancher's twill and his cowboy boots and came in from the country, sitting silently through the first day's meetings, the fatigue growing on him. That night he went to the reception for the 1,000 guests. The strain took its toll. For Johnson the rest of the night was filled with pain and restlessness. His doctors suggested,

pleaded, ordered him to give up his scheduled address the next day. He ignored them. He put on his dark-blue presidential suit and those flawless polished oxfords and came back the next morning.

He didn't take a seat in the auditorium but, with a worried Lady Bird at his side, watched the first two hours' proceedings on closed-circuit TV in the anteroom. Near noon he walked slowly to the podium. In a low but steady voice he talked eloquently for 20 minutes. "Until we overcome unequal history, we cannot overcome unequal opportunity," he said. "But to be black in a white society is not to stand on equal and level ground. While the races may stand side by side, whites stand on history's mountain and blacks stand in history's hollow. . . . So I think it's time to leave aside the legalisms and euphemisms and eloquent evasions. It's time we get down to the business of trying to stand black and white on level ground." Even in that short plea there was pain, and Johnson reached for one of his pills, munching in front of everybody. It was something he rarely does.

When he was done he acknowledged the applause and stepped off the stage to take a seat in the auditorium. Then squabbling broke out among the black factions, and one of the participants read an indictment of Richard Nixon and his administration.

Lyndon Johnson sat for a few minutes in the midst of it. Then, just as if he were back in Washington, he moved. The fatigue of the night before seemed to drop away, the old adrenalin machine pumping back into action. Going to the microphone, with his hands molding the air, he delivered one of his sermons on brotherhood and reason, favoring it with one of those marvelous stories about a backwoods judge and the town drunk, reminiscences of when he arrived in Hoover's Washington and the bonus marchers were driven down Pennsylvania Avenue.

"Now, what I want you to do is go back, all of you counsel together," he said, "that soft, kind way, just cool and push off wrath, indulge, tolerate, and finally come out with a program with objectives. . . . There's everything right about a group saying, 'Mr. President, we would like for you to set aside an hour to let us talk,' and you don't need to start off by saying he's terrible, because he doesn't think he's terrible. . . . While I can't provide much go-go at this period of my life, I can provide a lot of hope and dream and encouragement, and I'll sell a few wormy calves now and then and contribute."

When all that human juice clattered out over the wire, the memories began to rise, of the lean, youngish Lyndon Johnson in 1957 leading the United States Senate to pass the first Civil Rights Act in 82 years. It was near midnight, and the tension was so thick you could slice it, but the majority leader just stood there on the floor, calmly counting his votes.

Then there were those later nights, when L.B.J. was President. He would talk about how he ceased to be just a man from the South and had become a leader for all of America. The old tales would roll out—about what it was to be a black and never sure as you traveled if you would find a decent place to eat or go to the bathroom; or how he knew what it was like to be a Mexican-American child in the Depression, rummaging in the garbage cans for food.

Another night: it was in New Orleans during the 1964 campaign when Johnson stood on a street corner in the harsh neon glare, white Louisiana state officials clustered around him, and shouted out his message of hope and equality to the blacks who stood below him. And then in his 1965 civil rights address to Congress, in the place he loved most, among the men he liked best, he sounded the most poignant refrain of the time: "We shall overcome."

No wonder his heart is scarred today. It has been a long and anguished journey, with a long way left to go.

In the auditorium in Austin, the ovation that followed Johnson's appeal washed away the controversy, for a moment. People came to the stage and crowded around him as he tried to leave. They were all reaching for a bit of the old magic. But nobody got so much of it as Mr. Youngblood, a thin, aging black who used to wait on tables in Austin's ancient Driskill Hotel, where Johnson sweated out election night returns. The former President and the former waiter stood there for a few seconds gripping hands, and if any questions lingered about what Lyndon Johnson had tried to do for his country, they were answered right then.

FLOODS IN SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIF.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in mid-January San Luis Obispo City and county, including many businesses, residences, and public facilities, were stricken by extraordinary floods.

High water rushed through their business, residential, and farm area. Water rose and stood 8 feet deep in many homes, offices, and stores. Many citizens lost not only their life's savings, but also some of their livelihood. History has recorded this flood as the most devastating in the San Luis Obispo area.

What words can explain to the citizens of any district that their flooded area does not qualify as a Federal disaster area, for the expressed reason that not enough dollar damage to public facilities or private property occurred to meet the Federal criteria? Estimates indicate that between \$800,000 to \$850,000 damage was done to public facilities and that about \$6 to \$6.5 million damage to private property—business, farm, and residential.

How do you tell an unadvantaged city and county government that they are really not disadvantaged? How do you tell a man who has lost everything, that his loss was not great enough? At least in the mind of his government?

And a more pertinent question, I suggest, in the light of previous disasters which have stricken our populous areas is whether the Government is offering equal treatment to the citizen who has equal losses, pays equal taxes, obeys equal laws but resides in different, less populated, locales?

We have heard the cry for equality in this Chamber for many years. It is distressing that a need should arise again on this occasion under circumstances of human disaster to call attention to unequal treatment of fellow citizens.

I was advised late last Friday that San Luis Obispo did not qualify as a national disaster area. If San Luis Obispo were larger, they would have qualified.

Let me give you a thumb-nail sketch of the San Luis Obispo predicament.

The San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors notified me that there would be extraordinary flood damage; so I sought Federal help. After an inquiry at SBA, I was informed that previous SBA authority to declare disasters had been re-

cently withdrawn—meaning SBA could not help.

I contacted OEP—Office of Emergency Preparedness. OEP requires a Governor's application before it can declare a disaster in any State. We therefore consulted Governor Reagan's office. He quickly sent an investigative team to San Luis Obispo to appraise the damage and gather the necessary information to support his application for the declaration of a Federal disaster. The Governor's team recommended that a "disaster application" be made to OEP. The Governor lumped Marin County, San Francisco and San Luis Obispo damages and forwarded to OEP the request that the three California flood stricken areas be declared a Presidential disaster area.

OEP then sent an investigative team to San Luis Obispo to evaluate the extent of the damage. Their report and evaluation substantiated the Governor's investigation and report.

A disaster evaluation committee of OEP in Washington recommended that the President not declare San Luis Obispo to be a Federal disaster area.

I commend the Governor for his prompt, competent and considerate response to the disaster suffered by the citizens of San Luis Obispo.

I commend the staff of OEP for their expeditious and thorough evaluation of the damages and the plight of the flood victims of San Luis Obispo.

My appeals to Mr. Tom Kleppe, Director of the Small Business Administration, to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Buttz, and to Administrator Darrell Trent of OEP brought sympathetic, prompt, even generous consideration, but all were proscribed by law or regulation from assisting San Luis Obispo. All SBA and FHA authority in disaster situations had been withdrawn only a few days before the rains came. The damage to public facilities and to private property in dollar amounts was "insufficient" to meet the complicated formula criteria required by Public Law 91-606 under which OEP functions.

Apparently under the particular circumstances pertaining to this flood in California, \$2 million damages to public facilities were required—California had only about \$1.6 million; \$10 million damages to private property is required to declare a Federal disaster; California sustained only \$4 to \$6 million in private damages in this flood.

The size of the disaster area, or the total amounts of damage done, do not make the disaster and damage to the individual businessmen and homeowner flood victims regardless of the size of their community or the number of their neighbors.

After struggling through the intricacies of the Federal bureaucracies and the Federal laws, rules and regulations pertaining to disaster relief—and particularly involving the citizens and officials of San Luis Obispo county—it seems to me that the whole subject must be reviewed and changed.

Flood insurance programs may be one answer.

Obviously every victim of a natural disaster cannot be made whole by a Fed-

eral grant. But it should be remembered that the miner's hilltop hut that it struck and destroyed by lightning, the dairyman's barn and home which are washed away by an extraordinary flood in San Luis Obispo, the retail store which is suddenly inundated by water 8 feet deep in San Luis Obispo, as well as the realtor's office in Harrisburg or the grain broker's office in Norfolk which are washed away, are all equally important and valuable to the owner, regardless of the size of the community or the number of neighbors any victim may enjoy.

Direct grants, low-interest loans, and loan forgiveness projects should not be given to some citizens and denied to others who suffer identical individual losses.

The present law is inequitable and discriminating and should be rescinded.

Either all citizens and municipalities should be eligible for disaster relief or none should.

The law appears to be for the sole benefit of U.S. citizens who sustain devastating damages but who also reside in heavily populated areas. All citizens pay Federal taxes; all should be treated equally, or fairly—in disaster. A family or business wiped out by a small flood in a small town apparently gets no Federal aid; a family or business in a big city, or developed county, damaged by a large flood is likely to be the prompt benefactor of the largess of numerous Federal disaster programs. This seems unfair to say the least.

A U.S. citizen who loses his business, farm or home by an act of God—an extraordinary flood, for instance—should be entitled to the same Federal relief or benefits regardless of where he lives or how many neighbors he has or how many acre-feet of water washes him out.

The disaster is just as acute, just as damaging, just as devastating to the isolated dairymen, the small town merchant; the rural homeowner sustains as much damage, loss, heartache and inconvenience as his big city fellow citizen sustains in a flood or hurricane or an earthquake.

If you have experienced a flood, I need not explain that the damage is disastrous regardless of where it occurs or how many of your neighbors are also damaged.

Our whole Federal disaster structure favors the big city dweller and businessman over the small town inhabitant. Reform and revision of our inequitable guidelines are essential to achieve equity and to avoid this gross discrimination toward some citizens.

The home that is washed away in San Luis Obispo is just as valuable, just as cherished, furnishes the same kind of shelter and investment as the home that is washed away in Norfolk, Harrisburg, or Los Angeles. The home owner in San Luis Obispo ought to be entitled to the same benefits as the home owner in other disaster areas.

Mr. Speaker, how can we, as representatives of all citizens, explain to our constituents a system that will provide aid to a foreign nation, such as Nicaragua, but in comparable disasters cannot help its own disaster victims. This is not

to infer that our efforts to aid Nicaragua were unwarranted—this is to suggest however, that our efforts to aid our fellow citizens seem inequitable by comparison.

Many U.S. flood victims—in San Luis Obispo, many of whom have paid considerable taxes for many years—will not receive as much help from their Government as their Government gave to the victims in Nicaragua and many other places throughout the world. Again, I have no objection to any aid to any victim by any charity. I do suggest that if aid and charity should not necessarily start at home, both ought to benefit our own citizens at least as much as aliens.

If the appropriate committee of the Congress does not undertake a revision of our disaster laws, I shall initiate legislation to rescind our disaster laws.

A RED LIGHT FOR THE WHITE- AND BLUE-COLLAR BLUES

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing into the House of Representatives today addresses the problems of a central facet of all human life: work. There can be no dispute about either the importance of work or the dissatisfaction which many Americans experience in it. I am therefore introducing the Worker Alienation Research and Technical Assistance Act of 1973 to accomplish three goals—to gather hard data on the problems of worker alienation; to experiment with and develop means to resolve those problems; and to stimulate and focus additional effort on the subject by Government, management, and labor.

The content of work for most members of our industrialized and highly technological society has undergone dramatic change from the daily tasks which were originally cloaked with the "work ethic" of Western civilization. Yet the essence of work remains unchanged: it is still central to adulthood, to identity, to self-esteem, and to the order and meaning of life. It is not surprising that dissatisfaction with work causes significant problems in the entire fabric of our society.

The rewards of improving the work experience are almost incalculable. On the most important level, that of the individual worker as a human being, the quality of life would be upgraded as a necessary consequence to the proper redesign of work. Recent research indicates that work discontent is related to declines in family stability, community cohesiveness and increases in drug and alcohol addiction and delinquency. Perhaps most startling, the report of a special task force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Work in America," suggests that work dissatisfaction can cause the worker to die an early death.

The society as a whole would also naturally benefit from proper work redesign. In addition to the aggregation of the improvement in individual lives, the economic base of society would be strengthened. Worker discontent is a major source

of low productivity, as indicated by high absenteeism, high turnover rates, wildcat strikes, sabotage, and poor quality products. Worker satisfaction and consequently improved productivity would go far in enabling this Nation to meet its other pressing problems.

The challenge to improve the quality of work in America is a massive one. Worker dissatisfaction is by no means limited to the unskilled or assembly line laborer. Nor will the solution be simple; there will be presumably many partial solutions, each applicable to a part of the entire problem. We need to start today to work toward those solutions, and we need to do so on the Federal level. Although some companies have initiated work redesign projects with promising results, there has been little effort expended to this end, and practically no coordination of the research and experiments which have been conducted.

The bill I am introducing today starts us on this challenge. It authorizes the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research to increase our knowledge of the problems of job discontent; to examine the methods currently used to deal with it; and to assist workers, unions, companies, State and local governments in experimentation and demonstration projects which address the problem. As "Work in America" concluded,

To do nothing about these problems in the short run is to increase costs to society in the long run . . . the essential first step toward these goals is the commitment on the part of policymakers in business, labor, and government to the improvement of the quality of working life in America.

I ask each of my colleagues to join in that most necessary commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the measure follows:

H.R. 3777

A bill to provide for research for solutions to the problem of alienation among American workers in all occupations and industries and technical assistance to those companies, unions, State and local governments seeking to find ways to deal with the problem, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Worker Alienation Research and Technical Assistance Act of 1973".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) alienation of American workers because of the nature of their jobs is a problem of growing seriousness to the national economy and to individual workers;

(2) alienation often results in high rates of absenteeism, high turnover, poor quality work, a decline in craftsmanship, and lessened productivity;

(3) alienation often results in high levels of frustration among workers with the following consequences: poor mental health, poor motivation, alcoholism, drug abuse, and social dissatisfaction among workers;

(4) it is in the national interest to encourage the humanization of working conditions and the work itself so as to increase worker job satisfaction and to diminish the negative effects of job dissatisfaction; insofar as possible, work should be designed to maximize potentials for democracy, security, equity and craftsmanship;

(5) it is in the national interest to promote the fullest development of the abilities,

creativity, skills, and personal growth of all American workers;

(6) the problem of worker discontent and alienation has for too long been largely ignored by government, management, and unions;

(7) promising efforts to deal with the problems of alienation carried out in this country and in Europe are not widely known.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are hereby authorized to either directly or by way of grant, contribution, or other arrangement—

(1) conduct research, to determine the extent and the severity of job discontent and the problems related to the nature of work in American worksites, included but not limited to:

(A) quality of work, levels of turnover, absenteeism, sabotage, and loss of productivity; and the monetary costs to the economy of those problems;

(B) worker health, including statistics on mental and physical health and emotional stability;

(2) conduct research on methods now being used in both this Nation and abroad to meet the problems of work alienation, including more flexible hours of work, reduced working days, profit sharing, additional responsibility for workers, job rotation, worker participation in the decision-making process with regard to the nature and content of his job, redesign of jobs and production patterns, autonomous work groups, and additional opportunity for education, training, and advancement;

(3) collect and disseminate research results and recommendation for relieving worker discontent and for improving the quality of work to workers, to unions, to companies, to schools of management and industrial engineering, and to the general public.

(4) provide technical assistance to workers, unions, companies, State and local governments for (i) practical experimentation in meeting the problems of alienation in their own places of work; (ii) the development and conduct of pilot demonstration projects expected to make significant contributions to the knowledge in the field, to include but not be limited to such programs as job enrichment, guaranteed employment, reduced workdays and weeks, autonomous work groups, job restructuring, increased worker participation in decisionmaking on the nature and content of his job, increased job mobility, job rotation, group productivity bonuses, compensation on the basis of skills learned, continuing education and training both to provide new careers and new opportunities for increased job satisfaction;

(5) provide support of the Triadic national survey on working conditions and work satisfaction of the Department of Labor;

(6) assist in the development and evaluation of curriculum and programs for training and retraining professionals and subprofessionals in work humanization approaches and methods;

(7) conduct pilot projects for a variety of experiments in both blue collar and white collar work redesign in selected Federal agencies to determine their effect in improved employee job satisfaction.

