

Three years ago, lawyers for Mr. Nader asked the Agriculture Department for reports on the safety of handling some pesticides. The request was refused on ground that the records sought were not clearly identified. The lawyers asked for the department's indexes to obtain proper identification. They were told that the indexes were private internal memoranda exempted from the act. Finally, after a successful court case, the department said it would cost \$91,840 to prepare the registration files for public viewing.

Philip Long and his wife, Susan, of Seattle, in 1970 faced an audit of their tax returns and asked the IRS for statistical reports on audits and internal materials on operating procedures involving audits. The request was refused.

"HANDS WERE TIED"

The officials "kept saying their hands were tied by the rules," Mr. Long says. "But they wouldn't let us see what rules they were talking about."

In the process of dealing with the Longs'

request, the Treasury Department found some quarterly statistical report on audits in its public library. They were removed from the shelves no longer to be disclosed.

After repeated futile trips to Washington and regional offices of the IRS, the Longs sued under the Freedom of Information Act and won. Some significant insights into the government's auditing procedures are now available to the public.

NO. 1?

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, which country in the world ranks 25th in life expectancy?

Which country ranks 14th in infant mortality?

Which country ranks 14th in literacy?

Which country ranks eighth in doctor-patient ratio?

The answer to each of these four questions is, I am sad to say, the United States of America. The information for the first three is taken from the World Data Handbook, "Issues in United States Foreign Policy," a publication of the U.S. Department of State: the statistic for the fourth comes from the United Nations Statistical Yearbook.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, when we consider the Nixon budget proposals, which increase military spending while slashing almost all of our domestic social programs, let us keep these questions—and their answers—in mind.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 20, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Adolfas Stasys, assistant pastor, Holy Cross Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Creator, in Your plan for creation You found a place for Lithuania, where Lithuanians for ages lived in peace, fostered education and culture, and cherished their land. Unfriendly eastern and western neighbors sought often to enslave and annihilate it.

Today we commemorate the 55-year anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Dear God, Lithuania is again enslaved by Communist Russia. Lithuanians in their land are without rights: without free speech, free press, free elections. Religion is ruthlessly persecuted.

Lithuania is grateful to the administration of the United States for not recognizing the occupation, and to Congress for its support of the cause of Lithuania's freedom.

Christ, move the conscience of the world leaders to be guided by right and justice, hasten Lithuania's hour of freedom, bless the United States of America, bless Lithuania.

Christ, Ruler of the World, You are our hope. 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 a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to authorize the erection of a monument to the dead of the 1st Infantry Division, U.S. Forces in Vietnam.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 6, 1973.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,

The Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On this date, I have been served with a subpoena duces tecum by a representative of the U.S. Department of Justice, that was issued and signed by the Chief United States District Judge for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. This subpoena is in connection with the United States of America vs. Grand Jury Investigation.

The subpoena commands me to appear in the said U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on the 13th day of March 1973 and requests certain House records of employees of a former Member, Congressman J. Irving Whalley (12th Congressional District, Pennsylvania) that are outlined in the subpoena itself, which is attached hereto.

House Resolution 12 of January 3, 1973, and the rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania]

SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT

United States of America v. Grand Jury Investigation.

To W. Pat Jennings or authorized representative, Clerk of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania at 708 U.S. Post Office and Courthouse in the city of Pittsburgh on the 13th day of March, 1973 at 10 o'clock A.M. to testify in the case of United States Grand Jury Investigation and bring with you the records listed on the attached sheet:

Bring with you the following records:

1. All pay records including clerk-hire allowance forms, payroll authorization forms, payroll cards, payroll confirmation sheets and any other records indicating the mailing address of U.S. Treasury Checks of the following former employees of Congressman J. Irving Whalley: Julia W. Kogut, Gilda L. Lesko, John F. Ziants, Judith Seese, Ronald K. Ence, D. Harold Troxell and James Phillips, for their employment period up to February, 1973.

2. All pay records including but not limited to buff and blue colored cards indicating the mailing address of U.S. Treasury Checks of the following employees of Congressman J. Irving Whalley: Leonard Howard, Jr., Daniel Helsel, Marjorie S. Glessner, Gene M. Hamilton and Thomas L. Rhoads.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States of America. February 5, 1973.

J. J. Graham, Attorney for U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

RABE F. MARSH,
Chief U.S. District Judge.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 221) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 221

Whereas in the Grand Jury Investigation pending in the United States District court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the grand jury of the said court at 10 o'clock antemeridian on the 13th day of March, 1973, and to bring with him certain papers and documents in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or pos-

session but by its permission; be it further *Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House, or any officer or employee in his office whom he may designate, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury in the subpoena duces tecum beforehand, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when the said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, be authorized to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of those requested papers and documents which are in possession or control of the said Clerk; and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents or papers in his possession or control that the court has found to be material and relevant and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under the said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena duces tecum a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION FOR FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider at any time after today a joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have just seen a copy of the report, but have not had time to read it.

How many subjects does this cover in addition to the foreign handout program otherwise known as foreign assistance?

Mr. MAHON. This continuing resolution provides further financing authority beyond the 28th of February for all agencies which are covered in the previous continuing resolution.

As our friend knows, there were two appropriation bills which were not enacted into law during the last session; one having to do with the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, and the other having to do with foreign aid. Those organizations have been operat-

ing, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, under the continuing resolution since the end of the last Congress.

The period of funding for those agencies expires at midnight on the 28th day of February, so that it is proposed that we extend the effective date of the resolutions to June 30.

In other words, the availability of funds for the foreign operations programs and the programs financed under the Labor-HEW appropriation bill will expire on February 28. We have to take action. Extensions of the effective date to June 30 is the proposed action.

Mr. GROSS. Well, this goes beyond HEW and the foreign giveaway program in that it apparently includes Nicaraguan earthquake relief, desalting in Israel, and international narcotics control. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, this does not call for additional funds for the international narcotics program. If they can find \$42.5 million in the funds previously appropriated for the other programs, they may fund the narcotics program, but there is no additional amount included in this continuing resolution.

The same thing is true for the \$35 million for Nicaraguan earthquake relief. They will have to find the money somewhere from the funds provided for in the continuing resolution. There will be no additional funds appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. I happen to be a member of the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We held a hearing prior to the Lincoln Day recess with respect to the earthquake in Nicaragua, and our committee was informed the U.S. Government had then made available \$12 million.

Government officials were asking then for an additional \$20 million, which means there is \$3 million more set forth in this report than the top figure the State Department suggested be made available for reconstruction and relief. I do not understand this presentation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield further.

Mr. PASSMAN. They stated this was the amount of their needs. We said, "We will not provide additional money, but if you can find sufficient funds under the continuing resolution to be able to fund the \$35 million for Nicaragua, you may proceed."

That is also true of the international narcotics item.

I am not sure they will be able to find \$42.5 million for the narcotics program and \$35 million for Nicaraguan relief, as requested, but whatever funds they are able to find they will have to take the money out of funds available under the continuing resolution. There will be no further appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to debate the merits or demerits of the matter itself, but as to the content of the continuing resolution, I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana a question. If there is \$35 million kicking around in

some other program, it seems to me that program whatever it may be has been badly overfunded. It is things like this I believe we ought to know something about before we give approval to the consideration of the request.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield further.

Mr. PASSMAN. We said, "You must fund the \$42.5 million and the \$35 million from available funds." They may not be able to find the additional funds. They can spend it on these programs provided they can take it from some other program in the bill. I am not too sure they will be able to find that amount of money, because this is a very tight bill this year. It is \$1.5 billion below the budget request.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that the necessity for this kind of a resolution, dealing as it does with fiscal year 1973 funds for HEW and foreign assistance—I call it the foreign giveaway program—is a sad indictment of the operation of the Congress. There are only 4 months left of this fiscal year, and here we are confronted with another continuing resolution with respect to these programs which ought to have been disposed of in the last session of Congress.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Would his resolution be subject to amendment on the floor of the House?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say of course the resolution will be subject to amendment when it is called before the House.

I would say, with respect to the foreign aid program, that the level of funds available under the continuing resolution is about \$1.5 billion under budget request, and about a half billion dollars below the level of the bill that was passed by the House last year for this same fiscal year. So this program is being held better in hand than in previous years, in my opinion.

Mr. GROSS. But the resolution will be subject to amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. So that the record may not be misleading, in recent years the international narcotics program has been funded the same way as we propose this year; that is, out of available funds in the bill.

In addition to that, some of the Nicaraguan aid has been funded out of the President's contingency fund. That is the purpose of having a contingency fund, such as the gentleman's committee recommends, so that if something like Nicaragua comes up, they will have money available.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a House joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

FEBRUARY 20, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am hereby submitting my resignation as a member of the House District of Columbia Committee effective immediately. I make this request because I have now been placed on the Select Committee on Small Business as I desired.

Thank you for taking the necessary action to fulfill this request.

Sincerely yours,
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 222) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 222

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Edward Young of South Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; E. G. Shuster of Pennsylvania: Committee on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. A. "LEX" GREEN

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that a former Member, the Honorable R. A. "Lex" Green, has passed away.

His death came on Friday, February 9, 1973, the day before his 81st birthday.

It has been over a quarter of a century since Mr. Green completed his service in the House. He had been a Member of Congress for 20 years when he left to run for Governor of Florida in 1945.

Lex Green was something of a legend

in Florida politics. With his white suit and flowing black bow tie, he could spellbind an audience as few men have ever done. Many a tale has been told me about his campaigns and his speeches by men and women who knew Mr. Green.

He was born February 10, 1892 in Lake Butler, Fla., in what is now Union County, but was then a part of Bradford County.

He began a teaching career at the age of 16 before going to Tallahassee to work in the State legislature, first as a messenger and later as chief clerk.

He graduated from the University of Florida in 1916 and moved to Live Oak, Fla., where he was principal of the high school.

He returned home and was elected to the State legislature 1918-20, and in that term served as speaker pro tempore.

Ambitious, he went to Yale to study law and was admitted to the bar in 1921. He set up a practice in Starke.

Mr. Green was elected county judge and served in that position until 1924, when he resigned, having been elected to Congress. From March 4, 1925, until his resignation on November 2, 1944, he was a colorful and well-liked Member of this body.

Mr. Green had a ready wit and a genuine concern for people. I have talked with some of the men who served with him and the one constant comment was of a man who had a sense of humor and who was never too busy to try to boost the spirits of a colleague. I know that he was that kind of friend to me, and I shall miss him.

He left the Congress to make an unsuccessful campaign for Governor and returned to Starke to practice law. He never lost his interest in politics and was a factor to be reckoned with for years after his retirement.

He was also a member of the Bradford Lodge No. 35 F. & A. M., the Shrine Morocco Temple, Woodmen of the World, and the Starke Rotary Club. He was a veteran of World War II, having served as a lieutenant commander in the Navy.

He had some lasting friends who, to him, were his most precious assets, after his family.

He is survived by his widow, Lucille Harris Green; a daughter, Mrs. Curtis Sanders, Starke; and two sons, Judge R. A. Green, Jr., Gainesville, and Dr. William Green, Arlington, Va. His five grandchildren were a source of pride to Mr. Green.

I think it interesting to note that after all of these years, only four men have surpassed his record for length of service by a Floridian in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He was a successful businessman, an outstanding elected official, a good friend and man—this is his legacy.

To his wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy. I do so not just for myself, but for thousands of others who I know would want to be remembered. He was a good man and a great friend. We will miss him.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I share the sense of loss which has been suffered by

the State of Florida and by our Nation in the death of Robert A. "Lex" Green who served in Congress from 1924 to 1944. His was one of the longest records of service in the history of our State and he left this body voluntarily to seek another office. He was a Member of Congress when I first came here. I already knew him well and I had been impressed by his ability. His counsel and advice, which were freely given to me as a new Member, were most helpful in my early days in Congress.

When he died on February 9, 1973, Lex left behind a reputation as a colorful and dedicated human being. His sense of the dramatic and his ability to attract to himself well deserved attention enabled him to become a strong force in the councils of the Nation during the trying days of the depression and into the tragic days of World War II.

But it was more than his flowing bow ties and dramatic manner of speech that made him an important factor in these halls. It was his inherent good sense, his love of country, and his devotion to his oath as a Member of Congress that earned for him the respect and the friendship of Members on both sides of the aisle.

At his death, he was 80 years of age. His life was one of service to his State and his Nation. He was a lifelong member of the State Democratic Executive Committee from his beloved Bradford County. He served in the Florida Legislature in 1919, was Bradford County judge from 1920 until his election to Congress in 1924, and he served the Congress with distinction for 20 years.

It could never be said of Lex Green that he was not involved. Even after his retirement from the Congress, he returned to the private practice of law and recently was honored by the Florida Bar Association for his 52 years of active membership.

All of us who knew him will miss Lex Green and our thoughts go out to his wife and family at their loss. Lex will not be forgotten—not by those of us who served with him, nor by countless others who remember him with appreciation and with esteem for his dedication and for being a very genuine human being.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the Honorable R. A. "Lex" Green.

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

There was no objection.

SAVE THE OEO

(Ms. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today we, as Members of Congress, are being visited and lobbied by people from every walk

of life, united in their determination to protest the inhumane program cuts which have been projected by President Nixon.

I am glad that they are here. I think it evidences the fact that the American people will oppose any dictatorial use of power that robs the poor to give to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity brought hope to many who live in poverty and who are in need.

They are unable to fulfill their needs with the termination of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Small children are victims of the squeeze play to scrap the child care bill. Working mothers have to come back on welfare rolls in order to qualify for child care, while our military millionaires get subsidies and military corporate producers get subsidies even for their mistakes.

The President would cut off loans to small farmers, take the milk out of the school lunch plan, cut out rent subsidies and funds for public housing while big industries often pay no taxes. Mr. Nixon will not meet the Congress' commitment toward our community development programs; he has even cut medical and health training grants.

One thing we can be sure of is that if the people continue to come to the House and the Members of this House respond to them, as I believe they will, the President will be forced, as he was forced last week, to back down from his stand and listen to the outcry from the public. I am counting on the public to remind us of our responsibility, to represent every single one of our constituents.

We do not need further military expenditures; we need help for the elderly, health care and education, and we have got to see to it in this House that we meet those needs.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, we are all proud of the way in which our American prisoners of war have conducted themselves upon their return to the United States. We could all learn something from these fine Americans who have given so much for their country and have shown that love of country and pride in what you do for your Nation still has deep meaning.

I hope and pray the returning prisoners will realize that only a small minority of Americans are counted among those preachers of doom in our Nation and those who are always finding fault with America. We can all benefit from the return of our prisoners and learn from them what it means to be an American and how thankful we should be that we live in the United States.

WELCOME AND COMMENDATION TO POW'S

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in a warm welcome to the POW's who have been privileged to come home or who are en route. And I warmly congratulate them on the good sense and the high patriotism shown in the public comments made by their members. America should be very proud of the attitudes they have expressed. The prayers of our Nation have been heard and it is indeed a time of thanksgiving for families and friends of those who are returning.

There remains the heartrending problem of the missing in action. For their families the long, lonely vigil continues, and for many of these that vigil will never end. A very determined effort is being made and must continue in order to pick up any scrap or piece of information that may help to locate the MIA's or, at least, to determine their fate.

For those who are privileged to come home, it is like the beginning of a new life. Some have been away for years. Many of them feel out of step with the new America to which they have returned. We have a serious and important responsibility to help them to adjust; to make them realize their country is proud of them and to make our country recognize its debt to them and their families. The heartless and inhuman attitude of the North Vietnamese toward American POW's and MIA's has produced one of the saddest chapters in American history. This and the perpetrators of this unhappy situation we must not forget.

WHAT THE GOOD LORD GIVETH SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AWAY

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to implore the Republican side of the House—I do not see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) on the floor—however, I want to implore the Republican side of the House to try to dissuade him from switching parties. We in the majority have treated you fellows pretty nice since I have been here, so I do not see why you would want to inflict him upon us. You know, after all is said and done, we have enough troubles of our own, and I do not think you ought to send any of your troubles over on our side.

We had a couple of switches around here a few years ago, one notably from South Carolina, and somebody said at that time the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, blessed be the name of the Lord.

Well, this time I just hope, since the Lord has given him to you, that He keeps him over there and you do all you can to keep him there, too.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTEN- NIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3694) to amend the joint resolu-

tion establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(a) of the joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes, approved July 4, 1968 (80 Stat. 261), as amended, is further amended by striking "until February 15, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "between February 16, 1973, and June 30, 1973".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'NEILL). Is a second demanded?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE).

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. FUQUA. 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. 18]

Abzug	Fraser	Murphy, III,
Anderson, Ill.	Gettys	Murphy, N.Y.
Arends	Goldwater	Myers
Ashbrook	Grover	Neisen
Ashley	Hanrahan	Patman
Badillo	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Bell	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Biaggi	Harvey	Rees
Bingham	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Johnson, Colo.	Rosenthal
Brown, Mich.	Johnson, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Burke, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Roy
Carey, N.Y.	Jordan	Ruppe
Chappell	Karth	Smith, N.Y.
Chisholm	Kastenmeier	Spence
Clark	Kemp	St Germain
Clausen,	King	Steed
Don H.	Kluczynski	Steele
Clay	Koch	Teague, Calif.
Conyers	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Cronin	Lent	Vander Jagt
Davis, S.C.	McEwen	Vanik
Delaney	McKay	Ware
Dellums	Macdonald	Wilson,
Dennis	Mailliard	Charles,
Diggs	Mann	Tex.
Dorn	Mills, Ark.	Wyatt
Dulski	Minish	Yatron
Edwards, Calif.	Minshall,	Young, S.C.
Foley	Ohio	
Ford,	Mitchell, Md.	
William D.	Mitchell, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTEN- NIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the authorization for appropriation for the American Revolution

Bicentennial Commission expired on February 15, 1973. This bill before the House, H.R. 3694, would merely amend existing law by providing an authorization for appropriations for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission for the period from February 16, 1973, to June 30, 1973. Last fall the Congress authorized the amount of \$3,356,000, which was one-half of the amount originally requested for the whole of fiscal year 1973, and provided that the period for the authorization would end February 15, 1973. The effect of the amendment provided for in this bill is to authorize appropriations of an amount not to exceed the same amount, first of 1973, \$3,356,000. It should be noted that existing law provides that not to exceed \$2,400,000 of the current appropriation is to be for the second year of a grant-in-aid program for each of the States. I understand that the States have yet to be paid half that amount, or \$1,200,000.

In order to put the matter into proper perspective, it is necessary to outline the history of the present provisions of the law. In September of 1972, the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary was directed to undertake a study of the operations and functions of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. This study was initiated because of criticisms and problems in connection with the functioning of the Commission. In June of 1972, a bill, H.R. 13694, had been reported by the committee providing for an appropriation authorization of \$6,712,000 for the Commission for fiscal year 1973—House Report No. 92-1127, 92d Congress, second session. When the bill was considered on the floor of the House on September 28, 1972, it was pointed out that the staff study was underway. Since the results of the study could have a bearing on future legislation relating to the bicentennial, the authorization for the Commission was limited to one-half of the funds requested for the fiscal year and the authorization was made effective just for the period ending February 15, 1973. This was done to give the 93d Congress the opportunity to consider legislation concerning the Commission and its operations.

The study by the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary was completed and a report was issued on December 30, 1972. The conclusions of the staff study were that the Commission had not fully accomplished its purpose and to a large degree its organization was not sufficient for its task. It was for this reason that the staff recommended the consideration of legislation providing for a reorganization. The study also considered other aspects of the Commission's activity, including its staffing procedures and the utilization of the funds provided for the Commission. The study criticized the manner in which the Commission utilized consultants and questioned certain practices concerning the selection and use of personnel and recommended that the Commission adhere to civil service procedures as required by the law and regulations. The report detailed other findings too numerous to detail here and I

would invite the attention of the Members to the report itself.

At the request of the Committee on the Judiciary the General Accounting Office also reviewed the activities of the Commission. The findings of that study support the findings and conclusions of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

In its report, the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary recommended the Congress consider amendments providing for a reorganization of the Commission. A suggested draft of a bill providing for such a reorganization was included as Appendix G on pages 130, 131, and 132 of the report. The staff recognized that the period ending February 15, 1973, would not provide sufficient time for adequate consideration of its recommended draft. It therefore recommended that there be an authorization for appropriation of the balance of the funds originally requested for fiscal year 1973 to enable the Commission to continue its operation during the period that legislation providing for a reorganization could be considered by the Congress. This bill would be consistent with that recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted in this connection that the Judiciary Committee has had referred to it an executive communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of legislation providing for an American Revolution Bicentennial Administration to replace the existing Commission and the purpose of the proposed legislation was stated to be—

To coordinate, to facilitate and to aid in the scheduling of events, activities and projects of local, State, national, and international significance sponsored by both governmental and nongovernmental entities in commemoration of the American Revolution Bicentennial.

A bill, H.R. 3695, has been introduced in accordance with that recommendation and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. It will be scheduled for prompt consideration and hearings will be held on the measure.

Therefore, the bill, H.R. 3694, provides an authorization for appropriation of funds for the period from February 16 to June 30, which is about 4½ months. There is a limit of \$3,356,000 on the amount which may be appropriated for that period and is the same figure fixed last fall for the period which ended on February 15, 1973. This period can be utilized by the Congress for a consideration of legislation providing for improvements or reorganization of the Commission that the Congress deems advisable. I urge the approval of the bill H.R. 3694 authorizing appropriations for that period.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has made clear the emergency nature of the measure before us. When the appropriation authorization for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was con-

sidered by this body last session, the funds requested were cut in half and the period covered extended only to February 15, 1973. This action was taken because an investigation by the staff of the House Committee on the Judiciary into the structure and operations of the Commission was then in progress. This investigation was originated by the former chairman of the committee because of the widespread criticism of the Commission and its operational record.

The staff investigation undertaken in September 1972 resulted in a report issued in December 1972 recommending a restructuring of the Commission to make more effective the carrying out of its responsibility to plan, coordinate and encourage projects in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution.

The Staff Report also recommended that if the proposed changes could not be effected by February 15, 1973, the Commission be authorized an additional \$3.35 million to complete its business through fiscal year 1973.

On February 5, 1973, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary introduced at the request of the executive branch the administration bill to reorganize the Commission. I introduced an identical bill on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader on February 7. This legislation will be considered by the committee as early as possible with appropriate hearings and careful analysis of the proposed structural changes for an administrator designed to coordinate and facilitate the events and activities proposed by local, State, national, and international agencies.

February 15, 1973, the date on which authorizing legislation expired, is now past. Proper authorizing legislation should be enacted without delay.

The present law committed the Federal Government to a 2-year program of grants in aid to the States, in fiscal 1972 and fiscal 1973—with \$2.4 million to be made available in each of those years. I understand the 1972 payment was made, but only half of the 1973 grants have been distributed, the other half awaiting an authorization of funds for the period commencing February 16.

Many of us in the 92d Congress were not satisfied with the performance of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. My own dissatisfaction included the grants in aid program. I anticipate a new approach in legislation which the committee will immediately undertake to consider.

In the meantime, our choice seems to be either to extend the present law to the end of this fiscal year or to bring the planning for the American Revolution bicentennial to an abrupt halt at the Federal level.

I feel that such a cessation at this time would create a most unfortunate impression throughout the world and in every one of our States. I therefore will vote for this interim extension, but in the firm conviction that before the end of this fiscal year we will have a better

structure for coordinating State and local, national and international observances of our country's bicentennial.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my colleagues the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for their role in bringing this matter before us.

Mr. Speaker, the authorization of appropriations for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and the funds appropriated in the last Congress for the operation of the Commission expired on February 15, 1973. Thus, we are faced with the necessity of enacting an interim measure to give us needed time to remedy the defects that exist in the present organization and operation of the Commission.

The bill, H.R. 3694, to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended, provides an authorization of that sum of money which had been subtracted last session and runs for 4½ months only—until the end of fiscal 1973.

You will recall that as a result of grave misgivings among the Members of Congress—and I include myself among those—concerning the organization and operation of the Commission, the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary at the end of the 92d Congress was ordered to complete a study of those operations and functions. This was done and the report was issued December of last year recommending a reorganization of the Commission.

The administration, as well, saw the need for reorganization and sent to Congress an executive communication proposing basic changes. I introduced the administration bill by request, as well as the instant interim bill. The Judiciary Committee will, I promise you, have intensive hearings on the comprehensive bill and will do so in very short order.

Therefore, it is necessary, as I have indicated, for us to bridge the time span between now and the enactment of an effective reorganization plan that has been thoroughly examined by Congress. Thus, if we act on the interim measure, we avoid the danger of doing great harm to the concept of an appropriate celebration of our Nation's 200th birthday.

For that reason, I have introduced H.R. 3694—the bill we are now considering under the suspension of the rules. This measure gives no added authorization of funds beyond the amount authorized in the 1973 budget submission. Instead, it merely authorizes the continued operation of the Commission for a period of 4½ months. I want to assure all of my colleagues again that under the circumstances the Committee on the Judiciary will give prompt and thorough consideration to permanent legislation providing for an effective reorganization of the Commission.

In the meantime, I urge that we, to-

day, adopt this needed interim measure so that we will not hastily destroy the entire concept of an observance of our Nation's 200th birthday.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 3694, which will authorize the expenditure of funds for the remainder of this fiscal year by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. As one of the four Members of this House who also sits as a member of that Commission, I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

As many of you know, this Commission has been the center of a great deal of controversy in recent months. A bill has been sent up from the White House which would reorganize the bicentennial effort. It has already received close study by those of us who represent the Congress on the Commission and we recognize certain deficiencies in this bill. I assure you that shortly, we will have the opportunity to consider a bill, here on the floor, which will reorganize the Commission, remove the stumbling blocks, and make the bicentennial effort far more responsive to the needs and desires of the people of this Nation.

However, to provide for continuity until that bill reaches the floor, we must pass the bill before us today. Last year, as a result of unfavorable publicity and general dissatisfaction with the lack of progress by the Commission, we passed their authorization bill only through February 15, 1973. At the same time, studies of the Commission were ordered by the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary and the General Accounting Office. Both of those studies are now complete and will be most helpful in determining the final structure after reorganization.

Both of those reports indicated that the ARBC has major problems. They also indicate that the ARBC has gathered an extensive body of knowledge and expertise relating to the bicentennial observance. If we do not act today to continue the authorization for the current Commission for the remainder of the current fiscal year, we will lose all that has been accomplished so far.

I have served on this Commission since September 16, 1971. On that day, I took the place of our colleague, Congressman JOHN Saylor. Since my appointment, I have been an active member of the Commission.

Many have been critical of various aspects of the bicentennial effort. I can assure you that much of the public criticism has been well deserved. The upcoming reorganization is long overdue. The current Commission has been strife-torn and problem ridden. As a member of the Commission, I am probably more aware of its problems than its critics.

At the urging of the National ARBC, every State has set up a State ARBC which looks to the National ARBC for guidance and for the \$90,000 we promised them for planning money.

But the point before us today is the

commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution. Just two centuries ago, the world witnessed a struggle unique in history. A small band of determined men raised the consciousness of their fellow colonists and threw off the oppressive yoke of royal tyranny.

The American Revolution was the forerunner of the age of democracy throughout the world. Two hundred years later, historians around the globe still point to our Revolution as the catalyst for free men everywhere.

We are now only 30 months from the start of the celebration of the bicentennial. We cannot allow all of the work that has gone into planning that celebration to be wasted. To allow the ARBC to die of financial strangulation now would all but assure that there will be no meaningful commemoration on the national level.

Let us pass this bill today, and I assure you that in the near future, we will have the opportunity to debate the plan to reorganize the bicentennial organization. That will be the proper time to work the will of the Congress on the commemoration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill before us.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address a few questions to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary who have brought this legislation to the House floor.

When were hearings held on this legislation?

Mr. DONOHUE. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield, there was a brief meeting before the subcommittee within the last week.

Mr. GROSS. When did the committee vote on this bill?

Mr. DONOHUE. In view of the fact that the full committee did not meet after the subcommittee met, in lieu thereof the full committee was polled, and a majority of the full committee assented and agreed to have this matter brought before the House.

Mr. GROSS. Was this vote conducted by telephone, or something of that sort?

Mr. DONOHUE. It was done by personal approach and by telephone.

Some were personally approached, and others were reached by telephone.

Mr. GROSS. I am not acquainted with that procedure under the rules of the House. Perhaps the gentleman could explain how one votes by personal pro tem.

Mr. DONOHUE. Thinking of the situation and the need for immediate action, it was felt that this action should be taken. It was felt that it was a unique situation, and that is why we placed the matter on the suspension calendar.

Mr. GROSS. The facts of the case are that there were no hearings on this extension. The committee did not formally vote on this legislation that is before the House to expend another \$3½ million of the taxpayers' money on what appears to

be something of a losing cause. The fact is that there are no printed hearings in connection with the bill. This is, I would say to the gentleman, a fitting introduction of the new rule that was adopted in January which makes Tuesdays additional days for the consideration of legislation under suspension of the rules. Yes; this is a fitting introduction, I would say to the gentleman and to the distinguished Speaker of the House, for the new rule under which even more legislation can be considered and approved without proper committee consideration.

Mr. DONOHUE. I would suggest to the gentleman that, time being of the essence, it is an unusual situation. That is why we took the unusual course to bring it to the floor of the House so that the House could work its will.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman and to the distinguished Speaker that that apparently was the reason for the adoption of additional days for consideration of bills under suspension of the rules—the probable increase of unusual situations in the 93d Congress.

Now it is proposed to expend \$3½ million, even though the committee staff has produced certain recommendations, of which we are unaware here today. Even though they have produced certain recommendations which have not been acted upon, we are asked to authorize the spending of \$3½ million in a period of 4 months, which is the other half of a total annual appropriation of \$6,712,000. Is that not correct?

Mr. DONOHUE. That was the original request.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and so we are going to spend—in the 4 months of what remains of this fiscal year, or will remain by the time this bill is signed by the President—as much as we would have spent in 6 months, or half of the total appropriation of \$6,712,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The gentleman's proportions are right, but the reason we must spend more money is that we must pay to each State the second payment of \$45,000. That is the sum which equals \$1,200,000, and that is why the proportions of the money spent during the first 8 months—almost 8 months of this fiscal year—are not as great as the money we are going to spend in the last 4 months of this fiscal year.

I also want to say that I have read the report produced by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I have also read the report of the General Accounting Committee. What they are recommending is exactly what we do here, and in the remaining 4 months of this fiscal year we may increase the ARBC drastically so that we can make the progress we must make so that we can have the proper celebration.

Mr. GROSS. I believe that the gentleman made that statement in the well of the House a few minutes ago.

May I ask the gentleman this question: How much has been expended by this Bicentennial Commission up to this point? The gentleman is a member of the Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This gentleman is a member of the Commission as of September 16, 1971. I would say in all probability something like \$8 million or \$10 million has been expended, in that area.

Mr. GROSS. I am not interested in an area. I want to know what the total expenditure of the Bicentennial Commission has been since 1966 when this outfit was first authorized?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts if the gentleman can shed some light on that question.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 there was appropriated \$150,000.

Mr. GROSS. Just give me the total figure.

Mr. DONOHUE. It is \$7,165,000, and it is my understanding that includes the money paid to the States.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman think of anything that has delivered less for that amount of money, unless it be the foreign give-away programs?

Mr. DONOHUE. I would say the gentleman from Pennsylvania, being a member of the Commission, would be more conversant with their accomplishments and achievements than I.

Mr. GROSS. The Judiciary Committee has not made available its recommendations and I have not seen the report of the staff study of the Judiciary Committee, and I would like to see that before I am called upon to vote for another \$3.5 million for this outfit.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLOY).

Mr. McCLOY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. While this measure comes to the floor of the House in a rather hurried way, our recesses and organizational meetings and things like that serve to account for the fact that we have been prevented from the opportunity to hold hearings up to this time. This bill represents sort of interim legislation which is going to carry us through until June 30.

I cannot think of any legislation which is more important for stimulating and encouraging faith and confidence in our Nation and renewing the spirit of America than is provided by this legislation. It is too early to gauge the benefits of the Bicentennial Commission. These will be experienced in later weeks and in later years throughout the Nation as the various State and local activities are developed. The urgency of this legislation and the appropriation which will follow are vital in providing for the appropriate commemoration of our Bicentennial and for developing the many celebrations we hope to witness throughout this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an overwhelming

vote in support of this bill (H.R. 3694).

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to complete my answer to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). Since this Bicentennial Commission was started in 1966 and through 1972, a total of \$4,852,500 has been appropriated. Donated funds have equaled \$41,392, and with revenues from what is known as philatelic and numismatic combinations, the combination of stamps and coins has yielded revenue of \$1,204,500. So all the expenditures, including the revenues, come out to \$6,098,392.

I could name the gentleman many programs that have produced virtually nothing for a sum of money like that.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain briefly my reasons for voting against this bill.

I am, of course, very much in favor of celebrating the 200th anniversary of our great Nation. I see it as a time to look back to our beginnings, and from them to refresh our understanding of just what this country is all about.

Unfortunately, the Bicentennial Commission does not quite see it that way. Their record has been one of orientation almost totally toward corporate institutions and corporate projects. In addition, their partisanship in terms of hiring and other policies has sullied what should be a proud celebration for all Americans. Their attention to the role of minorities and women has been too little and too late, and I cannot vote to give them any more money until I see a marked change in the way they run their operation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3694.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 286, nays 72, answered present 1, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]		
YEAS—286		
Abdnor	Bray	Butler
Adams	Breaux	Byron
Addabbo	Breckinridge	Carney, Ohio
Andrews, N.C.	Brinkley	Carter
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brooks	Casey, Tex.
Annunzio	Broomfield	Cederberg
Archer	Brotzman	Chamberlain
Armstrong	Brown, Calif.	Chappell
Baker	Brown, Ohio	Clancy
Barrett	Broyhill, N.C.	Clausen,
Bennett	Broyhill, Va.	Don H.
Bergland	Buchanan	Claeson, Del.
Biesler	Burgess	Cleveland
Blackburn	Burke, Fla.	Cochran
Boland	Burke, Mass.	Cohen
Bowen	Burleson, Tex.	Collier
Brasco	Burlison, Mo.	Conable
	Burton	Conte

Corman Hunt Rangel
 Cotter Hutchinson Reid
 Coughlin Ichord Rhodes
 Culver Jarman Riegle
 Daniel, Robert Johnson, Calif. Rinaldo
 W., Jr. Johnson, Pa. Robinson, Va.
 Daniel (Dan) Jones, N.C. Robison, N.Y.
 Daniels, Karth Rodino
 Dominick V. Kastenmeier Roe
 Danielson Kazen Rogers
 de la Garza Keating Roncallo, N.Y.
 Dellenback Kemp Rooney, Pa.
 Denholm Kluczynski Rose
 Dent Kuykendall Rosenthal
 Derwinski Kyros Roush
 Devine Landrum Roybal
 Dingell Latta Runnels
 Donohue Litton Ruth
 Downing Long, La. Sandman
 Drinan Lott Sarasin
 Dulski Lujan Satterfield
 Duncan McClory Sailor
 du Pont McCloskey Schneebeli
 Eckhardt McCormack Sebelius
 Edwards, Ala. McDade Seiberling
 Edwards, Calif. McFall Shoup
 Ellberg McKinney Shriner
 Erlenborn Madden Sisk
 Esch Madigan Slack
 Eshleman Mahon Smith, Iowa
 Evans, Colo. Mallary Staggers
 Fascell Maraziti Stanton, J. William
 Findley Martin, Nebr. Stanton, James V.
 Fish Martin, N.C. Mathias, Calif.
 Fisher Mathis, Ga.
 Flood Mathis, James V.
 Flowers Matsunaga Steelman
 Ford, Gerald R. Mayne Steiger, Wis.
 Forsythe Mazzoli Stratton
 Fountain Meeds Stubblefield
 Fraser Melcher Stuckey
 Frelinghuysen Metcalfe Studs
 Frenzel Mezvinsky Sullivan
 Frey Michel Symington
 Fulton Milford Talcott
 Fuqua Mills, Md. Taylor, N.C.
 Gaimo Mink Thompson, N.J.
 Gibbons Mizell Thome
 Ginn Moakley Thornton
 Gonzalez Moilhan Tierman
 Goodling Montgomery Towell, Nev.
 Grasso Moorhead, Pa. Treen
 Gray Morgan Udall
 Green, Oreg. Mosher Ullman
 Green, Pa. Moss Veysey
 Griffiths Murphy, N.Y. Vigorito
 Gubser Natcher Waggoner
 Gude Nedzi Walsh
 Guyer Nelsen Wampler
 Haley Nix Whalen
 Hamilton Obey White
 Hammer- O'Neill Whitehurst
 Schmidt schmidt Parris Whitten
 Hanley Passman Widman
 Hanna Patman Wiggins
 Hansen, Wash. Patten Williams
 Harrington Pepper Wilson, Bob
 Harsha Perkins Winn
 Hastings Pettis Wolff
 Hays Peyser Wright
 Heinz Pickle Wydier
 Heistoski Pike Wylie
 Henderson Poage Wyman
 Hicks Podell Young, Fla.
 Hillis Preyer Young, Ill.
 Holifield Price, Ill.
 Holtzman Quile Young, Tex.
 Horton Quillen Zablocki
 Howard Railback Zion
 Hungate Randall Zwach

NAYS—72

Abzug Flynt McSpadden
 Alexander Froehlich Miller
 Anderson, Calif. Gaydos Mitchell, Md.
 Aspin Gilman Moorhead,
 Badillo Gunter Calif.
 Bafalis Hawkins Nichols
 Beard Hechler, W. Va. O'Brien
 Bevill Hinshaw O'Hara
 Brademas Holt Owens
 Camp Huber Powell, Ohio
 Clay Jones, Okla. Pritchard
 Collins Jones, Tenn. Rarick
 Conlan Ketchum Regula
 Conyers Landgrebe Reuss
 Crane Leggett Roberts
 Davis, Wis. Lehman Roncallo, Wyo.
 Dickinson Long, Md. Rousselot
 Diggs McCollister Ryan
 Sarbanes

Scherle Stokes Wilson,
 Schroeder Symms Charles H.,
 Shipley Taylor, Mo. Calif.
 Shuster Teague, Calif. Yates
 Snyder Van Deerlin Young, Ga.
 Stark Walde

ANSWERED PRESENT—1

Thomson, Wis.

NOT VOTING—72

Anderson, III. Gettys Mitchell, N.Y.
 Arends Goldwater Murphy, Ill.
 Ashbrook Grover Myers
 Ashley Hanrahan Price, Tex.
 Bell Hansen, Idaho Rees
 Blaggi Harvey Rooney, N.Y.
 Bingham Hébert Rostenkowski
 Blatnik Heckler, Mass. Roy
 Bolling Hogan Ruppe
 Brown, Mich. Hosmer St Germain
 Burke, Calif. Hudnut Sikes
 Carey, N.Y. Johnson, Colo. Smith, N.Y.
 Chisholm Jones, Ala. Spence
 Clark Jordan Steed
 Cronin King Steele
 Davis, Ga. Koch Stephens
 Davis, S.C. Lent Teague, Tex.
 Delaney McEwen Vander Jagt
 Dellums McKay Ware
 Dennis Macdonald Wilson,
 Dorn Mailliard Charles, Tex.
 Evins, Tenn. Mann Wyatt
 Foley Mills, Ark. Yatron
 Ford, Minish Young, S.C.
 William D. Minshall, Ohio

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. King.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. William D. Ford.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hogan.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Minish with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Koch with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Dennis.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Lent.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Cronin.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Hudnut.
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Roy with Mr. Hanrahan.
 Mr. St Germain with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Johnson of Colorado.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Dellums with Mr. Foley.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Myers.

Mr. McKay with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Mitchell of New York.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Spence.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
 Mr. Mills or Arkansas with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Ware.
 Mr. Young of South Carolina with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mrs. Burke of California with Miss Jordan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that on tomorrow we plan to call up House Joint Resolution 345 making continuing appropriations for Labor-HEW and for foreign assistance, which would otherwise expire on February 28. It is a straight continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this time to announce that we will call up tomorrow H.R. 1975, an amendment to the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, subject to a rule being granted today. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has received unanimous consent to have the bill reported.

Also, subject to rules being granted, we will consider House Resolution 182, travel and investigative authority for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; House Resolution 185, travel and investigative authority for the Armed Services Committee; and House Resolution 187, travel and investigative authority for the Merchant Marine Committee. I understand the provisions of these three resolutions are identical to last year.

As announced yesterday, we are postponing consideration of H.R. 3577, the interest equalization tax extension, at the request of the chairman. It will not come up this week.

That will be scheduled for next week. Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the anticipation that this program that has just been announced will be concluded on Wednesday and there will be no business on Thursday?

Mr. O'NEILL. At the present time it is our expectation that if we conclude the business on tomorrow, then there will be a pro forma session on Thursday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 19 today, I was unavoidably detained

concerning business in my district. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was walking in the Chamber as the Speaker was announcing the vote on the last rollcall. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

WHERE IS THE GRAND STRATEGY FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE?

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the devaluation of the dollar accomplished last week is medicine we were forced to take and unfortunately is medicine which reduces the headache, but does not address itself to the basic illness. The weakness of the dollar derives from the absence of a basic, meaningful reform of the international monetary system which would take the stress off the dollar and which would call for timely adjustments both up and down of all currencies within the system. This would allow disposition in an orderly way of the excess in the \$55 to \$60 billion overhang in the world and would give minimum opportunity for speculative attacks against the various currencies. Unilaterally, we can only press strongly and urgently for all other nations in the IMF to join in this immediately required task.

The second weakness of our currency derives not so much from inflation, about which we hear so much, but from the lack of an energetic and effective program for international trade. Here is a place where unilateral effort is all that is available and therefore our administration should be very active in addressing itself to all phases of this problem. Mr. Speaker, I should like to describe some things not now being done which should very soon be accomplished. First: I am constrained to agree with David Steinberg, Director of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, who was quoted in the *Journal of Commerce* as saying that—

President Nixon lacks a game plan to move the nation down the hazardous playing field of foreign economic policy toward an open world economy.

He suggested that what is needed is a dramatic free-trade strategy of the scope and size of the Marshall plan with an all-out Presidential commitment. In all of this I agree.

Second. I am sure that the supereconomic Cabinet headed by Secretary of Treasury Shultz, and made up of Secretary of State Rogers, Federal Reserve Chairman Burns, White House Economic Advisor Stein, and Presidential Advisor Flanigan, is primarily crisis oriented and has not worked directly and closely with President Nixon on devising and describing an overall plan and strategy for our country.

Third. Internally we must have an effective and massive program that dramatically addresses adjustment and con-

version in those sectors of our domestic economy which are adversely affected by our free-trade posture. This is the only viable and intelligent alternative to quotas, surcharges, and selective tariffs. In the final analysis, each of the latter are inconsistent with free and open trade.

The obvious conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that we must have articulated from either the President or the Congress our bifurcated aims in a total international trade strategy that makes clear and strong our position on monetary reform and at the same time expresses with equal clarity a position domestically which energizes and supports further trade efforts from our domestic producers. In this latter regard, we must give incentives and provide expanding and effective financing. While we have surpassed the efforts of our competitors in controlling our domestic inflation, our efforts in the area of international trade remain disturbingly weak. Extracting the aircraft and military components from our present trade effort would leave us with less than 2 percent of our GNP in international trade. This is not acceptable, and with the immediate present this picture must radically change. Only this will solve the basic problem. Here, Mr. Speaker and members, lies the core of our dollar problem.

Simply put, the United States must demonstrate an aggressive showing of goods and services attractive and competitive in foreign markets; then dollars held by others will begin to have attraction and value. Link this with absorption of some overhang; and the setting of new IMF reserve alternatives, and we can begin to recapture the healthy and desirable monetary conditions we experienced after World War II.

SENATE CONFIRMATION OF OMB OFFICIALS

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to require Senate confirmation of the Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. This bill is identical to the one that recently passed the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of Congress share my deep concern over the manner in which the Office of Management and Budget has conducted its affairs during the last few years. In the name of efficiency and proper management, the President, through unelected officials at OMB, has effectively taken away from Congress the power of final decision of the Nation's priorities.

Determining this Nation's priorities is the function of the Congress and the President working with each other under the constitutional declaration that these are two coequal branches of Government. However, for many years, the President, through the Office of Manage-

ment and Budget, has acted as the superior and final, sole word in this area, and the Congress has been merely a protesting appendage to the Office of the President.

As a consequence, the true decision-maker in this Government has not been the 535 elected Members of the Congress and the President, but the President alone, acting through the unelected, unreviewed bureaucracy of OMB.

Now, it may be true that the Congress has not properly organized itself, that we are slow, that we are inefficient, that we are, as the bureaucratic parlance of OMB might have it, "not optimally cost effective." Yet I dare say that any sixth-grade civics student ought to know, and certainly the President and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget ought to know, that what is efficient, what is cost effective and what is quick may not be legal. Strong executives may make the trains run on time, but they cannot begin to match the efficient vision of the Founding Fathers in terms of freedom and popular sovereignty.

We have seen whole programs "terminated" by the Office of Management and Budget, in order to meet the policy priorities of the President. But these are not just "programs," these are actions required by law to carry out the ideas legislated by the Congress of the United States. We have the new Director of the Office of Management and Budget claiming that the President has the power to terminate programs which he claims to be unwise or imprudent, that the President has the responsibility, if not the authority, to pick and choose among the programs voted by Congress. In sum, we have the President and OMB claiming that the sum total of congressional appropriations are merely a set of tools handed over to the President to fashion his program according to his own set of priorities.

But who is OMB to decide whether Congress has acted "wisely" or "prudently"? Where in the Constitution or the laws of the United States does OMB or the President find the authority to wield, in effect, an item veto over the programs and funds voted on by the Congress?

Mr. Speaker, in 1969, the then Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, the "Department's lawyer," stated in a memorandum to a White House aide:

With respect to the suggestion that the President has a constitutional power to decline to spend appropriated funds, we must conclude that existence of such a broad power is supported by neither reason nor precedent.

Now the Nixon administration disavows that statement and that conclusion. Should it not be noted that it was made by the Honorable William H. Rehnquist, now an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court? During the recent hearings of the House Appropriations Committee, both Treasury Secretary George Shultz and OMB Director Roy Ash declined to answer inquiries as to the legal authority of the Executive to terminate

entire congressionally mandated programs. Each declined on the basis that he was not an attorney. Does this mean that the officials in the Nixon administration who have acted to terminate entire governmental programs acted without regard to whether they had the legal authority to do so? I should hope not, and I think not. Rather, I think they acted less out of ignorance of their legal powers and more out of defiance of the Congress to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, this is neither the time nor the place for a full discussion of whether the Antideficiency Act and other legislation permits the President to impound funds to achieve his own policy goals. However, I do commend to the attention of my fellow members of the House the recent statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States. After discussing the limited authorization of impoundments by subsection (c) (2) of the Antideficiency Act, Mr. Staats told the subcommittee:

We are not aware of any specific authority which authorizes the President to withhold funds for general economic, fiscal, or policy reasons.

As to the administration's arguments that the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 or debt ceiling laws justify withholding of funds, Mr. Staats laid that argument to rest by stating that—

There is nothing explicit in those laws which authorize (sic) the President to go beyond the Antideficiency Act in accomplishing the objectives of these acts.

Furthermore, the doctrine of constitutional law prohibiting unduly broad and vague delegations of power by the Congress to the Executive militates against an excessively expansive reading of those two laws so heavily relied on by the administration to carry on its impounding activities.

We are a Federal Government of limited powers. Surely a sensitive reading of the Constitution and an understanding of the positive virtues of a balance of power between coequal branches leads me to the conclusion that the President has greatly overstepped his ground.

In view of the need to restore that balance, the bill which I am introducing would subject the two leading officials of the Office of Management and Budget to Senate confirmation. I hope that the Congress will pass this bill with efficiency, with optimal efficiency. Article II, section 2 states a presumption in favor of Senate confirmation of the President's agents. This subjects the President's officers to the proper influence of the Congress, to insure that each of these officers knows that while appointed by the President, he must also faithfully execute the laws passed by the Congress. Senate confirmation is often a routine matter, but occasionally it serves as an opportunity to impress upon a nominee the fact that, while the nominee will serve the President, ultimately he serves a higher master, the laws and the Constitution of the United States.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, again this year I take pride in being able to join with my colleagues in commemorating the independence of once-free Lithuania.

It is with pride beyond all measure that we in this country are able to stand as free men in this great public forum and speak without fear of rebuke or retaliation. This pride is mixed with sorrow when we remember that so many friends and families of American citizens behind the Iron Curtain do not share this great privilege with us.

On this 55th anniversary date, I should like to recall two aspects of Lithuanian relative to this commemoration, namely, free Lithuania, and Lithuanians in my own State of Pennsylvania.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people broke a long period of Soviet domination—1795–1915—followed by a short period of German domination, and declared themselves an independent nation.

Just 21 short years later the Lithuanian people were again brought under Russian domination, and on August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union—a cruel joke this country has never recognized.

Briefly occupied by the Nazi troops during World War II, the Soviets reoccupied the little country in 1944 with the help of the Red army, and to this day the Lithuanian Republic is a ward of the Kremlin colonists.

World War I cost the Lithuanian people a great deal for in 1915 they traded Russian oppression for German persecution. The Russians were finally gone, but the Lithuanian people were not free. However, within 2 years two events, as important as any in this century, led to the eventual and long-awaited freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people: The Russian Revolution and the defeat of Kaiser Germany.

With independence on the horizon 200 Lithuanian delegates formed a congress laying the groundwork for an independent Lithuania based on ethnological frontiers. Finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared itself an independent nation in the family of independent nations.

As we all know, a declaration of any kind does not establish a condition in fact. For example, our own American Declaration of Independence was made in 1776, but we were not free from the British until the War for Independence ended in 1783, and we did not become the country we know today until 1789.

Before the first year of independence had run its course, the German army left the country, and immediately on their heels, the Soviet army reentered the country. There obviously is more to being independent than merely saying so, for it was not until the following year the

Russian Red army was forced out of the country under the leadership of the Polish Army.

Besieged with problems at home and with that infinite patience that Communist governments seem to have, Russia decided to sign a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920.

We know that Russia made a sham of that treaty within 20 years, but we did not know the extent of that deception until we realize exactly what the treaty included. That treaty made it clear that the Soviet Union recognized "without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania," and "voluntarily and forever renounced" all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. That would have been a treaty of splendor and hope if only the Russians had not intended it to be a farce and the most degenerate of jokes.

Following the treaty of peace with Russia, the struggling, newly independent nation immediately had a dispute of long standing with Poland on its hands involving the fate of Vilnius, the designated capital of Lithuania. When the issue reached the League of Nations, the city of Vilnius was awarded to Poland due mainly to the fact that Poles were in the majority of the city's population. This dispute wrecked Lithuanian-Polish relations until 1938.

Lithuania, which was recognized by the United States on May 31, 1921, joined the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, and thus began Lithuania's brave attempt as a free and equal independent nation in the world community.

As is the case with all new states who are not prepared by their colonial masters to assume self-government, there was some internal disruption and political discord. However, one cannot discount the great advances the country made during its brief tenure of independence in industrialization, farming and agriculture, social legislation, and in cultural pursuits. While the country struggled with itself, it did so with a dignity of which we can all be proud.

When war again engulfed Europe, little Lithuania was squeezed by both Germany and Russia, and during that conflict, was occupied by both countries, suffering terrible human and material losses. Since the end of World War II, Lithuania has been a colony of the Soviet Union.

I am especially proud, Mr. Speaker, that so many of these fine and brave people who have left Lithuania for one reason or another to come to the United States, have elected to settle in my own State of Pennsylvania and particularly in my congressional district in the northeastern part of the State.

In the last century coal mining and railroad employment drew many to Pennsylvania as well as to the steel centers around Pittsburgh and the great oil regions in the Alleghenies in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Today we find many Lithuanians and their descendants living in Wilkes-Barre and the Wyoming Valley, Scranton,

Shenandoah, Mahanoy City, Pottsville, Shamokin, Mount Carmel, and many other communities in my section of the State. They have made great and important contributions to their respective communities and have bravely and patriotically served our Nation during the periods of its greatest peril.

I deeply and sincerely wish along with these Americans that some day in the near future Lithuania will once again have the opportunity to govern its own affairs and destiny with dignity and human justice.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a resolution from representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of Luzerne County in Wilkes-Barre:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the 55th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuania's Independence, we representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of Luzerne County, assembled here on the 11th day of February 1973, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. to Commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence proclaimed on February 16, 1918, in Vilnius whereby a sovereign Lithuania State was restored; to:

Honor, The memory of the generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters and partisans who fought to defend Lithuanian national aspirations and values against foreign oppressors; and

Whereas, Once again we emphasize our confidence that, regardless of what methods the Soviet oppressors devise, they will in the end, be unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian peoples for freedom and the exercise of their human rights. These hopes were made most evident in the successful hijacking of a Soviet aircraft to Turkey by Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, as well as in Simas Kudirka's heroic attempt at defection and Roman Kalanta's immolation;

Whereas, We do hereby protest Soviet Russian aggression and perpetration of crimes in occupied Lithuania such as; the persecution of the faithful, the restriction of religious practices such as the persecution and imprisonment of Priests that teach children religion and the closing of the houses of worship . . . the distortion of Lithuanian culture by efforts at incorporating it into Soviet Russian culture and the continuous denial of creative freedom; murder and deportation of Lithuanian citizens to slave and concentration labor camps in Siberia; and therefore be it;

Resolved, That Soviet Russia immediately withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian nation to freely exercise sovereign rights to self-determination, and therefore be it;

Resolved, That our Senators, Congressmen and our Government of the United States raise the issue of Lithuania in the United Nations and at various international conferences, as well as to support our just requests for the condemnation of Soviet aggression against Lithuania and the Baltic States; therefore be it

Resolved, That President Richard Nixon, of these United States, once again publicly reiterate long standing United States position of the nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues as well as all Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent in commemorating the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania.

It is unfortunate that only in Lithuania itself will Lithuanians be unable to observe this historical event, because of the continuing domination of that country by the Soviet Union. However the hopes and aspirations of these people have not been diminished as evidenced by their continuing defiance of the Soviet regime.

As citizens of a country that was founded on the principle of independence, Americans share the fervent desire of Lithuanians that someday religious and political freedom may become a reality.

We express the hope that the forthcoming European Security Conference will act in recognizing the right of Lithuania and other Baltic peoples to freedom and self-determination.

Conflict may cease throughout the world, but peace will only occur when every individual is allowed to practice the freedoms that we Americans have come to know as inalienable rights.

We must never come to think of peace as being merely the absence of war. The Lithuanians have known what it means to be independent and free and are now risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of their oppressors.

It has been 32 years since Lithuanians last enjoyed freedom and independence. For 6 weeks in 1941 they were able to free themselves from the Communist regime. Though we have never known the loss of our freedom, a large number of those in Lithuania have never known the realization of theirs.

America stands proud of its citizens of Lithuanian descent and their cultural contributions to the American way of life.

It is with great honor that Americans commemorate this anniversary and we join with all Lithuanians in the hope that their rights may soon be restored.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who hold the ideals of freedom and protection of human rights most dear, February 16 holds a special place. For on that momentous day, 55 years ago, the independent nation of Lithuania was created.

Little known to history, Lithuanian heritage traces back to the 11th century when some neighboring principalities united into a common state. In 1253 a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas first king of a united Lithuania. Mindaugas was a good, charismatic man. He began a tradition the Lithuanian people cherish, that of noble leaders who have strived to forge Lithuania into a strong, progressive nation. Vytautas the Great stood out in the Middle Ages. He strengthened both Christianity and Lithuania's ties with western Europe. Clarence Manning very eloquently describes Lithuania's role in the Middle Ages.

They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedom than in neighboring countries. They encouraged educa-

tion and toleration and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

Time and time again, foreign powers attempted to replace Lithuanian language and culture but each time the Lithuanian people remained faithful. World War I was cruel to Lithuania. However, German defeat, coupled with the revolution in Russia rendered favorable conditions for Lithuania to proclaim the independence they had so longed for.

Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, and was a model member, continually striving for peace and understanding in all parts of the world.

Domestically, Lithuania exhibited all the traits of a free and progressive society. A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922, and it accorded to all citizens the basic human freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. The power of legislation was vested in the Seimas and the executive authority in the President and Cabinet of Ministers. Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania and proceeded to chart a course of great social reform for his homeland. A land reform program was enacted, to revitalize Lithuania's primary occupation, agriculture. Industrialization progressed and a fine school system was established. The tremendous pride of the Lithuanians was also pronounced in great pieces of literature. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of Lithuania and great achievements were made in opera and music.

All this wonderful development came to a tragic halt during World War II. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania suffered terribly and emerged under the tyrannical control of the Soviet Union. All freedoms were abolished, fear replaced happiness as the prevailing mood of the country. But Mr. Speaker, it is truly a tribute to the tremendous spirit of the Lithuanian people that in spite of the despotic rule by the Soviets, they have never resigned themselves to Communist domination.

On this Lithuanian Independence Day we rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom for all men. The illegal annexation of Lithuania, suppression of all human rights and self-determination by the Soviet Union, will, in the end, fail. For the cause of the Lithuanian people is a just one. The pages of history are filled with the triumphs of captive peoples shaking off the shackles of oppression and reaching the daylight of freedom. The Lithuanian people will be free once again someday. In just a short time the European Security Conference will devote its attention to the plight of Lithuania and the other Baltic States. Hopefully, constructive formulas will emanate from this conference and the first steps will be taken toward reaching a new and lasting freedom for all captive peoples. But these steps will never be taken if we here in the United States do not reaffirm our dedication to the cause of liberty. The yoke of oppression cannot be worn long, and will not be worn long, for the

ideals of freedom and human dignity will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I salute today Mr. Joseph Kajeckis, head of the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, and Lithuanian people around the world. For the Soviet Union will not achieve its goal. The people of Lithuania have too much spirit, too much undying faith in their national destiny. It is small condolence I am sure, but on this Lithuanian Independence Day we can be sure that independence still lives in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians everywhere. And where there is life, there is hope. And where there is hope, there is destiny.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to join my respected colleague, Congressman DAN FLOOR, in commemorating the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuania lost its independence in 1940 when Soviet military forces occupied the country and it was a battleground throughout World War II, first occupied by the Nazis and then again by Communist forces.

Well over a million people of Lithuanian background live in the United States, approximately 200,000 of them in Illinois. Many of them came to America after their native land had been seized by the Soviet Union. Thousands of others fled from Lithuania to other lands and still other thousands have been sent to Siberia and elsewhere by the tyrants in the Kremlin.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of migration, deportations, and repopulation from other sections of the Soviet Union, over half of the people now living in Lithuania are unable to speak Lithuanian. What makes this so tragic is that Lithuanian is the oldest living language in all Europe. May I emphasize the point that this Russification program is continuing, and is one of the most diabolical forms of long-term genocide now in active practice.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege Sunday to participate in the annual Lithuanian Independence Day program sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council which was held at Maria High School in Chicago. The unquenchable spirit of the Lithuanian people is such that I am confident that the day will come when this brave nation and its steadfast people will once again enjoy the independence which they so richly deserve.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16, Lithuanians in America and throughout the world observe the occasion of Lithuania's independence—a condition that no longer exists today.

The history of Lithuania has been one of growth, development, oppression, independence, and finally domination. For many centuries Lithuania was part of the most powerful kingdom in the whole of eastern Europe. In the late 16th century this kingdom was united with that of the Poles and the union lasted more than 200 years. However, at the end of the 18th century, Poland was partitioned and ceased to exist. Lithuania sharing a similar fate, became part of the Russian Empire.

For more than 100 years the Lithuanians battled czarist oppression and worked steadfastly to keep their national spirit alive. Their faith and work were rewarded when on February 16, 1918, the birth of the Lithuanian Republic was proclaimed.

The Lithuanian Republic flourished both economically and culturally for over two decades until the dark shadows of the approaching war between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union foreshadowed the fall of the Lithuanian independence. The Soviets occupied the territory and in July of 1940 Lithuania was dissolved into the Soviet Union.

The tragedy of this nation was a page in history—not the prologue of the Communist doctrine. The body of man can be held in bondage but his spirit is immune to the chains that enslave his body—awkward in oppression, graceful in freedom.

Let us today reassure these physically bonded members of the family of man that we in America and the free world are enslaved when one member is denied the freedom of expression, of hope, of peace. Let us hope that one day the Lithuanians will again join the ranks of the free.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Lithuania was established on February 16, 1918. This is a fitting time to renew our support and encouragement to the people of Lithuania and to Americans of Lithuanian descent. We owe so much to these courageous people. Their heroic stand against oppression by Communist forces should be an example to all Americans. We must not betray their goals and hopes. I would like to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in extending my greetings to this nation as they commemorate the independence of a people whose courage and contributions to the betterment of our world should never be forgotten.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 55th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. It is appropriate that we, as individuals who cherish the blessings of liberty, should pay tribute to a people who have never wavered in their devotion to the cause of liberty for their country. Our observance of this anniversary is much more than the marking of an historic event in the history of nations; it is a recognition of the courageous resolve with which the people of that country have steadfastly maintained their love of freedom.

Lithuania was declared an independent nation on February 16, 1918, and in the short 22 years that it enjoyed independence the country made great progress. However, the enjoyment of liberty was brutally cut off in 1940, when the Soviet Union forcefully annexed that Republic with its Union of Socialist Republics, an incorporation which has never been recognized by the United States. While we deeply sympathize with the people of Lithuania for being crudely enshamed in the harsh yoke of communism, we re-

joice that their physical bondage has failed to break their constant hope for sovereignty and individual freedom.