(b) In carrying out the research and technical assistance program authorized by this section, the Secretaries shall consult with the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and representatives of workers, unions, management, academic, and medical experts.

(c) Each December 31, the Secretaries shall file an annual report including any recommendations for further legislation with the Congress. The Secretaries also shall file an interim report no later than six months after passage of the Act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Health, Educa-

tion, and Welfare, in consultation with the Administrator of the General Services Administration, is directed to insure that Federal agencies seek to maximize job satisfaction of their workers and consider that factor in the design of new Federal facilities.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall consult with each other concerning the implementation of this Act for the purpose of avoiding duplication or conflict in the activities of their respective Departments under this Act.

Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized an appropriation of \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1974 and \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1975 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES ON APPROPRIATIONS PROCESSES

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, Congress begins each year with renewed good intentions to expedite and control the appropriations process. Later in each year, we are uncertain as to where we stand and what we have actually accomplished. Appropriations measures are passed with little, if any, idea as to their impact on our economy. As we stumble along, spasmodically restraining ourselves in one area only to triple a suggested outlay in another area, financial extravagance is perpetuated year after year.

Congress' irresponsibility has led to a serious schism between the executive and legislative branches. The present controversy has been caused by President Nixon's actions to trim fiscal year 1973 spending to \$250 billion. As such, the President has already impounded more than \$12 billion in funds appropriated by the Congress for the rural environmental assistance program, rural electrification 2 percent direct loans, many Environmental Protection Agency plans, and subsidies for new housing and reconstruction.

It is my firm belief that until Congress takes the initiative and responsibility to reform its own budget system, impoundment will continue to be a weapon which the executive branch can and will successfully wield.

I am therefore introducing legislation which will provide the mechanism for the House to adopt its own limit on spending.

Traditionally, the congressional review of the budget starts when the President transmits it to the Congress. It is at this time that the Congress could exhibit much more responsibility. My bill provides that not later than 90 days after the President's budget has been received, the Committee on Appropriations is to review and study the budget—consult with members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee—and submit to the House of Representatives a resolution containing its recommendation for a comprehensive limit for all appropriations. The House then has 30 days in which to adopt a comprehensive limit for that fiscal year. Once all appropriations bills have been passed, the Con-

gress, prior to adjournment sine die, shall conform those appropriations to such limit by reducing unobligated appropriations. If, however, the Congress, does not reduce the appropriations, I have proposed a percentage formula by which the total appropriations for such fiscal year will automatically be cut.

Another important section of my bill states that whenever the President impounds funds, he must submit a full report to both bodies of Congress. If either body disapproves by a three-fifths vote of the impoundment, then the impoundment of such funds shall cease.

Finally, I have included a provision in my bill which is identical to language originally introduced by Congressman BOB MICHEL. It provides that the calendar year and the fiscal year shall coincide.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues subscribe to the objective of curbing Federal spending. It is clear that reform must begin in our own Chambers. We must be willing to assume the responsibility that is unequivocally ours. We must refine and improve the machinery with which the Congress handles matters of public finance. Numerous bills to accomplish this goal have already been introduced this year. However, no significant action has been taken to date. I am hopeful my bill will prove a meaningful solution on which we all can agree.

I will be circulating a Dear Colleague letter soliciting cosponsors for my bill. The legislation will be reintroduced immediately following the Lincoln Day recess, and I am hopeful favorable action will be forthcoming.

THREE CIVIL SERVICE BILLS ARE INTRODUCED

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission has submitted to you three separate requests for legislation, each of which you have referred to our committee. Pursuant to those requests I am today introducing the recommended bills.

The first bill proposes to change the present law applying to automatic separation of a 15-year Federal employee at age 70. The bill would reduce the service requirement to 5 years, but specifies that the change would not be effective during the first 5 years following enactment.

The second bill liberalizes the eligibility for cost-of-living increases in civil service retirement annuities.

The third bill proposes to extend civil service Federal employees group life insurance and Federal employees health benefits coverage to U.S. nationals employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the texts of the three letters to you from Chairman Hampton:

JANUARY 12, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit for the consideration of Congress, and recommend favorable action on, the attached draft bill

to amend (among other things) the separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement law.

This law now requires automatic separation of a 15-year employee at the end of the month in which he attains age 70. Should he not have served 15 years upon reaching that age, the separation date moves to the end of the month in which this service requirement is met. Extension beyond retirement age may be authorized in unusual cases, and the age retiree can be reemployed by the Government if need for his service exists.

There are also some exceptions to the 70-15 automatic separation provision. The retirement law (1) sets age 62 as the superannuation point for employees of the Alaska Railroad in Alaska and for citizen employees of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government serving on the Isthmus (with 15 years' service on the Isthmus or in Alaska) and (2) exempts from its regular 70-15 requirements Members of Congress, Congressional employees, the Architect of the Capitol and his employees, and judicial branch employees appointed for definite terms. In addition, the law's automatic separation provisions do not apply to the other Federal and District of Columbia retirement systems covering a sizeable number of workers.

Studies conducted over the years by the Commission and by two independent Committees (the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel which was created by an Act of Congress in 1952, and the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems which was created by the President in 1965) have all concluded that the present age 70, 15-year service provision in the Civil Service Retirement law for age retirement is not, and has not been for quite a number of years, responsive to the needs of the Government. For instance, in its 1966 report to the President, the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems summed up the rationale for amendatory legislation in this area by saying that:

"... the 15-year service minimum in mandatory retirement not only prolongs the employment of some who should retire, but stands in the way of the hiring of new workers who would not have 15 years of Federal service by the time they reach age 70. This provision was adopted in 1926, when there were few private pension plans and no Social Security program. There were compelling social and economic reasons for permitting older hires to stay on the rolls until they could gain a significant CSR benefit, even if this took their Government employment well past age 80. Today, the older person with short Federal service may be presumed to have other public or private pension coverage through Social Security, corporate retirement, State or local government retirement, Veterans' compensation, military retirement * * *."

The foregoing problems in CSR as it concerns the older worker point to a serious need for amendment in order to make the system more responsive to operating requirements and give more realistic recognition to the needs and individual capacities of employees."

Although the Government's policy is not to discriminate in hiring on the basis of age, the 15-year service requirement, almost without question, adversely affects Federal employment opportunities for qualified people who are age 55 or older. We believe that if the service requirement for mandatory retirement were changed from 15 to 5 years, it would have the immediate effect of lessening resistance to the appointment of persons over age 55, and at the same time it would open up promotion opportunities for other employees. In addition, it would standardize at 5 years the service period required for dis-

ability, deferred, and age-service retirements.

Draft legislation to produce this result is attached. Under the terms of the proposed legislation, persons now serving would continue to be subject to the present age-70, 15-year mandatory retirement provision. The amendment in this respect would apply only to persons appointed or reappointed following a break in service of more than three days, after the date of its enactment. Since the amendment would not be operative until 5 years after its enactment, there would be no increase in the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund during the first 5 years following its enactment. The normal cost would be increased by .01 percent of payroll.

In addition, the draft legislation proposes to amend both the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance and the Federal Employees Health Benefits laws to reduce from 12 to 5 years the length of service required by a retiring employee to retain his group life insurance and health benefits coverages during retirement. At present, disability retirees are the only group of employees who may continue their life insurance and health benefits coverage, after retirement, with 5 years' service; all other employees who retire on an immediate annuity must, among other things, have completed at least 12 years of creditable service in order to so continue their coverages.

The Commission believes that, if the retirement law is amended to require mandatory retirement after 5 years' service, it would be desirable to set this same period of service requirement for retention of group life insurance and health benefits coverages after retirement. Such a change would permit not only the age retiree, but other eligible employees with 5 or more years' service—some of whom no doubt stay on the job now for the sole purpose of completing the required 12 years' service—to retire with the assurance that the security they had during employment will continue to some degree during their retirement years.

However, we also believe that the effective date for any such change in the life insurance and health benefits laws should be five years in the future to coincide with the operative effect of the proposed 5-year service requirement for mandatory retirement. This then would not result in any added cost to these programs for the first five years after enactment. Thereafter, though, we estimate that there will be certain increases in the costs of these programs. The regular group life insurance biweekly rate, per \$1,000 of insurance coverage, would have to be increased from 4 1/4 cents to 42 cents [employees' biweekly life insurance rate would therefore be increased by 1/2 cent (from 27 1/2 to 28 cents) and the Government's contribution would be increased by 1/4 cent (from 13 1/4 to 14 cents) for each \$1,000 of regular group life insurance coverage]. The biweekly rate for the \$10,000 optional group life insurance would have to be increased by an average of 5.6 cents. Also, the average high-option biweekly health benefits rate would have to be increased gradually to an additional 38 cents over a period of about 15 years, due to the increasing average age of enrollees under the health benefits program.

The enactment of the attached legislative proposal would go a long way in making the retirement, life insurance and health benefits laws more responsive to the needs of both the Government and its employees. The Commission accordingly recommends the introduction of the draft bill and urges its early enactment.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposal.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HAMPTON,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

JANUARY 18, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commission submits for the consideration of the Congress, and recommends favorable action on, the attached legislative proposal which provides that the immediate (not deferred) Civil Service Retirement annuity of an employee or Member of Congress retiring after the effective date of a cost-of-living annuity increase shall not be less than his annuity would have been if he had retired and had been eligible for annuity on the effective date. Similarly, the proposal provides that the annuity of an employee's or Member's widow(er) commencing after the effective date of a cost-of-living annuity increase shall not be less than it would have been if it had commenced on the effective date.

Whether an employee's annuity will be greater computed on the basis of (1) service and salary up to the effective date of the most recent cost-of-living increase, plus that percentage increase or (2) all service and salary up to the date of actual separation, without a cost-of-living increase, depends on factors which vary with the individual. Assuming a normal pattern of past and future salary increases, and a 5 percent cost-of-living increase, an employee would need 3-10 additional months' service, depending on his total years of service, for his annuity without the cost-of-living increase to equal the amount he could get if he had retired on the effective date of the cost-of-living increase. Under the proposal, an employee would in all cases receive the larger annuity.

The present cost-of-living adjustment provision, found in 5 U.S.C. 8340, provides that an employee must retire and his annuity must commence on or before the effective date of a cost-of-living annuity increase in order to have it applied in the computation of his annuity. The reasons for the proposed change are:

(1) The present provision produces the anomaly of an employee who retires soon after the effective date of an increase receiving less annuity than an employee, with the same service beginning date and high three-year average salary, who retires on or before the effective date, even though the employee who retires after the effective date has more service. A similar anomaly exists in computing a survivor's annuity because the survivor of an employee who dies on or before the effective date of a cost-of-living increase receives the increase, but the survivor of an employee who dies after the effective date does not receive it.

(2) We are concerned about the way the large number of retirements which follow cost-of-living annuity adjustments affects the administration of the Civil Service Retirement System. The present cost-of-living adjustment provision "bunches" retirements immediately before the effective date of every cost-of-living annuity increase by accelerating the retirements of employees who had been planning to leave within six months or so after that date. The last such increase, effective July 1, 1972, for example, produced about 60,000 retirements in addition to the 20,000 or less that occur in a normal four-month period. Despite the Commission's plans to cope with such a peak load, work is disrupted and annuity payments are seriously delayed when so many retirements that would otherwise have been evenly spaced over a period of several months occur at the same time.

(3) Agencies throughout the Government are also adversely affected because an indeterminate number of employees decide to retire immediately before a cost-of-living annuity

increase. Many of these people, if they are willing, must be reemployed as annuitants to complete the projects on which they were working.

Enactment of the draft bill would (1) eliminate the anomaly between annuities that commence on or just before the effective date of a cost-of-living increase and those that commence shortly after that date; (2) moderate the peaking of retirements immediately before cost-of-living increases become effective, with an estimated savings of \$300,000 in administrative expenses now charged against the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for processing the peak work load that accompanies each cost-of-living adjustment; and, (3) reduce the disruption in the work of agencies throughout the Government caused by many employees suddenly retiring at the same time, with many leaving work projects incomplete.

To the extent that employees delayed retirement by a few months they would (1) pay contributions to the Fund for a longer period, and (2) not receive any annuity for those months—a combination necessarily resulting in more money in the Fund. On the other hand, to the extent that employees who would have retired after the effective date of the cost-of-living increase anyway receive a higher annuity than they would have received if they had retired on the effective date, more money would be paid out of the Fund.

The additional annuity benefits which would be provided by the draft bill for each cost-of-living annuity increase authorized on or after its enactment would increase the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. Assuming, for example, that the draft bill is enacted and that then a 4.5 percent cost-of-living annuity increase is effective July 1, 1973, the unfunded liability of the Fund would be increased by \$7.5 million. The annual interest on this \$7.5 million would be \$375,000.

Under 5 U.S.C. 8348(g), the Secretary of the Treasury, before closing the accounts for a fiscal year, would have to credit to the Fund, as a Government contribution, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the following percentages of all interest on the unfunded liability existing at the start of that fiscal year: 40 percent for 1974; 50 percent for 1975; 60 percent for 1976; and continuing to increase by 10 percent each year until 100 percent of the interest would have to be credited for fiscal year 1980 and for each fiscal year thereafter.

Each additional cost-of-living annuity increase authorized subsequent to fiscal year 1973 would have a cumulative effect on the Retirement Fund's unfunded liability and the annual interest thereon. If, for example, there is one cost-of-living annuity increase of 4.5 percent in each fiscal year 1974 through 1980, the unfunded liability would be increased by a little over \$52.5 million, and the annual cumulative interest payment due the Fund from the Secretary of the Treasury at the end of fiscal year 1981 would be a little over \$2.6 million.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this draft bill to Congress.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HAMPTON,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

JANUARY 18, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commission submits for the consideration of the Congress,

and recommends favorable action on, the attached legislative proposal which provides that United States nationals who are Federal employees shall be extended the same rights and benefits as are presently provided United States citizens employed by the Federal Government.

Section 1408 of title 8, United States Code, defines nationals, in pertinent part, as follows:

"Unless otherwise provided in section 1401 of this title, the following shall be nationals, but not citizens, of the United States at birth:

(1) a person born in an outlying possession of the United States on or after the date of formal acquisition of such possession * * *"

As originally enacted, provisions in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (now codified as 5 U.S.C. 8701(a) (B) and 5 U.S.C. 8901(1)(ii), respectively) excluded from their coverage U.S. nationals by barring coverage of noncitizen employees whose permanent duty station is outside the United States. The question of whether as a matter of policy U.S. nationals should be so excluded came into sharp focus in 1970 when it was found that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) at Pago Pago had permitted six American Samoan employees to participate in these programs. On April 27, 1970, the Civil Service Commission issued a bulletin (see enclosed copy of Federal Personnel Manual Bulletin No. 300-26) which determined that U.S. nationals employed by Federal agencies outside the United States are not entitled to life insurance and health benefits. As a result, these six American Samoans had their life insurance and health benefits coverage terminated.

The draft legislation would have the effect of extending coverage to these six American Samoan employees as well as an estimated 2,000 U.S. nationals employed by the Federal Government at permanent duty stations outside the United States. Currently American Samoa and Swains Island are the only areas under U.S. jurisdiction whose citizens are nationals rather than citizens of the United States. To the best of our knowledge, the Federal employees affected by this legislation would all be American Samoans mostly employed in American Samoa. However, we believe the draft legislation amending the laws should be general and should include those U.S. nationals now employed or someday to be employed at another duty station.