On this occasion, we should reaffirm our commitment to those Baltic nations still struggling for independence. The eventual freedom and independence of Lithuania, as well as Estonia and Latvia, must be an objective of freedom loving people throughout the world. There are about 1 million Americans of Lithuania descent, including many in my own State of Michigan. I join these Americans in their hopes and prayers for the early restoration of freedom and independence for Lithuania.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to be able to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 55th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

For over 700 years, the brave people of Lithuania have suffered under foreign oppression. They have felt the wrath of the czars as well as Stalin and Hitler. During the two World Wars, Lithuania was overrun by armies of both Germany and the Soviet Union.

In 1922, the people of newly independent Lithuania adopted a permanent constitution which guaranteed freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. During its brief period of independence, Lithuania made enormous progress, not only in agriculture and industry but also in education and social legislation.

With the Second World War came an end to Lithuania's cherished independence, when it once again fell under Soviet domination. Today, 33 years later, it is still being deprived of independence.

I salute the courageous people of Lithuania who know the value of freedom that we often take for granted. I join them in the hope that they may soon again enjoy that freedom.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania. What should be a happy time, a time for celebration and thankfulness, is a time for reflection, looking back on 33 years of Soviet oppression.

But even with this intrusion on their independence, the Lithuanians who were not fortunate enough to escape this tragic fate, still maintain a great faith, a great pride and a great sense of nationalism which has fared so well for them for more than 700 years. They live with a confidence almost unparalleled anywhere on this earth of ours, that some day their great country will once again revel in its independence.

The struggle continues. Both here in our country where over 1 million Lithuanians have found, as have so many before them, a free way of life, and in their homeland, a subtle and at times a not so subtle protest goes on.

As we approach our 200th year of independence, we should not forget the peoples of the world who have no reason to rejoice. We should reaffirm our commitment to them, and to cause of freedom for people everywhere. A commitment America cannot afford to ignore.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, February always is a very special month for Americans as we honor the memory of two of our greatest leaders—Washington and Lincoln. The liberty and freedom which are synonymous with their names has taken on a more special meaning this month as our prisoners of war begin returning home from Southeast Asia.

So, it is with a sense of sadness and sympathy, that we recognize that Americans of Lithuanian descent—and Lithuanians almost everywhere except in Lithuania itself—have marked the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence for Lithuania with the knowledge that the country is not free. February 16, 1973, commemorated the establishment of the modern Lithuanian Republic and the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State.

That Lithuania today is not free is a tragedy of immense proportions. For, if ever there were a people who yearned and deserved to be free, it is the Lithuanians. The spirit of freedom is not easily subdued as the Soviet Union has come to know in the years since 1940 when Lithuania and two sister nations were forcibly annexed.

The smoldering fires of freedom in Lithuania erupt periodically into world headlines. The most recent and forceful expression of the Lithuanian people followed the self-immolation of a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, who was protesting Soviet subjugation of his country and people.

The riots of last May effectively reminded the Soviet Government of the true feelings of the Lithuanian people. Some 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics petitioned Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations for protection of their human rights.

The spirit of liberty, exemplified by the Lithuanian people, is evident to those who have traveled or had experiences with countries in the Soviet bloc. I remember vividly my visit to the infamous Berlin wall and the stories of the lengths to which people would go in trying to escape to the West. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia demonstrated the depth of the Communist commitment to impose complete control on any nation harboring illusions of achieving a degree of freedom.

The efforts of the Lithuanian-American Council and the Lithuanian-American community of the United States of America in calling attention to the continuing plight of Lithuania are commendable. They make us remember that there are peoples throughout the world who do not enjoy any freedom that we so easily take for granted. And they make us remember that unless we exercise the eternal vigilance so necessary to preserving liberty, that we risk a loss in the value of our freedom.

I would hope that some day—some day not too distant—that we may not have to speak in Congress of the loss of liberty by the Lithuanian people. Instead, we will speak of Lithuania's new-found freedom and how well the fight was fought for that freedom. Until that day, we all owe a debt to the Lithuanian peo-

ple for reminding us—through their story—of how precious is freedom and how costly is the loss of that freedom.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence on February 16 again reminds us of the pursuit of independence not realized in Lithuania for more than 30 years. It is a day of sadness and rededication for Lithuanian Americans and friends of Lithuanians throughout the world who together renew the hope that Lithuania may again be freed from Soviet oppression. As we pause to mark this anniversary, we recognize also the large contribution of the more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent to the development of the United States and the preservation of its ideals of freedom and liberty. But let us never forget the continuing struggle of the Lithuanian people for the fundamental human liberties long suppressed by harsh Soviet domination.

Because the Baltic people have not willingly accepted the domination of the Soviet Union, they have been removed from their homeland in an effort to destroy their unity and identity. More than one-fourth of the population has been moved, with many hardships in the process. In spite of unreasonable and continuing hardships, Lithuanians have kept alive the struggle against suppression of their independence and religious and political freedoms and have long been an example of the pursuit of liberty and world peace.

We condemn the Soviet suppression of such fundamental rights as repugnant to the principles of free world nations. The United States has consistently refused to sanction the forcible occupation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors. While denying official recognition, the United States has insisted on self-determination as the keystone of U.S. foreign policy. I continue to support that policy for Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors. To further the hopes and efforts of these courageous people I sincerely hope that we will implement the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 416 and reaffirm our commitment to Lithuanians who continue to strive toward the realization of the ideals of personal liberty, independence, and human dignity long maintained by the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the privilege to join in observing all Americans of Lithuanian descent and Lithuanians throughout the world as they commemorate the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. However, this day of celebration is cloaked in sorrow for the many Lithuanians in their homeland, who are unable to show their joy, for indeed they have no reason to be joyous. They now lie captive and the lives which once were filled with purpose are now filled with despair.

I am in firm agreement with the United States policy of nonrecognition of forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Empire and feel that this nonrecognition policy must

continue, especially in view of the Soviet proposed European Conference on Security and Cooperation. I feel that such recognition would serve only to further enslave a once free people in the darkness of totalitarian oppression.

It is fitting that we in the Congress keep alive, through this commemoration, the precious concept of freedom in the hearts of oppressed people throughout the world who look to America as a beacon of freedom.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, no nation or people should be subjugated to the will of another unless that is their wish. They should be free to determine their own future in any way they choose. This is the essence of democracy.

And that is also why today we salute the valiant efforts of the people of Lithuania as they celebrate the 55th anniversary of their independence.

But they are not free today. They are currently under the domination of the Soviet Union against their will. This has been the case since Russia annexed them in 1940. Since then, the brave people of this land have fought to regain their fledgling independence in the face of one of the most awesome military giants in all history.

They have not thus far been successful. But they have the support of millions of people and countless nations around the world. The people of Lithuania may not ever be strong enough militarily to regain their freedom, but morally and politically, if enough people and nations support them, they may one day force the Soviet Union to grant them their hard-earned right to govern themselves.

What we are observing here today, Mr. Speaker, is not only an anniversary of independence, but hopefully also the beginning of a new period of freedom for that tiny nation.

It is my hope that today we can all join in reassuring the people of Lithuania, both abroad and in this country, who have fought for the cause of their nation's freedom. To that end we as a leader of world democracy must continue to lend moral support to those who must still fight against oppression. To that end we today join with the rest of the free world in saluting the nation of Lithuania on this their 55th anniversary of independence.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of the United States will commemorate two very important anniversaries this month. First, they will observe the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities in 1251. Second, and perhaps most important, they will mark the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1973.

As most Americans know, the Communist dictatorship began in the Soviet Union on November 7, 1917. What must be emphasized, however, is that the spread of communism not only began during those dark days in 1917, but also continued through World Wars I and II and progresses even today.

The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, or the two other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia, by legal or democratic processes. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering ever since. Regrettably, the Balts have had to suffer oppression for centuries due to the "accident of geography." From the West, they were invaded by Teutonic knights, and from the East by the Russians. Accordingly it has taken remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive these pressures from both sides.

Just as the Balts resisted invasions throughout the centuries, they have waged an intensive fight for freedom since the very beginning of Soviet occupation. During the period from 1940 and 1952 alone, approximately 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952, however, did not spell the end of Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained new impetus.

Such passive resistance has also been exhibited by the U.S. Government since we have refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations only with the former free governments of the Baltic States and not the Soviet dominated puppet governments in existence today.

Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, all the Presidents of the United States have stated, restated, and confirmed our policy of nonrecognition of the occupied Baltic States. Hopefully, the present generation of Americans will continue to recognize that the bonds which many U.S. citizens have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism.

The U.S. Congress has made a step in the right direction by unanimously adopting House Concurrent Resolution 416 which calls for freedom for the Baltic States. It is my hope that all freedom-loving Americans will urge the President to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations to request that the Soviets withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Certainly, the time has come for everyone to demand that the principle of self-determination be respected and that the nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be free to choose their own form of government. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in whole or in part, anywhere in the world, is surely intolerable.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1973, marked the 55th anniversary of the formation of the Republic of Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have a rich heritage, tracing their national history back to 1251. They form one of the oldest distinct national groups in Europe.

But our commemoration of this occasion is not a joyful one. Each year's an-

niversary is marked by sadness, for the people of Lithuania still yearn for full independence. They still yearn for the freedom to follow their own cultural, social, and economic traditions. Their brief period of independence has been followed by most difficult trials, but the Lithuanian people have maintained their spirit and courage.

As we join the more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in recalling the proud history of Lithuania, let us also renew our hope for the future. Let us rededicate ourselves to work for the time when Lithuanians and all people can share in the blessings of freedom.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 55th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I rise today to pay my respects to the brave people of Lithuania and to reiterate my support for their struggle against foreign domination.

History will surely record that Lithuania has and continues to bear more than her fair share of distress as she seeks to take her rightful place among the community of free and sovereign nations of the world. From 1795 until 1918, she struggled in vain against the subjugation of czarist Russia. Then in 1940, after a mere 22 years of independence, this Baltic nation was once again engulfed by the tyranny of Communist Russia.

However, during its brief experiment with liberty, the roots of democracy took hold. Despite the most determined and ruthless efforts of the U.S.S.R., those roots remain to this day. They give sustenance and hope to the courageous Lithuanians who continue to look with hope toward the day when their nation will once again be independent.

Mr. Speaker, thousands upon thousands of Lithuanians have risked and are risking their lives in order to advance the struggle against Communist oppression. They are engaged in a desperate and noble battle for their political, religious, and cultural integrity. We in the United States are aware of some of the more graphic and more moving examples of that struggle.

It was only a short time ago that Romas Kalanta, whom history will surely record as a martyr to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, gave his life in a public demonstration against the repression and tyranny of the U.S.S.R. That ultimate sacrifice on his part brought forth an eruption of national spirit and emotion that shook the Soviet Empire and the world. The intensity of the reaction was culminated by a petition signed by 17,000 Lithuanians asking for U.N. consideration of the plight of their homeland.

This was not an isolated incident. There are many, many more examples which prove beyond a doubt that Lithuania still strives for the precious freedom it once enjoyed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise my colleagues that I have recently introduced a resolution calling upon Radio Free Europe to initiate cultural radio broadcasts to the captive Baltic countries of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. I can think of no more appro-

priate time for Congress to give consideration to this resolution than on this 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 55th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is certainly fitting that we in the Congress take note of this most auspicious day and once again voice our fervent hope that the people of Lithuania will soon achieve their independence once again.

This nation has been the site of a continued struggle for independence by its courageous people. Held in Communist tyranny for so many years, the Lithuanians have still retained a strong sense of their lost liberty. The history of their struggle for freedom from oppression is truly an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere.

For 21 years, the people of Lithuania controlled their own destiny. Then Lithuania found itself in the middle of a vicious power struggle, a situation so common to European history. The battle between Fascist Germany and Communist Russia eventually took its toll on the proud people of Lithuania. In 1939, the Hitler-Stalin pact and the Polish partition exposed Lithuania to the threat of Communist invasion despite the Soviet Union's pronouncements to the contrary. On October 10, 1939, Lithuania signed an agreement with Stalin and its fate to be a cog in the wheel of Soviet domination has been sealed ever since.

Lithuania's struggle for freedom continued, however. When the Germans invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the people of the capital city, Kaunas, rose up and drove out the Russian invaders.

Later in 1944, after suffering under 3 years of Nazi oppression, this small, proud and brave nation once again picked up their arms to fight the Soviet aggressors. History tells us that the Lithuanians lost. Their country was conquered but not their spirit.

Today these brave people cling to the hope and idea of freedom and independence. I am happy to join my colleagues today in celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day and I hope that next February 16, we will be celebrating a rebirth of that freedom and independence that sparked Lithuania 55 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks today, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the very spirited and moving resolution adopted by Lithuanians living in the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey and their fellow members of the Linden, N.J., branch of the Lithuanian-American Council. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included in today's RECORD.

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanians residing in the city of Linden, N.J., and vicinity, gathered in Linden on February 3, 1973, to commemorate the 55th anniversary since the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Recalling that:

1. The sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian state restored by the act of the Lithuanian Council on February 16, 1918, won and protected by the blood sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during 1919-1920, and

recognized by the international community, was destroyed by the Soviet Union in 1940 and, repeatedly, in 1944 by military occupation and incorporation into the USSR in violation of international law.

2. The Lithuanian nation resorted to arms in 1941 and succeeded in restoring its state sovereignty in Lithuania's territory for a brief interval, only to have it suppressed by the German Nazi occupation.

3. The Lithuanian people continued the unequal struggle for freedom from 1944 to 1952, when large Soviet military and police forces finally managed to extinguish armed resistance against Bolshevik oppression.

4. The Soviet Russian occupying power has perpetuated acts of genocide in Lithuania, resulting in the deportation to Siberia and other remote areas and in physical extermination of about one million Lithuanians.

5. Soviet Russia maintains its illegal overlordship in Lithuania to this very day.

6. Following the destruction of armed guerrilla forces by the occupying power, the freedom fight of the Lithuanian nation acquired different forms, which received worldwide attention. Among the recent outstanding actions of resistance were:

(a) the defiant courtroom speech of the sailor Simas Kudirka, following his unsuccessful attempt to escape to the free world on November 23, 1970, and his condemnation in Vilnius, in May 1971, to ten years of especially severe forced labor;

(b) the self-immolation of Romas Kavanta, a young student and worker, in a public park in Kaunas on May 14, 1972, and action designed to symbolize the Lithuanian people's protest against the occupying power and their demand for freedom;

(c) the petition addressed at the juncture of 1971-1972 to the First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev, and to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, by 17,000 Lithuanian religious believers who risked their personal freedom in protesting against the denial of religious freedom in Soviet-occupied Lithuania.

We resolve:

1. To demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves freely;

2. To request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegation at the Conference on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki that it demand the restoration to the Lithuanian people of the free exercise of their sovereign rights in their own land.

3. To ask Senators and Congressmen of the United States for their support of the above requests.

Copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, United States Ambassador to the United Nations John Scall, United States Senators from New Jersey, Harrison A. Williams and Clifford P. Case, a member of the United States Congress from New Jersey, Matthew J. Rinaldo, and Governor of New Jersey, William T. Cahill.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join my colleagues today as we commemorate the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I feel a deep sorrow that Lithuanians in their homeland cannot join us in what should be a joyful celebration similar to our Fourth of July festivities.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a trip that took several of my colleagues and I behind the Iron Curtain. We felt the fear of a subjugated people afraid

to even smile least the iron hand of tyranny come down on them even harder. I do not feel that any person should be forced to live under these conditions, and I hope that through our work with other nations we can bring about the freedom of suppressed people like the Lithuanians. For they indeed have expressed their desire for our way of life.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared its independence. It had been a long struggle for them which was marked by Russian and German domination dating back to 1795. But now they were free, and they made the most of it. They adopted a constitution and passed social legislation; they improved their land, and their arts flourished. Then came World War II, and the might of Hitler and the Soviet Union was too great for this tiny nation.

The Soviet occupation has been fierce, because the Russians have tried to force their ways on the minds and bodies of the Lithuanians. The Lithuanians, however, remember their years of independence; and it burns like a flame inside each and every one of them. To keep this flame burning must be our responsibility, because it is a key to our own freedom.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey is privileged to have many citizens of Lithuanian descent. Like their counterparts in Lithuania itself, these citizens are hard working and industrious. They have contributed much to our own culture over the years. In talking to them, I have come to understand the dreams they had for Lithuania and the hope they still hold that their dream might come true. I hope all who hear us today or read our words will join us in urging our Government to work for the freedom of Lithuania so that her citizens will once again have the freedom to set their own destiny.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, February 16, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent, had two anniversaries. That date marked the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Ordinarily we would think of an annual independence celebration as synonymous with celebration and savored traditions. But, for Americans of Lithuanian descent and for free Lithuanians throughout the world, this anniversary is a sad reminder that the nation where they were born, or where their parents were born, is again captive.

Lithuania's independence lasted only until 1940 when the Red Army invaded and clamped its web of repression over the previously independent Baltic States.

Today Lithuania languishes in repression, condemned to live as part of the captive Soviet colonial empire. The occupation has been cruel yet the people carry the hope that they will someday share in the freedom found in countries such as ours.

May we never forget our blessings and remember Lithuania as a sign of the Soviet Union's oppression, and let us pray these people will someday stand together with us as free men and women.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD

a copy of a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of the State of Arizona and sent to me by Vladas Mielzelis, president of the Lithuanian Community of Arizona:

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian Americans of the State of Arizona, assembled this 11th of February, 1973 in Phoenix to commemorate the 55th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, protest—

1. The continuation of the forcible occupation and illegal annexation of the Republic of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, which fact has been officially confirmed by the findings of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress of the United States,

2. The subjection of the Lithuanian people to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation which constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, contrary to the Charter of the United Nations,

3. The colonization of the land by the Russians and continuation of their efforts to force to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania, thereby committing the offense of genocide.

4. The suppression of religious life in Lithuania by closing the churches and persecution and jailing of priests for religious instruction of youth.

We demand that the Soviet Union shall withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus and the imported colonists from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights.

We respectfully express our gratitude to the United States Government for the non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania.

We respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and of the other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights of the Baltic people which policy was recommended to the President of the United States by the House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress,

We urgently request our Government to make all possible efforts to have Simas Kudirka returned to this country with his family.

The copies of this resolution shall be mailed to President Richard M. Nixon, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, to both Senators and all the Members of Congress from the State of Arizona and the Press.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, this month we mark the 55th anniversary of Lithuania's rebirth of independence, Lithuanian Independence Day.

I do not regard this observance, or similar observances, as meaningless, pro forma exercises. I believe we should take them seriously, for each has something to teach us and real flesh and blood people are involved.

Most Americans have no personal memory of the 1939 Russian takeover of the Baltic nations. Either they were unborn then, or too young, or had but the dimmest perception of what was happening.

Let us turn to Winston Churchill's great history of World War II. In volume 1, "The Gathering Storm," he writes:

The next step taken by Russia after partitioning Poland with Germany was to make three "Mutual Assistance Pacts" with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. These Baltic States were the most vehemently anti-Bolshevik regions in Europe. They had all broken themselves free from the Soviet Government in the civil war of 1918 and 1920,

and built up, in the harsh manner in which revolutions are conducted in those regions, a type of society and government of which the main principle was hostility to Communism and to Russia. From Riga in particular for twenty years a stream of violently anti-Bolshevik propaganda had flowed daily by radio and all other channels to the world. With the exception of Latvia, they had not, however, associated themselves with the Hitlerite Germany. The Germans had been content to throw them into their Russian deal, and the Soviet Government now advanced with pent-up hate and eager appetite upon their prey. These three states had formed a part of the Tsarist Empire, and were the old conquests of Peter the Great. They were immediately occupied by strong Russian forces against which they had no means of effectual resistance. A ferocious liquidation of all anti-Communist and anti-Russian elements was carried through by the usual methods. Great numbers of people who for twenty years had lived in freedom in their native land and had represented the dominant majority of its people disappeared. A large proportion of these were transported to Siberia. The rest went farther. This process was described as "Mutual Assistance Pacts."

Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a long and frequently distinguished history, dating back to 1009 A.D. It was the first nation in Eastern Europe to embrace Christianity.

It must be particularly bitter for men and women of Lithuanian blood to see small nation after small nation recognized in the U.N. while Lithuania, with its long history, languishes almost unnoticed under Russian dominance.

The Russians have employed the techniques of deportation, execution, colonization, and sheer power to diminish the chances of Lithuania's survival as a people with a distinctive culture. It is remarkable, therefore, that Lithuanians have endured and, indeed, have given increasing evidence that the desire for their own identity remains strong.

The fact that the U.S. Congress takes cognizance of Lithuanian Independence Day gives notice to the world that we care about the painful history of this century and that we have a continuing sensitivity regarding the millions of people of Eastern Europe.

We do not seek to give false hope. But we must note that Lithuania has emerged from seemingly hopeless situations in the past.

During the 120-year Russian occupation of 1795-1915, for example, there were five insurrections. And when the chaos of World War I allowed Lithuania to break loose, its people formed a free and independent government which lasted 22 years.

The point is that during the bleakest times, somebody has to continue to "make the record," so to speak. And the record is worth making.

It is natural and desirable that men and women of good will would like the detente between the United States and Russia to grow into a long-lasting thaw. This can be done. But we should be on guard to know the history of our own times, and to proceed without illusions and without romanticizing our all-too-frequent adversaries.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, these are days when the sound of the word "freedom" warms the heart and wets the

eye of every American. With great relief we have witnessed the return of our first prisoners of war to safety, home, and freedom.

The drama and emotion of their return have made it easy for us to forget that in another part of the world freedom is far from becoming a reality.

The month of February commemorates the birth of the Republic of Lithuania, 55 years ago, and the 722d anniversary of the formation of the State of Lithuania. Yet in Lithuania there will be no hearts warmed nor eyes glistened with joy, no celebrations of independence, no atmosphere of victory. There will be only the somber observance of another day in captivity; for Lithuania remains a prisoner to the rule of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

By now the history of the courageous people of Lithuania is a familiar story to my colleagues, who have voiced yearly their concern over continuing Soviet oppression of the Baltic peoples.

The clash of forced rule versus individual rights is not new to Lithuania, nor to her sister countries, Latvia and Estonia. An accident of geography has made them the target of invasion from all sides. The State of Lithuania first fell to Russian control in 1795, but a determined struggle for freedom finally bore fruit in 1918, when the Republic of Lithuania regained her independence. This democracy lasted only until World War II, when first Germany and then Russia invaded the small country and wrested control of its government. A fraudulent election, offering only a slate of Communist candidates enabled Russia to claim that Lithuania had "freely" voted to join the U.S.S.R.

The United States deplores this affront to human dignity and individual rights, and has expressed its support of the Baltic peoples through continued recognition of the sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Congress, through House concurrent resolution of 1966, has directed world attention to the need for restoration of the rights of Baltic peoples.

With the settlement of conflict in Southeast Asia, an American dream is coming true: The possibility of global peace. We must remember, however, that peace means more than just the absence of fighting. Our President has often spoken of peace with honor, a peace which preserves not only life, but also the quality of freedom in life.

This is the true dream of peace upon which our country is built: The right of individuals and nations to direct their own destinies and to choose their own governments. Until freedom and justice are within the grasp of all oppressed nations, in all parts of the world, there will be no true peace.

The ceaseless resistance of the courageous people of Lithuania attests to this fact. In the years of Soviet oppression since World War II, the struggle for freedom has continued undaunted, even by the loss of over 50,000 freedom fighters, who have been deported or destroyed. Even now Lithuanians reared under the yoke of communism are risking and sacrificing their lives in the hope of political and religious freedom for their country. Certainly the

Lithuanians have shown the world that peace without freedom is worthless, and that they will accept no less than full human rights.

The temerity and tenacity of the Baltic peoples stand as a living tribute to the value of freedom, and I join my esteemed colleagues of the 93d Congress in praise and support of the people of the Republic of Lithuania. As we give thanks for the newly regained freedom of our own countrymen, let us rededicate ourselves to the pursuit of independence for all men in all countries.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this month Americans of Lithuanian heritage and their friends everywhere will be commemorating two important anniversaries: The 72d anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251; and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania in 1918.

Years of joyous rebuilding and growth followed Lithuanian independence, but unfortunately came to an end after World War II. The Hitler-Stalin-Molotov-Ribbentrop—Pact of August 1939, contained a secret protocol which gave Lithuania and the Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia to the Soviets, at a time when these states were still free republics. War began days later. The Soviets forced the Baltic States to sign mutual assistance pacts which exacted under duress permission for Russian military bases on Baltic soil. After the fall of France, there was a full-scale Soviet invasion, "legitimized" by these forced treaties, and by June 17, 1940, all three countries were occupied.

I am proud to say it was the Government of the United States that was first in 1940 to strongly and emphatically denounce the Soviet takeover of the Baltic States. Our Nation's statement of July 23, 1940, has become known as the Freedom Charter of the Baltic States. It reads:

The political independence and territorial integrity of the Baltic Republics, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors.

The government and the people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by those who use force or the threat of force.

They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of any state, however powerful in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state however weak.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law, in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself cannot be preserved.

Through the years which have followed, the United States has continued its support of the Baltic peoples' struggle to regain their freedom. We have steadfastly refused to recognize the Baltic States' forced annexation by the Soviet Union. In the words of John Foster Dulles in 1959:

The United States was quick to denounce this aggression, and refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into

the U.S.S.R. Today, over 18 years later, we wish to assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia once more that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

In 1966, the House and Senate unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 calling for freedom for Lithuania and the Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia. That resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

And our Nation's commitment has been expressed by President Nixon:

In committing aggression against the Baltic countries, the Soviet Union violated not only the spirit and letter of international law but offended the standards of common human decency.

We are now rejoicing at the return of our men who have been held as prisoners of war, but we must not forget that entire peoples, such as the freedom-loving Lithuanians, still remain in captivity.

Living in a free nation, we can never really understand the sufferings of the captive peoples. We can, however, offer to the brave citizens of those lands who still fight for liberty, and to their many friends and relations in the United States, the assurance that we as a people will never rest until Lithuania and the other captive nations regain their rightful heritage of freedom. We will never rest as long as there is denial of religious freedom, denial of self-determination, and denial of human rights.

I am proud to join my colleagues to-

day in commemorating the Lithuanian Day of Independence, and by doing so, help demonstrate our continuing commitment to the Lithuanian people and to the other captive nations.

The importance of the forthcoming European Security Conference in regard to Lithuania and other captive nations cannot be overemphasized. I will urge the President to request that the question of the restoration of freedom and the exercise of self-determination by the Lithuanian people and other captive nations be raised at the conference.

The Lithuanian-American organizations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations are to be commended for their efforts in the cause of freedom. I include at this time for the information of my colleagues an appeal to the United Nations Secretary General sent by the Assembly of Captive Nations and a statement concerning the importance of the European Security Conference provided by the Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc.:

AN APPEAL TO THE UNITED NATIONS
SECRETARY GENERAL

The following letter, signed by Chairman Stefan Korbonski, and Secretary General Feliks Gadomski, was sent by the Assembly of Captive European Nations to His Excellency Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General of the United Nations, asking for his intervention in order to stop the wave of recent Communist persecutions in Lithuania and Czechoslovakia:

The world is witnessing a cruel violation of human rights of the peoples of two small countries perpetrated by a great power, a member of the United Nations, with a cynical disregard of its obligations arising from the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Soviet Union, having forcibly incorporated Lithuania into its Communist empire after the Second World War, is relentlessly pursuing a policy of persecution and destruction of religion in that country. This provokes a stubborn resistance of the Lithuanian people in defence of their religious and national freedom which so tragically manifested itself recently in the self-immolation of three youths and bloody clashes with police in Kaunas and other Lithuanian cities. A petition signed by seventeen thousand believers appealed in vain for freedom of religion for the oppressed people of Lithuania.

In Czechoslovakia, where the liberally inclined government of Dubcek has been crushed by Soviet armed intervention and replaced by a Moscow subservient government of Husak, we see mass unlawful political trials on trumped up charges against hundreds of former followers of Dubcek who now fill the prisons of Prague.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations, representing in the free world the inalienable rights to freedom for Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, deeply shocked by the victimization of innocent people by the Communist rulers in Lithuania and Czechoslovakia, appeals to you, Sir, to intervene with the government of the Soviet Union and its satellite regime in Prague to bring about their compliance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and an end to all forms of persecution for political and ideological reasons.

Your previous pronouncements concerning human sufferings give us hope that you will again raise your voice in this case which is so abhorrent to all the freedom loving people of the world.

EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE AND ITS POSSIBLE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON LITHUANIA

On February 16, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent will commemorate two anniversaries—the 72nd anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania's independence lasted only until 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and forcibly annexed these Baltic States into the Soviet Union. The United States and other great western powers have steadfastly maintained a policy of non-recognition of this forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Empire. This non-recognition policy must continue, especially, in view of the Soviet proposed 'European Conference on Security and Cooperation.' As indicated in the published preliminaries of the Conference the Soviet concept of the security of the European States has one primary prerequisite: That the territorial integrity of the states and inviolability of their frontiers be maintained.

The recognition of the territorial "status quo" in Europe would violate the right of self-determination of the peoples and the nations of Eastern Europe. It would be tantamount to world ratification of the infamous 'Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939', and would extinguish for all time the small candle of hope in the darkness of totalitarian oppression.

Today, the United States stands on the threshold of the most meaningful and potentially rewarding era in the history of mankind. For the first time in the last fifty years, global peace is attainable. However, global peace is only the first great objective of our nation, we must also seek the attainment of freedom and justice for all oppressed nations. For even if the countries of the world cease hostilities toward one another, the unresolved legacies of the Second World War must be confronted; the status of the Baltic Nations must be once and for all—equitably resolved. Furthermore, let us not be fooled that world peace can be attained by offering the inalienable rights of the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations upon the altar of appeasement.

Even now, Lithuanians raised under the yoke of communism are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Soviet escape attempt of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, and the subsequent demonstration by thousands of young Lithuanians, and the petition of 17,000 Lithuanian Roman Catholics to Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations, demonstrates their thirst for freedom at any price.

The 89th U.S. Congress during its second session adopted House Concurring Resolution 416, urging the President to direct the question of the status of the Baltic countries in the United Nations and other international forums.

The time is now, to present to the public at large and the government of the United States the grave concern shared by Lithuanian Americans and the people of Eastern and Central Europe over the approaching Soviet proposed 'European Conference on Security and Cooperation.'

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. Although the Lithuanian peoples were not allowed to celebrate this meaningful occasion in their own country, it is significant that a country whose people have not been allowed to govern themselves for 33 years still has strong national ties.

So strong is their hunger for the religious and political freedom that Lithuanians are still risking their lives to gain this freedom.

We in the United States of America have long been proud of our heritage of freedom, both political and religious. And, along with this freedom for ourselves, we have long supported those who sought the same freedom.

The Lithuanians are a strong and proud people, and they must be commended for their strength in this time of trial. But this commendation is not enough. We must remind the Soviet Union of their responsibilities to the minorities under their control—such as the Lithuanians—and ask them to respect their rights to freedom and privileges of self-determination.