Section 3 of Public Law 91-418, effective September 25, 1970, extended coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance and Federal Employees Health Benefits laws to formerly excluded noncitizen employees whose permanent duty station is in the Panama Canal Zone. It would appear that U.S. nationals should be entitled to the same benefits.

Assuming the draft bill is enacted, the additional annual cost to extend life insurance and health benefits to these employees would be approximately \$604,000.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this draft bill to the Congress.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HAMPTON, Chairman,
U.S. Civil Service Commission.

CHANGES IN HOUSE POST OFFICE SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House some changes in the House post office service which have been effected in order to improve mail service for Members of Congress.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend once again Postmaster Robert Rota for the excellent cooperation he has extended to the Subcommittee on Personnel, which I have the honor to chair as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been working closely with my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Chairman WAYNE HAYS of House Administration Committee.

The postmaster has extended full cooperation to our subcommittee, and after much discussion and deliberation, the following changes are now in effect:

Each new employee meets with the postmaster and the assistant postmaster and is instructed and briefed on his job and what is expected of him in the performance of his duties.

Duties of post office personnel have been rearranged and all personnel, except supervisors, are classified as mail clerks so they may be substituted on any operation whenever necessary. This results in a minimum use of the voucher fund.

When mail carriers, on their regular delivery routes notice that a Member needs to have mail picked up, the carrier immediately calls the post office and a special pickup man is sent to that Member's office; thereby avoiding any delay in mail distribution and saving considerable time in getting Members' mail dispatched. A special pickup for Members, when requested by the Member's staff, was also initiated.

A new added service which the postmaster has started is the security of all mail. The postmaster and assistant postmaster have been trained in the operation of the X-ray machine, examining all suspicious mail coming through the House post office.

Another service initiated, is the 1-day service on social security mail. This procedure has cut days in the response time to Members on all social security correspondence.

At the present time, the postmaster is also trying to arrange another service whereby he can take advantage of the messenger service between the Library of Congress and the House of Representatives. This will provide a service similar to that in effect with the Social Security Administration.

With added responsibilities, it became impossible for Mrs. Mary Bowman to do the additional secretarial work and perform the services that the Congressmen need. To alleviate this problem one of the mail clerk positions was changed to a secretarial position. Since that time Miss Ruth Jones has been employed as a secretary and is taking care of payroll changes, vouchers and other secretarial duties.

The hours of the post office personnel have been lengthened. To accommodate

the Members, all stamp windows' services—parcel post, registered mail, money orders, and stamp service—have been extended to 6 p.m.

The postmaster is also trying to add the mail service to the Congressional Office Building Annex—Congressional Hotel—without additional personnel.

With these changes the Members have been provided with extra service, and I believe the post office is operating more efficiently. This has been accomplished without adding employees or additional cost to the House of Representatives.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION CONCERNING ILLEGAL ALIENS

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the growing numbers of illegal aliens in this country has been a serious problem for some time and it is getting worse.

Current estimates of the number of illegal aliens now in this country range from 1 to 2 million. This group is a major burden on our economy which must be relieved immediately.

Illegal aliens take jobs—at the lowest possible wages—from citizens and legal residents and they are willing to work long hours of overtime without additional compensation.

They often live in overcrowded slum dwellings which aid in the destruction of our urban areas.

And, finally, when they cannot get work, illegal aliens add to our burden by going on welfare.

These people come to the United States because they cannot earn a decent living in their countries and they have heard that they can get good paying jobs here.

Most of them are able to get work because unscrupulous employers have found that they can pay illegal aliens wages much lower than citizens or legal residents would have to accept and they threaten to turn them over to immigration authorities if the aliens complain about long hours, working conditions or the poor pay.

The problem is purely one of economics. If there were no jobs persons would not remain in this country illegally, but the only way to eliminate these jobs is to make it unprofitable for employers to hire them.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality I have been able to make a full and careful study to this problem. Last year my committee wrote and approved legislation designed to deal with this matter. The measure was approved by the House of Representatives during the 92d Congress, but there was not enough time for the Senate to act.

This proposal lays the blame where it belongs, on the unscrupulous employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens, in order to exploit them so profits will be greater. At the same time it takes into account the real possibility of an employer unknowingly hiring a person who is in the country illegally.

For these reasons the sanctions for

hiring illegal aliens become increasingly severe for repeated violations of the law.

The first is a citation from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. There are no penalties, but the employer is put on notice that he must immediately and permanently discontinue the practice.

The penalty for the second offense is an administrative fine of up to \$500 for each illegal alien found working in a business or factory.

All subsequent offenses would carry a fine of up to \$1,000 and/or up to 1 year in prison for each illegal alien employed.

As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, my committee believes the only way to end this problem is to make it unprofitable for the men and women who are making money because of it.

For this reason, I now introduce this proposal:

H.R. 3803

A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 245. (a) The status of an alien who was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if (1) the alien makes an application for such adjustment, (2) the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence, and (3) an immigrant visa is immediately available to him at the time his application is filed.

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, or the number of visas authorized to be issued pursuant to the provisions of section 21(e) of the Act of October 3, 1965, for the fiscal year then current.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to: (1) an alien crewman; (2) any alien (other than an immediate relative as defined in section 201(b)) who has hereafter accepted unauthorized employment prior to filing an application for adjustment of status; or (3) any alien admitted in transit without visa under section 238(d)."

Sec. 2. Section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) is amended by deleting the proviso in paragraph 4 of subsection (a) and by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (e) and adding new subsections (b), (c), and (d) to read as follows:

"(b) (1) It shall be unlawful for any employer or any person acting as an agent for such an employer, or any person who for a fee, refers an alien for employment by such an employer, knowingly to employ or refer for employment any alien in the United States who has not been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, unless the employment of such alien is authorized by the Attorney General: *Provided*, That an employer, referrer, or agent shall not be deemed to have violated this subsection if he has made a bona fide inquiry whether

a person hereafter employed or referred by him is a citizen or an alien, and if an alien, whether he is lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence or is authorized by the Attorney General to accept employment: *Provided further*, That evidence establishing that the employer, referrer, or agent has obtained from the person employed or referred by him a signed statement in writing that such person is a citizen of the United States or that such person is an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or is an alien authorized by the Attorney General to accept employment, shall be deemed prima facie proof that such employer, agent, or referrer has made a bona fide inquiry as provided in this paragraph. The Attorney General of the United States shall prepare forms for the use of employers, agents, and referrers in obtaining such written statements if they so desire, and shall furnish such forms to employers, agents, and referrers upon request.

"(2) If, on evidence or information he deems persuasive, the Attorney General concludes that an employer, agent, or referrer has violated the provisions of paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall serve a citation on the employer, agent, or referrer informing him of such apparent violation.

"(3) If, in a proceeding initiated within two years after the service of such citation, the Attorney General finds that any employer, agent, or referrer upon whom such citation has been served has thereafter violated the provisions of paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall assess a penalty of not more than \$500 for each such alien employed in violation of paragraph (1).

"(4) A civil penalty shall be assessed by the Attorney General only after the person charged with a violation under paragraph (3) has been given an opportunity for a hearing and the Attorney General has determined that a violation did occur, and the amount of the penalty which is warranted. The hearing shall be of record and conducted before an immigration officer designated by the Attorney General, individually or by regulation. The proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with such regulations, within the constraints and requirements of title 5, section 554 of the United States Code which shall be applicable to the hearing provided for herein, as the Attorney General shall prescribe and the procedure so prescribed shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for determining the assessment of a civil penalty under this subsection.

"(5) If the person against whom a civil penalty is assessed fails to pay the penalty within the time prescribed in such order, the Attorney General shall file a suit to collect the amount assessed in any appropriate district court of the United States. In any such suit or in any other suit seeking to review the Attorney General's determination, the suit shall be determined solely upon the administrative record upon which the civil penalty was assessed and the Attorney General's findings of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

"(c) Any employer or person who has been assessed a civil penalty under subsection (b) (3) which has become final and thereafter violates subsection (b) (1) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this subsection occurs.

"(d) (1) Any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft which has been or is being used in furtherance of a violation of subsection (a), or which has been or is being used by any person who for a fee refers or transports an alien for employment in furtherance of a violation of subsection (b), shall be seized and forfeited: *Provided*, That no vessel, vehi-

cle, or aircraft used by any person as a common carrier in the transaction of business as such common carrier shall be forfeited under the provisions of this section unless it shall appear that (A) in the case of a railway car or engine, the owner, or (B) in the case of any other such vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, the owner or the master of such vessel or the owner or conductor, driver, pilot, or other person in charge of such vehicle or aircraft was at the time of the alleged illegal act a consenting party or privy thereto: *Provided further*, That no vessel, vehicle, or aircraft shall be forfeited under the provisions of this section by reason of any act or omission established by the owner thereof to have been committed or omitted by any person other than such owner while such vessel, vehicle, or aircraft was unlawfully in the possession of a person who acquired possession thereof in violation of the criminal laws of the United States, or of any State.

"(2) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of vessels and vehicles for violation of the customs laws; the disposition of such vessels and vehicles or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this chapter, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof: *Provided*, That such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of vessels and vehicles under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft under this section by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General."

Sec. 3. The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting immediately after section 274 the following new section:

"DISCLOSURE OF ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO ARE RECEIVING ASSISTANCE UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

"Sec. 274A. Any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall disclose to the Service the name and most recent address of any alien who such officer or employee knows is not lawfully in the United States and who is receiving assistance under any State plan under title I, X, XIV, XVI, XIX, or part A of title IV of the Social Security Act."

Sec. 4. The first paragraph of section 1546 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes any immigrant or nonimmigrant visa, permit, border crossing card, alien registration receipt card, or other document prescribed by statute or regulation for entry into or as evidence of authorized stay in the United States, or utters, uses, attempts to use, possesses, obtains, accepts, or receives any such visa, permit, border crossing card, alien registration receipt card, or other document prescribed by statute or regulation for entry into or as evidence of authorized stay in the United States, knowing it to be forged, counterfeited, altered, or falsely made, or to have been procured by means of any false claim or statement, or to have been otherwise procured by fraud or unlawfully obtained; or"

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this Act, unless otherwise specifically provided therein, shall be construed to affect the validity of any document or proceeding which shall be valid at the time this Act shall take effect; or to affect any prosecution, suit, action, or proceeding, civil or criminal, done or existing, at the time this Act shall take effect;

but as to all such prosecutions, suits, actions, proceedings, statutes, conditions, rights, acts, things, liabilities, obligations, or matters, the statutes or parts of statutes repealed by his Act are, unless otherwise specifically provided therein, hereby contained in force and effect.

SEC. 6. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month after the expiration of ninety days following the date of its enactment.

THE BIG LIE—THE 1974 FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has challenged the Congress to be responsible in considering his 1974 budget. I believe that we should again live up to that challenge.

Over the past 4 years, Congress has altered the administrations' priorities by cutting defense, foreign aid, and SST funds and shifting such funds to domestic programs. In the 91st Congress, about \$10 billion was cut from military and foreign aid requests, and nearly \$4 billion was added for education, clean water, health care, agricultural conservation, urban programs, and veterans benefits.

In the first session of the 92d Congress, the Congress trimmed \$4.3 billion from the administration's foreign aid and military requests, and added \$2.5 billion to the nonmilitary budget categories to help meet vital domestic needs. During the second session, the pattern continued, as Congress added funds for various domestic programs and cut by over \$5.2 billion the military budget.

Thus it is clear that the accusation by administration officials that the Congress is responsible for the inflationary budgets of the past 4 years is totally false. Instead, the Congress has reduced Nixon's budgets for military expenditures and foreign aid by about \$20 billion, while adding some \$10 billion of these cuts to domestic programs—a reordering of priorities of some \$30 billion.

This, I submit, is responsible government, very different from what we have been getting from the Nixon administration.

No one should be fooled either by Mr. Nixon's argument that this budget is necessary for fiscal responsibility and to prevent tax increases. I submit that this Nation can afford needed social programs and that it can support them without increasing taxes. The solution is simple: cut the fat and waste out of the defense budget and reform the tax system to make it more equitable for the average American—make the rich pay their fair share. Fiscal responsibility and small government are desirable. But we could better let out fewer military contracts and withdraw special benefits and subsidies from the rich, the super-rich, and giant corporations; and at the same time preserve and even expand valuable programs to protect our environment, create new jobs, improve our health, assist our poor, and educate our children. Nixon's values are, frankly, backward.

Not all these programs, of course, should be retained. Some, such as hospital construction, for example, should be cut back. But even in such instances, it is foolhardy to terminate the program entirely when there are still areas where shortages exist, where improvements could be made, and where shortages will develop in the next few years as facilities become obsolete. The Hill-Burton Act was passed to meet desperate needs in this Nation and it has worked. So we have made progress. That does not mean that it is time to scrap a good program, even if it is time to scale it down.

Second, some of the cuts are frauds on the American people. Elementary and secondary assistance is being cut about in half. Nixon says this is giving government back to the people. But in fact it is giving them nothing. They already control their local systems so they will have no more power. But they will get fewer funds from the Federal Government so that to maintain the quality of the education of their children they will have to raise State and local taxes. Thus overall taxes will not fall, the taxes levied will be more regressive, and the quality of education may well fall. This policy makes no sense. All that it does is let Nixon point to a lower budget figure then claim that he is returning power to the people. What, we should ask, is Nixon cutting? Not military spending, not foreign aid, and not even the space program. Instead he is cutting programs related to human needs.

Nixon is proposing to eliminate dozens of popular education programs, including the dismantling of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Among the programs that would be eliminated are those of title I for the act, which provides for compensatory education for disadvantaged pupils. These programs have worked and the annual cost of \$1.5 billion will either have to be picked up locally or the educational assistance be dropped. If there is one thing I thought we stood for as a Nation, it was for the principle that we would give all our children a fair chance for a decent education. And now Nixon attacks even this.

In addition, part of the Federal aid for communities with Federal installations, called impact aid, would be eliminated, and part of the vocational education programs would go down the drain. Again, either our constituents will have to pay higher State and local taxes or the programs, which we all know have proved valuable, will have to be scrapped.

If it is not enough that we will abandon the education of our children, Nixon proposes to abolish Federal job-training and employment services to State and local authorities. The major element in this cutback is the elimination of the emergency employment assistance program, a public employment program that was created to provide temporary work during periods of high unemployment. High unemployment is still with us, and this is no time to abandon those who have been thrown out of work for no fault of their own.

Nixon's budget also serves notice that he will end by next July the Federal com-

mitment to urban development programs enacted by Democratic Presidents and Congresses over the past four decades. The Department of Housing and Urban Development will now approve no new projects for urban renewal, Model Cities, open space, neighborhood facilities, water and sewer systems, rehabilitation loans or public facility loans. Housing and community programs, although funded and administered separately, have been major components in the efforts of the municipal governments' efforts to renew and rebuild neighborhoods. Until now, the Federal Government has supported these efforts. Nixon is deserting that responsibility and it will cost the taxpayers \$1.6 billion to replace and preserve the programs Nixon is slashing.

Cities are not alone. Nixon is cutting agriculture programs as well. He will cut rural housing subsidies \$842 million, price-support operations \$715 million, the rural environmental assistance program \$172.5 million, and the special school milk program \$72 million.

Finally, Nixon is abandoning his fight to save the environment. His budget proposal is barebone and although it appears to be an increase, a substantial part of the funds proposed will go to State and local governments to repay environmental loans already made. In addition, the increased funding only matches the \$950 million he impounded last year. Beyond that, Congress authorized \$6 billion of which Nixon proposes to spend only \$3.5 billion. Nixon, in short, has put a good face on what amounts to desertation of a good cause.