I am deeply moved by the valiant struggle of the Lithuanians, and I salute them on the anniversary of their Declaration of Independence.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to include their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, among my happiest memories is that of the first time I went hunting with my dad. We lived near the banks of the Mississippi River. And, that is where we took our recreation.

The chemistry of a father/son relationship; the fresh air and exercise; the experience of being close to nature, were all there.

The woods and wildlife along the river banks were abundant then. Now, much of the woods has been cleared away. Much of the land is cultivated into a state of high productivity. Most of the game is gone. And, the opportunity for a boy or girl and his or her father or mother to get outdoors together—that is almost gone, too.

One of this Nation's most critical needs—one which affects the environment, resource conservation, and population distribution patterns—is in the area of outdoor recreation.

It is to this recreation need that I direct my discussion today.

During the 92d Congress, I introduced a bill which would authorize a study meant to alleviate at least part of this critical need for more recreation facilities to serve both nonmetropolitan and metropolitan areas.

My proposal, calls for the establishment of the Huckleberry Finn National Recreation Area on and along the Mis-

sissippi River from its junction with the Missouri River south to the Gulf of Mexico. This project is meant to operate in conjunction with a proposal of our former colleague, the Honorable John Kyle of Iowa.

Since Mr. Kyle is no longer a Member of the Congress, I have, after consultation with him, determined that I will also reintroduce in this Congress the bill to create a National Recreation Area on the upper Mississippi River.

As with any new—and many older projects—there is always the problem of financing it. To that end, I plan to introduce a third bill—to establish a national outdoor recreation trust. Funds for the trust which I propose would be derived from the repayment to the United States certain delinquent debts owed to us by other nations. Use of the trust funds to acquire appropriate lands for outdoor recreation would, of course, not be limited to the Huckleberry Finn National Recreation Area.

In order to keep some order in this discussion, I would first describe the aims of my proposal for a national recreation area reaching from Lake Itasca in Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico. Calling this a national recreation area is meant to make clear that selected sites on islands in the river and on the left and right banks which would be included in the project could be used in a variety of ways.

The recreational activities would be diversified and would include fishing, hunting, marinas, boat trails, hiking trails, campsites, wilderness areas, bird sanctuaries, game refuges, and nesting grounds.

It is not my intent with these proposals to prohibit further appropriate commercial development along, or use of, the Mississippi River. Nor, is it my intent to prohibit further use of existing private or public recreation facilities compatible with the national recreation area concept. Compatible uses would certainly include private hunting and fishing clubs and modern marinas. And, I recognize and support the need for Federal cooperation with State and local governments, whose jurisdiction includes the river, in their recreation development efforts on or adjacent to the Mississippi River.

Known by many names—"The Father of Waters"; "Old Man River"; the Indians called it "Mississippi." Those who know its folklore believe it was sired by a hurricane, endured an earthquake and was born of calamity. This magnificent, legendary river is one of this Nation's most important national resources. My goal is that the greatest and best use be made of its recreation and economic potential.

I do not have available an accurate estimate of the millions of persons who would benefit from the establishment of the Huckleberry Finn National Recreation Area. But, the Bureau of Census says that 8.28 million persons live in just the 110 counties bordering the Mississippi River between Lake Itasca and the Gulf of Mexico. These are in the 10 States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The proj-

ect would serve the metropolitan areas of St. Paul, Minneapolis, Davenport, Des Moines, Springfield, Chicago, St. Louis, Memphis, Baton Rouge, and New Orleans.

A 1969 report by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation—BOR—clearly points out the need for a project such as I am proposing. According to that report the south central region of the United States has one of the highest per capita needs for increased recreation facilities in the Nation. The north central region ranks in the second highest need category.

That report also indicates that while these areas have high recreation needs they have not been receiving a comparable share of the available Federal recreation funds and effort.

The Mississippi River can in terms of recreation, be to Mid-America what the Grand Canyon is to the West. But, its recreation potential is not yet being fully used.

Department of Interior studies show that most Americans now take part in some kind of outdoor recreation. That participation is increasing at a rate of 10 percent per year. It is estimated that, with increases in income and leisure time, the participation will increase fourfold by the year 2,000.

Establishment of a national recreation area can help relieve the visitor pressures on existing national recreation facilities. The need for such relief is evident in the Department of the Interior's efforts to reduce, stabilize or otherwise more rigidly control the use of existing facilities.

Visitors for all units of the national park system, except the National Capital Parks, rose from 33.25 million in 1950 to 72.28 million in 1960. Yet, during that decade only 30,000 acres were added to the system. By December 1971 the visitor figures had risen to 200.5 million persons. But, between 1962 and 1972 the gross acreage in the park system grew by less than 9 percent.

The 92d Congress authorized the addition of 1,519,932 acres to the national park system. Of the lands authorized for inclusion in the system, less than 6 percent of this new acreage is located in the 20 States that make up the central region of the United States. And, this is the region with among the highest per capita needs for expanded recreation outlets.

Now, I would turn to my proposal for financing acquisition of lands appropriate to recreation use—the National Outdoor Recreation Trust.

The idea for this trust has evolved, in part, from my work as a member of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information. For more than 2 years the subcommittee has conducted an investigation into the problems of delinquent international debts and unpaid claims owed to the United States. The total international debt owed to our Nation now stands in excess of \$46 billion.

When the subcommittee first became active in this area there was not much optimism about the prospects for collecting these debts. But, at our insistence, collection efforts have been stepped up with the result that many debts once con-

sidered virtually uncollectible and all but written off, are now being paid.

Many of these debts stem from lend-lease assistance provided other nations during and after World War II. Last year the subcommittee was responsible for spurring the actual collection or agreement to settle delinquent international debts owed the United States in excess of \$142 million. This does not include the \$722 million settlement with the Soviet Union initiated by the subcommittee in 1971.

Still at issue are millions of dollars owed by France in unpaid claims associated with the pullout of U.S. NATO forces 5 years ago and prospective claims which Germany would owe us when our forces are reduced in that country, depending on the outcome of current international negotiations.

Most of these repayments are finally put into the General Treasury of the Nation. I recognize that this is a somewhat erratic source of national income, that vigilant congressional oversight is required to insure collection activities are kept up, and that there are many demands on the fiscal resources of the Nation.

I believe that most of the current demands on the National Treasury must be satisfied with a continuing supply of funds from fiscal resources which have been traditionally more stable than repayment of delinquent international debts.

Further, I believe that the need for the benefits which will result in the areas of environment, resources conservation, and population pressures from expanded recreation facilities is of so critical a nature that we, as a nation must employ the repayment of international debts which have been delinquent for, say, 5 years, as I have proposed.

The National Outdoor Recreation Trust, as I envision it, would be administered by the Department of the Interior. It would be used, initially, for the acquisition of lands for recreation purposes in such high need areas as the nonmetropolitan and metropolitan regions of the central United States, as well as other areas in which serious outdoor recreation shortages have been identified.

I urge my colleagues and other interested parties to thoroughly consider the proposals I am making and solicit their support and constructive comment.

BALANCED LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH TRADE AND BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEMS

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that this country faces a severe trade problem and one that can be dealt with in many ways. The imbalance of payments 2 years ago, including as the major element short-term outflows of capital, deteriorated last year when an imbalance of trade became the major aggravating factor. For this reason, there is increasing concern about the trade component in our imbalance of payments and also an increasing feeling that we

must deal with the trade issue decisively and promptly.

The President, who has been considering the ingredients of a trade bill for some time, has indicated through suggestions emanating from the White House that he wants a balanced piece of legislation as the basic negotiating authority which Congress passes. Aware of the strong and active congressional advocacy of protectionist measures, centering in the Burke-Hartke bill, he evidently feels that simple extension of America's more traditional free trade posture will not be possible. He has suggested that his negotiating authority should include the power to raise as well as lower tariffs by limited amounts. He points to this exercise of Executive discretion, coupled with the recent devaluation of the dollar and floating of major world currencies, as being the kind of balanced proposal which will permit America to continue its trade outreach while protecting against the specific competitive problems which have aggravated our trade picture. He has previously shown, almost throughout his first 4 years, a willingness unique among recent Presidents to use the administrative and discretionary devices available to him under existing law for the benefit of American commercial interests beset with dumping and unfair foreign subsidy problems.

In a very interesting statement the other day the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, suggested, among other things, that the trade issue might be better handled by a 15-percent surtax on imports. His proposal, as reported in the press, was not entirely clear to me, but I assume it was intended as a counter-proposal to some of the suggestions emanating from the White House. There is something to be said for an import tax, because it can be quickly imposed and would have a major but predictable impact almost immediately on the competitiveness of all foreign goods in this country. Although unilateral, it would be a more urgent remedy than a negotiated solution, reflecting the seriousness of our present imbalance and the buffeting the dollar has been taking abroad. As Secretary Shultz has pointed out, it would affect imports only, while currency adjustment helps both the import and the export picture. There are other reasons to favor the administration's probable approach, but the chairman's proposal represents a possible alternative, and thus is a contribution to the dialog that is just opening. It is in this spirit I want to commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for his statement.

If we should decide to go the surcharge route, at 10 or 15 percent, I personally think it should be set up to be phased out in an orderly way over a 2- or 3-year period. It should be stated, in short, in terms that will indicate that such unilateral action reflects current necessities but is not a permanent part of American trade policy. An import surtax, appropriately limited, could be a congressional substitute for the up-side tariff authority the President has suggested. If in our

trade authorization legislation, we then couple such a surcharge proposal with authority to the President to reduce tariffs in limited ways as negotiated, it would signal our determination to correct the current imbalance but would permit the United States also to reassure its trading partners about our long-term intentions in trade, making it clear that Congress for the long term wants to continue trade outreach and the liberalizing leadership which has characterized this country now for many years.

I am not suggesting that this is all that need be included in a trade bill, but only that it could be an important congressional contribution, an immediate benefit for our deteriorated balance of trade, and a proposal designed to reassure rather than to signal the opening gun of a trade war. I do not believe that either the President or the chairman—or the other Members of Congress who have discussed this matter publicly—are locked into a rigid formula for dealing with trade problems in a corrective way. Our trading partners should understand that, rather than assuming that the United States is about to embark again on major unilateral action. Goodness knows, the Common Market has enough digestive problems of its own; like the Congress, the constituent forces of the Common Market may find it easier to block other initiatives and more difficult to generate positive initiatives of their own, following the recent market extension and all the internal sensitivities and problems which such an event inevitably causes. It would be too bad for our trading partners to react to proposals emanating from responsible sources here as though the trade war were already begun, when such reaction would be premature even though understandable. Reaction is always easier than the opening of dialog.

Thus, I would like to suggest that this dialog between the White House and Congress must be handled with restraint and responsibility. European and other trading partners know that Congress has an initiating authority in respect to trade legislation and that the President cannot initiate negotiations of any significance on his own authority despite his other constitutional responsibilities in foreign policy. We are caught in a cruel dilemma as Members of Congress with respect to this issue at this time.

If the White House and the Congress can work closely together without sensitivity about which branch of government does what, it is generally desirable to construct a flexible trade policy which can accommodate to changing circumstances, advancing the national interest without the rigidities implicit in legislative formulas. The issue of Presidential-congressional confrontation over fiscal and other matters just at this particular time inevitably reduces the willingness of Congress to give the President what would amount to a blank check in the form of wide discretionary authority over trade. Support of the AFL-CIO for tough trade policies, and the emotional surcharge which 5 percent unemployment places on the issue, make this a political concern as well as one of institutional confrontation.

None of us in this body is committed to irrational or extreme proposals in the trade field. Because the activism on this issue has been on the protectionist side, there is a feeling that any congressional input into a trade solution will be inevitably destructive of our leadership in the expanding world of trade. I doubt that many of my colleagues will want to approach this issue simply by reacting to Presidential leadership and initiative or by applying the simplistic rules of protectionism or free trade to a complex issue. Much dialog will be necessary over the next few months. It will be heard both in this land and abroad and it should be carried on in a spirit which will reassure America as well as our trading partners that American interests are being rationally advanced. I urge my colleagues to study the issue carefully, to participate in the dialog constructively, to respond with support for the ideas involved rather than the agencies advancing them and to consider long-term as well as short-term interests of a high priority.

THE HONORABLE EARLE CABELL OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former distinguished Member of this body, a distinguished citizen of my home city of Dallas, Tex.

Today I am introducing a bill, along with 20 other of my colleagues from Texas on both sides of the aisle, and I should like at this point to read into the RECORD the text of the bill:

H.R. 4411

A bill to name a Federal office building in Dallas, Texas, the "Earle Cabell Federal Building".

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal office building and United States court house at 1100 Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Earle Cabell Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Earle Cabell Federal Building".

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cabell and I were opponents in the last election. We are members of different parties. However, I believe a time comes when we as Members of this body and as Americans must rise above party, and in this case we must pay tribute to a Member who has served this body and served the city of Dallas, Tex., in such a distinguished fashion.

Earle Cabell comes from a Dallas family with a tradition of public service. His father and his grandfather were mayors of Dallas.

In 1932, Mr. Cabell and his two brothers organized Cabell's, Inc.—dairies and drive-in food stores—which turned into one of Dallas' highly successful businesses. Earl Cabell served as secretary-treasurer, executive vice president, presi-

dent, and chairman of the board of this organization.

He was twice elected mayor of Dallas and served in that capacity from May 1, 1961, until his resignation February 3, 1964, to become a candidate for Congress. He served in the 89th, 90th, 91st, and 92d Congresses.

Earle Cabell has contributed much to the professional, civic, and philanthropic life of Dallas. He is a former director and member of the executive committee of the Grand Avenue Bank & Trust Co., Dallas, Tex. He is a member of the Dallas Country Club, the Dallas Athletic Club, McKinney Club Lake and City Club.

His services to the people of Dallas are many and I feel that it is just and appropriate that this building be named after him, for it was largely through his efforts that it was constructed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of the Honorable Earle Cabell.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT NIXON FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS REGARDING WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 the Minnesota House of Representatives passed a house resolution commending President Nixon for his achievement in negotiating the Vietnam cease-fire agreement, and the return of our prisoners of war.

I join in the sentiments expressed by the Minnesota House, in which body I formerly served, and include, at this point in the RECORD, the resolution:

RESOLUTION BY THE STATE OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

(A House resolution commending President Nixon for his accomplishments regarding the war in Vietnam)

Whereas, President Nixon has served the American people for four years as Chief Executive; and

Whereas, he has contributed to the ideal of world peace by improving communication and understanding between the powers of East and West; and

Whereas, President Nixon, with determination, has sought to effect a cease-fire in Vietnam by means of formal negotiation, an earnest dedication to peace and the return of prisoners of war: Now, therefore

Be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, that commendation be extended to President Nixon for his achievement, and that the wholehearted support of the Members of this House, as well as the American people as a whole, be given to the President.

Be it further resolved, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States,

the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Minnesota Representatives and Senators in Congress.

Adopted by the House, State of Minnesota, February 12, 1973.

MARTIN OLAV SABO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
EDWARD A. BURDICK,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL FAN CLUB OF JOHN VOLPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that the congressional fan club of John Volpe has many members. I am certainly one and I know a great many of my colleagues are, too.

Those of us who know him and have done business with him in the various public offices he has held can afford, from the vantage point, to speak well of him and to wish him only the best as he moves on to still another critical post.

Perhaps the best measure of the regard in which John Volpe is held by his friends and constituents is the fact that he is not without honor in his own home State. As former head of the State department of public works and former Governor of the Commonwealth, he is just as popular in Massachusetts today as he ever was.

I offer for substantiation an editorial that was recently broadcast over radio station WEEI in Boston regarding John Volpe. To which I would like to add my own expression of gratitude and every good wish for the future.

EDITORIAL

An editorial isn't a biography, and today that's a shame. Because the story of John Volpe is always worth retelling. The latest chapter in his truly remarkable life story was written in Washington recently when during the first term of the Nixon Administration, he was named Ambassador to Italy.

As White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler put it: John Volpe "will be retracing a journey that brought his own parents to this country as penniless immigrants at the turn of the century."

John Volpe's journey was tough, but always uphill. He formed his own construction company during the depths of the depression and built it into a multi-million dollar operation. Most Horatio Alger stories end right there, but not John Volpe's. Successful in private life, he launched a new career—one dedicated to honest public service. He rose from head of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, to the nation's first Federal Highway Administrator, to Governor of this Commonwealth, to the Nixon Cabinet.

In Washington, they were ready to call the new Transportation Secretary a "road man," expecting him to continue the on-going process of turning out ribbons of concrete. True, highways were built during his years at Transportation, but John Volpe could see that the nation's needs were more complex than just concrete. And soon, Secretary Volpe was a proponent of using dollars from the Highway Trust Fund for mass transit.

WEEI was proud not only to editorially endorse John Volpe for Governor, but also to support his many outstanding programs for the Commonwealth. Now John Volpe

goes to Rome as the first Italian-American to serve as Ambassador to Italy. WEEI is sure his handling of this post will some day be added to Mr. Volpe's long list of successful achievements. For as an old proverb says, "Nothing succeeds like success."

PHASE III PLAN CALLS FOR CAUTION—AND ACTION BY THE CONGRESS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress soon will consider legislation to renew the Economic Stabilization Act. There is growing indication that this act should be amended to do more than simply extend the time for the executive department to establish wage and price controls.

I soon will introduce a legislative proposal that will amend the act to make mandatory the price guidelines of phase II for all corporations controlling assets or any sales of more than \$500 million.

The administration has tried unsuccessfully to control inflation and spiraling costs affecting many areas and commodities—including food. Beginning in 1970, the administration created 2 million more unemployed in an effort to slow the rate of inflation. As we all know, this failed and the administration resorted to phase I and phase II price controls previously authorized by the Congress but scoffed at by the administration. Eight months before the President invoked price controls, I was joined by 65 of my colleagues in introducing legislation that would have led to establishment of controls on the larger corporations.

Dr. Gardiner C. Means, an eminent economist, has written a most engaging article on the subject that appeared in the Sunday, February 18, edition of the Washington Post. The legislation that I plan to introduce will embody many of the suggestions offered by Dr. Means. I wish to enter at this point in the RECORD the text of this important article:

BEWARE PHASE III—OR, HOW CONGRESS CAN FIGHT FAILURE, LOSS OF POWER AND LEARN TO LIVE WITH CONTROLS

(By Gardiner C. Means)

While Congress complains that the White House has been usurping its powers, the peril in the economic field is that Congress might give President Nixon a blank check for Phase III of his anti-inflation program—a plan that may well put more people out of work without curbing rising prices and further weaken confidence in the dollar.

The dangers in Phase III arise from a faulty diagnosis of the forces creating today's inflation. The Nixon administration, which appears ready to repeat its earlier mistake of relying heavily on monetary and fiscal policy, is still treating inflation as if it were the result or aftermath of too much money chasing to few goods, a textbook inflation stemming from excess demand. But in the past four years there has been no excess demand. Indeed, in the past 20 years, when prices rose 50 per cent, there was only a year and a half, during 1967 and 1968, when there was excess demand.

Rather, most of our price increases have

come from two quite different types of inflation, both of which are operating today.

INFLATION IN RECESSION

The first, which is our major problem, arises from the exercise of market power. It can be initiated by business managers in an effort to widen profit margins. It can be caused by labor leaders seeking excessive pay increases. In either case, it is an "administrative" inflation that does not rely on classic supply-demand forces.

Such inflation can occur whether employment is full or less than full, and whether we are in a recession, as we were in 1969-70, in stagnation, as in 1971, or in a recovery. In any of these periods administrative inflation can show up in price rises for autos, steel, machinery and other products of the concentrated, less competitive industries.

The first clear case of an administrative inflation occurred in the 1950s. From 1953 to 1958, the wholesale price index climbed 8 per cent (see Chart 1 on Page B4) at the same time that manufacturers idled an increasing portion of their production capacity and joblessness became excessive. What we had, in short, was simultaneous inflation and recession, something impossible, according to the textbooks.

It is clear that the major cause of the wholesale price rise was a 36 percent boost in steel prices and substantial price increases in steel-using industries; together, these accounted for more than half of the wholesale advance. Subsequent information has also made it clear that the steel price boosts involved a considerable widening of profit margins.

REFLATION: A GOOD THING

The second inflationary force we are experiencing today is the "reflation" of prices that occurs in periods of recovery, which explains part of the recent rise in food prices.

In a recession, flexible prices such as those for food, cotton and hides tend to fall sharply. But administered prices, especially in the less competitive industries, tend to fall little. In a recovery, the reverse tends to happen: Prices for food and other flexible items tend to bounce back the most, while prices in the steel, auto and other concentrated industries tend to rise the least.

This is precisely what happened in the Depression and post-Depression period (see Chart 2), and price data collected from buyers by the National Bureau of Economic Research show that it also happened in the recession-recovery cycles of 1957-58 and 1960-61. It is similarly involved in the current recovery from the 1969-70 recession.

Reflation is a necessary part of the recovery process and should be considered a good thing that helps restore balance in both prices and employment. During the Depression, for example, joblessness hit almost entirely in the concentrated industries whose prices had fallen the least; the later job recovery also came mostly in these industries. What happened was that rising demand during the recovery lifted the more sensitive market prices while it increased employment in the concentrated industries whose prices were least sensitive, thus restoring the pre-Depression price balance and full employment.

The current reflation thus should not be interfered with. The big problem today is to prevent or minimize administrative inflation. And it is the failure to recognize that we are faced with administrative inflation, and the failure to apply the lessons of the past, that constitute the current danger.

DISMAL FAILURES

On two past occasions, the effort to treat administrative inflation by measures designed to control demand inflation resulted in dismal failures.

In 1957, the Federal Reserve Board sought to control the administrative inflation of the 1950s through a tight money policy that more than halted the growth of the nominal stock of money and produced a 10 per cent drop in the real stock of money. This precipitated the recession of 1958.

The failure of this effort arose from the fact that, while a tight money policy can control demand inflation, it cannot control an administrative inflation. This was acknowledged in 1959 by the chief economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, Woodie Thomas, who noted that "Recent discussion of the influence of administered prices, stimulated by . . . the Kefauver Committee, has made a significant contribution to a better understanding of the problems of inflation and fluctuations in economic activity and employment. This contribution is in pointing out that there are destabilizing forces in pricing actions of the private economy—on the part of both labor and management—that cannot be effectively controlled or corrected by government actions in the area of fiscal and monetary policies."

The Nixon administration's first attempt to control inflation, beginning in 1969, was also a complete failure due to faulty diagnosis.

On taking office, President Nixon announced that prices and wage rates would be left to the free market and inflation would be controlled by fiscal and monetary means. A large budget surplus, based on the Johnson surtax, was maintained throughout 1969, and so tight a money policy was adopted that expansion in the money stock was halted. There was no excess in demand. Yet in 1969 the wholesale price index rose 4.8 per cent, more than twice the rate of the years from mid-1965 to the end of 1968.

In his 1970 Economic Report, the President tried to explain this price rise by saying, "The inflation unleashed after mid-1965 had gathered powerful momentum by the time this administration took office a year ago." He called the growth of total spending "the driving force of the inflation" and outlined a program to "slow down the rapid expansion of demand."

The program was to take the heat out of the inflation by creating 2½ years of stagnation. Economic growth was to be halted by mid-1970, followed by two years in which the gross national product was, by plan, to be kept some \$30 billion below the economy's estimated potential. This called for putting an additional 2 million people out of work so as to increase the unemployment rate to about 6 per cent.

ADMISSION OF FAILURE

This brutal plan was successful in creating stagnation (see Chart 3.) The continued budget surplus became a restraining force and the money stock, measured in constant purchasing power, was reduced. Real demand declined, industrial production started down in the summer of 1969, and unemployment increased as planned. By the end of 1970, the objective of 6 per cent unemployment had been achieved.

But stagnation did not prevent inflation. The reason is simple. The driving force of the inflation in 1969 was not "the growth of total spending." Rather, the President had unleashed the forces of administrative inflation by rejecting the price-wage guideline principle. The inflation in the 1969-70 recession was entirely administrative inflation, the kind of inflation that Woodie Thomas had said could not be controlled by fiscal and monetary measures.

The administrative character of this inflation-in-recession is easily shown by examining the main sources of the rise in the wholesale price index (see Chart 4). The

great bulk of the price increase during the recession was contributed by the concentrated industries. In the more competitive industries, prices went up little or went down. The only exception was the fuel and power index, which rose 11 percent, largely because of the scarcity of pollution-free fuels.

The dismal failure of this program was acknowledged by the August, 1971, price-wage freeze after it had already cost the country nearly \$50 billion in lost GNP and promised more loss until reflation could restore full employment. No apology was given to the millions who suffered unnecessary unemployment or to the stockholders whose profits were reduced.

KENNEDY GUIDEPOSTS

Now, with the new emphasis on monetary and fiscal policy and with the weakening of price and wage controls in Phase III, it looks as if the Nixon administration is about to repeat these same errors. This is all the more disturbing because we have had importantly successful experiences in the control of administrative inflation, the Kennedy guideposts and the Nixon Phase I and II, which point the way toward an effective program.

The Kennedy guideposts directly faced the problem of administrative inflation. When the program was being drafted in 1961, unemployment was above 6 per cent and the problem was recognized as one of preventing administrative inflation while expanding demand through fiscal and monetary measures to achieve full employment.

The Kennedy program was both an outstanding success and a partial failure. Its success was in holding down administrative inflation while achieving full employment. By the fall of 1965, unemployment was down close to 4 per cent. Labor had adhered to the wage guideposts so closely that the labor cost per unit of manufacturing output was down 3 per cent. Management had not adhered as closely and industrial prices rose a little. This in itself was not serious and might have been corrected. Nearly full employment had been achieved with an annual rise in the wholesale price index of only 0.6 per cent.

But this goal had been achieved at the expense of a serious distortion in the relation between prices and wage rates because the guidepost program took no account of the *reflation* rise in the more competitive prices, which was appropriate to recovery. The increase in demand which reduced the unemployment rate from over 6 per cent to 4 per cent could be expected to raise the average of farm prices and other flexible market prices substantially and produce only a small increase in the most administered prices, thus bringing a moderate increase in prices and living costs. Yet the wage guidepost took no account of this appropriate rise in living costs.

NO DEMAND INFLATION

Because of the failure to include a cost-of-living factor in the wage guidepost, the program suffered a partial breakdown. By 1965, the rise in living costs had absorbed more than a third of labor's legitimate productivity gains and had significantly widened profit margins.

When this unfairness became obvious, labor refused to play ball and forced wage increases larger than the increases in productivity. Management, striving to maintain the widened profit margins, passed along the increases in labor costs. This struggle lifted the wholesale index by another 3.5 per cent from mid-1965 to mid-1967 and brought wages and profits more nearly into line with each other.

Even with the partial breakdown of the wage guidepost, full employment was maintained throughout 1966 and 1967, and the

rise in the wholesale price index from mid-1961 to mid-1967 was only 6 per cent—just a little more than the reflation that could have been expected in moving from more than 6 per cent unemployed to the 3.8 per cent reached in 1967.

In no part of this period is there evidence of demand inflation. Farm and other sensitive market prices rose rapidly until relatively full employment was reached, but they were little higher in mid-1967 than in mid-1965. Most of the rise in those two years was administrative as labor sought to recover from the unfairness of the wage guidepost.

It seems likely that, with an appropriate living-cost provision in the wage guidepost, the full reflation could have been accomplished by 1965 with negligible administrative inflation, and full employment could have been maintained without further inflation.

THE NIXON PROGRAM

The Nixon guidelines program, initiated in August, 1971, after the failure of the stagnation policy, also directly faced both the need to control administered prices and the necessity of reflation.

The guidelines introduced in Phase II were a distinct improvement over the Kennedy guideposts in three respects. The wage guideline included as a factor for the cost-of-living rise that could be expected from reflation, and the price guideline focused on containing profit margins, which allowed businesses to increase profits by producing more but not by increasing prices relative to costs. Finally, Phase II was backed by authority to exercise controls.

Phases I and II were quite successful in preventing administrative inflation. In the first 15 months to November, 1972, the weighted index for the six most concentrated industrial groups of Chart IV went up only 2.2 per cent, while that for the three mixed groups went up 3 per cent, mostly because of the scarcity of pollution-free fuels. Both of those increases could be expected as a part of the reflation accompanying the partial recovery. The cost-of-living factor meant that the non-farm labor cost per unit of output increased, but by less than 1.5 per cent.

On competitive prices, special developments led to price increases exceeding those to be expected from reflation alone. A severe drought in Texas and the destructive corn blight in 1970 broke the cattle cycles so that less meat and fewer hides were available in 1972. Then drought in other parts of the world forced up grain and feed prices and, in turn, produced abnormally high prices for hogs, poultry and eggs, and also caused a further increase in beef prices.

Next summer, as the effects of these abnormal developments pass, food prices could be expected to fall if there is no further recovery. With a complete recovery to full employment, the reflation can be expected to be completed without much further rise in food prices, particularly if farm production is allowed to expand.

A FAIR DEAL

Phases I and II have also been substantially fair to both labor and capital. In the last half of 1972, the division between capital and labor of the income generated by non-financial corporations has been almost exactly the same as that in 1969 and as that in the eight years of the Eisenhower administration. While profits per unit of output have gone up faster than the compensation to labor, interest costs per unit of output have gone up less, so that the total compensation to capital and to labor have risen together.

The success of Phases I and II in preventing administrative inflation suggests the need for retaining this type of program until reflation is complete and full employment is achieved.

But instead of perfecting the controls over administrative inflation, the Nixon administration persists in returning to the myth of a momentum from demand inflation and in emphasizing fiscal and monetary restraints. Thus, the President's 1973 Economic Report, after recognizing the existence of non-classical inflation, attributes it to momentum from the preceding demand inflation, saying: "Inflationary expectations and behavior left over from the country's experience since 1966, even though reduced in 1972 from previous heights, have not been completely eliminated."

The demand inflation arising from the Vietnam war was indeed real, but it did not start until mid-1967. In calendar 1966, the federal budget was in essential balance, and in the first half of 1967 there was practically no increase in the wholesale price index. But with the economy already at full employment, rapidly increasing military needs could be expected to produce an excess in demand and a demand inflation unless other demand was restricted.

THE JOHNSON SURTAX

This danger of demand inflation was well recognized by the administration, and in January, 1967, President Johnson recommended a 6 per cent surtax to be effective by mid-1967. The Congress failed to act. The President repeated his request in the summer of 1967, raising the requested rate to 10 per cent. Again, in January, 1968, the President repeated his request.

It was not until mid-1968 that the surtax finally passed, a year and a half too late. By that time, demand inflation had carried the wholesale price index up at an annual rate of 2.2 per cent from its mid-1967 level, with the increase approximately equal for competitive and administered prices.

The surtax brought the federal budget into essential balance by the last quarter of 1968 and insured a substantial surplus in 1969. It seems probable that, if the surtax had been passed in early 1967 and the guidepost policy stressed, full employment could have been maintained without either demand inflation or serious administrative inflation. As it was, the prime source of the 1967-68 demand inflation had been removed by the end of 1968.

Actually, there was no excess demand when President Nixon took office and little momentum from the preceding year and a half of mild demand inflation. And today one cannot take seriously the claim that a year and a half of demand inflation in 1967-68 at the rate of 2.2 per cent a year could engender such a momentum that, with no excess in demand in 1969, wholesale prices would rise 4.8 per cent and that four years later, with a recession in between, momentum from the earlier inflation is still the problem.

THE DANGERS AHEAD

Because of this faulty diagnosis and the President's willingness to use unemployed workers as an instrument of policy, there are serious dangers in the Phase III program he announced last month.

The first danger is that fiscal and monetary policy will again be used in an effort to prevent an administrative inflation that it cannot control. This would create more unemployment without reducing the pressures producing administrative inflation. The appropriate level of demand in the economy will not have been reached until full employment is attained and maintained. A restrictive fiscal and monetary program can prevent demand inflation, but it cannot prevent the arbitrary lifting of prices and wage rates in the less competitive industries or achieve price reductions where costs have gone down.

The Phase III guidance program may turn out to be so weak that it will allow substantial administrative inflation, regardless of Mr.

Nixon's "big stick" in the closet. The profit margin provisions have already been weakened to the point that there would be room for considerable administrative inflation even if the guidelines were consistently adhered to. And the administrative inflation is likely to be greater still because the pressures for adherence have been greatly relaxed.

The last danger is that the employment goal will be too niggardly. Even apart from human considerations, each extra 500,000 persons employed can produce an extra \$6 billion or \$7 billion of production, while the resulting wages, profits and taxes can provide a corresponding market.

In the light of all this, it is vital that Congress refuse to simply renew the Economic Stabilization Act expiring April 30. A mere renewal, leaving it entirely up to Mr. Nixon to use this crucial authority as he wishes, would be an abdication by Congress of its responsibility for basic policy and another transferral of vast power to the White House.

A NECESSARY NUISANCE

Rather, Congress should make mandatory the price guidelines of Phase II for all corporations controlling assets, or having yearly sales, of more than \$500 million. To enforce this policy, Congress should create an interim wage-price guidance board equivalent to the President's Cost of Living Council, thus making that unit accountable to the Congress as well as to the White House. Businesses with assets or sales below the \$500 million cutoff should operate under voluntary guidelines unless the wage-price board finds that mandatory controls are necessary.

The wage guidelines should parallel those for prices: mandatory for workers in corporations with assets or yearly sales of more than \$500 million, voluntary for others unless the wageprice board decides otherwise.

Nor should Congress stop there. The legislation should make Congress' intent specific and clear on several other fronts:

It should adopt 4 per cent unemployment as the interim goal for the end of 1973 and 3.8 per cent for the end of 1974.

It should recognize that some reflation is to be expected in moving from the present level of employment to the interim goals.

It should approve the principle of a full employment budget—a budget that would balance at the interim employment goal but operate with a deficit when unemployment is more than the interim goal and a surplus when unemployment is less than the interim goal.

It should direct the Federal Reserve Board to adopt a "full employment monetary policy" under which it would expand the monetary stock to that level estimated as necessary to support the interim job goal but not to an extent that would result in excess demand and demand inflation.

In passing such legislation, Congress must be aware that while controls are a nuisance to both management and labor, that nuisance would be small compared to the "nuisance" the President was willing to impose on individuals by putting 2 million people out of work in his earlier attempt to control inflation.

The Congress should also recognize that some distortions can be expected in the economy as a result of prolonged price-wage guidance (though the President's 1973 Economic Report was not able to report any significant distortions to date or any other significant costs of the guideline program). But such distortions as may develop in the next two years are likely to be insignificant compared to the distortions that would arise with administrative inflation. And the costs are likely to be insignificant compared with the advantages of a quick return to full employment.

Such an interim program should allay the fear in foreign quarters of runaway inflation in the United States and give ample

time to develop a more permanent program to maintain full employment without administrative inflation.

THE FORT WORTH FIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Five are a group of Irish-Americans from the New York City area who were hailed before a grand jury in—of all places—Fort Worth, Tex., last summer and jailed without bail when they sought to assert their constitutional rights under the fifth amendment.

Apparently, it is alleged that these individuals were involved with, or know something about the procurement of weapons for the Irish Republican Army. None of these five men has any criminal record. All are well-regarded in their home communities, and three are the fathers of families and own their own homes.

The five men involved—Thomas Laffey, Matthias Reilly, Kenneth Tierney, Daniel Crawford, and Paschal Morahan—were in jail for several months last summer and fall, then were admitted to bail by Mr. Justice Douglas pending the appeal of their case to the Supreme Court. Last week, the Supreme Court declined to hear the case, and so they have been rearrested and are once more confined to the Tarrant County jail in Fort Worth.

One basic question underlying this entire case is why this investigation is being carried on in Fort Worth, Tex. The witnesses are from New York, the alleged gun running was to Northern Ireland, and indictments of a related nature have been handed down in New York by another Federal grand jury. This venue, which is wholly incompatible with the rights of witnesses, was selected, according to the New York Times, "because of the high regard in which Attorney General Kleindienst holds the local U.S. attorney and district judge."

I submit that this rationale is hardly a proper basis for locating a grand jury investigation; it and the fact of the indictments in New York lead me to wonder whether the Fort Worth investigation is in fact just another administration use of the grand jury for political harassment.

Time and time again, the Department of Justice has refused to explain to Members of Congress the reasons for this rather unorthodox procedure and venue. I think that it is high time that we made a formal request for some explanation and, with my colleagues, JONATHAN BINGHAM, EDWARD KOCH, BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, and ROBERT TIERNAN, I have introduced a resolution of inquiry directed to the Attorney General. The text of this resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 220

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby directed to furnish the House of Representatives within ten days after the adoption of this resolution, with the following information:

1. The basis of the venue in the Northern District of Texas of the present grand jury investigation before which Kenneth Tierney,

Thomas Laffey, Matthias Reilly, Paschal Morahan, and Daniel Crawford have been summoned.

2. A listing of any other districts in which the said grand jury investigation might have been conducted, together with the basis of venue for each such district.

3. Whether the said grand jury investigation has been completed.

Under clause 5 of the House Rule XXII, this resolution of inquiry must be reported back to the House within 7 legislative days of its introduction. It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee, to which it has been referred, will hold early hearings on it and will report it to the House with a favorable recommendation, so that we can at last get to the bottom of this case. The resolution makes no judgment on the propriety of the investigation or on the guilt or innocence of anyone. All it seeks are several simple facts: The basis of the venue in Fort Worth, a list of other districts in which the investigation might have been brought, and whether the investigation has been concluded.

I have also reintroduced, in slightly modified form, my bill of last session which would provide for the transfer of grand jury and special grand jury proceedings "for the convenience of witnesses, where the interests of justice so require." At this point, I include the text of that bill in the RECORD:

H.R. 4322

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 215 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new section:

§ 3329. Change of venue

(a) For the convenience of witnesses, where the interests of justice so require, a district court shall transfer any grand jury proceeding or investigation to any other district where it might properly have been convened.

(b) As used in this section, "district court" includes the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; and "district" includes the territorial jurisdiction of that court."

Sec. 2. Chapter 216 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new section:

§ 3335 Change of venue

(a) For the convenience of witnesses, where the interests of justice so require, a district court shall transfer any special grand jury proceedings or investigation to any other district where it might properly have been convened.

(b) As used in this section, "district court" includes the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; and "district" includes the territorial jurisdiction of that court."

PRISONS IN TURMOIL

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, crime is costing this country billions and billions of dollars a year. Drug-related crimes alone cause incredible financial losses, not to mention human losses. A drug addict with a \$50-a-day habit has to steal more than \$50,000 worth of property a year to support his habits and there are

more than 300,000 addicts in the United States. The addict who does not steal supports his habit by selling illegal drugs to other addicts. The high rate of recidivism among convicts indicates that our prisons have been no more than revolving doors. Inmates who are released with \$40 in cash and a new suit of clothes find that society continues to punish them for their past transgressions: felons and some misdemeanants frequently lose their rights to vote, to hold appointive, and elective public office, to serve as jurors, to testify in court, to obtain professional, business, and occupational licenses, to enter into contracts, to take or transfer property, and to sue civilly. Is it then any wonder that on a nationwide basis, 80 percent of all felonies are committed by ex-inmates?

In my home State of New York, for example, former prisoners are barred from working in a place selling alcoholic beverages, in a bank, or in an insurance adjuster's office. The goal of a civil service system is to hire individuals on the basis of ability, but ex-offenders in New York are prohibited from being licensed for such occupations as auctioneer, junk dealer, pharmacist, dental hygienist, undertaker, real estate salesman, physiotherapist, or taxi driver. California can refuse or revoke licenses for 39 occupations. Well-paying jobs are not available to ex-offenders. Unemployment for former offenders is from four to five times higher than that of the general public and the salaries of working ex-offenders are less than that of the general public, with the majority of ex-inmates working in low-paid, unskilled or semiskilled jobs.

Federal legislation is needed to prohibit public and private employers from asking about arrest records on job applications, and law enforcement agencies should be prohibited from divulging arrest records unless convictions are involved. Millions of persons in our country may be hampered in finding employment because of arbitrary and capricious actions by police officers or by an exercise of an officer's judgment under duress. Of particular concern is the fact that black people have long been subjected to a disproportionate number of arrests, some of which are called investigative arrests and frequently result in early release. Nevertheless, that arrest record, no matter what its disposition, is there on the books to hinder full job potential.

According to Daniel Glaser in "The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System," employment is usually a major factor in a convicts reintegration into the community. A failure to obtain meaningful employment may lead an ex-offender to a return to crime. It has been demonstrated that the rate of recidivism can be cut substantially by opening new doors for employment of ex-offenders. The U.S. Department of Labor administered a bonding assistance program whereby fidelity bonds were posted in order to protect the prospective employer from loss due to theft or acts of dishonesty. The program provided bonding assistance to more than 3,400 persons, most of whom were ex-offenders. Included were inmates released after completing skill

training programs conducted in correctional institutions under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Less than 2 percent defaulted over a 5-year period, and a State official administering this program declared that nationwide statistics regarding the programs' loss experience indicate that the average ex-offender was a better risk than some regular company employees. This program has become so successful that bonding assistance is now available to all institutions where skill training under the Manpower Development and Training Act is provided.

An offender should not forget what he has done; however, after he has paid his debt to society there is no value in using his record of crime to determine eligibility for employment, bonding and licensing. We must inspire wrongdoers to hope and work for a second chance. We must then give them that second chance.

Under the leadership of Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER, the Select Committee on Crime has studied the problems correlating recidivism and the lack of rehabilitation in our corrections system today. The Crime Committee held extensive hearings on the need for penal reform and determined that the bulk of correctional manpower and money is institution oriented and that real alternatives to incarceration are largely unexplored or experimental, notwithstanding the fact that many authorities indicate such alternatives could decrease the inmate population by 40 percent and, for the money spent, produce at least as good results. Chairman PEPPER discusses the need for expunging criminal records and restoring civil rights, as rehabilitation tools, in "Prisons in Turmoil," an article in the December 1972 issue of Federal Probation, a journal of correctional philosophy and practice published by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice. I introduce that article into the RECORD herewith:

PRISONS IN TURMOIL

(By Claude Pepper, Chairman, Select Committee on Crime, U.S. House of Representatives)

Over 100 years ago, the Nation's leading prison officials met in Cincinnati, Ohio, and in recognition of the importance of prison reform established the National Prison Association. Its Declaration of Principles has remained to this day the bible of prison reform. "Reformation," they declared, "not vindictive suffering, should be the purpose of the penal treatment of prisoners."¹ The tragedy is that what was set forth as a declaration of *goals* in 1870 still remains a declaration of *goals* in 1972. The degrading and dehumanizing conditions characteristic of our prisons over a century ago are still prevalent today. We need only look at Attica, Raiford, and other more recent prison uprisings to see what little progress reform has made.

Soaring crime rates provide further testimony to the failure of America's prison system, for recidivism is responsible for a disproportionate share of this country's crime problem. Nine out of 10 of our prisoners will one day be released and it is estimated that two-thirds of these will then commit additional crimes.² In fact, it is said that ex-offenders are responsible for four out of every five felonies committed today.³

Footnotes at end of article.

In truth, then, it seems that our prisons are not "correctional" institutions at all but rather "crime hatcheries" which produce men and women more deviant, disturbed and finely skilled in criminal ways than when they were first admitted.

We must ask, therefore, why our prisons are failing to rehabilitate? And how we can improve them? With these questions in mind, the House Select Committee on Crime, of which I am chairman, held hearings in November and December of last year to investigate the tragic outbreaks at Attica and Raiford. If we could determine the root causes of these disturbances, we surmised that we could perhaps isolate the major problems of our correctional system as a whole and thereby find effective paths to reform. Because our committee's principal concern is the problem of crime, we were particularly interested in ideas and programs which would have an immediate impact on reducing the rate of recidivism by those who have been in such institutions. This article will discuss some of the major problems the correctional system faces today, as illuminated by these hearings, and some ideas on how we can most effectively improve the rehabilitation process.

Based on our hearings and study of the problem, we concluded that the failure of the rehabilitation process is caused by both the in-prison and post-prison experience. Principally, we need to phase out large "correctional institutions" and replace them with small community-based treatment facilities and programs. Also, we need to utilize those alternatives to incarceration which have shown some success in reducing recidivism rates, such as probation and parole supervision, halfway houses, and work-release programs. Finally, we must improve the post-prison experience of the ex-offender by restoring his civil rights upon release and ending discriminatory job-hiring policies.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

What is wrong with the typical inmate's prison experience? How can we improve it?

Five years ago, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice conducted one of the most comprehensive studies ever made on the American correctional system. It concluded:

"Life in many institutions is at best barren and futile, at worst unspeakably brutal and degrading. To be sure, the offenders in such institutions are incapacitated from committing further crimes while serving their sentences, but the conditions in which they live are the poorest possible preparation for their successful reentry into society, and often merely reinforce in them a pattern of manipulation or destructiveness."⁴

It was not hard to see why. In 1967, thousands of inmates were housed in grim impersonal fortress-like structures, some of them actually built over 100 years ago. Little effort was made to separate the violent and nonviolent, the hardened criminal from the first offender. These institutions, located in remote rural locations, isolated offenders from society, both physically and psychologically. They cut off offenders from schools, jobs, families, and other support influences and provided few job training or educational programs, increasing the probability that the label of criminal would be indelibly impressed upon them.

Based on its study, the Commission set forth a model for correctional institutions. They should be small, located as close as possible to areas from where they draw inmates, probably in or near the city rather than in a remote area. Architecturally, they should resemble a normal residential center, as similar as possible to that of the real world where the offender would eventually return. Vocational and educational training would be carried on within the community. Even if initial screening and classification in-

dicated that long-term incarceration was called for and the offender was of necessity confined in a more secure facility, the small community-based institution could serve as a halfway house or prerelease center to ease his eventual transition to community life.⁵ The Commission also urged the utilization of alternatives to incarceration to keep the offender in the community, such as probation, parole, halfway houses and work release programs. It was within the context of the community that the offender first had trouble adjusting and it was to that community he would someday return. It was here, therefore, that meaningful rehabilitation could take place, not in an artificial prison environment.

Community-based programs, the Commission concluded, were by-and-large less costly than institutional incarceration and usually at least as effective in reducing recidivism, and in some cases significantly more so.

Although the Commission's recommendations were highly praised, and have been espoused by correctional authorities ever since, few of them have been implemented on any significant scale. The majority of our prisons are still massive antiquated institutions housing thousands in remote areas. And they are still ill-prepared—if not more so—to return an offender to the community.

THE ATTICA AND RAIFFORD DISTURBANCES

Let us look at Attica and Raiford prisons, the subject of our hearings.

Prior to this last year's disturbances, Attica housed over 2,200⁶ inmates; Raiford over 3,000.⁷ Both were located in small rural towns quite remote from the homes of the majority of inmates—the ghettos of Harlem and Bedford Stuyvesant, the cities of Jacksonville and Tampa.

Repeatedly, our witnesses stressed the need for smaller facilities; that is, if we were earnestly concerned with rehabilitating rather than "warehousing" convicted criminal offenders. With more than 500 to 600 inmates, the emphasis in a correctional institution necessarily shifts from rehabilitation and treatment to security and regimentation. There is no time for personal attention—no opportunity to effect the changes in mental attitude and social outlook necessary for rehabilitation to take place.

The location of a prison is equally important. The remoteness of these institutions made it difficult for families and friends to visit the inmates, thereby depriving them of beneficial support and encouragement during the time of their incarceration. On-the-job training opportunities for offenders in communities, such as those provided by work-release programs, also suffered. There were few job opportunities in the small town of Attica, for example, and Buffalo was too far away for daily commuting.

In addition, the rural situations of Attica and Raiford made it difficult to recruit a racially balanced corrections staff. At Attica, for example, 55 percent of the prison population was black; 7 percent Puerto Rican. Yet there was only one black and only one Puerto Rican on the prison staff out of a total of 540 employees.⁸ At Raiford, 60 percent of the inmates were black, while there were only three black guards.⁹

The result was that few staff members had the ability or the background to communicate with the inmates, thereby contributing to tensions behind prison walls. Most of the inmates had serious difficulty relating to the typical white guard. As one Florida prisoner put it:

"For the black person . . . there is no source of identification, there is nobody to identify with. We are never going to feel that any real rehabilitation program is going to be worthwhile until we can see more people we

can identify with—which means some black people. . . ."¹⁰

There were other differences, too, contributing to communications problems. The typical inmate at Attica, for example, was under 25 and from the ghettos of New York City; the typical guard was middle-aged and from upstate rural New York.

Unfortunately, the situation at Attica is typical of correctional institutions nationwide. Although nearly 40 percent of the inmates in our Federal, State, and local prisons are black, only 8 percent of our correctional personnel are black. Although most inmates are in their twenties, the median age of prison guards is over 40—30 percent are over 50 years of age, and only 13 percent are under 30.¹¹

Moreover, most staff members at Attica and Raiford were primarily concerned with custody not rehabilitation, further increasing communications difficulties. Inservice training programs which could improve their ability to deal with offenders in other than a security-oriented manner were also missing. The result: Our corrections personnel, perhaps the key influences in an institutionalized offender's life, were ill-prepared to help the offender. According to one of our witnesses, what was needed was training not only in offensive and defensive tactics, but also in sensitivity involvement so that corrections personnel could relate to the inmates—whether black or white, urban or rural-bred.¹²

The inmates at the institutions at the time of the disturbances required professional help because 72 percent of them had been habitually unemployed or underemployed before sentencing; 40 percent lacked marketable job skills;¹³ 80 to 90 percent were underprivileged¹⁴ educationally, economically, and culturally; and a substantial number had not even completed elementary school. But professional help was extremely scarce. At Attica, there were only 11 staff members responsible for improving the inmates' academic proficiency.¹⁵ And at Raiford there was only one psychiatrist available on a part time basis to assist the offenders with their psychological problems.¹⁶

Attica and Raiford are typical of too many of our so-called correctional facilities. They manifest all the deficiencies pointed to 5 years ago in the President's Commission report on corrections. If we are going to reverse the trend of failure manifested by our correctional facilities, we need to eliminate these large overcrowded institutions and replace them with smaller community-oriented facilities and programs which emphasize rehabilitation rather than custody. Rather than spending over \$1.5 billion a year to perpetuate a system which has clearly been a failure, we should spend our resources on developing those alternatives to incarceration which have shown some indication of success, such as probation and parole supervision, work-release and halfway house programs.

PROBATION IN LIEU OF INCARCERATION

Expanding the use of probation should be high on the list for any State seriously interested in rehabilitating offenders and cutting recidivism rates. As the President's Crime Commission pointed out, the correctional strategy that presently seems to hold the greatest promise is that of reintegrating the offender in the community. In addition, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency has stated that only a small percentage of offenders—usually estimated to be 10 to 20 percent—really need to be behind bars for the safety of the community. The rest could be treated more effectively in the communities.

Placing an offender on probation instead of incarcerating him has a number of advantages. Probation gives the offender a second chance to adjust to community life with help. At the same time the supervision of

the offender affords the community a measure of protection. Probation also protects the offender, particularly the first offender, from the deleterious effects of modern day institutionalization, thus decreasing the probability that the criminal label will be indelibly impressed upon him. In addition, probation programs are far less costly than incarceration and have proved to be at least as effective in reducing recidivism, and in some cases significantly more so.

Although widely recognized to be an effective way to deal with offenders, probation is still not utilized by some of our States, particularly with persons convicted of misdemeanors. And where laws providing for probation do exist, they often exist in theory but not in practice. High caseloads for probation officers, and lack of funding and community resources have negated its potential effect. Typically, probation supervision consists of a 10 to 15 minute interview during which the probation officer queries the probationer or admonishes him for his actions. There is little time for real assistance such as vocational or psychological counseling.

Treatment in the community cannot be effective if the community lacks the services and facilities to support a meaningful rehabilitation program for each and every offender according to his particular needs. If offenders could function on their own in the community in the first place, most would not be in their present situation. These individuals need adequate help and supervision in overcoming their problems. Yet few probationers receive either.

New York City's probation system is representative of many of the problems probation programs are facing today. The system is badly strained due to excessive caseloads and too little money. Although the President's Crime Commission recommended 35 as the optimal caseload per probation officer, the average caseload in New York is 86 per officer. The amount of attention any of the City's 15,000 or so probationers can expect from their caseworkers, therefore, is minimal. The result: Meaningful probation work is not being carried out, and probationers are now getting rearrested, absconding, and otherwise violating their probation at higher rates than in previous years.¹⁷

Ironically, however, probation is far less costly than incarceration. In 1965, it is estimated to have cost about \$3,600 per year to institutionalize a juvenile (a figure which is probably double today). However, it costs only one-tenth that amount to keep him on probation.¹⁸ Even assuming a substantial improvement in salaries and personnel which would upgrade the quality of our probation services, probation would still be less costly than incarceration. The savings become more apparent when we consider the costs of welfare for families of the incarcerated, and the additional loss of taxable income on the part of the offender.

Properly administered, probation provides an excellent alternative to incarceration. California's probation subsidy program is a good example of how our States could operate their probation programs more effectively. The State of California pays its counties up to \$4,000 not to send a youthful offender to a State correctional institution. Instead the offender is kept in the community and provided with intensive probation services, which are made possible with the State payment. As a result of this program, California has reduced the number of youthful commitments, lowered recidivism rates, and substantially improved the overall quality of its probation services. In addition, the probation subsidy program is far less costly than incarceration, having saved the State millions of dollars since its beginning 6 years ago.¹⁹

Footnotes at end of article.

Although widely acknowledged to be successful, only a few States have put similar programs into practice. *Our States should be learning from the successes of their neighbors, and expending their resources on these proven effective programs rather than on such known failures as our large correctional facilities.*

The number of criminal offenders coming before our courts is growing by leaps and bounds. This Nation simply cannot afford to incarcerate them all. The safety of our society demands that we develop effective alternatives, and a good probation program is a significant start.

PAROLE SUPERVISION

What about those who are institutionalized? How can we increase the chances that they will not return to a life of crime upon release?

Most correctional authorities agree that the critical period for a newly released prisoner in terms of his potential return to crime is the first several months to a year following release. This is the time when he must face the pressures of finding a job, renewing ties with his family and friends, finding housing, and generally adjusting to a way of life quite different from the mindless, routinized life behind bars. The stresses are frequently too great to bear, and all too often the offender falls right back into a pattern of crime.

Parole programs enhance greatly the chances that the released offender will become a law-abiding citizen, for he has the benefit of help and supervision upon his release rather than having to face the world alone. As is the case with probation, however, parole in many States exists in name only. High caseloads, inadequately trained parole officers, and lack of community resources, including job placement programs, psychological help, counseling, and other support services, negate its potential impact. Where it has been utilized properly, however, parole supervision has proved successful in helping reintegrate the offender into society, and reducing recidivism rates.²⁰

HALFWAY HOUSES

In recent years, a number of experimental community programs called halfway houses have been established across the country which offer the offender even greater supervision and guidance than the usual parole routine. These are now considered important supplements to an effective parole program.

The period immediately following his release usually proves the most difficult for the ex-offender. He may have no place to live, no job, little money, and no one to turn to for advice. Can he withstand the day-to-day pressures of a community life he is not used to? Will he be able to handle his new status as an ex-offender? How he initially adjusts to his new atmosphere usually determines his success in avoiding a return to crime. The purpose of the halfway house is to help the offender make the difficult transition from institutional life to community self-sufficiency, by providing him with room and board, psychological and vocational counseling, and other support services.

A major recommendation of the President's Crime Commission called for the development of such facilities:

"... located close to a population center, maintaining close relations with schools, employers, and universities—housing as few as 50 in each; serving as the center for various kinds of community programs and as a port of reentry to the community for those offenders who have been exiled for a time to the penitentiary."²¹

Although the number of halfway houses throughout the Nation has increased four-

fold since the Commission's recommendation,²² few offenders actually benefit from their services. Moreover, as was the case with probation and parole, the halfway house in theory is not always one in practice. Some it seems are doing only a halfway job in trying to rehabilitate offenders. They are providing merely room and board while neglecting the crucial support services such as job placement and vocational and psychological counseling, which are considered the key ingredients to an effective halfway house program. Correctly administered and with the proper programming for offenders, however, halfway houses can be effective in reducing recidivism. Mr. Norman Carlson, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, testified at the hearings of the Select Committee on Crime that recidivism among Federal offenders were reduced by 10 percent when halfway houses were utilized as a transitional step to the community.²³ In addition, halfway houses can be used in other capacities; for example, as alternatives to imprisonment for the probationer (halfway in prison) or as prerelease guidance centers for those still under sentence of imprisonment.

The chief problems halfway houses across the country are experiencing today stem from their most characteristic feature—their community-based location. In recent years, there has been growing opposition by members of our communities toward the placement of such facilities in their neighborhoods. According to a 1967 Harris poll, it was found that 80 percent of those questioned approved the idea of halfway houses. But when it came to actually placing one in their neighborhoods, about half interviewed said they would oppose it. In addition, more than two out of three thought most of their neighbors would be against establishing one.²⁴ This view on the part of the American public hurts our rehabilitation efforts. The public must be made to realize that the offender referred to a halfway house is only a few months away from his eventual release anyway. In a short time, like it or not he will be back among us; this time without the benefit of the help and supervision a halfway house could provide. In the long run, a few months "decompression" time in such a facility reduces, not increases, an offender's potential threat to society. We should expand our development of halfway houses, with an eye toward recruiting competent staff members and instituting worthwhile programs of assistance for the resident offender.

WORK RELEASE

Another rehabilitative tool which helps bridge the gap between the isolated prison environment and the real world is work release. Work release allows an offender who is usually nearing the completion of his sentence to leave the prison during the day to work in the community. There are many benefits to such a program.

First, participating in a work-release program gives the inmate an opportunity for job training unavailable in a prison. One of the worst features of prison life is idleness. At Attica over 60 percent of an offender's time is spent unproductively in his cell.²⁵ This is tragic in view of the fact that almost three-quarters of the inmates lack marketable job skills. The prison job training programs which do exist are simply too few to go around, and are often hopelessly irrelevant to the demands of today's labor market.

We talked to one of the guards at Attica about that institution's training program. He informed us that although there was a metal shop at Attica in which inmates could receive job training experience, it only employed 450 men out of the total prisoner population.²⁶ Moreover, within the shop itself, there was not enough work to go around, so that many inmates would spend their so-called training time as onlookers

rather than as participants. We asked a former correctional officer at Raiford's prison about the adequacy of its educational and training programs. In his words, they were not by any stretch of the imagination adequate:

"The thing about it is you might have 20 inmates working in a shop learning a good trade, and at the same time 100 inmates working out on the farm cleaning out ditches."²⁷

Work-release programs are a good way to provide the offender with meaningful on-the-job training experience. He is out in the real world using equipment that is up to date and building good work habits under supervised and structured conditions. Work release also gives the offender the opportunity to develop and practice a new social role in the outside world, further easing his transition to community life.

Second, a prisoner can help pay for his keep in prison with work-release earnings, and contribute to the support of his dependents to help keep them off welfare rolls. His earnings also enable him to put aside a considerable sum of money against the time of his parole or discharge. In so doing the inmate is able to maintain his dignity—the importance of which cannot be overemphasized. Again and again, we have heard our rioting inmates cry for the right to be treated as human beings. The robbing of prisoners of their dignity is one of the most heinous and detrimental results of prison life—one that should be corrected now. For unless we do treat our prisoners as men by giving them an opportunity to perform worthwhile social functions—we cannot expect that they will act as men upon their return to society.

Third, one of the principal reasons for the establishment of work-release programs is to provide the offender with an opportunity to obtain a job which he might keep upon release, thus helping him overcome the difficulties of finding postprison employment.

Wisconsin began the first work-release program in 1913, when it permitted misdemeanants to take outside jobs in the community. However, it was more than 40 years later when the first State offered work release to adult felons on a large scale. In the 1960's, spurred by the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission report, the idea caught on, and it has been estimated that now approximately 37 of our States have work-release laws. However, all too often their programs are token measures rather than viable efforts to get offenders out into the community. Reports are that only 2½ percent of the total number of inmates are actually participating in work-release programs, a substantial number of whom are from the few of our States which have instituted work-release programs on any significant scale.²⁸ At Attica, for example, a work-release program was just started in April of last year, and only six inmates were participants at the time of the uprising.²⁹

Restrictive laws are one factor which has limited the utilization of work release. For example, many State laws prohibit work release for inmates who have committed certain offenses, or who are more than 6 months away from their release date. Although under no circumstances should the jeopardy of the community be placed at high risk, indications are that a far greater number of inmates could participate in work-release programs without compromising the safety of the community.

The remote location of most of our prisons is another factor responsible for impeding the development of work release. Transportation is a major problem and cooperating employers are hard to find. In addition, the nature of work found in rural locations is rarely relevant to life in the metropolitan areas, where most offenders eventually find themselves. Consequently, work release loses one of its principal advantages—providing

Footnotes at end of article.

offenders with an opportunity to work on jobs they can keep upon release.

There are, however, several effective work-release programs which are operating now in the United States—programs which are helping the offender maintain his sense of dignity, and which have shown some success in reducing recidivism. One such program was described to us by William Leeke, Director of the South Carolina Department of Corrections.

In South Carolina, remoteness from metropolitan areas is not a problem, for work-release participants are housed in community-based prerelease centers which are located in downtown areas or on the outskirts of town. Work-release participants, therefore, are able to commute daily to their regular jobs in the community. They are paid the minimum wage; and thus are able to pay the State of South Carolina for their keep, and contribute to the support of their families. Since 1968, when the series of community-based prerelease centers were first put into operation, less than 10 percent of the people who have successfully completed work release have returned to the South Carolina Department of Corrections for parole violations.²⁰

For most offenders, incarceration is a temporary matter. They will sooner or later be back among us and they must be prepared to lead a law-abiding life if we want to see a reduction in recidivism. Alternatives to incarceration, such as probation and parole supervision, halfway houses, and work-release programs have proven themselves—to date—to be most effective means to achieve this end.