This raises an interesting point. Nixon, in fact, is abandoning his own programs. Less obvious than the reduced items, but just as important are the omissions from the budget that indicate changes in Nixon policy. Welfare reform, estimated last year to cost \$5.5 billion a year, has disappeared from the new budget altogether. Although Nixon has repeatedly promised Federal tax relief to homeowners with heavy local property taxes, there are no funds set aside for this purpose. National health insurance is promised, but there are no funds earmarked for it in the new budget; a year ago it was budgeted at \$1.1 billion. The four special revenue-sharing plans totaling \$6.9 billion yearly in the new budget are hailed as the cornerstone of Nixon's support for domestic programs, but in fact compare with six such plans totaling \$12.3 billion in last year's budget.

Nixon's 1974 budget is not only a retreat from the Great Society programs of Lyndon Johnson which deserve study and in some instances reform and preservation, but from his own hopes and aspirations for our Nation as he has outlined them himself. This is no New American Revolution. It is a withdrawal from social responsibility.

The core problem with Nixon's budget is that it has no plan and no sensitivity. A meat ax has been taken to past social programs, some of which worked and some of which did not, throwing out the good with the bad and leaving the average worker and consumer unsupported and undefended by the Federal Govern-

ment. Nixon is not creating a responsible government—he is abdicating social responsibility under the cover of thrift.

This is a serious subject and not to be taken lightly. The people deserve the ear and the help of responsible government officials. Therefore, I am announcing today that beginning during the February congressional recess, I shall hold hearings across New England to determine the local impact of the Nixon budget. I will meet with responsible elected officials, labor representatives, businessmen, and academicians. I hope to hold such hearings jointly with local members of Congress. The goal of the hearings will be to determine as precisely as possible the local effect of the Nixon budget cuts, what programs and how many people are affected in what ways, and finally to begin to develop alternative strategies for dealing with the problems Nixon is creating. I expect to work with all the Members from New England in this effort and I further expect that we will develop within a brief time a series of specific proposals to present to the Congress, the Governors, and the State legislatures. In addition, I hope that we will successfully develop a useful methodology and strategy that others in different regions of our Nation will be able to employ to the benefit of us all.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET REFORM PROPOSED

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a proposal for a congressional budget procedure which I submitted to the Joint Committee to Review Operation of the Budget Ceiling:

PROPOSAL FOR A CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCEDURE, JANUARY 11, 1973

More responsible Congressional budgeting is needed. A full-employment-without-inflation economy requires a considered judgment about the amount and timing of spending and revenues. Because Congress has seemed to proceed in an uncoordinated way, it has steadily seen its powers erode to the executive. The following proposal could enable Congress to exert greater responsibility:

1. *House and Senate Budget Committees.* The traditional right of the House to initiate taxing and spending bills suggests separate House and Senate Committees, rather than a joint committee. But coordination could be obtained by the use of a joint staff, and by frequent joint meetings.

Each committee, along the lines of the present temporary Joint Budget Committee, would be composed of seven members of the House or Senate tax-writing committee (four majority, three minority), seven members of the Appropriations Committee (four majority, three minority), and two members of other committees (one majority, one minority).

Immediately after the President's budget is transmitted to Congress in late January, the House Budget Committee would begin work on a Tentative Budget Resolution. The Senate Budget Committee may desire to sit in with the House Budget Committee at this point.

The Budget Committees would request the Joint Economic Committee to supply by February 15 its estimate of the budget deficit, surplus, or balance needed to produce

full-employment-without-inflation in the upcoming fiscal year, together with supporting data.

The Budget Committees would prepare by March 1 a Tentative Budget Resolution, setting a total spending limit (both appropriated and "backdoor"), and a total revenue target. Within the total spending limit, the Budget Committees would set specific limits—delegating to the Appropriations Committees the subdivision of total spending (roughly 60 percent) which is subject to appropriation. The Appropriations Committees would hold hearings and take prompt action to provide target totals for each of the 13 Appropriations Subcommittee categories, adding up to the Appropriations Committee total. As to that portion of total spending (roughly 40 percent) not subject to annual appropriation, the Budget Committees would consult with the chairman and ranking minority members of the relevant legislative committees (e.g. Ways and Means and Finance on general revenue-sharing, Banking and Currency on urban renewal, Agriculture on price-support payments).

2. *The Tentative Budget Resolution.* By March 1, the House Budget Committee and the House Appropriations Committee would jointly report to the House a Concurrent Resolution (since this is internal Congressional housekeeping, the President's signature should not be required), including:

(a) A total spending limit, broken down into the total sum available for normal appropriations bills, with subtotals for each of the 13 Appropriations Subcommittee categories, and the specific sums recommended for legislative action to each committee with mandatory or back-door spending programs; and

(b) A total revenue goal, with recommendations to the Ways and Means and Finance Committees to raise or reduce revenues (whether by surcharge, loophole-plugging, or new forms of taxes, is left to the discretion of the tax-writing committee).

The floor rule governing the Tentative Budget Resolution would allow for lengthy debate, the permit amendments from the floor at any point. Present House and Senate procedures allow roll call votes on all points of the Resolution. After House passage, the Senate procedures follow. Differences between the two bodies would be resolved by the usual Conference Committee and floor action. Final action on the Tentative Budget Resolution would be sought by April 1-15.

Since this action on the Tentative Budget Resolution will be taken early in the year (more than two months prior to the start of the Fiscal Year), it is clear that all the figures will and should be viewed as subject to change. More definitive action would be taken in connection with the Final Budget Statute discussed below.

3. *Action following adoption of Tentative Budget Resolution During Pre-July Period.*

(a) *On appropriation bills.* Under proposed new House and Senate rules, any appropriation bill (and any floor amendment offered to it) that departs from the targeted amount for that category in the Tentative Budget Resolution must contain a provision specifying the amount by which it exceeds or falls short of the tentative targeted amount. There would be no penalty for departing from the Tentative Budget Resolution target at this point; but any legislation departing from the target would be a prime candidate for revision in connection with the later Final Budget Statute.

(b) *On non-appropriation spending.* The legislative committees having jurisdiction over the mandatory or backdoor spending which was the subject of recommendations in the Tentative Budget Resolution would be expected to report out implementing legislation by June 1. (The respective Budget Committees, following the passage of the Tentative Budget Resolution on April 1-15,

would notify the appropriate legislative committees of the recommendations, and request action by June 1.) As in the case of appropriations bills, departures from the Tentative Budget Resolution would have to be specified in the bill (and in floor amendments), but there would be no penalty for departing from the Tentative Budget Resolution target at this point. Again, however, a second look would be taken at this legislation in connection with the Final Budget Statute.

If the legislative committees do not report out the implementing legislation by June 1, it would be in order for the Budget Committees, pursuant to new House and Senate rules, to bring such legislation directly to the floor for a vote (subject, of course, to a rule's being granted and approved by a majority in the case of the House).

(c) *On taxes.* Since both Ways and Means and Finance Committees would be well represented on the respective Budget Committees, it would seem highly likely that they would respect by the July 1 target date the revenue-raising (or lowering) requests contained in the Budget Resolution.

4. *The Final Budget Statute.* Immediately following July 1, at the start of the new fiscal year, the Budget Committees (with the assistance of the Joint Economic Committee) would review revenue and spending estimates, and general economic conditions, in order to determine what changes (if any) are needed in the total spending and revenue targets. Having made the decision on this issue, the respective Budget Committees would then determine what changes should be made in previously-passed appropriations legislation, mandatory and back-door spending legislation, and tax legislation, in order to meet the final spending and revenue targets.

The respective Budget Committees would then report to the House and Senate their Final Budget Statute. Title I of the Statute would specify the final spending and revenue totals agreed on by the Budget Committees. Title II would specify the changes needed in the spending levels for specific programs, and in specific revenue provisions, to meet the spending and revenue totals in Title I.

The rules for floor consideration of the Final Budget Statute would require that Title I be debated, amended, and finally agreed to before Title II could be taken up. (An alternative would be to separate Titles I and II into separate measures, and finally enact the first before addressing the second.) In this way, the decision on the proper overall level of spending and revenue needed for a sound, full-employment-without-inflation economy would be less subject to bias by pressures for greater or lesser spending on individual programs.

With the final spending and revenue totals firmly set, floor consideration of the specific spending program and tax changes contained in Title II would begin. Amendments could be offered from the floor changing the spending totals for specific programs and/or making specific tax changes, but these amendments could not change the overall budget surplus, deficit, or balance figure agreed to in Title I. Thus, for example, a package amendment could be offered cutting \$1 billion from Defense Department programs and \$1 billion from highway programs, and adding that \$2 billion to water pollution control programs. But an amendment cutting \$2 billion from some programs and adding \$3 billion to others would not be in order.

The Final Budget Statute passed by each House would then have to be reconciled in Conference, passed in final form, and signed by the President. (The Final Budget Statute must have the effect of law, since it will amend existing, just-passed spending and taxing measures.)

Consideration of Title II would thus represent a real debate over national priorities,

but within the limits of fiscal responsibility established earlier by final action on Title I.

CRIME COMMITTEE BATTLES FOR PEP PILL CONTROLS CITED BY NATIONAL MAGAZINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Roy) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the pioneer work of the House Crime Committee to place reasonable quotas and controls over the production of amphetamines which 3 years ago were pouring out of the Nation's pharmaceutical firms in the amount of 6 to 8 billion pills per year.

The Crime Committee focused the attention of the Congress, the Food, and Drug Administration, the Bureau of Narcotics, and Dangerous Drugs, and the Justice Department to the extent of the overproduction of the bill which in its injectable form was called "speed" in the drug subculture and responsible for the deaths of some young abusers.

Following 3 years of prodding by the Crime Committee, the House Health Subcommittee, and a few other concerned parties, amphetamines overproduction was curtailed 82 percent. The Food and Drug Administration applying the law originating in the Health Committee, just recently recommended at least another 60 percent cut over 1972 quotas which would reduce production from a former high of 6 to 8 billion pills to somewhere around 200 million pills for the treatment of narcolepsy and hyperkinesis, their only medically necessary function.

Recently, the New Republic magazine traced the history of amphetamine overproduction which commented at length of the work of Chairman Pepper and his Crime Committee. This article entitled "Amphetamines and Barbiturates—Legal Drugs, Illegal Abuse," was authored by Peter J. Ognibene.

I submit a copy of the article as well as a recent news release from the Food and Drug Administration recommending further reductions on amphetamine production:

LEGAL DRUGS, ILLEGAL ABUSE: AMPHETAMINES AND BARBITURATES

(By Peter J. Ognibene)

A story in The New York Times several weeks ago caused quite a stir on the cocktail party circuit. It implied that a prominent New York City physician had administered amphetamines intravenously to President Kennedy in Vienna when he met Khrushchev there in 1961, and at other times. The physician allegedly gave similar preparations to other patients, many of them prominent in politics and the arts.

Amphetamines, or "speed," are a significant source of drug abuse among young persons, but they have also been misused by their elders. Until the recent clampdown led by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, American pharmaceutical manufacturers had been producing some eight billion doses of amphetamines each year. First marketed in the 1930s under the trade name Benzedrine, amphetamines have been used to treat narcolepsy, a rare disease whose victims fall asleep involuntarily and frequently. They have also been used to treat hyperkine-

tic children, another rare affliction. Treating these two disorders would justify the production of thousands of amphetamine doses a year, not billions.

Most legally prescribed amphetamines have generally been used for a less serious medical problem. Because they are an appetite depressant, many physicians have prescribed them for obese patients. In most instances, they have had only modest results: the average weight loss has been on the order of a few pounds. A controlled diet and exercise are more effective ways to lose weight. "Diet pills" are central nervous system stimulants, and some people who had them prescribed for obesity have used them as pep pills. They were also used that way by the armed forces of the United States, Great Britain, Germany and Japan during World War II to combat fatigue and extend alertness, and the American military continued their use after the war. In 1970 the House Select Committee on Crime reported "that one of the largest purchases [of amphetamines] is still the US military establishment."

Unlike heroin, which is illicitly produced and thus never medically prescribed, amphetamines have been introduced to many people by doctors who regard them as wonder drugs of a sort. "Heroin," one government official who is responsible for controlling illicit drug traffic commented, "has the mystique as 'the killer drug,' but amphetamines and barbiturates are worse because they are available, medically respectable and you don't know you're getting hooked." Estimates of the number of heroin addicts (500,000-600,000) can be made on the basis of heroin-connected deaths, hepatitis cases and related phenomena, but amphetamine abuse is harder to measure because, except for the declining number of "speed freaks" who inject the drug intravenously, most abusers are pill poppers. Some who become dependent on them while under a doctor's prescription may be maintained on the drug by further prescriptions by doctors who are unaware of the drug's danger. (Some doctors, for instance, still do not believe amphetamines are addictive.)

Dr. Sidney Cohen, former director of the division of narcotic addiction and drug abuse at the National Institute of Mental Health, has told Congress that "the use of hundreds of times the average dose of amphetamines is physically addicting, meaning that tolerance builds up, and definite withdrawal symptoms occur when the drug is discontinued." Over extended periods of time, Cohen warned, "the use of very high doses may also lead to serious psychological problems and violence. Dr. Joel Fort, a professor at the School of Social Welfare at the University of California at Berkeley, believes that "on a typical run (prolonged heavy use) of speed, here develops severe paranoia (paranoia characterized by delusions and hallucinations, violence, etc.), a marked tendency to violence sometimes tragically leading to murder, and serious physical deterioration." A common hallucination is that "bugs" are crawling under the user's skin.

After prolonged use of speed, users "crash" and can sleep for more than a day. To counteract the fatigue and depression which follow, many turn to "downers" such as barbiturates or heroin. The "needle culture" of the speed freak makes the transition to heroin an easy one, and it was a step many of them took a few years ago when speed became less fashionable and heroin was relatively cheap and in large supply.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and, more recently, the Food and Drug Administration have tightened federal controls on amphetamines and amphetamine-like drugs. Production has been cut by 83 percent, and the drugs are now subject to the strict regulations regarding security and record-keeping under Schedule

II of the Controlled Substances Act. One government official told me, with more than a little satisfaction, that the cut in manufacturing quotas for amphetamines has resulted in "a dying industry." He also noted that "doctors are not prescribing amphetamines as freely as they once did." The FDA is currently sending a "drug bulletin" to some 600,000 physicians and other medical professionals to encourage limiting the use of these drugs. (We have still to follow the example of Canada which on January 1 prohibited physicians from prescribing amphetamines and pharmacists from dispensing them except for narcolepsy and other rare diseases.)

Three years ago, the House Select Committee on Crime found that Bates Laboratories of Chicago "had shipped 15 million amphetamine tablets . . . to a post office box for an alleged drug store in Tijuana, Mexico." If one had taken literally the street address for this nonexistent drug store, it would have been located at "the 11th hole of the Tijuana Country Club golf course." The committee estimated that "more than 50 percent of these drugs manufactured in this country find their way into the illicit traffic" and that "more than 60 percent of the amphetamines and methamphetamines presumably exported to Mexico find their way back into the bootleg market in the United States." When one pharmaceutical firm, Strassenburgh Prescription Products of the Pennwalt Corporation, sought to renew its license to export amphetamines, BNDD ordered it to "show cause" why its application should not be denied. In this order BNDD alleged the company was ineffective in controlling its Mexican subsidiary, citing, in this instance, that 1.2 million doses of amphetamines from this subsidiary had been seized from illicit traffickers over a nine-month period. Strassenburgh subsequently dropped its renewal application. Other companies have curtailed amphetamine exports: some because of government pressure, others because of a belated recognition that the drugs were being diverted into illicit channels.