RESTORING THE EX-OFFENDER'S CIVIL RIGHTS

The failure of the rehabilitative process cannot be attributed solely to the offender's experience behind prison walls, for his experience in the community upon release is equally as damaging. When a man is convicted of a crime and is sent to prison to serve out his sentence, this is often just the start of the price he must pay. Although we claim the purpose of rehabilitation is to successfully reintegrate the offender into the community, we deny him entry by means of Federal and State laws which deprive him of many civil rights and make it extremely difficult for him to obtain postrelease employment.

In many States, a convicted offender cannot vote. He cannot hold public office. He may not bring suit, enter contracts, testify in court, or even obtain life or automobile insurance—all privileges that do not threaten the public in any way, and the lack of which deter the ex-offender's rehabilitation. An offender may also lose his home and property, or even his family. Most States make criminal conviction or imprisonment grounds for divorce; and some make it reason to deprive him of his children.²¹ Yet the support of the family can often determine the success or failure of an offender's rehabilitation. There is, in fact, no better way to harm his chances for a successful life upon release than to preside over the disintegration of family ties. Yet that is what we are doing by tolerating such statutes.

A few of our States have recognized the damaging effect of such laws, and have remedied the situation by instituting expunction or annulment procedures, both of which are designed to restore to the offender his forfeited rights and exonerate him from the fact of his conviction.²² These procedures seem to be the most successful in giving the offenders an opportunity to live down their records, and more of our States should put them into practice.

We must all ask ourselves what we gain when we deny the offender the full opportunity of citizenship—particularly once he is released. By refusing to restore his rights,

we are preventing the convicted offender from assuming his role as a responsible citizen, with a stake in the society in which he lives. And we should not be surprised when he registers his discontent by setting his own standards which he knows he can follow.

JOBS AND HIRING

Nowhere is the public's lack of commitment toward rehabilitating the criminal offender more apparent, however, than with its job-hiring policies which so discriminate against the ex-offender.

Studies have shown conclusively that the ability of an offender to stay out of trouble after his release from prison is directly tied to his ability to obtain and hold a job.²³ Yet we have developed job hiring policies which have made it so difficult for ex-offenders to obtain a job that it is no wonder that their unemployment rate is two to three times higher than the national average.

Most offenders leave the prison confines with nothing more to their name than \$40 and a suit of clothes. Their academic and vocational deficiencies together with the prejudices of many private employers close many doors to employment opportunities. Discriminatory job hiring policies take care of many of the remaining options. In the State of Florida, for example, there are 63 jobs in which an ex-offender is ineligible to perform simply because he is an ex-felon.²⁴

One of the greatest barriers the offender must face in obtaining employment upon release is the necessity for an occupational license, which a growing number of occupations are requiring. To be a barber, plumber, or even a beauty operator, one must be licensed; yet many Federal, State and county laws exclude from consideration the offender convicted of a serious crime. Some of the States directly disqualify the offender from holding a license. Others are more subtle, disqualifying him, for example, by requiring "good moral character." What good will it do to train a man to become a barber in our correctional institutions, we must ask, if State law prohibits him from practicing?

Government job applications are another barrier. A recent study conducted by the Labor Department's Manpower Administration surveyed State civil service statutes and local ordinances and regulations. The survey showed that there were few clearcut standards governing the employment of a person with a criminal record. Many contained exclusionary provisions which were broadly worded and subjected to highly personal interpretation. For example, many jurisdictions authorized the exclusion of applicants "unfit" and some excluded those who had been guilty of "infamous" or "notoriously disgraceful" conduct. The study revealed only one State which did not ask applicants about arrest or criminal records.²⁵

Perhaps the greatest single contribution we could make to reduce recidivism would be to increase employment opportunities for the ex-offender. First of all, we could do this by increasing the quantity and quality of job training programs in our correctional institutions so that our offenders will not be sitting idle, but learning job skills which are in demand in today's labor market.

Second, we need to eliminate the artificial barriers to employment which are posed by arbitrary licensing and registration requirements. It is difficult to see the wisdom in denying a beautician's license to a man simply because he is an ex-felon. On the contrary, such exclusionary practices not only harm the offenders chances for rehabilitation, but increase the threat to the community by heightening the likelihood that he will be forced back into crime in order to earn a living.

Third, we need to assume the responsibility of hiring the ex-offender ourselves. This must be a concerted effort undertaken by both the public and private sectors. For example, an ex-offender can obtain a Civil

Service position in the Federal Government, but the procedure is drawnout and difficult, and few do. We need to improve this situation and open up more employment possibilities for the ex-offender on the Federal and State level. But the governments cannot handle the job alone. The offender must be able to take his place in the private sector as well.

The time for prejudice is passed. Unless the offender can feel part of the community again—measured by his ability to obtain and hold a job—he cannot be expected to live by its rules and standards. And it will be the private citizen who will pay the price in the end, for that offender is going to be back in the community some day and he is going to be looking for a means to support himself. It is up to us whether he goes the legitimate or illegitimate route.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the Committee's hearings on the disturbances at Attica and Raiford, we have been able to draw some conclusions on how we can best rehabilitate our criminal offenders and reduce recidivism rates.

First and foremost, it is very clear that our prisons are far too large and unmanageable for any serious effort at rehabilitation to take place. Our ultimate goal must be to eliminate these huge monstrosities and replace them with smaller correctional complexes located in or closer to the community. More immediately, we must focus our attention on alternatives to prison such as halfway houses, work-release programs, and probation and parole services. We need to expand these programs so that they will benefit a far greater proportion of our correctional population. Simultaneously, we must improve the quality of these programs' services.

Second, our rehabilitation efforts must not cease when we discharge the prisoner from custody. We must continue our efforts into the community and provide the ex-offender the greatest possible opportunity to live the remainder of his life as a law-abiding citizen. By restoring his civil rights and eliminating discriminatory job hiring policies, we can best help the ex-offender feel part of a society whose standards he would want to uphold.

Third, we need to allocate a greater proportion of our resources towards developing community-based treatment. Although about \$1.7 billion is spent by the State, county, and local governments for corrections, currently about 90 percent of it goes toward institutional programs. Only 10 percent is allocated for community-based programs or alternatives to incarceration, despite the fact that two-thirds of our correctional population is in the community.²⁶ In other words, we are spending 90 percent of our correctional budget on a strategy that we know has failed, and only 10 percent on a strategy which already has proved itself more effective.

We need a reordering of our priorities. And it is in this capacity that the Federal Government has a role to play.

The major Federal program which provides financial aid to States and localities for the purpose of strengthening their crime prevention and control activities is the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) program, established in 1968 under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. As amended in 1970, the program now provides that not less than 20 percent of the funds made available for the regular assistance program shall be allocated to correctional activities. Moreover, States wishing to receive funds for corrections programs must submit a State plan which provides satisfactory emphasis on the development and operation of community-based correctional facilities and programs, including halfway houses, probation, and other supervisory release programs. The bulk of assistance, therefore, is to go

for the development of alternatives to incarceration, not institutional programs."¹

Although the Federal Government can play a part in encouraging the States and localities to develop effective rehabilitation programs, it cannot do the job alone. The rest is up to the American people. For it is the American public who must realize that the overwhelming majority of people who go to prison will one day return. We are going to have to either put offenders away and keep them there indefinitely, or we are going to have to support more effective rehabilitation efforts. For without them we will all be forced to cope with the end results of our current prison system—recidivism, growing crime, future Atticas. The choice is up to us. A halfway house cannot exist without the support of its neighbors, a work-release program will fail without employers, and offenders will return to crime if denied legitimate participation in the American way of life.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "The Shame of the Prisons," *Time*, January 18, 1971, p. 51.

² U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Reports—1970*. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970, p. 39.

³ Ramsey Clark, *Crime in America*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970, p. 55.

⁴ President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 159.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

⁶ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, Part I, November 29, 30; December 1, 2, and 3, 1971, p. 4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 260.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

¹¹ Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time To Act*, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969, p. 12.

¹² U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 317.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 418.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 228.

¹⁷ Wesley Oelsner, "Rise in Crime Straining Probation System Here," *The New York Times*, December 6, 1971, p. 43.

¹⁸ President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

¹⁹ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *Juvenile Justice and Corrections*, Third Report, January 2, 1971, p. 42.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²¹ National Institute of Mental Health, *Graduated Release*, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, p. 15.

²² John Prestbo, "A Helping Hand," *The Wall Street Journal*, March 3, 1972, p. 1.

²³ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

²⁴ Walter Rugaber, "Public Is Found To Resist Prison Reform Proposals," *New York Times*, October 25, 1971, p. 29.

²⁵ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

²⁸ Rugaber, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

²⁹ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 397.

³¹ Neil Cohen and Dean Hill Rivkin, "Civil Disabilities: The Forgotten Punishment," *FEDERAL PROBATION*, June 1971, p. 22.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³³ Daniel L. Skoler, "There's More to Crime Control Than the 'Get Tough' Approach," *American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals*, September, 1971, p. 36.

³⁴ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, p. 356.

³⁵ Patricia Marshall, "Criminal Records and Public Jobs," *Manpower*, December 1971, pp. 3-4.

³⁶ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Crime, *American Prisons in Turmoil*, p. 460.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 451.

THE CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the balance of power between the President and the Congress is out of joint and needs to be righted.

CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

This imbalance is the dominant theme in the opening days of the 93d Congress. A mood of anxiety about the expansion of Presidential power at the expense of the Congress dominates the speeches and the conversations of the lawmakers. The imbalance is present in practically every legislative issue before the Congress, but it is most obvious in the spending issues, with all the debate on the impoundment of funds, and foreign policy. My observations concern the imbalance in foreign policy.

Without consulting Congress, Presidents can commit American troops to Korea, Cuba, Dominican Republic, and Vietnam. Without consultation, Presidents can make commitments pledging the money and the lives of Americans. Without consultation, they can conclude a 10-year war by executive agreement.

The constitutional power of the Congress to declare war has passed to the President.

The constitutional power to ratify treaties has been nullified by the extensive use of executive agreements. And even the constitutional power to advise and consent, once intended to make the Senate a partner in policymaking, has been diminished and ignored.

Scholars once commented that in foreign policy the President proposes and the Congress disposes, but in a large number of highly important instances, Congress does not even have the opportunity to dispose.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations states:

It is no longer accurate to characterize our government, in matters of foreign relations, as one of separated powers checked and balanced against each other.

There is no democracy in the making of foreign policy in the world's greatest democracy, and the Congress, in large measure by its own fault, has become a mere appendage in the foreign policy-making process.

This is not what the Founding Fathers

intended. They intended for the Congress to play an important role in shaping the foreign policy of the Nation. The Constitution gives to the Congress the power—

To declare war;

To provide for the common defense;

To regulate the armed services; and

To regulate foreign commerce.

Congress is charged with making all laws "necessary and proper" for putting into effect these powers. It is given residual powers:

All other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By comparison, the Executive is given the executive power and serves as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He is given the power to make treaties and certain appointments only with the requirement that two-thirds of the Senate concur.

Beyond any doubt, the Founding Fathers wanted to deny the President unrestrained power in matters of war and peace. In the Federalist Papers, Hamilton more than once assured the public that the powers of the Executive to make war were not nearly so sweeping as those of a monarch and that the Constitution placed severe and effective constraints on Executive prerogatives.

In a letter to James Madison in 1789, Thomas Jefferson expressed his satisfaction that the President's war powers were adequately curtailed:

We have already given in example one effectual check to the Dog of war by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay.

Senator MATHIAS recently observed that:

In relation to the Executive Branch of government, the Congress today has become a third- or fourth-rate power, a separate and thoroughly unequal branch of our national government.

HOW CONGRESS LOST ITS POWER

The expanded powers of the President in foreign affairs is a result not only of aggressive Presidents, but also of the acquiescence of the Congress.

In the first century of our history, Congress was an active partner in U.S. foreign policymaking.

Jefferson, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, and James Buchanan—to name a few—confirmed the warming powers of Congress. President Buchanan wrote:

(The Executive) cannot legitimately resort to force without the direct authority of Congress, except in resisting and repelling hostile attacks.

In the War of 1812, the war with Mexico, and the Spanish-American War, the Congress either declared war or formally recognized the existence of war.

During the 19th century, several incidents involved the use of American forces by the President without specific congressional authorization, but they were minor undertakings for limited purposes, such as suppression of piracy and slave trade, "hot pursuit," and protection of American lives and property.

Most of these incidents involved no combat, or even its likelihood, with the forces of another state. So the experience of the 19th century left the basic authority of Congress to approve the initiation of armed conflict intact, if somewhat frayed around the edges.

The 20th century brought some changes. The President pursued aggressive policies to establish U.S. hegemony in the Western Hemisphere and in the Boxer Rebellion U.S. troops were used, for the first time, outside the hemisphere without congressional authorization.

Later, the Congress flexed its muscles and, rightly or wrongly, blocked U.S. membership in the League of Nations. The foreign policy record of the Congress between the world wars, when the Senate rejected the League of Nations and the Congress exhibited an isolationist attitude during the 1930's, was not good, and probably contributed to the Congress dependence upon the President in foreign policy.

After World War II, the flow of power from the Congress to the Executive increased. The President assumed that the power to send American troops abroad and engage them in hostilities was inherent or implied in the Constitution. Edward S. Corwin described the Constitution as "an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy." In these years, Congress did not put up much of a fight.

REASONS FOR CONGRESS LOSS OF POWER

Several factors contributed to the accelerated flow of power to the President.

Following World War II, one crisis followed another:

The reconstruction of shattered countries;

The menace of an aggressive international Communist movement; and

Berlin, Korea, Greece, Iran.

During these crises, the appeal for unity was irresistible. Bipartisanship became the standard operating procedure of U.S. foreign policy. The American people tend to rally around their President in times of crisis, and neither they nor the Congress were to be bothered by constitutional niceties. Congress was mesmerized and impotent. Its power was fragmented and diffused. The President was unified and confident.

Congress had difficulty gathering, or absorbing information, and it was dependent upon whatever information the President wanted to give and when he wanted to give it. Given the mood of the period, Congress was under enormous pressure to support the President and under the threat that congressional delay could damage the national security.

Officials of the executive branch publicly declared that Congress was not a necessary and desirable element in shaping U.S. foreign policy. In 1951, Secretary of State Dean Acheson said:

Not only has the President the authority to use the Armed Forces in carrying out the broad foreign policy of the United States and implementing treaties, but it is equally clear that this authority may not be interfered with by the Congress in the exercise of powers which it has under the Constitution.

Acheson further berated Congress for questioning the constitutionality of some executive initiatives:

We are in a position in the world today where the argument as to who has the power to do this, that, or the other thing, is not exactly what is called for from Americans in this very crucial hour.

That kind of thinking is what got us into the mess we are in now.

This constitutional imbalance, then, was caused by—

The inability of Congress to respond to crisis and war as we responded to one crisis after another without regard to the constitutional processes;

The superior information, actual or presumed, of the President; and

The natural hesitancy of the Members of Congress to defer a judgment on difficult public issues, preferring to let the President act and then wait and see how public opinion developed.

But the events of recent years have caused many people to begin to examine the premises upon which American foreign policy operated. We found ourselves in a war we did not fully understand. We asked ourselves:

How did we ever get into it?

Why were we fighting it?

It was obvious that the Congress had sat idly by while one Presidential action after another involved us even deeper in Indochina. The constitutional concept of checks and balances and separation of powers became something more than the topic of an academic discussion in political science classrooms. Its failure to operate helped plunge us into the most tragic and useless war in our history.

RECENT CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES

Gradually, during the last half of the 1960's, the Congress became restive and anxious to play a role in foreign policy. By early 1966 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was holding televised hearings on Vietnam that affected public opinion significantly.

The Congress deserves the criticism heaped upon it for its passivity during the war. But the critics sometimes fail to acknowledge that it was the Congress—specifically, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that served as the focal point of dissatisfaction with the war. Eventually the critics, although they never won a single vote in the Congress, succeeded in turning war policy around 180 degrees.

Other actions by the Congress show its concern in foreign policy.

In 1969 the Senate passed a resolution defining a national commitment. Under the resolution, a national commitment does not exist without "affirmative action" by both the executive and legislative branches. This resolution, while without the force of law, was a warning to the President.

In 1970 the Senate rejected the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

During the 92d Congress both the Senate and the House passed war powers legislation to allow needed Executive flexibility to respond to emergencies, but which would require subsequent congressional approval of Executive use of

U.S. Armed Forces in absence of a declaration of war by Congress. The war powers legislation was approved in a different form in each House, and did not emerge from conference to become law. New war power legislation has already been introduced this year.

The Symington Subcommittee on National Commitments unearthed several secret agreements entered into without reference to Congress—with Ethiopia, Laos, Thailand, Korea, and Spain, among others. Senator FULBRIGHT put it rather succinctly:

We get many treaties dealing with postal affairs and so on. Recently we had an extraordinary treaty dealing with the protection of stolen art objects. These are treaties. But when we put troops and take on commitments in Spain, it is an executive agreement.

But the executive branch will no longer be able to make such commitments completely unfettered. A law passed last year provides for congressional review of executive agreements within 60 days after they come into force. At least Congress will have an opportunity to inform itself of what the executive is doing and to review such agreements.

Congressional restiveness has been evident in amendments to end the war, stop military aid to Greece, reduce troop levels in Europe.

WHAT MORE CAN BE DONE

The mood of Congress today is more assertive and aggressive than at any time since I have been in Washington. The question is not whether but what the Congress should do to retain its traditional role in foreign policy.

To revitalize the role of Congress, the essential step is for the Congress to employ the constitutional powers already available to it.

First. Congress must use with vigor its power to oversee and investigate.

The Congress must assure that—

Its legislative intent is being carried out;

Programs are being effectively administered; and

There is no misfeasance.

Professional investigators and auditors should be employed. Members of Congress should travel to the site of operations, and the Government Accounting Office should be fully used.

The executive branch must be required to state and defend its policy at every opportunity, and the congressional hearing should be employed for that purpose. Asking the right question is an important obligation of the Congress.

The House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments went 11 years without a meeting. Small wonder that the Congress lost its position as a partner in policymaking.

Second. Congress has the power to confirm and deny appointments of certain officials.

This power in the past has been more a rubberstamp for Presidential actions than a vital constitutional responsibility of the Senate. Properly used, it can check unwarranted Presidential actions. It can be used as a forum to express the view of

the Congress. Careful examination of the nominee should reveal how he views his job. Congress should elicit from the nominee assurance of his cooperation and his availability to the Congress, and a pledge to carry out the intent of the Congress as expressed in law.

The Congress has an obligation to offer to the President the best advice it can on foreign policy. This advice should be offered at every appropriate opportunity and in the appropriate forum and whether or not it is solicited by the President.

In the past few years the Senate rejected two Supreme Court nominees. Although that is an extreme step it is at times appropriate if the Congress is to fill its constitutional role.

Third. Congress has the power of the purse.

James Madison said the power of the purse "may be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any Constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people."

This weapon grown rusty from disuse, is clearly its most formidable weapon. It can be utilized to pursue positive goals and to prevent actions by the President the Congress believes harmful. The efforts in the Congress to cut off funds for the Vietnam war, even though not enacted, undoubtedly put pressure on the President to end that conflict.

Fourth. Congress has the power to be informed.

The Congress must assure itself of a steady flow of information on all foreign policy concerns. Information is the key to power. The hearings on the Vietnam war before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee produced information which, in time, turned U.S. war policy around in Vietnam.

Congress has often failed to act out of fear that it did not have sufficient information to decide. The tendency has been to defer to the President who has superior information.

The Congress needs access to the best information available on foreign policy topics. It does not have that access today. A solution for this lack is not easy, but the Congress should begin now to explore ways and means for its membership to assimilate the best available information. The present assistance available to a Congressman, including personal and committee staffs, and even the Library of Congress, simply does not provide the kind of quality information that is routine for the President, but unavailable to Congressmen.

Perhaps the answer is a "think tank," or an intelligence gathering and analyzing agency, not part of the Library, staffed by highly qualified experts, responsive to the congressional leadership, immune from the trivia that inundates the Library of Congress and capable of giving the Congress independent judgments on policymaking issues.

Today the flow of information to the Congress is impeded by the excessive and indiscriminate use of executive privilege and the self-serving overclassification of executive documents. Both practices constitute an obstacle to Congress' legitimate need for information.

George Ball said,

I think there is very little information that the Congress should ever be denied.

A flow of information is indispensable to wise participation in foreign policy. Executive privilege, which is constitutionally a dubious device, should not be invoked by the President to shield public officials from interrogation by the Congress unless the President himself makes the decision and communicates it to the Congress.

Cabinet and supra-Cabinet officers must be responsive to Congress. When administration officials refused to appear before Senator PROXIMIRE's Joint Economic Committee recently, he charged, and I agree, that—

It shows a distinct absence of understanding of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, a lack of respect for the division of powers, and a failure to comprehend and carry out the fundamental principle that open debate and inquiry serve, better than any other instrument, the interests of a free people and a free society.

The objective of a better informed Congress is nothing more complex or less critical than that Congress be able to arrive at its own conclusions independent of the executive. If this goal is not realized, the concept of checks and balances is inoperable.

Fifth. Congress should speak on foreign affairs with a unified voice through a Joint Committee on National Security.

The making of foreign policy is so fragmented in the Congress that it defies understanding. One estimate is that more than half of the standing committees of Congress are involved in some aspect of U.S. foreign policy. No one knows who speaks for Congress in foreign policy, and one need is for coherence.

A permanent committee, operating in a manner similar to the Joint Economic Committee, could articulate the collective view, or views, of the Congress in a coherent, unified voice.

I will soon be introducing legislation to create such a committee.

Sixth. Congress should enact war powers legislation to reaffirm the constitutional role of Congress in foreign affairs.

Such a bill should spell out the specific rules governing the use of armed services by the President in an emergency. The principal bill before the Congress today would authorize the President to take appropriate military action—

To repel an attack on the United States or its armed services:

To protect the lives and property of American citizens; and

To execute a duly authorized national commitment.

The President would be obligated to report his actions to the Congress immediately and he would not be permitted to sustain the military action beyond a 30-day period unless Congress took affirmative action authorizing him to do so.

War powers legislation . . . properly written, could help preserve the constitutional role of Congress without destroying the flexibility the President needs to respond to authentic emergencies and threats to our national security.

Seventh. Finally, no substitute exists for people in the Congress and the executive branch who are sensitive to the requirements of the Constitution and the joint possession of powers it clearly provides for.

Awareness and sensitivity to this joint obligation can go a long way in resolving the difficulties of joint participation in the foreign policy process.

CONCLUSION

Someone asked Secretary of State Rusk how foreign policy was made in the United States? His reply was, "The President makes foreign policy." He was probably right. But my point is that that is not the way it ought to be. Everyone would concede that the President should play the chief role in the foreign policy-making process. The concern is simply that we have gone too far toward the concentration of the warring and other powers in the hands of one man.

The concern over the amount of power concentrated in the Executive cuts across party and ideological lines. Liberals and conservatives are concerned. Democrats and Republicans are concerned.

The present imbalance must be corrected. Not alone because it makes a sham of our Constitution—although that is sufficient reason—but also because a strong and independent foreign policy role for the Congress is the best hope to prevent one-man rule in the most important decisions Government makes—those of war and peace. Unrestricted Presidential power in foreign policy making is neither necessary nor tolerable in a free society.

DISMANTLING OEO: FROM WAR ON POVERTY TO WAR ON THE POOR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most shocking and almost unbelievable sentence in the fiscal year 1974 budget proposal of President Nixon was this one:

No funds are requested for the Office of Economic Opportunity for 1974.

We have since been told that some of the OEO's programs will be "spun off" to other Federal agencies; that legal services, perhaps the most successful of OEO's programs, will be constituted a separate, independent corporation; that community action agencies—CAA's—must rely for any further funding, as the budget message euphemistically put it, on "the discretion of local communities."

Mr. Speaker, the dismantling of OEO would be a tragic mistake, and I for one, as a Member of Congress, pledge myself to do everything I can to prevent it from happening. The net effect of the President's proposal would be to wipe out the most visible sign of America's commitment to equality of economic opportunity. For some strange reason, President Nixon, by one stroke of his pen, would deny to that one citizen of every 12 who happens to be poor the newly found voice which has made his own government more meaningful to him.

In my own State of Hawaii, programs such as Headstart, Upward Bound, transportation services, and activities for youth and senior citizens have demonstrated the positive contribution that OEO can make. I would like to share with my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD excerpts from some of the scores of letters I have received on this subject.

One letter from a resident of the island of Kauai made this plea:

Please help the people in keeping OEO active. It has helped the people of Kauai in so many ways. People who have never been out of their homes are now really active in these programs. I have seen adults and youths learn to work more together on problems through the Youth Development program and parent group.

Parents who have and had children in Headstart have really seen the improvement in their children and themselves.

Another letter stated:

Would you please fight for the life of OEO, because this is an office informing the people of assistance for their benefits. It's channel of reaching the poor people in their every day life.

The young and old are really depending on the OEO assistance to (help them know how to help themselves.)

And another wrote:

The Head Start program for four year old children is accepted as a must by the parents of the low income group. The parents are so enthused that they have been volunteering in the classroom as well as on outings for the Head Start children. When we asked the parents "Would you want President Nixon to dismantle this program?", they answered "Definitely no!"

The legal services program of OEO has been generally recognized as one of the most effective of all Federal programs. It has provided access to "the system" for millions of Americans for whom a courtroom previously meant only a place to be found guilty of a criminal charge against them.

Having sponsored legislation both in the last Congress and in this for an even more effective legal assistance program, I fully share the President's desire to insulate the legal services program from partisan politics by constituting it as an independent corporation. However, the President knows full well that a major conflict developed over the same proposal in the 92d Congress and may yet develop in this Congress. Provisions must be made. Therefore, for continuing operation of the legal services program during this transitional period.

Perhaps the most tragic aspect of President Nixon's proposed dismantling of OEO is the not-so-slow death planned for community action agencies. This action was somewhat surprising, since Mr. Nixon has frequently advocated a decentralization of Federal programs to bring decisionmaking closer to those directly affected by those decisions.

The CAA's represent the best in decentralization. Although there were early instances of friction between CAA's and local elected officials, that is no longer the case. In a report issued only last month by OEO itself, it was found that

CAA's are rapidly becoming very positive forces in their communities that can

play significant roles in helping communities rise to the challenge of revenue sharing and other forms of government decentralization.

Mr. Speaker, it was only 6 months ago that President Nixon signed into law Public Law 92-424, extending the life of OEO through June 1974. Is the \$870 million provided in that measure and considered necessary in September 1972 to help the poor suddenly not necessary in February 1973? Have those in need become somehow less worthy? Is the Federal Government's duty toward them any less? Or is the difference all a matter of viewing the issue before an election and after winning it?

It is said that revenue-sharing funds will be available to CAA's and other OEO programs. This may be so, but experience during the first year of revenue sharing has shown that such funds are much more likely to be used to balance State budgets or lighten property tax loads, rather than to fund programs for the poor, previously financed wholly by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there will be ample opportunity, through the appropriations process, in the consideration of the President's proposed reorganization plan and special revenue-sharing plans, and through direct legislation, for Members of Congress to indicate their views on OEO. I intend to take full advantage of those opportunities and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. The poor must be given a voice, an access to the system by which they are governed. For countless thousands over the past few years, OEO has provided that access. Regardless of the announced intention of the President, we of the Congress, who are closer to the people, must work toward preserving the democratic process for all concerned, including the poor. We must not allow the dismantling of OEO.

REPLY TO PRESIDENT'S ENVIRONMENT MESSAGE OF FEBRUARY 14

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, last week, when the Congress was in recess, the Republican administration sent to Capitol Hill a so-called ecology package. It included one more chapter in this year's serialized State of the Union message and a laundry list of 19 bills, most of which the Congress has seen before.

The ecology package followed by 1 day the radio address in which President Nixon outlined to the Nation his program on ecology and environment. While I commend the President's initiative in these vital areas, it seems to me that he has seriously underestimated the size of the job to be done. Especially, with regard to farm programs, he has adopted a course that will be just plain ruinous. His farm policy will drive more and more family farmers out of business, force them off their land, and leave the fields to fewer and larger agribusiness producers. For city dwellers and for all of us, this course can lead only to higher food prices.

Mr. Nixon tells us that we are "well

on the way to winning the war against environmental degradation." I admire his optimism, but I think we ought to face the problems of pollution with more realism.

The fouling of our environment has been a long, slow process stretching back to colonial times. Naturally, it accelerated during the 19th and 20th centuries with the expansion of the United States, the growth of its population and the development of the Nation's industrial might.

It was not until the 1960's that a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress recognized the dimensions of the problem and the significance of it and determined finally to exert national leadership toward its solution.

Now, hardly a decade later, a Republican administration wants us to believe that the job is nearly done—that in 10 years we have stemmed or reversed a tide that has been rolling against us for more than two centuries.

Our air may be a bit cleaner, as the President says. But it is not clean enough.

Our water may be a bit clearer, as the President says. But it is not clear enough.

We may have made some progress toward ridding the landscape of junked automobiles and other debris. But we have yet to establish an effective, consistent and workable policy for the disposal or recycling of solid waste.

The achievement of the past 10 years is dwarfed by what remains to be done. It is an awesome project. And a costly project. I can understand the President's eagerness to be done with it.

But the fact remains that an enormous task still faces us. And if the President will not provide the leadership to deal with it, then the Congress will.

Hearings in both Houses already have been held or are being held on a wide range of bills dealing with environmental protection. Many of them are more constructive and substantive than the rehash of old legislation which the President has resubmitted to the Congress.

Environment is one area in which the funds we allocate have double impact. They carry on the great work of restoring our environment and refreshing our surroundings. And they create jobs, which the common man badly needs. Unemployment is still running at 5 percent, and the President is doing far too little to reduce it.

Despite the President's statements last week on the environment, I think that his actions these past few months have been more revealing. He professes concern for our surroundings, and yet he withholds the funds necessary to take care of them.

He has held up some \$6 billion which is available during the next 2 years for construction of sewage treatment plants. He has refused to use some \$474 million in fiscal 1972 and 1973 funds for land and water conservation.

In January he impounded \$520 million of a \$650 million fund earmarked for water and sewer lines construction in big cities and smaller communities throughout the Nation. In December, he cut REAP dead. The rural environmental assistance program is a dollar-for-dollar matching program. It encourages

livestock feeders and dairymen to control erosion and to prevent runoff of soil nutrients.

Last week Mr. Nixon made much of sending up a bill calling for Federal standards on drinking water. Yet, by his cutbacks, he severely handicaps the States in their efforts to improve water quality.

Of course, I can understand the President's reluctance to spend more money. In the 4 years of his administration, we have amassed about one-fourth of the national debt. During those 4 years, the budgets Mr. Nixon prepared and sent to Congress have run a total of \$106.2 billion in the red—more than the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations put together. In each year since 1971, the President has asked Congress to authorize spending which would result in substantial budget deficits. The deficit spending of the past few years has been done upon the initiative of Mr. Nixon, not the Congress. It is his budget, and it is his deficit. Any attempt to place the blame somewhere else is mistaken.

This Congress believes that Mr. Nixon's priorities are in the wrong place. We will not let him turn his back on this Nation's pressing domestic needs.

This Congress favors responsible and constructive Federal spending policies. This Congress feels that the administration has given too little thought to the best uses of Federal funds.

We are headed for even worse economic troubles if this administration continues its shortsighted policy of cuts in domestic programs. I mean cuts in such areas as emergency employment, housing, urban renewal, and education.

By its actions, this administration could slow down the economy to such an extent that we would begin the slow slide toward recession. We are being pointed once again toward another economic crisis like the recession of 1957-58—which was also manufactured by a Republican administration.

There are disturbing similarities, for example, between the farm policies of that administration and the present one.

President Nixon says he wants to make the farmer free to plant. At the same time, he wants to reduce price supports. The combination of increased production and inadequate price supports will mean a drop of \$1 billion in net farm income in 1973. That could push additional thousands of family farms into bankruptcy.

We should, instead, be giving more constructive thought to the uses of our agricultural abundance. If we are going to encourage production, we should devote our surpluses to worthy programs like food for peace. We can offer substantial food supplies to developing nations or other nations with food shortages. At the same time we must assure all farmers—not just the big ones—of a fair return for their investment and their work.

Agriculture already has suffered disproportionate cuts in its funding. Agriculture accounted for one-twenty-fifth of the Federal budget in fiscal 1973. Yet it took one-fifth of all the cuts. And now agriculture is asked to take another \$2.1 billion cut in fiscal 1974, and President

Nixon has made no secret of his intention to get rid of price supports altogether. I can tell you that if we do not treat our food producers better, all of us—city dwellers and rural—are going to suffer for it.

The President had all too little to say about the energy crisis in this message. He promised to save that for another installment in his series of State of the Union messages.

He should have much to tell us. I believe that the energy crisis is much worse than we have been led to believe. Our fuel consumption has jumped alarmingly. In the past dozen years we have used as much coal, oil, natural gas and other fossil fuels as in all previous history, all the way to the caveman.

We are in danger of exhausting the world's known deposits of fossil fuels by the end of the century. Our newest and most promising source of energy—nuclear power—remains relatively undeveloped as a peacetime tool. In fact, of our present \$3.3 billion budget proposed for atomic energy in fiscal 1974, only eighteen percent is devoted to peaceful uses.

The President's message on environment simply does not deal with the hard problems facing this Nation. Mr. Nixon wants to abandon the war on pollution to the industries that are responsible for a good share of this Nation's pollution in the first place. He wants to disrupt the country's food production system in a manner that would force thousands of family farms into bankruptcy. And he is playing with an economic fire that could lead to recession a few years hence.

Last week's message tells us that the President once again proposes to abdicate his leadership responsibilities. It is quite plain that Congress must assume the burden.

A DISAPPOINTING BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal 1974 budget proposals sent to the Congress by the President are disappointing and hold little hope for those of us concerned about improving the quality and equality of opportunity in our society. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I cannot accept the proposed priorities which the President has offered to us.

During the next few months, various committees of the House will be reviewing in depth the budget proposals as they relate to individual programs. As this process continues and as appropriation bills are drafted, I hope that Congress will totally redirect the thrust and direction of the budget so as to establish clear and realistic priorities. It is tragic that after so many years of waiting for an end to our costly involvement in the Vietnam war, we receive a blueprint for the future which downgrades basic domestic programs.

There are many drastic changes in national commitment proposed in the

budget and a further shift away from programs designed to meet human needs. Not only are several programs drastically cut but others are totally abolished. The budget has fallen on a wide range of programs in health education, housing, and the war on poverty yet military and defense programs managed to avoid the ax and come away a littler richer under the President's master plan.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Perhaps the most shocking and disappointing of the proposals would eliminate funding for all community action programs. The proposed budget ends the Office of Economic Opportunity as a government agency devoted to finding ways to reduce poverty in America. While some of the Agency's programs are shifted and transferred to other Federal departments and agencies, there is no mention of community action programs in the budget. I submit that this callous action illustrates a determined effort not only to dismantle all Great Society programs but a refusal to face the real issues facing our Nation.

The continuation of poverty in the midst of plenty is disappointing in itself but the conscious decision not to try to reduce that poverty and despair is shocking and outrageous. The time has come for the Congress to speak out against executive tampering with the establishment of spending priorities and there is no clearer issue upon which to base that action than the funding of community action efforts to combat the plight of less fortunate Americans.

EDUCATION

Other areas of the budget which should produce public outcry include large reductions in spending for education. The proposed budget is particularly harsh on programs like library construction, reduced by \$138 million; and aid to impact areas, reduced by \$143 million. Since 1966 Congress has made clear its intention to assign a high priority to Federal aid to education by appropriating more funds for these programs, yet the proposed budget would reverse that commitment.

HEALTH

In the field of health and the improvement of our Nation's system of improving access to medical care, the proposed budget is particularly radical. Programs to aid hospital construction and modernization, improve medical research, and develop community mental health centers are abolished while funds to train health manpower are reduced. In addition the President proposes to shift some of the costs of the medicare program away from Government and onto the medicare patient by imposing a higher deductible and a 10-percent daily charge at the doorstep of the ill elderly patient. I do not believe Congress is ready to accept this kind of turnabout in our pledge to help the medicare patient meet the increasing costs of health care.

HOUSING

The proposed budget shows no funds for new projects in the areas of urban renewal, model cities, open space, neighborhood facilities, and other programs designed to erase the blight of our urban areas. New commitments for housing

subsidies are also suspended by the budget, ending aid to families which have waited for an opportunity to live in a decent home.

NEW PRIORITIES NEEDED

I recognize that all existing Federal programs have not been successful. Many have failed to live up to their announced expectations. Others have proved to be wasteful and inefficient. Others have failed for lack of imaginative administration. These facts point up a need for streamlining, modernizing, and improving those programs but instead the administration has applied the ax and has shown a marked preference for abolishing programs rather than improving them.

That is the task before Congress and I am confident that we will choose the more difficult goal of improving domestic programs, not abolishing them. Millions of Americans can have better lives if we are successful but if we never try, there can be no hope.

HAZARDOUS CARGO

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I requested a study late last fall after I contended that the best available research, including a GAO 1970 Bureau of Mines study RI-7448, indicated that a catastrophe of major proportions could result from an LNG spill.

Approximately 1 month after I had requested the GAO report, which was to include a cost-benefit analysis of so-called population remote ports for delivery of hazardous cargo such as LNG, my staff was informed that, for technical as well as financial reasons, such a report would be unfeasible. It was, therefore, agreed that, on my behalf, the General Accounting Office would solicit from the Federal agencies involved with LNG their best estimates of the hazards associated with the handling of the gas in the marine environment.

The GAO has informed me that although several agencies are involved in various aspects of LNG transport, storage, delivery, and safety, only the Coast Guard was actively engaged in research efforts. For this reason, the Coast Guard was asked to submit to the GAO a detailed assessment of LNG dangers. At this point, I would like to focus on several of the problems presented in the Coast Guard report.

First, the Coast Guard report specifically cites the unexpected finding of the Bureau of Mines study that occasionally LNG explodes without fire when it contacts water. This finding, according to the Coast Guard, has resulted in the award of a followon contract for further study of this particular hazard.

In this regard, the report also notes that it will be between 3 to 5 years before the results of the Coast Guard's study on evaluating hazardous material transport risk will be completed. The Coast Guard states:

This is an extremely complex undertaking since it involves identifying all of the events in water transportation which may cause a significant release of cargo . . . and determining an acceptable level of risk.

The Coast Guard report, in discussing the current assessment of hazards, contends that designs for ships and barges are safe from the standpoint of normal operations. Furthermore, the report points out, preventive measures are being used to avoid the dangers of so-called cargo rollover as well as the more obvious danger of ship collisions.

Even a cursory reading of the Coast Guard's report should reveal that it is geared more closely to normal operations than to the possibility of a serious emergency. While studies that would more clearly identify risks are underway what might be viewed as experimental deliveries of LNG continue to flow into New York and Boston. The Coast Guard appears to be allaying fears about the danger of LNG while at the same time it may be laying the framework for a major disaster.

While some of the risks have been identified, it is not entirely clear what might happen under abnormal circumstances. I think that the Coast Guard's ongoing review and updating of its methods for handling hazardous cargo is essential. However, I feel that it is too dangerous to allow continued deliveries of LNG while these studies, as well as the probe of the Staten Island LNG tank disaster, are still far from complete.

Therefore, I am going to introduce legislation to suspend all LNG ship deliveries until the Coast Guard, in conjunction with other Federal agencies, provides to the Congress a complete evaluation of all foreseeable hazards in transporting LNG and a comprehensive plan for dealing with any emergency created. I feel very strongly that the unknown dangers, as well as the known potential for risk, make such a suspension imperative.

According to the American Gas Association, LNG imports account for only about two-tenths of 1 percent of our domestic gas supply. Certainly the safety of hundreds of thousands of city dwellers who might be affected by a large-scale LNG spill is worth insuring through this temporary suspension until we can assure that such accidental spills could be adequately predicted and safely contained.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the date of the enactment of this Act no liquefied natural gas (except such gas as may be in transit on such date for importation) may be imported into the customs territory of the United States and no new construction of storage facilities for liquefied natural gas may be commenced within the United States until—

(1) the Commandant of the Coast Guard, in conjunction with other appropriate Federal agencies, submits to Congress—

(A) a comprehensive evaluation of all foreseeable hazards associated with the marine transportation and the delivery and storage of liquefied natural gas, and

(B) a comprehensive plan (which may include suggested legislation) for preventing or minimizing the hazards indicated in such evaluation;

(2) the Commandant of the Coast Guard, under existing authority of law, by regulation prescribes such safety standards as may be required to prevent or minimize any of the hazards indicated in such evaluation; and

(3) the Congress, after reviewing such evaluation, plan, and regulations authorizes by law the resumption of importation of liquefied natural gas and the construction of new storage facilities for such gas.

CRIME COMMITTEE'S WORK OUTSTANDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman member of the House of Representatives from a district concerned about crime in this country, I was shocked recently to read of efforts underway to end the work of the Select Committee on Crime and its chairman and my good friend, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER.

It would be strange indeed for history to record that at a time when crime is uppermost in the minds of our citizens that one of the first acts of this body would be to strike down the only committee focusing directly on crime.

Just prior to my election to represent a constituency which was partially represented by Chairman PEPPER last year, I had the opportunity to follow 3 days of informative hearings held by his committee in July in Miami. These hearings were part of a nationwide inquiry into the effect of the drug crisis in secondary and elementary schools which the committee studied in 1972.

I recently read in the Washington Post a story by Jules Witcover of a committee report that describes the scope of a drug epidemic in our schools together with recommendations for a Federal response.

In a recent conversation with Congressman PEPPER it became apparent to me how very vital and useful this committee has become to this House.

Because Chairman PEPPER was impressed with the testimony of many witnesses during its field hearings, he arranged for Dr. Marcus A. Foster, Superintendent of the Oakland Public Schools, to testify before the Education and Labor Committee on the need for Federal funds to develop effective drug programs in schools.

Chairman PEPPER and Dr. Foster were greeted most favorably by Chairman CARL PERKINS who noted that drug education funds for the schools would receive attention this year by his committee.

It is this kind of cooperation between an investigative committee and a legislative committee that I am sure the Members desired to see when they created the Crime Committee by a vote of 343 to 19 in May 1969.

I, for one, hope that I have the opportunity this session to cast my vote

for a further extension of the committee's life so that the recommendations contained in four reports, soon to be released, can be fully debated. It would also give Chairman PEPPER and his committee the opportunity to inquire into the nature and causes of street crime, such as the senseless shooting of a U.S. Senator and the robbery at the Alexandria home of a widow of a Supreme Court Justice.

For the record I insert the following news articles to include a Miami Herald story entitled, "Pepper's Crime Committee Doomed?" by David Hess; Jules Witcover's Washington Post article entitled, "Drug Epidemic Has Hit Schools, Hill Unit Says;" Jack Anderson's story entitled, "People's Crime Committee Faces Ax From Opponents," and a selection of articles describing the Crime Committee hearings last July in my city.

PEPPER'S CRIME COMMITTEE DOOMED?

(By David Hess)

WASHINGTON.—Florida Rep. Claude Pepper's Select Committee on Crime has been mugged.

The controversial committee, which Democrat Pepper has used sporadically to spotlight the activities of organized crime, appears to be headed for oblivion—the victim of a House power struggle.

On Jan. 15, the House passed a resolution that clearly states that all select committees and their staffs will be funded through March 31.

But the head of the House Administration Committee says he cannot legally issue paychecks or other funds to the select committee staffers.

Administration chairman Wayne L. Hays (D., Ohio) concedes that the House resolution "appears to authorize payment to the select committees."

But the House parliamentarian and his own Administration Committee lawyer, Hays says, advised him not to sign the paychecks.

"Select committees," Hays explained, "are temporary bodies that die with the end of each Congress. Until they are reconstituted by the Rules Committee and approved by the House, they can't be supported."

Anxious to avoid a knock-down drag-out fight that could jeopardize continuation of the committee, Pepper says he "hopes to get this problem straightened out amicably with the Rules Committee as soon as possible."

Pepper is sixth-ranking Democrat on Rules.

His efforts, however, will be contested by Rep. Peter W. Rodino (D., N.J.), the new chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Rodino is claiming jurisdiction over crime investigations.

Hays admitted that "there seems to be a jurisdictional problem involved here." But he denied that the dispute in any way influenced his somewhat unusual interpretation of the House resolution that authorized continued support of all select committees.

"Sure, I agree that the Judiciary chairman ought to have jurisdiction over crime matters," Hays said, "but that didn't—sway me. I'm just one vote on the House floor and I don't intend to try to influence others to follow me."

Hays also said that "in my opinion," Rodino seems to be winning the power struggle.

"If I were a betting man," he said, "I'd say the Crime Committee's days are numbered."

Though Pepper has been accused by critics of running a "scattergun" attack on organized crime, most agree that his committee has at least focused public attention on some of syndicated crime's activities.

Whether a subcommittee within Judiciary

could bring the same attention to bear on crime is uncertain.

Pepper believes that a select committee, with wide-ranging subpoena powers and a higher profile, is a more effective tool for investigating organized crime.

Others, including Hays and Rodino, are said to feel that the powerful Judiciary Committee would bring more credence and prestige to the House's investigations.

DRUG EPIDEMIC HAS HIT SCHOOLS, HILL UNIT SAYS

(By Jules Witcover)

The House Select Committee on Crime, on the basis of a yet-unpublished staff report that says a "drug epidemic" has hit the nation's public schools, has voted to call for "massive" federal aid for inschool detection, treatment and drug-abuse education.

According to Chairman Claude Pepper (D.-Fla.), the committee backed away from its staff's recommendation for a \$5-billion fight against drugs in the schools over a five-year period.

Until legislative hearings can be held to determine the exact need, Pepper said, the committee's consensus favored using only the word "massive." But nobody really quarreled with the \$1-billion-a-year figure, he said.

The committee staff report said the money should be raised through increased excise taxes on drugs—including alcohol and cigarettes, which are considered part of the "epidemic."

The staff report, based on a seven-month investigation in six major American cities, also had proposed a ban on drug advertising on television during hours it usually is watched by children, and specifically on children's TV shows.

But Pepper said that in light of reports that the television networks were planning an early meeting on the problem, the committee has decided only to urge the TV and drug industries to exercise "voluntary restraints" on drug advertising.

The staff report that went to the committee on Wednesday also takes school administrators to task for having "ignored their responsibility" in coping with in-school drug abuse. It says teachers are ill-trained to do so and it charged existing anti-drug education programs are a "disaster."

Calling the proposal only "a first step in a long march to provide a drug-free environment for our children," the report says:

"Drug abuse prevention and treatment must become an integral part of school life. It must be integrated into our schools with the permanence, expertise and long-range commitment accorded the highest priority."

The report calls the \$1-billion-a-year figure "a modest proposal" that provides only \$10 a semester for each student in an elementary or secondary school—"barely enough money to provide the first fundamental building block in any drug program, one drug specialist (a teacher-counselor) in each of the nation's schools."

Included in the report are a number of independent surveys and case histories, some of them previously reported, to justify the label "epidemic."

The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse report of last March is cited, for instance, indicating 6 per cent of high school students had used heroin, 8 per cent had tried LSD, mescaline, peyote and other hallucinogenic drugs, 5 per cent cocaine, 8 per cent methamphetamines, 7 per cent barbiturates and 5 per cent painkillers like morphine and codeine.

A 1968-1972 study of high-school student drug use in San Mateo County, Calif., is reprinted indicating slight rises in 1972 in the use of alcohol, tobacco and marijuana, a leveling-off in use of LSD and amphetamines and a slight drop in barbiturates and heroin.

Alcoholic beverages and tobacco are considered drugs in some of the surveys, but not all, and there is no indication whether beer is included in the alcoholic beverage category.

The committee took testimony from mid-June through December in New York, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, Kansas City and Los Angeles, from more than 200 witnesses, school officials, teachers, nurses, PTA officials, students, doctors, judges and police officers.

"Our preliminary examination of the matter indicated that the problem was severe," the report says, "but our investigation demonstrated that the drug crisis in our schools greatly exceeded our worst expectations . . .

"As we delved further into the problem we discovered that drug abuse in our schools is appropriately described as an extremely deadly epidemic which is presently raging in our schools; it is infecting our youth and contaminating our schools; it has reached crisis proportions; and it is leaving a trail of devastation that will take a decade to remedy."

"Tragically, the chances are substantial that when a parent sends his child to high school each day he is sending him into a drug-filled environment. He is placing him in an atmosphere where drugs are usually bought and sold—an atmosphere where there is considerable pressure from other students to use drugs."

"Drug abuse in our schools has become so extensive and pervasive that it is only the uniquely gifted and self-possessed child who is capable of avoiding involvement with some form of drug use."

Of TV drug advertising, the report says:

"It is clear that pharmaceutical companies are not only proliferating this country with pills but they are also contaminating our airwaves with unnecessary and deleterious advertising . . . it is deleterious to children's health because it conditions them to the unnecessary use of drugs . . .

"One in every six television advertisements is a drug advertisement. Over \$211 million is spent annually to indoctrinate and brainwash us with the necessity of purchasing various drugs . . ."

"In the course of our investigation we were repeatedly told by educators that television commercials had already conditioned a child's values before he enters school . . .

"In the course of our investigation we were repeatedly told by educators that television commercials had already conditioned a child's values before he enters school . . . Undoing the initial impact of these television commercials will take a lifetime of education . . .

"If one is ill and requires medication, a doctor is the most appropriate agency for prescribing drugs—not an advertising agency."

The report says schools are ideal for any attempt to reform attitudes on drugs.

"But the most imaginative and effective efforts in our schools will be undermined by the continuous barrage of TV advertising. Any national commitment to eliminate drug abuse by a preventative educational system must prohibit the proliferation of advertising of drugs on television."

The report proposed the \$1 billion needed to pay one drug abuse teacher-counselor in each of the nation's 66,800 elementary and 26,300 secondary schools be raised thus:

A 25-cent tax on each bottle of liquor manufactured or distributed in the United States—\$365 million; a two-cent tax on each pack of cigarettes—\$536 million; a five-cent tax on each amphetamine and barbiturate—\$300 million.

School administrators, the report says, must develop a clearly defined policy on how to deal with drug users and sellers and "such policy must include guidelines for harmoniz-

ing and integrating of law enforcement efforts on school campuses," with pushers the first target.

In school programs to identify users by "physical inspection, medical examination, urinalysis or interview" are needed, the committee survey says, and starting next September, "school boards should refrain from appointing any teacher who has not attended a college course" in drug education for children.

Finally, the report urges greater curbs on the manufacture of amphetamines and barbiturates.

Barbiturate manufacture, now unchecked, should be cut 50 per cent by new legislation, the report says. "We need not look for a Mafia or organized criminal element for the cause of barbiturate abuse in this country," it says. "The fault lies squarely with our pharmaceutical manufacturers, drug wholesalers and retailers."

PEPPER'S CRIME COMMITTEE FACES AX FROM OPPONENTS

(By Jack Anderson)

The House Crime Committee is about to become the victim of its own success. Its enemies are converging on it from all directions.

The committee was set up four years ago under crusading old Claude Pepper, (D., Fla.), to expose interstate crime and drug abuse. For two years, it plugged along ineffectively.

Then Miami's Pepper installed a vigorous new staff. Seldom has a congressional committee produced such useful testimony and challenging reports in any two-year period.

It exposed mob infiltration of sports, tying Frank Sinatra to a syndicate-run race track in the process. It hauled grumbling, growling Mafia bosses Raymond Patriarcha and Carlos Marcello into the public spotlight.

Pepper infuriated Dun and Bradstreet and the dignified accounting firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co. by showing they were used unwittingly in a nationwide phony securities scheme.

He horrified the TV industry by demanding that the pill and tonic ads, which bring in billions of dollars, be totally banned from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. to keep children from becoming pill addicts.

So aroused are the pharmaceutical firms that they have flooded committee offices with queries about Pepper's proposal. Calls have even come from stock brokers worried about what would happen to their drug investments.

Worst of all, Pepper stepped on the toes of powerful congressmen who felt he had intruded into their jurisdiction.

With such a record against the special interests, a counterattack was inevitable. Some three weeks ago, minority leader Gerald Ford, (R., Mich.) slipped into Speaker Carl Albert's office and strongly urged him to kill the crime committee. Albert listened but made no commitment.

The White House is also unhappy with the Pepper unit. If the committee gets a new lease on life, the administration is due to get a going-over for its failure to curtail street crime. White House insiders have bad-mouthed the committee for years.

Shortly after it was set up, John Dean III, then a top Justice Department aide and now a Presidential counsel, was dispatched to see what the committee was up to. His negative report caused Justice to refuse to cooperate fully with Pepper. In fact, Justice denied Pepper the names of the 10 top heroin financiers even though their identities were known to Justice.

Within the committee itself, ranking Republican Charles Wiggins of California and Rep. William Keating, (R., Ohio), are working to kill it. Both have contacted the leadership of the Judiciary Committee in an attempt to get the crime unit's functions transferred there.

Significantly, Keating has two major pharmaceutical firms in his district and the committee has lambasted the industry for producing goof balls and pep pills that wind up on the black market.

Judiciary's new chairman, Peter Rodino, (D., N.J.) is also eager to see the Crime Committee die. He wants to build up his jurisdiction, even if it means gobbling up the committee of his old friend, Claude Pepper.

At present, Pepper's opponents plan to bury the committee's funds and authority in the Rules Committee without bringing the issue to a floor vote. A floor vote would put the law-and-order-minded Republicans and their Democratic allies in the uncomfortable position of assisting the Mafia and the drug interests by openly killing the only House committee now dealing exclusively with crime.

SCHOOLS VERSUS NARCOTICS

In the wake of hearings held by the Select Committee on Crime, chaired by U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper of Dade, local school officials have announced an expanded drug program for the coming school year.

The project has yet to be voted on by the Board of Public Instruction. The community should familiarize itself with the program's three approaches and relate these goals to the hearing on crime and drugs.

The panel heard about the accessibility of drugs in the schools as well as various crimes committed while young people were allegedly experiencing the effects of drugs. At the time, Rep. Pepper criticized Dade's ineffective attempts to identify and rehabilitate drug users in the schools.

The school plan has been months in the making, and will expand the present drug information approach and the process approach (where youngsters share experiences in hopes of understanding their own problems) to include the activities approach. This would provide secondary schools with funds to expand extra curriculum programs.

The logic is that if students are actively pursuing interesting and creative programs of their own choosing, much of the temptation to become involved with hard drugs can be avoided. The concept has much to offer, since many youths who suffer drug experiences often are alienated from their daily school and personal lives. Some additional form of personal stimulation might be the way to combat drug abuse.

THE DRUG CRISIS

It is disturbing that the United States House of Representatives Select Committee on Crime has called world wide attention to drug crisis existing in our local schools.

The Committee's hearings were initiated in various cities to determine the extent to which drugs are being bought, sold and abused by school children. It was stressed, however, that the Committee was essentially questioning the abject failure of our governmental institutions—especially schools—to attack aggressively the problems of narcotic abuse.

The Congressional Committee, chaired by Claude Pepper, highlighted the fact that Dade County Public Schools, like most big-city school systems, does not have an effective program for providing remedial attention to its students with drug problems. This is an indictment which must be answered with concrete action.

Awesome facts about our local drug scene were brought out in the hearings: that 12-year olds are experimenting with heroin bought in the school yard; that young girls and boys are "popping" pills of all kinds; that 13-year olds are buying dope from their 15-year old school friends; that approximately 1 in 137 local residents is a hard core addict; that more than 450 people have died in drug related deaths over the last five years, 70 of whom were teenagers; that

in the last two years school age children's drug deaths have more than doubled.

This gruesome list goes on and on.

Having had this ugly picture painted for us, Dade Countians must look now for solutions to the drug problems. All those agencies—both public and private—which can influence the development of a comprehensive action plan for Dade County must come together now so that we can begin to eradicate the menace in our midst.

We owe a sincere thank you to Florida Congressman Claude Pepper for convening his Committee in our city and allowing the true facts—however hard they might be—concerning the drug epidemic to come into the public eye.

We owe our young people all the resources we can muster to get those in need immediate help.

We must begin now.

DAUG "EXPERT" TESTIFIES ABOUT HOOKED DAUGHTER

"When I put Kathy in *The Seed*, she was 15 and had been using drugs for two years. She screamed for her lawyer."—U.S. Commissioner Edward Swann

MIAMI.—"I thought I was the top expert on drugs in Miami, then I found out my own 15-year-old daughter was hooked on cocaine," said U.S. Commissioner Edward Swann.

"I handled all kinds of drug cases, from customs, the FBI and other agencies. I knew it all."

"But I've been re-educated in the last 90 days," Swann continued. "I knew just this much." He held up his thumb and forefinger spaced close together.

Swann, father of six children, was testifying before Rep. Claude Pepper's House Select Committee on Crime late yesterday. Pepper, Miami Democrat, and four other congressmen are conducting three days of hearings, ending today, in the Miami area on the problems of drug abuse among school-age children.

Swann told his personal experiences alongside another father, Dr. E. (Jack) Taylor, vice president of student affairs at Fort Lauderdale University, who told of his 19-year-old daughter being rehabilitated after three years as a heroin addict.

THEY TRIED

Both fathers said they had the means and the drive to "try everything" to straighten out their afflicted children.

"I wasn't a bad parent," said Taylor and Swann nodded agreement that neither was he. Their daughters, they said, had both started with marijuana under pressure to stay in step with their school friends.

When none of the treatments and consultations worked, both wound up forcing their children to enroll in "*The Seed*," a project in Fort Lauderdale aimed at rehabilitating school-age children hooked on drugs.

"When I put Kathy in the program, she was 15 and had been using drugs for two years," Swann said. "She screamed for her lawyer."

"After two weeks, when we attended one of the meetings, she still tried to con us, whispering 'Take me home.' Her mother and I just smiled and whispered back, 'We love you.' The experience will tear your heart out."

"Love" is the big word in *The Seed* program, which teaches the youths 9 to 20 years old to love and respect themselves, their country and their parents and to be honest with everyone, the testimony brought out.

For Swann and Taylor there are happy endings. Both daughters are "straight" now and the families have learned new awareness, attitudes and knowledge about each other, the fathers said.

"When I tell some of my acquaintances, lawyers and professional men, that my daughter was a drug addict," Swann said, "they pat me and say, 'You poor man.'

"Funny thing is, my daughter was shooting drugs with some of their kids."

"We have a brand new beautiful daughter in our home now," Swann declared. "And I don't have to worry about the other children in my home. I have the best CIA agent in the world in my house."

The panel of congressmen listened in rapt attention yesterday as a quartet of youngsters from The Seed, along with Seed Director Art Barker, described the revolutionary drug program in Broward County.

So spellbound were they yesterday by the four youths, that the group went straight through the lunch hour as Ann, 14, told about joining a car stripping ring to support her drug habit and Larry, 18, said he skipped drugs only two days in three years before going to The Seed.

Libby, 19, insisted that going cold turkey from heroin isn't all that bad with a sympathetic group near by.

"Junkies are pretty good actors," she said. "They can make themselves as sick as they want. Alcohol is a lot worse to get off of. People have blown it (coming off junk) all out of proportion."

Libby says when she showed up at The Seed, she was on a \$200 a day habit.

Barker appeared yesterday to outline The Seed program.

"We're teaching these kids a sort of primitive Christianity. We're teaching them how to love themselves, how to love others," he said.

In the past two years, 1,800 youths have gone through The Seed program. Barker told the committee. He belittled those who claim there is no drug program in the schools.

"One school security man says he knows of only 60 drug cases," Barker said, adding scornfully, "Four hundred and forty-one of those 60 cases were referred directly to The Seed."

The congressmen asked the youths what parents and teachers can do to combat drug use. The answer: very little. The answer, the youths agreed, is pressure from youths their own age.

Sally, 16, downgraded school drug programs. She complained that teachers either so overstate the dangers that no one believes them or they make the drugs sound exciting.

"You can't really scare a kid into not using drugs because fear lasts only so long. A kid has to want to stay straight," she said.

What teachers and parents can do, she said, is talk to youths and find out how they truly feel, then observe them and become familiar with the terminology and the physical signs of drug use.

Dade County Criminal Court Judge Al Sepe, who has sent several youngsters to The Seed as an alternative to prison, predicted "The government ultimately is going to have to give a single stamp of approval to one drug program."

He said he saw nothing wrong with funding other drug programs. Some day, a choice would have to be made on which program to push the hardest.

He believes that program should be something like The Seed, which uses heavy peer pressure and constant discussion sessions led by ex-junkies.

MOTHERS TELL PROBERS OF SCHOOLBOY DRUG USE

MIAMI.—Three mothers detailed for a House committee on drug abuse yesterday how the use of marijuana obtained at school put their children on the road to hard drugs and death.

One housewife, Mrs. Shirley Fletcher, suggested the death of her 21-year-old son Michael in 1971 was ordered by a crime syndicate along with two other deaths connected with his case.

"Michael died of an overdose of pure, uncut heroin and two boys dumped his body in the Mt. Sinai Hospital parking lot by the bay," Mrs. Fletcher said.

Only three months before, she said, Michael had told her the name of the man supplying him heroin. She reported the man to police, he was arrested and released on bail.

"My son was afraid he might be killed," she said.

Eight days before his death, she said he had kicked the drug habit and had gained 20 pounds.

The two youths who dumped his body pleaded guilty at their trial a year later to third-degree murder and were sentenced June 18 to two years in prison, Mrs. Fletcher said. A boy who had been slated to testify at the trial was also found dead of an overdose of pure heroin and the drug seller named by her son met a violent death.

"I can only guess that organized crime had a great deal to do with these three deaths," she said.

The mothers' testimony led off a three-day hearing of a house subcommittee on crime and drug abuse headed by Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla.

All three mothers said their sons started using marijuana obtained on school grounds and later switched to hard drugs.

Mrs. Fletcher, who now works at a center treating school-age drug addicts, said "it had been in the paper that alcohol is more harmful than marijuana."