Amphetamine abuse seems to be on the decline. Some users have switched to another central nervous system stimulant, cocaine, which was popular in the 19th century and is now enjoying a comeback. Others have turned to heroin, but most have probably found barbiturates. Unlike amphetamines, whose legitimate medical uses are few, barbiturates have dozens of important uses. Although they are being abused on a larger scale than amphetamines ever were, the legitimate needs for barbiturates require billions of doses per year compared to the thousands of doses of amphetamines needed to treat two rare diseases. Hence, these drugs cannot be controlled by drastically cutting production quotas.

The person who takes speed and then discontinues its use before the addiction-psychosis-brain damage cycle is run can generally make a complete recovery. Although young drug users passed the word that "speed kills," death from an overdose of amphetamines is rare. Death from an overdose of barbiturates is not.

Since the turn of the century, scientists have found more than 2500 derivatives of barbituric acid, some 50 of which have been put to medical use as "sedative-hypnotics." All of them are central nervous system depressants, and some of the long-acting ones, such as phenobarbital, are important in treating epilepsy and in controlling high blood pressure and peptic ulcers. The short-acting ones are commonly used as sleeping pills, and because their effects can be felt within minutes, they are the drugs of choice for abusers of barbiturates. This abuse potential led BNDD to recommend that nine of the short-acting barbiturates be put under Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act

to increase the security under which the drugs are manufactured and distributed. The recommendation, which was sent to the FDA last November 16, requires the concurrence of the secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (and the director of BNDD) to put these drugs under Schedule II. One inevitable consequence of such action would be lower production of barbiturates: a move which could be opposed by some of the powerful pharmaceutical companies even though it is the laxity of their present controls that has permitted millions of doses of barbiturates to be diverted from legitimate channels into the illicit market.

Heroin and amphetamines have been characterized as "hard" drugs, whereas barbiturates have come to be called "soft" drugs. This erroneous distinction—no doubt a part of the heroin mystique—is dangerously misleading: there is nothing "soft" about these drugs. Although their effects are similar to those of alcohol, barbiturates are potentially the most lethal of all abused drugs. A small dose reduces social inhibition and produces a mild "high." A somewhat larger dose intoxicates and results in a loss of judgment and physical coordination. The next stage is a loss of consciousness from which the individual can be aroused. A higher dose produces a coma, and a sufficiently high dose results in death. With alcohol, the user generally passes out before he can drink enough to go into a coma, but with barbiturates, a killing dose can be ingested before even the first effects are felt. Barbiturate overdose, not surprisingly, has long been a leading method of suicide, but accidental death from such is also common. It will probably become even more prevalent if abuse of these drugs continues to rise.

In December, Senator Birch Bayh (D, Ind.), chairman of the judiciary subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency, issued a report: "Barbiturate Abuse in the United States." The subcommittee found that an increasing form of drug abuse involves mixing alcohol and barbiturates. Because one potentiates, or intensifies, the other, a small dose of barbiturates can have a more serious effect when taken with alcohol than when taken alone. Dr. David Lewis of the Harvard Medical School told Bayh's subcommittee that "death has been reported with as little as 300 milligrams of the short-acting barbiturate plus a couple of ounces of hard liquor." (A typical pill might be 100 milligrams.) In other words, taking alcohol with barbiturates drastically compresses the boundaries between a dose that merely intoxicates and one that can kill. In spite of the well-publicized "horrors" of heroin withdrawal, it is rarely fatal. But going "cold turkey" from a high level of barbiturate addiction may lead to convulsions, psychosis or even death.

Because heroin is expensive and lacks potency when taken orally, it is used intravenously. Short-acting barbiturates, by contrast, are effective within minutes after they have been swallowed. Some young drug experimenters, apparently unaware of this potency, have tried to inject barbiturates, often with horrible results. The danger of an overdose is, of course, increased, but mistakes in making the injection—a likely result when earlier doses have impaired the user's motor functions—can maim, if not kill. If the vein is missed and the drug is injected under the skin, a painful abscess will result. If an artery is accidentally hit instead of a vein, gangrene can result. Dr. Max Gaspar, clinical professor of surgery at the University of Southern California School of Medicine, told the Bayh subcommittee that "six of the patients, or 30 percent of the first 20 we saw [who had injected barbiturates into an artery] have had amputations of part of the hand or foot."

Barbiturate abuse is also associated with violence. One barbiturate user told Dr. Roger Smith, the director of the Marin Open House (a drug treatment center), about the effect of mixing "uppers" and "downers": "Once you've got enough goofers [barbiturates] so you're ready to kill some cat, you have to shoot up the crank [amphetamine] so you get the energy to do it." Those who saw a recent NBC documentary, "Thou Shalt Not Kill," about two convicted murders on death row in a Utah state prison, may remember that they described their murder spree with no signs of remorse. Those murders took place over several days in which they were drinking heavily and popping pills. The pills were pentobarbitals.

Illicitly manufactured barbiturates are essentially nonexistent because these drugs are easy to obtain and inexpensive. Some children need only reach inside the family medicine cabinet; others buy them on the street for a quarter apiece. The drug manufacturers are now making more than 10 billion doses a year, or 50 for every man, woman and child in the United States.

Two years ago BNDD required that thefts of barbiturates be reported, and in the first report (for the 12-month period ending April 1, 1972) more than seven million doses were reported stolen. BNDD audits for a two-year period (ending April 1972) showed an additional six million doses which could not be accounted for. Indeed, the normal route of legitimate barbiturates (from manufacturer to wholesaler to pharmacy to doctor or patient) and the lax controls of Schedule III make diversion of these drugs a relatively simple matter for drug traffickers with plenty of bribe money. Like BNDD, the Bayh subcommittee would put the nine short-acting barbiturates under Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act. The move, while no panacea, would seem justified.

Much has been written about treating addiction to heroin and other opiates, but less work has been done on the problems of amphetamine or barbiturate dependence. Although most government experts now concede that heroin addiction is past its peak and barbiturate abuse is on the rise, the federal drug treatment and prevention effort still seems to be directed exclusively to the heroin problem and the creation of more methadone maintenance treatment facilities. That heroin is still a serious problem and that more methadone facilities are needed are nondebateable, but there seems little justification for ignoring other forms of drug abuse which are every bit as lethal. An official at the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention conceded that his agency was doing little to help the barbiturate addict but said that something would be done within the next six months. Without questioning his agency's good intentions, one sees little preparation for a federal effort to curb amphetamine and barbiturate abuse. There seems to be a dearth of ideas about how to do it and what facilities will be needed. One SAODAP official suggested that existing hospitals were sufficient, but another official in the same agency who has directed narcotics treatment programs said it was "hard to get hospitals to take barbiturate addicts" because many doctors consider such addiction to be an "illegitimate medical problem."

Burglary and theft by heroin addicts are serious problems in every metropolitan area, and so there is strong public pressure to get addicts off the street. Methadone maintenance is one way, incarceration another. On the other hand, amphetamines and barbiturates are inexpensive, and those addicted to them rarely have the criminal "talents" of members of the heroin subculture; little property crime is associated with their abuse. The violence and property crimes these drugs do cause are usually contained within the us-

er's subculture. Put another way, a speed freak is not likely to steal your color TV but a heroin addict is. Nevertheless, amphetamines and barbiturates have been taking a heavy toll in human misery, and a humane government should act to alleviate it. It remains to be seen whether this administration will commit itself to helping these addicts with the same zeal it has applied to getting heroin addicts into methadone maintenance where they are no threat to private property.

AMPHETAMINES QUOTAS

The Food and Drug Administration today recommended further restrictions on production and availability of amphetamines and other drugs prescribed for weight loss.

FDA's proposal to the Department of Justice's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) would lower amphetamine production for 1973 by over 60 percent when compared to 1972. With the major production cutback imposed in 1972, this would mean a total reduction of 92 percent or more since 1971.

The FDA further plans to limit availability of amphetamines by ordering injectable amphetamines and amphetamines combined with a sedative or other drugs off the market. This action will be based on the FDA conclusion that the injectable form is unsafe and that all the ingredients in the various combination products do not contribute to the claimed weight loss. Combination amphetamine currently are believed to represent 72 percent of the appetite suppressing drugs prescribed by doctors.

FDA is also recommending to BNDD that five other weight-control drugs widely used in the United States be listed under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 but in a less restrictive category than the amphetamines. The Act provides classes of availability based on medical usefulness of listed drugs and their potential for abuse and harm to public health.

The five are all stimulants and appetite depressants—though not directly related to amphetamines. Three additional drugs of the same type are expected to be marketed in the near future would also be added to the controlled-drug list according to the FDA recommendation.

During 1972 FDA completed an extensive review of drugs used for treatment of obesity. The review showed that amphetamines and methamphetamines have limited effectiveness in weight control.

FDA's findings apply to all anorectic (appetite depressant) drugs. Among the specific drugs evaluated were amphetamine preparations such as Dexedrine, Biphitamine, and Obotan, and closely related drugs such as phenmetrazine (Preludin), methamphetamine (Syndrox, Desoxyn), benzphetamine (Didrex), phendimetrazine (Plegine), diethylpropion (Tenuate, Tepanil), phentermine (Ionamin, Wilpo), and chlorphentermine (pre-Sate).

In addition, FDA evaluated the three about-to-be marketed anorectic drugs mentioned in the control recommendation to BNDD. All were found to have limitations similar to those of the currently marketed products.

In addition, FDA evaluated the three about-to-be marketed anorectic drugs mentioned in the control recommendation to BNDD. All were found to have limitations similar to those of the currently marketed products. These drugs are fenfluramine (Pondimin A.H. Robbins), clortermine (Voranil U.S. Vitamin Co.), and mazindol (Sanorex-Sandoz Pharmaceuticals).

All FDA findings have been communicated to the Nation's physicians in the Agency's *Drug Bulletin*. A number of State medical societies have passed resolutions recommending little or no physician use of such drugs for the treatment of their obese patients.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade I have followed an annual practice of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an accounting of my personal financial condition. Today, I am continuing that policy by issuing a financial statement for the calendar year 1972.

I have commented many times in the past that Members of Congress and holders of high office in general should make periodic public disclosures of their personal finances as a matter of course. Such statements are needed to provide the citizenry with information that will enable them to assess whether the personal holding of their elected representatives and public leaders have affected, in any way, the performance of their public trust and, I, once again, call for the enactment of legislation such as I have introduced, H.R. 1868, which requires a complete public disclosure annually of all sources of income for Members of Congress, members of the Federal judiciary, and certain employees of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, a report of my personal financial condition for calendar year 1972 follows:

*Statement of financial condition,
Dec. 31, 1972*

Cash on account with the Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives	\$502.93
Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C. Checking account	1.70
Securities	None
Residential real estate:	
House, Arlington, Va. (assessed value)	69,650.00
Less mortgage	36,639.09
Equity	33,010.91
House, Sun Prairie, Wis. Cost, July 1, 1972	29,000.00
Plus improvements	916.66
Lot	1,200.00
Less note	1,200.00
Less first mortgage	19,805.78
Less second mortgage	4,500.00
Equity	5,610.88
Household goods and miscellaneous personalty	7,000.00
Miscellaneous assets, deposits with U.S. civil service retirement fund through Dec. 31, 1972, available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations	32,060.07
Cash surrender, value of life insurance policies:	
One the life of Robert W. Kastenmeier	None
On the life of Dorothy C. Kastenmeier	544.00
Donaldson Run deposit	300.00
Automobiles:	
1963 Oldsmobile	250.00
1971 Ford Thunderbird	3,400.00
1966 Ambassador	600.00
Total Assets	83,279.89

Liabilities, including loan, 3 notes National Bank of Washington	1,600.00
Net	81,679.89
Income for calendar year 1972, excluding congressional salary and expenses:	
Gain, sale of stock:	
Reynolds Metal (loss)	-432.93
Austral	+986.25
Solitron devices	+174.27
Stock dividend (Solitron)	5.00
Honoraria (2)	350.00
Rent	210.00
Sale of book review	20.00
Total	1,312.59

OBSCENE RADIO BROADCASTING—II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD, I inserted a letter I had written to the U.S. attorney in Cleveland relative to allegedly obscene radio broadcasting in that city. Today, because of the currency, importance and constitutional sensitivity of this topic, I ask, for the information of Members of the House, that the following letter to the Federal Communications Commission be placed in the RECORD. In the next few days, I will submit for the RECORD letters I have written to the Office of Legislative Counsel and the Justice Department dealing with other aspects of this problem. The letter to the FCC follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1973.

HON. DEAN BURCH,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I enclose herewith a copy of a letter I sent on January 30 to the United States Attorney in Cleveland, pertaining to allegedly obscene radio broadcasting by Station WERE. I ask that you read the letter carefully, since it deals with a problem over which the Commission exercises control and for which your agency is charged with a great deal of responsibility. I refer you especially to the third last and second last paragraphs, which point up the national scope of this problem and the fact that the Commission has an array of weapons that are not being used.

As a matter of fact, the inaction of your agency does not appear to be in accord with your own personal views; you have been quoted as saying: "Obscene programming is a form of air pollution." And it appears to run contrary, too, to a formal policy statement made by the Commission, as will be shown below.

The purpose of this letter, then, is to respectfully suggest to you that there are three fronts on which, as I see it, the Commission could be moving. I ask you to consider each of these approaches, then to determine which of the three appears to hold the most promise for proving effective, and then to take whatever actions are necessary to carry that strategy into execution. You might decide to proceed simultaneously on more than one front. In any event, I trust that you will keep me informed of what you intend to do. I have no doubt that you ought to be preparing to do something because, as the National Observer reported on January 13, 1973, the FCC "received 2,141 complaints last year about offensive language on the air."

You might want to consider (a) action based on Title 18, United States Code, Section 1464, cited in my letter to the United States Attorney; (b) imposing certain sanctions that stem from your authority to act in the "public interest;" (c) instituting an official inquiry and a rulemaking proceeding, with the aim of tapping the wisdom that abounds in this nation, so as to advise the Commission on promulgating a national regulatory policy in this area.

SECTION 1464

In considering whether to elect this alternative, you have available to you the file of complaints which the Commission itself has accumulated on Station WERE, and which has been examined by one of my staff members at your offices. You might also consult with the United States Attorney in Cleveland, who has examined and is examining certain tapes of broadcasts by WERE. And you could, of course, also direct your own Field Engineering Bureau to monitor the station in an effort to develop up-to-date evidence to suit your needs.

Should you conclude, after employing these tactics, that the evidence against WERE is, for one reason or another, insufficient to sustain sanctions by you, then you might turn to your complaint files on other stations around the country that include similar talk shows in their broadcasting formats. I have been told by your staff members (I have no information of my own that corroborates or refutes this) that WERE is not "as bad" as some of these other stations. Apparently, then, there is a lode of evidence to be mined. I have no doubt that action against any one of these stations will have a salutary effect on all of them, including WERE in Cleveland, and therefore, the public would be served no matter which target you select.

Evidently, the Commission thought so itself at one time. In this connection, I would like to call your attention to your proceedings in 1970 against Station WUHY-FM in Philadelphia. Words were uttered in a broadcast which the Commission found to be indecent. Accordingly, you asserted on April 3 of that year: "... We have a duty to act." Your ruling, which I quote from here, made statements which appear to me, at least, to be applicable to broadcasts that my constituents keep hearing over Station WERE. The Commission said:

"We have a duty to act to prevent the widespread use on broadcast outlets of such expressions . . . For, the speech involved has no redeeming social value, and is patently offensive by contemporary community standards, with very serious consequences to the 'public interest in the larger and more effective use of radio' . . . However much a person may like to talk this way, he has no right to do so in public arenas, and broadcasters can clearly insist that in talk shows, persons observe the requirement of eschewing such language."

"The consequences of any such widespread practice would be to undermine the usefulness of radio to millions of others. For, these expressions are patently offensive to millions of listeners. And here it is crucial to bear in mind the difference between radio and other media. Unlike a book which requires the deliberate act of purchasing and reading (or a motion picture where admission to public exhibition must be actively sought), broadcasting is disseminated generally to the public under circumstances where reception requires no activity of this nature. Thus, it comes directly into the home and frequently without any advance warning of its content. While particular stations or programs are oriented to specific audiences, the fact is that by its very nature, thousands of others not within the 'intended' audience may also see or hear portions of the broadcast. Further, in that audience are very large

numbers of children. Were this type of programming to become widespread, it would drastically affect the use of radio by millions of people. No one could ever know, in home or car listening, when he or his children would encounter what he would regard as the most vile expressions serving no purpose but to shock, to pander to sensationalism. Very substantial numbers would either curtail using radio or would restrict their use to but a few channels or frequencies, abandoning the present practice of turning the dial to find some appealing program."

This reasoning by you led, as you know, to a decision to impose a monetary fine upon the station. But you were concerned, because of "the new ground which we break with this decision," that your action might be violative of free speech. So you met this problem by observing:

The courts are there to review and reverse any action which runs afoul of the First Amendment. Thus, while we think that our action is fully consistent with the law, there should clearly be the avenue of court review in a case of this nature. Indeed, we would welcome such a review, since only in that way can the pertinent standards be definitively determined.

Whereupon, you fined the station \$100 (although a maximum of \$1,000 was authorized). All this, as you know, was in vain. The station paid the \$100 and elected not to go to court, leaving the Commission still uncertain over how far it could go in curbing obscenity—and with no test case immediately at hand which would cause the courts to prescribe, or not to prescribe, boundaries on free speech.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I find it inexplicable that, after the lapse of nearly three years, you have yet to find another "test case"—despite the fact that the number of such talk shows have proliferated since April 1970. The reasons you gave for acting at that time seem even more compelling today. Isn't it about time you went forward with another such case? Doesn't WERE's programming provide you with suitable material? If not, what about that of the other stations which your staff members describe as being "worse"?

PUBLIC INTEREST

It seems to me that, in mounting an offensive against obscenity on the air waves, the Commission would find plenty of room for maneuver under the law (Title 47, United States Code, Section 307) which commands your agency to promote the "public interest, convenience and necessity" in its licensing of stations. As you well know, actions taken by you under this mandate present you with certain tactical advantages, important from a legal standpoint. When the criminal statute, Section 1464, is selected as the weapon, the burden falls on the Government to prove its case in court. However, when the Commission invokes the principle of "public interest," the burden shifts to the licensee—and he must prove that his broadcasting operation meets the requirements of Section 307.

In the Red Lion Broadcasting Co. case, decided in 1969, the United States Supreme Court gives us a number of reasons why the burden is properly placed on the licensee in any proceeding involving the "public interest." I find the language of that decision quite clear, and I offer a few excerpts:

"This mandate to the FCC to assure that broadcasters operate in the public interest is a broad one . . . whose validity we have long upheld.

"Although broadcasting is clearly a medium affected by a First Amendment interest . . . differences in the characteristics of new media justify differences in the First Amendment standards applied to them.

"No one has a First Amendment right to a

license or to monopolize a radio frequency; to deny a station license because 'the public interest' requires it 'is not a denial of free speech.'

"It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount.

"Licenses to broadcast do not confer ownership of designated frequencies, but only the temporary privilege of using them.

"The Court (upholds) the regulations, unequivocally recognizing that the Commission (is) more than a traffic policeman concerned with the technical aspects of broadcasting and that it neither (exceeds) its powers under the statute nor (transgresses) the First Amendment in interesting itself in general program format and the kinds of programs broadcast by licensees."

Keeping in mind the fact that the air waves are owned by the public, not the broadcasters, and the additional fact that scarcity of space on the radio spectrum limits the number of stations that might be licensed, we can readily see that conferral of a license by the FCC constitutes the grant of a special privilege—one that is very valuable, indeed, and that ought to be earned.

Is WERE doing anything to abuse this privilege? In view of the complaints reaching me, and the FCC as well, should it not be called on to prove that its programming is in the "public interest"? These are questions, I submit, which become particularly appropriate this year, in view of the fact that the station's license is expiring on October 1. As I understand it, the application for renewal must be filed by July 1, and I trust that you will become properly inquisitive around that time, if not before.

Short of revoking, or failing to renew, or suspending a license, you might consider imposition of alternative sanctions. If your investigation satisfies you that WERE has not been acting in the "public interest." For example, you could—as a warning—renew the license for less than the usual three-year period. You could issue cease-and-desist orders against certain practices. You could refer the complaints you have, or the complaints you might yet receive, or the evidence that the Commission itself uncovers, to the station with demands for an explanation. You could hold a public hearing at which aggrieved persons would be given an opportunity to vent their feelings.

INQUIRY AND RULEMAKING PROCEEDING

Because of complaints you have not only from Cleveland but from around the country, it appears to me that the Commission should want to promulgate a regulatory policy that could be applied uniformly across the nation. Under your administrative procedures, you could institute an inquiry in which interested parties and organizations representing certain sectors of the public, and in which informed individuals, as well, would advise the Commission in setting standards and establishing criteria for the control of offensive language on the air. Issuance of appropriate regulations could ensue.

It seems to me that the Yale Broadcasting Co. case decided last January 5, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia gives us an apt example of the Commission's inquiry and rulemaking powers. The court said:

"In the late 1960's and early 1970's, the FCC began receiving complaints from the public regarding alleged 'drug oriented' songs played by certain radio broadcasters. In response to these complaints the Commission issued a Notice, the stated purpose of which was to remind broadcasters of their duty to broadcast in the public interest. To fulfill this obligation licensees were told that they must make 'reasonable efforts' to determine before broadcast the meaning of music containing drug oriented lyrics.

"A licensee could fulfill its obligations through (1) prescreening by a responsible station employee, (2) monitoring selections while they were being played, or (3) considering and responding to complaints made by members of the public.

"Far from constituting any threat to freedom of speech of the licensee, we conclude that for the Commission to have been less insistent . . . would have verged on an evasion of the Commission's own responsibilities."

I would like to call your attention to one highly important area where regulation is sorely needed, and where promulgation of strict rules would go a long way toward abatement of complaints, and perhaps, partially, of the problem itself. This is the exposure of children to obscene programming. To a certain extent, this could be controlled by the Commission by relegating questionable programs to hours of the day or night when children are not likely to hear them.

One of the recent complaints that you have in your WERE file is from a Greater Cleveland woman who wrote:

"My concern is not so much with censorship (although if this continues I would have to be for it) but with the lack of consideration as to the time of day much of this programming occurs. Most of these subjects are being discussed in the hours from 5:00 AM on into the day. I am deeply concerned about the effect on the young people, of which there must be many who are listening while getting ready to go to school. If a radio station wants to use the above subject matter for programming I would suggest that it be done in the very late evening hours. I realize that I can always turn the dial if I do not like a program, but I am more concerned about the effect on the community in general and I strongly urge you to look into this complaint."

In my own files I have this very recent complaint from another woman:

"One point brought up was timing, since children would be at home for lunch. Mr. Wheelwright blithely retorted that the 'turn-off' knob could be used where desired, and also that a child of six could not understand the broadcast. This is utterly irresponsible! I can think sensitively of children of many ages at home for lunch in 'working-mother' homes, and of immature adults as well, who are harmed by these programs."

In conclusion, I would like to touch on two other matters.

First, I understand that, in an administrative proceeding concluded by the Commission not long ago, a decision was made not to require radio stations to keep tapes of their broadcasts, to be furnished on demand to Federal authorities. I would hope that you reconsider this ruling and that, in fact, you do require that tapes be kept on hand. On December 6, 1972, the United States Attorney in Cleveland wrote to me that he could not complete his investigation of complaints I had advised him of because "the recordings of other broadcasts by Gary Dee were missing and could not be located." I fail to see how the Commission can carry out its responsibilities if it has to fall back on disputed and contradictory versions of what might have been uttered on the air.

Second, I would like to serve notice that I intend to introduce legislation that, hopefully, would assure more effective and fair enforcement of Section 1464. When a draft is completed, I will submit it to you, and I would appreciate your comments at that time, pro or con.

I trust you will be replying to me soon about the various points raised both in this letter and in my letter, enclosed, to the United States Attorney.

Kindest regards,
Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation which will lift a hardship imposed on our elderly, blind, and disabled citizens by an amendment to last autumn's Revenue Sharing Act of 1972. This amendment, the total ramifications of which were not explored in the rush toward adjournment, placed an overall ceiling of \$2.5 billion for social service programs made available under all of the public assistance programs in the Social Security Act. A further stipulation directed that 90 percent of these limited funds be utilized for services for those who are receiving or have applied for assistance, and in need of these services to become self-sustaining.

Only now are the full implications of last year's amendment becoming clear. As a result of this 90-10 limitation on social services, one of the most serious impacts has been the suspension of many ancillary service programs that are badly needed by our elderly, blind, and disabled citizens who are not receiving welfare, either because they prefer to get by with their small pensions or because they refuse to place a lien on their modest homes. For the last 2 months my mail has brought a daily bundle of letters from elderly, or handicapped citizens pleading for congressional action saving the social services upon which they depend. Transportation, nutrition, recreation, personal care, and other services, things which so many of us take for granted, are often the services that elderly or handicapped people are least able to provide for themselves. Yet they too are entitled to a life of independence and dignity, and to demand that these people apply for welfare in order to receive these social services is both unwise and inhumane.

I, therefore, offer this amendment assuring that while the \$2.5 billion limitation will remain on Federal support for social services, the 90-10 limitation will not apply to service programs for the elderly, the blind, or the disabled. Therefore, States will be allowed to fund from their total Federal allotment social services for nonwelfare poor who are elderly, blind, or disabled.

Immediate action on this legislation is imperative since many States, including Pennsylvania, will soon exhaust the 10 percent of the funds reserved for social services for nonwelfare recipients. In fact, the State of Pennsylvania reports that if it is to avoid closing down already existing programs for the elderly, it will have to come up with an additional \$10 million in funds that formerly came from its Federal social services allotment. I assume that what is happening in Pennsylvania has implications for all States across the Nation.

I therefore urge Congress to move with all haste on this bill.

For the convenience of my colleagues, the full text of the bill is reprinted below:

H.R. 3819

A bill to amend section 1130 of the Social Security Act to make inapplicable to the

aged, blind, and disabled the existing provision limiting to 10 percent the portion of the total amounts paid to a State as grants for social services which may be paid with respect to individuals who are not actually recipients of or applicants for aid or assistance

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1130(a)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "of the amounts paid (under all of such sections)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of the amounts paid under such section 403(a)(3)"; and

(2) by striking out "under State plans approved under titles I, X, XIV, XVI, or part A of title IV" and inserting in lieu thereof "under the State plan approved under part A of title IV".

BILL TO RESTORE RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to give notice to my colleagues that I will offer an amendment tomorrow to H.R. 2107, the Agriculture Committee bill to restore the Rural Environmental Assistance program commonly known as REAP.

My amendment will be in the interest of compromise and in the interest of assuring that an REAP program is funded in this fiscal year.

The Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, has reported a bill providing for a mandatory expenditure of \$225 million for the REAP program in fiscal 1973. There are strong indications that President Nixon will veto this legislation if passed, and the delay involved in overriding that veto—if indeed there are enough votes to override it—would virtually assure that no REAP program at all would be funded for the current fiscal year.

The amendment I will offer contains the language of a bill I introduced on January 22, providing that the Secretary of Agriculture allocate \$140 million for REAP in fiscal 1973, the level of initial allocation announced by USDA for this program in September of last year.

While this legislation represents a reduction from the \$225 million level proposed in H.R. 2107, thus taking into account the much-needed austerity measures being called for throughout the Government, it also reinstates exactly the amount which USDA, county agriculture offices, and individual farmers have planned on for the current fiscal year.

I believe my amendment will offer a better course for the Congress to follow in this matter, and I intend to offer it as a substitute measure tomorrow.

The amendment reads as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 2107, as reported, offered by Mr. Mizell:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert: "That funds allocated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of carrying into effect the rural environmental assistance program authorized by sections 7 through 15, 16(a), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590g, h, i, j-o, 590p(a), and 590q) for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, shall be fully expended for such purpose in such fiscal year."

PURE FOOD ACT OF 1973

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced H.R. 323, the Pure Food Act of 1973—See pages 498-499 in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 6, 1973. At that time, 24 Members of the House joined me as cosponsors of the bill.

Today I am reintroducing that bill, and I have the honor of adding Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. NIX, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California as cosponsors. This legislation would put teeth in our pure food laws by giving the Food and Drug Administration the legal authority which it requires if it is effectively to exercise its watchdog function and really protect the American consumer.

Although the proposed Federal budget contained deep disappointments in the form of elimination or cutbacks of vital people-oriented programs, it was gratifying that the pressing fiscal needs of the Food and Drug Administration were reflected in increased budget proposals for that agency. About \$37 million was spent by the FDA in 1972 for its food inspection activities. That figure will rise to about \$61 million in fiscal 1973 and continue upward to almost \$70 million in 1974. These increased expenditures for food inspection personnel and sanitary programs are sorely needed. The next step in the process of increasing the FDA's effectiveness is to strengthen its statutory authority.

Together with the Members of Congress who have cosponsored the Pure Food Act of 1973, I express the hope that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Mr. PAUL ROGERS, will hold hearings on the statutory authority of the FDA at the earliest possible date.

OUT OF INDOCHINA TO STAY

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, I introduced H.R. 3349 and H.R. 3350, and on February 1, I introduced H.R. 3548. (See pages 2869-2870 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 31, 1973) These are identical bills which provide that, after the release of all American prisoners of war and a full accounting for all our missing in action, no further expenditures may be made for U.S. military involvement in Indochina without specific congressional authorization. Identical to S. 758, the proposal introduced in the Senate by Senator CASE and Senator CHURCH, this bill would restrict all military funds, including those appropriated prior to the signing of the Paris cease-fire agreement.

Today I am reintroducing this legisla-

tion, and I am honored to add as co-sponsors Mr. GUDE, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. SCHROEDER, and 43 Members of the House of Representatives have now joined me as a co-sponsor of this proposal.

The urgent need for this legislation has become increasingly apparent since the signing of the Paris agreement. Fighting, albeit on a reduced level, has continued in Vietnam and the status of hostilities in Laos and Cambodia remains unresolved. The activity of the international observation force has been hampered by organizational difficulties. In view of the threat which he perceives from the Vietcong and North Vietnam, President Thieu appeared in an interview televised in America and ominously declared that the United States would support his regime with resumed bombing in Indochina if the Communist violate the cease-fire agreement and imperil the South Vietnamese position.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the American people want all American forces out of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia permanently, and they wish to leave the resolution of the Indochina dispute solely in the hands of the inhabitants of that area. The bill which I am reintroducing today would guarantee that result.

BROADCAST LICENSE RENEWAL LEGISLATION

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleague, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, in introducing legislation to establish by law procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses. This bill also changes from 3 to 5 years the term for which broadcast licenses would be granted.

The need for this legislation arose from a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals regarding broadcast license renewal procedures issued in June, 1971. This decision in effect revoked the standing policy of the Federal Communications Commission to give preference to the current holder of a license over a competing applicant if the licensee's service has been "substantial." The court's decision stated that the FCC did not have statutory authority under the Communications Act of 1934 to initiate such a policy.

It is vital that Congress act to clarify the relicensing procedure used by the Federal Communications Commission. Otherwise, every licensee is open to harassment by any group who wished to obtain a license. In my opinion, any broadcast license renewal procedure should encourage continuity of broadcast service when that service has substantially met the needs and interests of the community.

I sponsored identical legislation in the 92d Congress and over 100 of my colleagues joined in supporting this proposal. I have received assurances from

the leadership that hearings will be scheduled early in this session on broadcast license renewal legislation and I am hopeful that my colleagues will again join me in supporting this needed legislation to correct obvious deficiencies in broadcast license renewal procedures.

H.R. 3854

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307 (d) shall be amended by striking the first two sentences and inserting the following: "No license granted for the operation of any class of station shall be for a longer term than five years and any license granted may be revoked as hereinafter provided. Upon the expiration of any license, upon application therefor, a renewal of such license may be granted from time to time for a term of not to exceed five years if the Commission finds that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby: *Provided however*, That in any hearing for the renewal of a broadcast license an applicant for renewal who is legally, financially, and technically qualified shall be awarded the grant if such applicant shows that its broadcast service during the preceding license period has reflected a good-faith effort to serve the needs and interests of its area as represented in its immediately preceding and pending license renewal applications and if it has not demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the Commission's regulations; *Provided further*, That if the renewal applicant fails to make such a showing or has demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the Commission's regulations, such failure or demonstration shall be weighed against the renewal applicant."

BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CREDIT UNION BANK

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would establish a National Credit Union Bank to serve the liquidity needs of the Nation's more than 23,000 credit unions. This bill is identical to one introduced earlier this year, H.R. 7, by the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. I believe that the measure is a most sound one and one which the credit unions of this Nation need. I believe that it is a measure which will materially aid credit unions in meeting the credit needs of their 25 million members, especially in times of a "credit crunch." It is a measure which will give credit unions a facility such as banks and savings and loan associations already have to meet their liquidity needs.

During periods of "tight" money and high interest rates, credit unions are likely to have difficulty in meeting members' credit needs from their own limited resources of members' savings. Since a vast number of the Nation's credit unions serve middle- and low-income people, they are the one most likely to suffer from a lack of available credit. I know this from personal knowledge of the credit unions operating in my own district. And I know how vitally important credit is to these people.

Under the terms of this bill, a National Credit Union Bank would be able to raise funds for loaning to credit unions by the sale of the bank's debt obligations on the public money market; it would be able to discount paper of member credit unions; it would assist in arranging inter-lending between have and have-not credit unions. In other ways it would be able to assist in providing credit resources to credit unions serving people with limited credit standing. It would help the "little man" in our society.

Briefly, I believe that a National Credit Union Bank will serve a vital need in our Nation's financial structure, and as a result of it for our people and the Nation's economy.

A SPIRITED CITIZEN FOR SCOUTING

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this week the Boy Scouts of America will celebrate their 63d anniversary of formation in the United States. My colleagues are well aware of the contributions scouting makes to this country; primarily the necessary role it plays in the development of this Nation's youth.

Last night I attended a dinner sponsored by the Penn's Woods Council of the Boy Scouts of America in Johnstown, Pa. One of the reasons I am confident in the dependability, resourcefulness, and future of today's youth is because of the sound character they develop as they are guided by the dedicated leaders such as those I had the pleasure of being with on this occasion.

However, a subject of interest that was discussed at the gathering is well worth describing. It is a description of a civic-minded individual who sensed the importance of scouting in today's world. She realized scouting was designed not only to teach skills and understanding for the future, but to show the youth of the country their relationship to the Nation's heritage.

Mrs. Martha Eastwood, of Somerset County, Pa., was the fortunate owner of a historical stretch of land which has served as the location for a hiking trail, known as the Forbes Trail, and which is linked directly to Fort Dewart, a famous fort in the development of Colonial Pennsylvania and America. As you know, many activities and results in U.S. history were determined by frontier outposts such as Fort Pitt, Fort Bedford, Fort Ligonier, and Fort Dewart.

Because of its importance and accessibility, the trail was being used by the Boy Scouts of the Penn's Woods Council. Mrs. Eastwood was so impressed with the efforts of Scoutmaster Jack Finnegan and the hundreds of hours he spent improving the trail that she donated the land to the council. The strategic location provides Boy Scouts of the area the opportunity to relive the colonial history of western Pennsylvania in a more informative and realistic setting.

I would like to offer my personal thanks to Mrs. Eastwood for her con-

tribution to scouting in Pennsylvania. In addition, I congratulate the Penn's Woods Council. I am confident they will strive to make the most of their new acquisition. It is an honor to represent this historical area and a pleasure to represent the men and boys of the Penn's Woods Council.

MORE ON NURSING HOME CARE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues know, because of the remarks I have made for the RECORD, of my interest in nursing homes, or if we want to use the fancy term, extended care facilities.

An interesting article on a local "extended care" hospital appeared in the Washington Post of January 28. The article shows the abuses to which Medicare can be put and also the sort of reaction which nursing home patients and their families are subjected to.

The article follows:

AILING HOSPITAL GETTING WELL AS HOTEL (By Eugene Meyer)

The Metropolitan Hospital for Extended Care, having suffered from an acute case of financial red ink, is on the road to recovery as the Metropolitan Hotel.

The owners of the 2-year-old building at 1142 New Hampshire Ave. NW resorted to the remedy of turning a hospital into a hotel because 60 percent of Medicare claims submitted on behalf of patients were rejected as ineligible under the law.

Consequently, the owners, the Washington Medical Center Corp., a \$50-million corporation whose shareholders are 400 doctors and their relatives, are stuck with a \$460,000 loss due to unpaid patient bills.

"It's a sad tale, a sad tale," said Dr. Oscar B. Hunter Jr., board chairman of the corporation and president of Doctors Hospital, which operated the facility intended for patients no longer needing full hospital care but not yet ready to go home.

"It's got a—I wouldn't say lurid—a colorful history," said Donald S. Farver, president of Group Hospitalization, Inc. which rejected the claims on behalf of the government.

Most of the rejected claims, however, were not for extended care, the original reason for establishing the hospital, but for regular hospitalization at Metropolitan.

A spokeswoman for the Social Security Administration, which dispenses Medicare payments, said there existed a "pattern of moving patients from Doctors to Metropolitan when they were, in fact, ready to go home."

"When you end a hospital stay in one hospital, you don't normally put a patient in another hospital," the spokeswoman said. The denial of claims for such new hospital admissions is "rare," she said.

Gloria Norris, patient accounts manager at Doctors Hospital, said the patients were transferred because their conditions had improved but not enough to be completely discharged from hospital care.

Meanwhile, the Metropolitan Hotel is doing fine. All rooms are booked through February and officials say they expect it to begin breaking even in March.

The \$5.3-million building never became what it was initially supposed to be. Three years ago, Dr. Arthur A. Morris, vice president and treasurer of the corporation, said the privately financed facility, with 532 beds, would be "the only true extended-care center in Washington and . . . the largest in the U.S."

The patient costs at the new facility were to be around \$43 a day, compared to \$100 a day at Doctors Hospital. Officials said the facility would also free needed regular hospital beds at other hospitals.

The Health Facilities Planning Council of Washington, a private advisory group that no longer exists, endorsed the new facility "only as long as (it) is operated as a non-acute or post-acute extended care and long term facility" in line with early plans.

Dr. Edward W. Nicklas, former board chairman of the council, said yesterday that the regular hospital care was a "fictitious type of thing," because Metropolitan had no x-ray machines, operating rooms or laboratories.

"They never used those Metropolitan beds," he said.

The facility was opened Jan. 15, 1971 with 23 beds for extended care. In December, 1971, the number of beds certified for extended care increased to 128. There also were 20 rooms on the first floor set aside as a "hotel" for ambulatory patients and their relatives. Another area was used for physiotherapy.

Metropolitan Hospital was also certified by the District government, acting for the Social Security Administration as a regular hospital with 105 "acute" care beds. The theory behind this, according to Mrs. Norris, the Doctors' account manager, was that patients not needing full hospital facilities but not well enough for extended care could still qualify for Medicare hospitalization benefits.

"There were people still acutely ill who could have stayed in Doctors Hospital," collecting benefits there, Mrs. Norris said. But GHI's Farver said that "had these patients stayed in Doctors and had we done a 100 per cent review, our answer (rejecting the claims) would have been the same."

Usually, Farver said, GHI does not review all of a hospital's claims.

A complete review of Metropolitan's claims occurred, Farver said, because of an unusual delay in certification of the hospital by the D.C. government on behalf of Social Security. The retroactive approval came on December, 1971, almost a year after the hospital opened.

"We sent a physician and a nurse to look at each case," Farver said. "What we found was that the level of care these patients needed wasn't hospital care."

Discussing GHI's actions, Thomas Foley, assistant treasurer of the medical corporation, said: "Our Doctors Hospital physicians' panel reviewed the claims and said (the patients) did need such care. They (GHI) have their feelings, we have ours."

GHI's Donald Farver says of Metropolitan's expectations that the claims would be honored. "They were dreaming. The Social Security Administration is responsible for benefits to provide only necessary care. These guidelines are rather strict."

The GHI rejection forms sent to Metropolitan patients said, "Medicare will cover in-patient hospitalization services when the patient requires treatment or a necessary diagnostic study and these services can be furnished appropriately when confined in a hospital. Since the services you needed do not meet this requirement, no hospital insurance benefits can be paid for your stay."

The rejection forms also said, Medicare "cannot pay for services which assist a patient to meet his personal needs of daily living. The care you received was considered as activities of daily living such as eating, bathing, moving about, getting in and out of bed, taking medications, etc."

"This type of care does not require the continuous supervision of a professional skilled nurse. Such care is excluded from coverage under the Medicare law," the documents added.

Dr. Hunter, the top Metropolitan official, explained that "the retroactive denials were just deadly. Patients were scared to death

about their obligations. Doctors and patients were irritated and upset."

Without assured benefits, the patients stopped coming. "It got so bad, we ultimately decided not to continue it," Dr. Hunter said.

The Metropolitan Hospital for Extended Care quietly went out of business last May. The conversion to a hotel began, costing \$8,000 to \$10,000 a floor.

The ground floor retains the physiotherapy facilities built for the extended care patients. Two therapists are on duty. There is also a pharmacy.

A single floor is set aside for nursing care, essentially an old-age home at rates from \$25 to \$35 a day. Its 64 beds are almost filled to capacity. The top two floors of the nine-story building are rented by the Washington Psychiatric Institute.

The red-carpeted lobby bears no resemblance to that of a hospital. There is a gift shop, a cafeteria managed by the Marriott Corp., and Muzak piped into the halls and elevators.

The rooms are furnished with French provincial furniture and have color television sets. Except for the substitution of regular beds for hospital ones, and the addition of mass produced pictures to the walls, they are the same as before. The bathrooms still have handles for disabled to grasp.

The hotel rooms are booked by clients such as IBM and AT&T, according to Jay Wolfgang, hospital administrator turned hotel manager.

The Metropolitan Hotel does not advertise, but, if any rooms are vacant, they are available to the public at \$12 for a single, \$18 for a double.

MORE DATA ON THE NURSING HOME SITUATION

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last year, during the month of December, an official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Marie Callender, said on a television show that "unfortunately" the Department—HEW—had not been gathering certain pertinent information involving nursing homes. She did not specify what information had not been gathered.

In a letter to then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliot L. Richardson, I question why the Department was not gathering the information and also the reason for Dr. Callender's statement.

After reading Secretary Richardson's reply, I am still puzzled as to why this important information-gathering function has not been accomplished. Since a number of our colleagues have expressed an interest in the continuing saga of HEW's obscure and reluctant attitude with respect to nursing home responsibility, I knew they would appreciate reading the correspondence on this matter.

The letters follow:

DECEMBER 1, 1972.

HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You know of my great interest in the general subject of nursing homes, and I was amazed to have reported to me that your assistant, Marie Callender, said on a recent TV show that, unfortunately, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had not been gathering certain perti-

nent information involving nursing homes. She did not specify what she had in mind.

My question is why have you not been doing this? I am unaware of any bar in the law which prevents you from making pertinent inquiries. I would appreciate hearing from you.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1973.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Thank you for your letter of December 1 regarding Mrs. Marie Callender's appearance on the television show, "Not for Women Only."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has the authority and responsibility to collect certain data regarding nursing homes. Mrs. Callender was referring to problems in the instruments of data collection and analysis. Different agencies and branches within the Department have long collected data, but have used different methods of doing so. These separate categories of data cannot be assembled to form a single comprehensive instrument for analytical purposes. Because different methodologies and systems of measurement were used, it has not been possible to completely utilize the data collected as a basis for policymaking. In addition, the Medicaid program, being a State-run program with Federal matching, has had to deal with fifty different sets of data. With each State establishing its own methods of data collection and analysis, it has been difficult for the Department to utilize the data extensively.

Mrs. Callender, as Special Assistant for Nursing Home Affairs, was charged with coordinating and unifying all long term care policy and implementation within the Department. In this capacity she has begun to draw the disparate agencies and programs together to devise a truly useful, common system for data collection, information and analysis. It is hoped that we will be able to gather and analyze data on patient characteristics and needs, nursing homes, costs of care, deficiencies, quality of care, and other pertinent aspects of long term care.

In addition to these essentially internal functions, the Health Services and Mental Health Administration has signed contracts with two States to test State based instruments of data collection and to find ways of establishing information linkages among States and between States and the Federal Government.

In these ways we are improving our information gathering system, and thus hope to implement better and more rational policymaking processes.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD on February 8, 1973, for 60 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DULSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EILBERG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, for 20 minutes, on February 7.

Mr. VANIK, for 60 minutes, on February 7.

Mr. DRINAN, for 60 minutes, on February 7.

Mr. DULSKI, for 30 minutes, on February 19.

Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, on February 20.

Mr. ROY, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELSON, for 30 minutes, on February 7.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAFALIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEYSER, for 60 minutes, on February 27.

Mr. BIESTER, for 5 minutes, on February 7.

Mr. TALCOTT, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAILSBACK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HEINZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MIZELL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HUBER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, to revise and extend his remarks immediately following those made by Mr. FISHER of Texas.

Mr. McFALL, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$192.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAFALIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina.
Mr. HANRAHAN in two instances.

Mr. STEELE in five instances.
Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. SHOUP.
Mr. CONTE.

Mr. WYDLER.
Mr. BAKER in two instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. HEINZ in two instances.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.
Mr. KEATING.

Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. COLLINS in four instances.
Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McFALL in five instances.
Mrs. BURKE of California in 10 instances.

Mr. RANGEL in five instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ, in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in five instances.
Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. DE LUGO.
Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
Mr. MEZVINSKY.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in four instances.

Mr. FULTON.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. McSPADEN.

Mr. COTTER.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in 10 instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.
Mr. POBELL.

Mr. THORNTON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 38. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to increase the United States share of allowable project costs under such Act, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce, and for other purposes; to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 267. An act to abolish the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 518. An act to provide that appointments to the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

376. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production), transmitting a list of Department of the Navy research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 and over, covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1972, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

377. A letter from the Acting Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting an interim report on the international transfer of conventional arms,

pursuant to section 302 of Public Law 92-352; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

378. A letter from the President, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc.; transmitting the 44th Annual Report of the work and operations of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering fiscal year 1972, together with a financial report for the same period, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 278b (H. Doc. No. 93-19); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

379. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional authority for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe standards of conduct, and to authorize investigation of, and arrests for, crimes committed, on lands and in buildings under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

380. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report on the activities of the General Accounting Office for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

381. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the impact of Federal programs to improve the living conditions of migrant and other seasonal farmworkers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

382. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 111. Resolution creating a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on the House Restaurant (Rept. No. 93-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 145. Resolution to create a select committee to regulate parking on the House side of the Capitol; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 188. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2107, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program. (Rept. No. 93-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 19. Resolution: Organization, jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the permanent Select Committee on Small Business to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business. (Rept. No. 93-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABDNOR:

H.R. 3774. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt employers of 15 or less employees from its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. FRECHARD):

H.R. 3775. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 3776. A bill to create the National Credit Union Bank to encourage the flow of credit to urban and rural areas in order to provide greater access to consumer credit at reasonable interest rates, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3777. A bill to provide for research for solutions to the problem of alienation among American workers in all occupations and industries and technical assistance to those companies, unions, State and local governments seeking to find ways to deal with the problem and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. MCSPADEN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 3778. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. NIX, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POBELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3779. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish procedures providing members of the Armed Forces redress of grievances arising from acts of brutality or other cruelties, and acts which abridge or deny rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States, suffered by them while serving in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 3780. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. NIX, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 3781. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the licensing of food manufacturers and processors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3782. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3783. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 577h) to make additional funds available to carry out the provisions of said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 3784. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3785. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and operate a National Museum and Repository of Black History and Culture at or near Wilberforce, Ohio; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3786. A bill to create a computerized catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3787. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials and elected town and township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3788. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Cedar Swamp National Monument, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3789. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit noncommercial broadcast stations to deny, under certain circumstances, access to their facilities by candidates for Federal elective office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3790. A bill to provide educational assistance to children of civilian employees of the United States killed abroad as a result of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3791. 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. CONABLE:

H.R. 3792. A bill to amend section 832(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 3793. 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. 3794. A bill to amend section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code to change the number of district judges authorized for the Southern District of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 3795. 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.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 3796. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 3797. A bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3799. A bill to liberalize eligibility for cost-of-living increases in civil service retirement annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 3800. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Secretary of Labor of all functions of the Secretary of the Interior under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, as amended, the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act, and any other law relating to the health and safety of persons working in the mining and mineral industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3801. A bill to extend Civil Service Federal Employees Group Life Insurance and Federal Employees Health Benefits coverage to U.S. nationals employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 3802. A bill to assist local educational agencies to provide quality education programs in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3803. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3804. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3805. A bill to eliminate racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes and to assist State and local governments in the enforcement of cigarette taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3806. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transportation, mailing, and broadcasting of advertising, information, and materials concerning lotteries authorized by law and conducted by a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3807. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3808. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3809. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for annual flu shots; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired policemen or firemen or their dependents, or to the widows or other survivors of deceased policemen or firemen, shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 3811. A bill to insure the free flow of information and news to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3812. 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 Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 3813. 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. GUDE:

H.R. 3814. A bill to establish a national system of solid waste management; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 3815. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways to provide that all sections of the officially designated National System of Interstate and Defense Highways shall become toll free for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. HANRAHAN, and Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri):

H.R. 3816. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY):

H.R. 3817. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify certain provisions relating to the Department of Defense which require the authorization of certain appropriations, and submission of weapons development and procurement schedules, for the Armed Forces, and reports thereon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 3818. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in the administration of the housing programs under his jurisdiction, to take more fully into account the special needs of the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 3819. A bill to amend section 1130 of the Social Security Act to make inapplicable to the aged, blind, and disabled the existing provision limiting to 10 percent the portion of the total amounts paid to a State as grants for social services which may be paid with respect to individuals who are not actually recipients of or applicants for aid or assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. McSPADEN, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 3820. A bill concerning the allocation of water pollution funds among the states in fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 3821. 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:

H.R. 3822. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3823. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. GINN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. McSPADEN, and Mr. BLATNIK):

H.R. 3824. 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. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. RAILBACK, Mr. RABICK, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. MADSEN):

H.R. 3825. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 3826. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3827. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to revise the warning statement required by that act to be placed on cigarette packages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3828. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to clarify the application of that act to little cigars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself,

Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PODELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. PREYER, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TREEN, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HUBER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 3829. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 3830. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act in order to provide assistance for the preservation of natural game fish streams in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. BRINKLEY):

H.R. 3831. 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. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 3832. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEZVINSKY:

H.R. 3833. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 3834. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate required under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. THORNTON):

H.R. 3835. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS of Maryland:

H.R. 3836. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3837. 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. 3838. A bill to permit retired personnel of the Armed Forces to receive benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation of Federal em-

ployees for work injuries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3839. A bill to amend section 40 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3840. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DENT, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. BENITEZ):

H.R. 3841. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of Roberto Walker Clemente; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. CARNEY of Ohio):

H.R. 3842. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide loans to small businesses for certain expenditures incurred as a result of complying with the Consumer Product Safety Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, and the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 3843. 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.

By Mr. PARRIS (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DOWNING, Mr. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. SATTERFIELD):

H.R. 3844. A bill to transfer to the Attorney General jurisdiction over the District of Columbia penal facilities at Lorton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS (by request):

H.R. 3845. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered to be income for the purposes of determining eligibility for a pension under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FREY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 3846. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 3847. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3848. A bill to provide that, after January 1, 1973, Memorial Day be observed on May 30 of each year and Veterans Day be observed on the 11th of November of each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3849. 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. QUIE (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 3850. 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. RANDALL:

H.R. 3851. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect recipients of veterans' pension and compensation from having the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. GINN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. ROE, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 3852. A bill to establish policy and principles for planning and evaluating flood control, navigation, and other water resource projects and the use of the water and related land resources of the United States and setting forth guidance for the benefit-cost determinations of all agencies therein involved; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 3853. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers, police, firemen, and members of an ambulance team or rescue squad; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ROY, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. WARE, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 3854. 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. RUPPE:

H.R. 3855. 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. SCHERLE:

H.R. 3856. A bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. POAGE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. MAHON, Miss JORDAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MCFALL):

H.R. 3857. A bill to designate the National System of Interstate and Defense highways described in title 23, section 103(e) of the United States Code, otherwise known as the Interstate System, as the Rayburn-Johnson Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3858. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft; to

amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft; and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to suspend the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3859. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the continuation of youth fares; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 3860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by repealing the present provisions with respect to income averaging and readopting the provisions in effect prior to 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 3861. A bill to create the National Credit Union Bank to encourage the flow of credit to urban and rural areas in order to provide greater access to consumer credit at reasonable interest rates, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 3862. A bill, the Consumer Agricultural Protection Act of 1973; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3863. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to repeal the special minimum wage rate under that act for agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3864. 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. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3865. A bill to provide for an additional life insurance benefit of \$5,000 in the case of certain beneficiaries of servicemen's group life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 3866. A bill to extend titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII of the Agricultural Act of 1970 for 5 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 3867. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing for Federal acquisition of that part of the tribal lands described herein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 3868. A bill to deauthorize the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 3869. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3870. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas to certain aliens entering the United States to perform services or labor of a temporary or seasonal nature under specific contracts of employment; and to require an immigrant alien to maintain a permanent residence as a condition for entering and remaining as an immigrant of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 3871. A bill to amend the Animal

Welfare Act, to cover midways at State and county fairs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3872. A bill 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.

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-540); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 3874. A bill to restore the right of freedom of choice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 so as to reduce from 6 months to 4 months the period for which daylight saving time shall be in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3876. A bill to require the Supreme Court to report the reversal of State criminal convictions in written decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3877. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second-class and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3878. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3879. A bill to authorize an additional 41,000 miles for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3880. A bill to provide that certain land acquired for flood-control purposes which is no longer needed for such purposes be disposed of as surplus property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3881. A bill to protect funds invested in series E U.S. savings bonds from inflation and to encourage persons to provide for their own security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3882. 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 to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3883. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3884. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3885. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3886. 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. WOLFF:

H.R. 3887. A bill to require States to pass along to individuals who are recipients of aid or assistance under the Federal-State public assistance programs or under certain other Federal programs, and who are entitled to social security benefits, the full amount of the 1972 increase in such bene-

fits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HICKS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study of the relationship of motor vehicle size to air pollution, fuel consumption, and motor vehicle accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences in 1976; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUBE, Mr. ROSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATES):

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim April 29, 1973, as a day of observance of the 30th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of April 23, 1973, as "Nicolaus Copernicus Week" marking the quinquacentennial of his birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate the increase in riots and law violations, including loss of life and property, damage to or threat of damage to or destruction of the economy of States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, the causes thereof, and to recommend legislation that would grant States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions additional rights to obtain injunctive and other relief to the end that the public welfare be protected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate the increase in law violation, to determine the causes and fix responsibility for the breakdown in law enforcement, with the resulting destruction of life and property, to recommend corrective legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing, as a House docu-

ment, of the eulogies and encomiums of the late President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Res. 189. Resolution to amend the rules to provide for timely appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 190. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 19; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 191. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 192. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. KYROS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H. Res. 193. Resolution endorsing the goals being sought by the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Seabed Committee in preparing for the Law of the Sea Conference, and commending the delegation for its work; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 194. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3888. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zambianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 3889. A bill for the relief of Lucrezia Adragna and her children Gioacchino Adragna and Luciano Adragna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arena his wife Anna Arena, and their daughter, Anna Nicoletta Arena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3891. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cucuzza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3892. A bill for the relief of Sigurd Daasvand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Assuntina, Angela, and Raimondo Florica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Teresa Metrisiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Rose Minutillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Margarita Badolamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3897. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Montemaggiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Stefano Patti, Filippa Scaturro Patti, and Benedetto Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3899. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Rugeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Pietro Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 3901. A bill to convey the mineral

rights in certain real property located in Seminole County, Fla., to Carroll L. Ward, Sr., the owner of such real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3902. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain cotton bags for Hamilton Specialties, Inc., of Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 3903. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in the State of Michigan to the Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FORMATION OF ECONOMIC INEQUITIES, INC., A NONPROFIT CORPORATION

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last month the Augusta Chronicle and the Savannah Evening Press, in my home State of Georgia, published a nationally syndicated newspaper column by John Chamberlain that mentioned the recent formation of a nonprofit corporation named Economic Inequities, Inc.

The corporation's Board of Trustees, which includes some of the Nation's most reputable economists, have approved resolutions that I believe Members of the Senate and House should bear in mind when they think about the long-run well-being of our national economy. As we know, free social and political institutions depend upon a free and healthy economy. We also know an economy cannot be healthy if it is afflicted by either inflation or unemployment.

In addition to approving the earliest possible completion of the massive book "Economic Inequities," or "The Wealth of a Nation," as it is sometimes called, the Board of Trustees of Economic Inequities, Inc., authorized three national conferences to which America's best theoreticians in economics, mathematics, and sociology will be invited to deliver formal papers. The first conference is to examine the relations between inflation, total public and private net debt, now over \$2,000 billion, and the economic production of goods and needed services. The second is to examine the several elements of true economic employment as distinguished from public employment. The third conference, which is dependent upon the first two conferences, is to be charged with the causes and conditions of simultaneous and enduring full economic employment alongside zero inflation.

William D. Partridge, of Washington, D.C., and Standardsville, Va., who is editorial director of the book "Economic Inequities," claims that widespread pre-conclusions of most professional economists that such a combination is impossible in a free economy itself housed in an open society are contrary to the natural order of human affairs. He likens this to intellectual defeatism. Disclaiming any fine knowledge of economic theory, I find myself agreeing with Mr. Partridge's disciplinary training and insight.

Inasmuch as the three conferences must await completion of the book, which

now has 40 of its 50 coauthors and 48 of our 50 States within its pages, it is hoped that book completion may be hastened so that the first two groundwork conferences may be organized. The third conference could inaugurate such a lasting era of economic strength for the Western World that communism would die on the vine.

Members of the Senate might question William Partridge, known to many of us, why he is so convinced that the American way of life, which depends upon the work ethic, and American socioeconomic intelligence together can offer a nonpublic job to any man or woman who believes in honest toil and decent wages. His answers will not give us any rest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a part of my remarks the John Chamberlain syndicated column as it appeared January 12, 1973, in the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle under the heading "The Illusion of Controls."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ILLUSION OF CONTROLS

(By John Chamberlain)

President Nixon, who once campaigned against "Communism, Corruption and Controls," wants wage and price controls to continue after the April 30 expiration of the current Phase II period. The idea is that controls enable the government to combat inflation, which is, of course, pretty much of an illusion. As William Partridge, the "disagreeable economist" of Washington, D.C. and Standardsville, Va., puts it, price and wage controls attack the result of inflation, not its causes in the increase in the money supply and in mass credit.

To be sure, the government can make a case that controls have kept price inflation within bounds in 1972, but, as the end-of-the-year Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. survey shrewdly observes, a "substantial slack in both plant and work force provided a favorable environment in which controls could operate." One can translate this to mean that controls have worked precisely to the extent that they made no difference—market conditions were such that neither businessmen nor labor leaders could have remained competitive if they had tried to get more than the controls would permit for their product.

The Morgan Guaranty Survey predicts a "spectacular rise" of \$56 to \$75 billion in personal after-tax income for 1973, which could result in a "colossal buying binge." As a curbstone economist, I would contend that any spending splurge under conditions of selective price controls must result in the strangest distortions. On the one hand, there must be a quick depletion of the stocks of superior goods in the controlled sector as the public, with money burning holes in its pockets, takes advantage of the enforced bargain prices. On the other hand, food prices, which are uncontrolled, would hardly dip in a splurging market. These are the prices that have mocked the inflation fighters all through Phase I and Phase II of controls; the housewife at the supermarket, paying 82 cents for

a jar of mayonnaise that used to cost 77 cents, has never known what controls meant.

One big trouble with "controlling" an economy is that nobody can trust government figures. The official Consumer Price Index, for example, indicates that a person with "take-home pay" of \$100 a week spends \$22 on food. Assuming he has to feed a family of four, this means that he must subsist on fish, stew meat and canned vegetables. The market for delicacies and steaks, however, would seem to indicate that the CPI estimate of \$22 is highly misleading. Rent, in the Consumer Price Index, comes to 5.05 per cent of "100 for all items." Well, University of Chicago Professor Arnold Weber, who once served as director of the Nixon Cost of Living Council, has been quoted as saying "to the guy who's renting a house, it's a hell of a lot more" than any mere 5.06 per cent.

In general, one suspects there has been a qualitative decline in a whole broad spectrum of goods. More than two years ago the "disagreeable" Bill Partridge predicted that a wage-price freeze would "aggravate" inflationary wage demands by "causing a severe reduction in the quality of both goods and needed services." Since Partridge's analyses of the relationship of debt (including mass credit) to production have yielded accurate estimates of inflation, it is good to know that he is putting together a non-profit corporation, Economic Inequities, Inc., to complete the book he has undertaken with 50 co-authors, many from prestigious universities, in an effort to enlist the best brains in a revitalization of economic science.

Partridge's board includes Richard Seldon, David Davies and Dudley Dillard, who are, respectively, the chairmen of the economics departments of the University of Virginia, Duke University and the University of Maryland, along with Anna Schwartz of the National Bureau of Economic Research and Paul Van Riper, a former secretary of Beta Theta Pi who is head of the political science department of Texas A. and M.

A stated objective of this group would be to hold national conferences on the interrelationships of inflation, debt and production, with the hope of providing the formula that would combine zero inflation with full employment.

Since nobody in the government Establishment yet has come up with such a formula, it will be good to get the non-government dissidents thinking about this. We couldn't do worse than we have done, and we might do a lot better.

REAP

HON. EDWARD YOUNG

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a few Sundays ago our preacher told the story of another minister preaching about man never really owning anything. After the sermon, one of the wealthiest members of the congregation invited the minister to his home for dinner. After the meal, the host pointed out the land surrounding his home and