"When a kid reads this, he goes out and lights up."

Mrs. Prescola Benaby, wife of a postal worker, said her son Alvin started using marijuana at junior high school when he was 16.

When he was 13 he was a heroin addict who locked himself in his room and strangled his 5-year-old sister Beverly last year.

"There he was, strangling my little baby daughter and I couldn't get in," sobbed Mrs. Benaby.

Her son is now in a Florida mental hospital.

"Where he is at now, I tried and tried to get him there," Mrs. Benaby said. She told the congressmen that probation officers had offered her little more help before the crime was committed than to put her son in the county prison stockade for a year.

"If I'd just had help, I believe it would have prevented the tragedy in my home," she said. "He tried very hard" to get off drugs.

Mrs. June Mock, a working mother, said her son began at age 13 using marijuana obtained while attending Valley High in Las Vegas, Nev., where he was living with his father. The couple is divorced.

At 16, she said, "I had no control over him." At 18, in June of 1969, Edward Mock died of an overdose of heroin.

"My 13-year-old daughter tells me that at Jefferson Junior High, where she goes to school, 'nearly everyone is on pills or pot,'" Mrs. Mock said.

When she tried to seek help for her son, she said, "a juvenile officer told me no help was available.

Pepper's committee is seeking means of providing federal funds for an all-out fight, aimed at school children, against drug abuse.

The Florida congressman emphasized testimony from Dr. Marvin Burt, a research analyst, that drug abusers are stealing an estimated \$28 million a year in cash and property in Dade County alone to support their drug habits.

Committee figures show more than 400 drug-related deaths in Dade County in the past five years. Burt estimated 7,000 to 12,000 heroin addicts lived in the county at the end of 1971, about one per cent of the total population of 1.2 million.

A COMMITTEE WITHOUT A PURPOSE

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the editors of The Daily Enterprise of Riverside, Calif., recently called for the elimination of what has long been regarded by many as the appendix of this body; namely, the Internal Security Committee.

Like the human appendix, HISC serves no purpose that anyone has yet been able to discover. And like the human appendix, HISC poses a constant danger of inflammation and eruption. The matter which builds up within the committee, in the form of dossiers and reports on organizations and individuals, is capable of doing great damage whenever this appendix releases its poison, as it has in the past.

Any doctor would urge a patient with such a condition to undergo surgery for removal of the offending organ, and any wise patient would take the advice. In the hope that this distinguished body will exercise similar good judgment in the near future, I offer this diagnosis from The Daily Enterprise:

A COMMITTEE WITHOUT A PURPOSE

No group calling itself the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation is likely to be received with much of a welcome in the halls of Congress, but a recent petition sponsored by that group and signed by 365 law professors provides a suggestion that has been made in the past by the groups with more respectable names.

The request, to eliminate the House Internal Security Committee, formerly known as the Un-American Activities Committee, is an idea that Congress should have accepted long ago. The committee's preoccupation with American communism, which has hardly been a threat in recent years, has led to most of the excesses one might fear from such a group.

Civil liberties have been breached in the name of preserving freedom, and while the members of the committee have been able to ignore the paradox, thousands injured unjustly by their actions have not.

There is a place for handling legislation on internal security, namely the House Judiciary Committee; the Senate gets along quite well without an Internal Security Committee.

The House Internal Security Committee remains as a throwback to the worst aspects of an earlier time. Even if it must be sold as part of a more general congressional reform, the committee should go. It's been around too long already.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill by request to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

The draft legislation on the subject was sent to the House on February 8, by the President.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place at this point in the RECORD

the letter from the President to the Speaker, as well as the text of the bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1973.
Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am forwarding here-with a draft of proposed legislation "To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes." This legislation would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for international security assistance and for relief assistance in Bangladesh, make appropriations available for disaster relief in the Philippines, and make our military assistance more effective. These proposals are the same as those I presented to the Congress last year.

Foreign assistance plays an indispensable role in the achievement of our foreign policy and national security goals. Because the last Congress did not take final action on the legislative proposals before it or on foreign assistance appropriations, these programs have been operating for almost seven months under a continuing resolution providing temporary appropriations. The delay in enactment of authorization and appropriation bills has created uncertainties among our friends and allies as to our resolution and willingness to provide essential economic and security assistance. Yet this is precisely the time when confidence is most needed in our commitment to continuing our efforts to build a lasting structure of peace.

In the conviction that the timely and full support of these programs on the part of the Congress is in our own national interest, I urge the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to the legislation I am transmitting today.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

H.R. 4395

A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, 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 491 of Chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to refugee relief assistance, is amended by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973"; by striking out the figure "\$250,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000"; and by striking out the words "East Pakistan" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "Bangladesh".

SEC. 2. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 10—PHILIPPINE DISASTER RELIEF"

SEC. 497. PHILIPPINE DISASTER RELIEF.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, the President is authorized to provide, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance in connection with damage caused by floods in the Philippines during 1972. Of the funds provided to carry out part I, \$50,000,000 shall be available only to carry out this chapter. Such assistance shall be distributed, to the extent practicable, under the auspices of or by international institutions and relief agencies or United States voluntary agencies."

Sec. 3. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 504(a), relating to authorization, strike out "\$500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972" and insert in lieu thereof "\$780,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973".

(b) In section 506(a), relating to special authority, strike out "1972" each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "1973".

(c) Section 514 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. Section 532 of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization for security supporting assistance, is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1972 not to exceed \$618,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1973 not to exceed \$844,000,000".

SEC. 5. The Foreign Military Sales Act is amended as follows:

(a) In section 23 of chapter 2, relating to credit sales, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty".

(b) In section 31(a) of chapter 3, relating to authorization, strike out "\$400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972" and insert in lieu thereof of "\$527,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973".

(c) In section 31(b) of chapter 3, relating to aggregate ceiling on foreign military sales credits, strike out "\$550,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972, of which amount not less than \$300,000,000 shall be made available to Israel only" and insert in lieu thereof "\$629,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973".

(d) In section 33(a) of chapter 3, relating to aggregate regional ceilings, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

(e) Section 33(c) of chapter 3, relating to aggregate regional ceilings, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The President may waive the limitations of this section if he finds that overriding requirements of the national security of the United States justify such a waiver and promptly reports such finding to the Congress in writing, together with his reasons for such findings. In any case in which the limitations of this section are waived under the preceding sentence, the report required under such sentence shall set forth, in detail, the amounts of assistance, sales, credits, guarantees, and ship loans proposed to be made in excess of the geographical limitation applicable under this section".

SEC. 6. Section 8(b) of the Act of January 12, 1971, entitled "An Act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes" (84 Stat. 2053), is amended by striking out "\$185,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$245,000,000".

PRESENTATION OF FLAG THAT HAS FLOWN OVER THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HUDDNUT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUDDNUT. Mr. Speaker, during the Lincoln Day recess, I had the privilege of presenting my first flag as a Congressman. It was a thrilling and heart-warming experience to visit Public School No. 59 in Indianapolis. We recited the pledge of allegiance, we sang "The Star-Spangled Banner" and "America the Beautiful," and two children read poems about the meaning of America. A State representative presented an Indiana flag, and then I talked with the assembled children—ranging in age from first graders through sixth graders—and their teachers, about this American flag that had flown over the Capitol of the United States, about what it meant, and where it came from. The day was Lincoln's birthday and also the day that the first Vietnam POW's set foot on free soil, an emotional moment in our country's history when Capt. Jeremiah K. Denton, speaking for the released prisoners, said, "God bless America."

We have much to be grateful for in our country, and, all too often, I think we

fail to express our appreciation. All too often, abrasive and irresponsible criticism is directed toward our country. All too often, people show little or no respect for the traditions and symbols of America, such as our flag. So, at an Indiana Pacer basketball game in the Indianapolis Coliseum that I attended recently with my family, two ingrates remained slouched in their seats near us while the colors were presented and "The Star-Spangled Banner" was sung. So, controversy boiled up recently over whether to play our national anthem at a sporting event in Madison Square Garden. So, when I was touring some CAAP agencies in Indianapolis recently, which the American people are funding with their hard-earned tax dollars, I saw a wall in one room plastered with pictures of Malcolm X, Angela Davis, and the Soledad brothers, as if to glorify their epithets against America and their calls for violence and revolution. So, a couple of athletes recently raised their clenched fists and bowed their heads during an Olympic award ceremony. So, the local branch of the American Civil Liberties Union in our State has offered a prize for the best essay on the subject of desecrating the American flag.

Now I would be the last one to assert that all is right with our country and nothing needed to be changed for the better. I agree with Carl Schurz' paraphrase of Stephen Decatur's famous toast:

Our country, right or wrong—when right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right.

But by the same token, it is our country, "land that I love." There is a lot that is good and fine and true and healthy and of good report about America. There is much to be grateful for. As a freshman Congressman, every time I walk through the corridors of the Capitol and into this magnificent Chamber, my heart fills with appreciation and awe. It is a rare privilege to be here, and to be a participant in the great dialog of American democracy. Would that every American could stand before the Speaker's chair and look at the stars and stripes behind it and read the words engraved in marble above it, "In God We Trust."

One day I came in here and sat alone in the quietness, lost in thought and contemplating what it all means. As I gazed at the flag behind your chair, Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to think about "the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." I called to mind what a distant relative of mine, a predecessor in the pulpit of the Second Presbyterian Church of Indianapolis, which I occupied before coming to the Congress, Henry Ward Beecher, once said:

Our flag carries American ideas, American history, and American feelings. Beginning with the colonies and coming down to our time, in its sacred heraldry, in its glorious insignia, it had gathered and stored chiefly this chief idea: divine right of liberty in man. Every color means liberty; every thread means liberty; every form of star and beam or stripe of light means liberty.

I felt a surge within as pictures and sounds from history flashed through my mind's eye and ear while I watched the

flag and listened in the silence to the beat of distant drummers.

I heard an old history professor of mine at college saying in his last lecture:

Gentlemen, the founding of America was one of the great steps in the freeing of mankind from its twin bondage to canon and feudal law.

I saw pilgrims and puritans setting their sails fearlessly toward an unknown horizon in order to establish a new world where men would be free to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience.

I saw pioneers hacking westward across the Appalachians and down the Ohio. I saw them sailing off the stern rock-ribbed New England coast in search of whale. I saw them trundling across the wind-swept plains and prairie wheat-fields in covered wagons. I heard the music of axes splitting wood as log cabins sprang up in the wilderness, and the measured tempo of hammers driving spikes as railroads pushed across rocky mountains to the seacoast beyond. I watched barges and river boats moving down the "Father of Waters" to the sea. I saw pony express riders and steam engines and telegraph lines and jet airplanes spanning the continent, making it ever smaller, ever more united. I saw schools going up, and churches with their spires pointing to the sky, and homes and alabaster cities. I heard the whirring of machinery as the industrial revolution shifted into high gear. I heard the roar of 100,000 fans at a football game, and I heard the tears of millions dropping on the pavement of our largest cities and littlest hamlets on that black Friday, November 22, 1963. I saw wave upon wave of immigrants coming to our shores in search of a dream, looking for a land where self-respect and respect for others, where tolerance and brotherhood and freedom to be different, formed a meaningful part of the social fabric, where minority rights were protected and all citizens were guaranteed certain basic freedoms regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. I heard the explosive catapulting of liftoff at Cape Kennedy, I heard the voice of an astronaut telling ground control all systems were go, and I saw a man, an American man, dressed in a space suit, walking on the surface of the moon.

I heard the distant tattoo of Yankee drums beating out their fateful call to arms as stout-hearted men and women were summoned from their homes and places of business to fight for the rights they adored, that freedom, and democracy, and rule of law instead of by tyrant, and government of the people, by the people, for the people, might not perish from the earth. I heard that faithful march of patriot's feet—men of all kinds from all walks of life, sophisticated and plain, rich and poor, black and white, educated and untutored, famous and unheralded, boys who carried out groceries in a supermarket, boys whose names were in the social register, boys from the Big Ten and the Ivy League and the West Coast Conference, boys in blue jeans, boys in coon skin caps, boys in gray flannel suits, boys from the suburbs, boys from the

asphalt jungles, boys from the rural village—I heard the march of these heroes' feet echoing among the hills around Concord and Lexington, tramping across the fields near Antietam and Gettysburg, advancing through the woods of Belleau and the forest of the Argonne, stumbling across the sands of a beach called Omaha and up the rocky slopes of an island called Iwo, slogging through the snow of a Korean mountain pass and the mud of a Vietnamese rice paddy.

All this I heard, all this I saw, all this I dreamed as I sat alone in the hall of this great Congress, all this I wanted to say to the children when I presented them with the flag. What is good about America? There is lots that is good about America. I say, let us emphasize it. Let us be done with disparaging our country. Let us think more frequently about what is right with America and with our fellow citizens. Let us keep the faith by looking up, not down; by looking ahead, not back. Let us thank God for our many blessings in this great country; and with Lincoln, let us not claim God is on our side, but earnestly pray that we, as a nation, will always be on His.

RECOGNITION FOR CHARLES E. BENNETT

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, February 10, one of our colleagues, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, from Florida's Second District, received from the Reserve Officers Association, the Minute Man Hall of Fame Award, in recognition of his outstanding work in keeping this Nation strong, safe, and secure. This award was made by Col. John T. Carlton, executive director of ROA, at the annual National Defense Week banquet of the Jacksonville chapter of ROA, of which Comdr. Dorothy Preuss, USCGR, is president. National Defense Week is observed each year on February 12-22 to call special attention to the importance of maintaining adequate national defense.

This story, including Colonel Carlton's remarks and the response of Congressman BENNETT is submitted as a matter of interest to all the Members of Congress for publication in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE BENNETT AWARDED ROA "MINUTE MAN HALL OF FAME" CITATION AT HOME CEREMONY

Rep. Charles E. Bennett was given the rarely-bestowed "Minute Man Hall of Fame" award by the Reserve Officers Association at the annual National Defense Week banquet at the Jacksonville chapter on 10 February.

LCDR Dorothy Preuss, USCGR, Jacksonville teacher who is president of the chapter, was in charge of the program. Colonel John T. Carlton, USAR, national Executive Director of the Association which has headquarters in Washington, made the presentation.

Recalling Congressman Bennett's own service during World War II with the guerrillas in the Philippines during the Japanese occupation, Colonel Carlton declared that Bennett fully measures up to the Churchillian definition of being "Twice the Citizen."

Bennett is a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee. He was the original sponsor of the legislation, introduced in 1965, to give permanent status to the military reserves, a bill which led to final enactment in 1968 of the Reserve Vitalization Act.

This bill rightfully could be called "The Bennett Act", Colonel Carlton said. Colonel Carlton added:

"Charley Bennett appeared in early 1965 at a hearing of the Armed Services Committee in his wheel chair, to which he has been confined from time to time because of dismemberment which occurred while he was serving his country overseas.

"His dramatic appearance before the committee brought an electrifying interlude to hearings which had been depressing and drab; his brief statement in typical Bennett eloquence pointed up the issue of the moment, and made it clear that to survive this nation must depend upon the tradition that every citizen owes and must be willing to give his service to his nation in time of peril.

"Chairman F. Edward Hébert said at the time that Congressman Bennett's appearance represented a stroke of genius on his part.

"The great characteristic—the inspiring aspect of Charlie Bennett's character—is that he gives the same dedication to all of his service in the Congress.

"He has set an all time record for attendance, and his 3253 consecutive roll call votes has surpassed any other member of the House for faithful and conscientious attention to his duty.

"Charlie Bennett is respected not only by his constituents in Florida's Second District, and by the entire Florida delegation, but by the leaders and rank and file of both parties in the House and in the Senate.

"If Churchill would have called him 'Twice the Citizen', as a Reserve Officer and a full time government official, we can observe that he is many times the citizen—a great friend, a doer of charitable deeds, an ardent patriot, a diligent scholar, a skilled legislator, a voter of principle, a dutiful son, a loving husband, a providential father—and a Christian throughout all his activity.

"He honors us by accepting a place in the Nation's Minute Man Hall of Fame which he so richly merits."

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

There have been profound changes in regard to Reserve forces in recent years, changes which are perhaps insufficiently understood by the civilian population. It is important that they be better understood by our citizens because their success depends, in part, on the cooperation of business and other community leaders.

During the early years of the Vietnam War, President Johnson made the conscious policy decision to use the draft to provide the necessary manpower for that war rather than to call up Reserve forces. Following that policy resulted in criticism of the Reserve in many quarters—criticism which was unfortunate because it was not the reservists themselves or their leaders who made the decision. The Reserve was ready to go.

A new national policy has been adopted for the seventies. In August of 1970 the Secretary of Defense directed the military departments to conduct their manpower planning according to what is called the total-force concept. Part and parcel of that concept is the policy that the National Guard and Reserve will be the initial forces used to augment the active military establishment if the need arises; relying on the draft first will no longer prevail.

Even before the decision to terminate the draft and go to an all-volunteer force, the policy decision was made that the draft

would be used only after the National Guard and Reserve were called up.

A second major policy decision for the seventies—which, of course, you are all aware of—is the decision to attempt to achieve an all-volunteer Armed Forces. The American people gave clear signals to the Congress that this was what they wanted, and the Congress complied. At the time our committee approved the pay legislation that was designed to attract sufficient volunteers, we said very clearly that if the country wanted an all-volunteer force, it had to be prepared to pay the price. We are paying the price now, and it is considerable. To give you an example, the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces is approximately one million less than it was in 1968. However, military personnel costs will be approximately \$7 billion more in fiscal year 1974 than they were in fiscal year 1968.

With a reduced active force and with the Reserve as the first-line augmentation force, it is vital that the Reserve be adequately manned and truly combat ready. We must recognize that with the manpower costs so high there will be continued pressure for reductions in active-duty manpower. It would appear to be axiomatic that the smaller the active force becomes, the more important Reserve forces become.

Over the last several years the Congress has substantially increased the investment in Reserve readiness chiefly in terms of improved equipment procurement for the Reserve forces.

The National Guard and Reserve portions of the defense budget have increased from \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 1969 to \$4.1 billion in fiscal year 1973.

In the budget for the year beginning July 1, fiscal year 1974, a further increase of \$431 million is contemplated for the National Guard and Reserve forces.

The Congress has mandated the service secretaries to give priority to adequately equipping Reserve forces, and by the end of the present fiscal year it is expected that most of the equipment deficiencies will be eliminated from selected Reserve units.

While the equipping of the National Guard and Reserve is approaching full readiness, there is a serious problem in the manning of our Reserve units.

As of last October, the latest month for which I have figures, the strength of the Guard and Reserve was some 51,400 below the minimum strength set by Congress. The Congress called for a combined strength in the drilling units of the Guard and Reserve of 976,559 men. The Reserve was simply not able to recruit and retain that number.

We all recognize that the existence of the draft motivated many young men to join Guard and Reserve units. Often their purpose was to avoid active military service. Such motivations adversely affected morale in the Reserves.

We can hope that all those who are recruited in the future will be better motivated toward a proper concept of Reserve service. However, at present we are unable to recruit the numbers required, and steps must be taken to change this situation.

The significant pay increases voted for the active-duty force in recent years have brought military pay to a competitive level with pay in civil service and private industry. The increases are reflected in increased Reserve pay. However, while we appear able to recruit the adequate number of personnel overall, there are areas where we are falling short in needed specialties among the active force; and additional incentives are clearly needed for the Reserve force.

The House Armed Services Committee, therefore, last year passed the Special Pay Act to provide additional bonuses for various categories of personnel where recruiting has fallen short.

The legislation passed the House last

year, but—for reasons that I do not pretend to understand—received no action in the Senate.

I have, therefore, this year reintroduced the bill as the Voluntary Military Special Pay Act of 1973, and over 100 Members of the House have joined me in sponsoring the legislation. I am hopeful of early hearings before our committee. The induction authority under the draft law expires this coming June 30, and this legislation is vital if we are to achieve our goal of an all-volunteer force.

One of the most important sections of the bill will provide special bonuses for the Selected Reserve and the Ready Reserve Force. The bill would authorize an enlistment bonus of up to \$1,100 for a 6-year enlistment in the Reserve of an individual without prior military service. It would also authorize a reenlistment bonus of up to \$2,200 for an individual with a critical skill or \$1,100 for an individual with a noncritical skill. In both cases the bonus would be for a 6-year reenlistment. Lesser amounts could be provided for shorter-term reenlistments.

The total amount of bonus any one individual could collect would be \$8,300, and the legislation limits the payment of bonuses to those whose period of military service does not exceed 12 years. Those who do not complete the prescribed period of enlistment or reenlistment would have to pay back a proportionate share of the bonus.

The total cost of this legislation will be approximately \$225 million in the coming fiscal year. Frankly, having voted over 95 percent of the money needed for an all-volunteer force, it simply makes sense to go ahead and provide the additional money needed that might make the concept work.

I think all citizens, and particularly our business leaders, should recognize that if we are going to recruit an adequate number of personnel into the Reserve, we must have, in addition to substantial pay incentives, a climate of acceptance in the civilian community. This involves an understanding of the importance of the Reserve on behalf of our business leaders and a willingness to cooperate by providing adequate leave for individuals to attend their Reserve active-duty training. Equally important is creating in our local communities a climate of respect for, and appreciation of, the importance of the Reserve.

The National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve has made an outstanding contribution to improved public understanding of our Reserve forces. More efforts of this kind are needed.

The great increase in the price of manpower, which I referred to earlier, has brought about a situation where 56 percent of the defense budget now goes for personnel costs. By contrast, the Soviets spend only 20 percent of their defense budget on personnel costs. It is easy to see, therefore, that if our total defense expenditure is roughly the same, over an extended period of years they will be putting a much greater amount into improved weapons and into research and development and in time could gain a frightening technological lead over the United States.

Two examples will give some idea of the increased impact of personnel costs on the budget:

The total spending authority requested for fiscal year 1974 is \$85 billion, an increase of \$4.1 billion over fiscal year 1972. Of this increase, \$3.2 billion represents increases in military and civilian pay and in retired pay. The rest of the increase results from inflation; that is, the increased cost of material and services bought by the Department of Defense.

The payroll for military and civilian and retired personnel for fiscal year 1964, the last

pre-Vietnam War year, totaled \$16.9 billion. In the present fiscal year, fiscal 1973, the total payroll cost will be \$36.2 billion, an increase of \$19.3 billion even though there will be 300,000 fewer people on the payroll in the present fiscal year than in fiscal year 1964.

It is worth looking at some other facts about the defense budget since it is often misunderstood.

Actual defense expenditures in fiscal year 1974 will total \$79 billion, which represents 28.4 percent of total Federal expenditures, the lowest level since 1950.

The defense budget in fiscal year 1974 represents 6 percent of the gross national product, the lowest level in 24 years.

While defense spending in straight-dollar terms appears to rise \$25.7 billion from fiscal year 1964 to fiscal year 1973, in terms of constant buying power defense spending actually drops \$6.6 billion. Conversely, even in constant-dollar terms, other Federal spending rose by \$64 billion between fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1973; and state and local spending rose by approximately \$70 billion in the same period.

The SALT agreements include a 5-year Interim Agreement on Offensive Weapons. We gained something in that agreement—a slowdown in the frightening rate of expansion of Soviet strategic systems. But we paid a price. The treaty limits the number of strategic systems, where the Soviets have an advantage. It institutionalizes their advantage.

One of the ways we offset the Soviet numerical advantage is by the superiority of our missiles, particularly with the MIRV (Multiple Independently-targeted Reentry Vehicle). We know the Russians have tested multiple reentry vehicles and are making an enormous effort to develop independently targeted vehicles. It is, therefore, vital that we keep our strategic systems modernized and take what steps we can to assure their invulnerability. For this reason I am happy to see the new budget calls for moving forward rapidly on development of the Trident, the follow-on to Polaris-Poseidon. The budget calls for \$1.7 billion for this program in the year beginning July 1.

I am equally happy that the budget includes substantial funds (\$657 million) for continued work on the CVN-70, the next nuclear carrier, a program with which I have been closely identified. No major defense program has been subjected to more scrutiny and study by the Congress, and the answer has always come out the same: we are a maritime nation that needs to be assured of use of the seas to maintain our world commercial and strategic position, and carrier forces are the backbone of our naval superiority.

In naval power as much as any other area the Soviets have made incredible advances in the last decade. They surpass us in number of submarines, in missile-firing submarine and surface ships; and in numbers of nuclear submarines operating or under construction they are ahead of us. They have surface-to-surface missile-firing ships while we are just developing a surface-to-surface missile. They have submarine-launched cruise missiles which we are not even talking about developing. The range of their submarine-launched intercontinental missiles is on a par with what we will get from Trident, which is years (at least 5) away from being operational.

Some people oppose developing carriers because the Soviets do not have any. As a matter of fact, the Soviets have one on the way now. But it makes no sense to me to stop development in this one area where we have a clear advantage when there are so many other areas where the Soviets have taken the lead.

The CVN-70 must be built.

As the new Secretary of Defense said re-

cently, "We should not allow ourselves to be lulled by the belief that there has been a change in Soviet intentions, but we should keep our eyes firmly fixed on Soviet capabilities."

ADJUTANT GENERAL OF FLORIDA SERVES AS PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Florida takes great pride in the fact that our distinguished Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. Henry W. McMillan, is currently president of the National Guard Association of the United States. The Florida delegation in Congress joins me in extending our sincere congratulations to this outstanding Floridian.

General McMillan has given a lifetime of dedicated service as a citizen soldier. Few men in our State or elsewhere have earned so impressive a record of service, and that record includes both civilian and military accomplishments.

I am happy to have enjoyed General McMillan's friendship for many years. I have trained with him. I know that he is one of the Nation's ablest soldiers. And I am glad to be able to say he is one of the most respected.

I am privileged to submit for the RECORD a chronological record of General McMillan's life and a list of his significant and outstanding accomplishments.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA, MAJ. GEN. HENRY W. McMILLAN, ADJUTANT GENERAL OF FLORIDA

He was born August 12, 1911, Oskyka, Pike County, Mississippi. Moved to Tallahassee, Florida with his parents at age 10. Enlisted in the National Guard as a private in February 1929. Has served continuously in the National Guard since that time. Held all enlisted grades, and was commissioned 2d lieutenant in February 1934. In 1940, when the National Guard was mobilized, was a captain, commanding the company in which he had enlisted as a private. After mobilization into the Army, was rapidly promoted to major, lieutenant colonel and colonel. Commanded an infantry company, battalion and regiment in World War II. In the latter part of World War II, was selected to organize and serve as first Chief of U.S. Military Mission to the Republic of Paraguay, South America. Was the only non-regular officer who was chief of a military mission in Latin America. Later served on the task force which drew up military phases of Inter-American Defense Treaty, which is the military part of the Organization of American States. Commissioned a colonel in Regular Army in 1946, but resigned to return to the State of Florida to live. Helped reorganize the Florida National Guard and was made Chief of Staff of the 51st Infantry Division upon its organization in late 1946. Served for five years as Division Chief of Staff and was promoted to brigadier general in November 1952. After ten years service as Assistant Division Commander, was promoted to major general on October 1, 1961 and assigned as Commanding General, 51st Infantry Division. Appointed Adjutant General of Florida, effective April 28, 1962.

Gen. McMillan has served for a longer period of time in the Florida National Guard than any other individual in the entire history of the Florida National Guard. Has been

a general officer since November 1952, and a field grade officer since April, 1941.

For 25 years he was connected with the U.S. Internal Revenue Service in various capacities in the District of Florida. When he resigned from the IRS on April 27, 1962, he held the position of Chief, Collection Division, District of Florida.

Civic affiliations—Currently serving as President, National Guard Association of the United States; Ex-officio member Florida Council of 100; Chairman, Florida Medal of Honor Grove Committee; Chairman, Sister City Committee of St. Augustine; former Chairman, Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee; Past President, Adjutants General Association of the United States; former Chairman, Finance Committee, National Guard Association of the United States; and a member of the Rotary Club.

Gen. McMillan is married to the former Louise Ford of Columbus, Georgia. They have two daughters, Karen (Mrs. Thomas E. Houston) and Julie (Mrs. Bruce B. Blackwell).

NORTHWEST INDIANA HONORS LITHUANIA

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Ind., commemorated the 55th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania at St. Casimir Church Hall, 1390 West 15th Avenue, Gary, Ind. The chairman of the banquet and president of the Lithuanian American Council is Albert G. Vinick of East Chicago, Ind. I was present and spoke at the banquet, along with Mayor Richard Gordon Hatcher of the City of Gary, Ind., who had issued a municipal proclamation declaring a holiday in commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence.

I include in the RECORD a copy of the resolution which was unanimously adopted on this occasion:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation proclaimed the restoration of its Independence as a free democratic republic which was won and secured by the blood sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during 1919-1920, and subsequently recognized by the international community; and

Whereas, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly occupied and illegally annexed the independent Republic of Lithuania and maintains its illegally overlordship in Lithuania to this very day; and

Whereas, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their right of self-determination, as most strikingly demonstrated by riots in Kaunas on May 18, 1972, following the funeral of a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, who had self-immolated in a public square in Kaunas in a dramatic protest against the Soviet enslavement of Lithuania and by a petition to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics in the occupied country charging the Soviets with religious persecution; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union;

That we again demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights;

That we request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegation at the European Security Conference in Helsinki to demand the restoration to the Lithuanian people of independence and self-government in their own land; and

That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to both Senators and all the Members of Congress from our State, and to the press.

PRIME TIME—WHOSE TIME?

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, should we encourage new directions in commercial television—or are we content with the current state of this all-pervasive medium?

On the theory that some change might be for the better, the Federal Communications Commission several years ago decided to invoke something known as the prime time access rule—PTAR. This was a requirement that stations affiliated with the three major networks open up at least 30 minutes every evening for nonnetwork programming. In this fashion it was hoped that new sources of production could be encouraged, to fill the "freed" time with creative and stimulating fare.

PTAR has been fully effective for only a few months, and so far it has not worked as intended. Instead of innovative programming, we have been getting mainly warmed-over quiz and variety shows, with a leavening of inexpensive foreign imports. Admittedly there has been precious little real innovation to occupy the vacated half-hours.

It seems to me, though, that PTAR still has not had a fair trial. There are some in the broadcast industry who insist the rule has failed and would like it junked, thus tossing the programmatic ball back to the networks. I am doubly pleased, therefore, that a key group within the industry, the National Association of Television Program Executives, has just given this embattled rule a ringing vote of confidence.

In a straw ballot taken at their annual convention in New Orleans last week, the men and women in charge of programming for stations across the land voted 3 to 1 in favor of keeping the prime time access rule, with or without modifications. Specifically, the count among the 350 who voted was only 24.4 percent for revoking the rule, 32.9 percent for continuing it without change, and 42.7 percent for keeping the rule but with revisions.

The message here is implicit: The men most in the know want the rule to survive because as programmers they recognize its potential for the enhancement of programming. They know of the creative energies, either at their stations or

elsewhere, that go untapped because there is insufficient time for them on the airwaves.

As a member of the Commerce Subcommittee with jurisdiction over broadcasting legislation, I say the program executives are right.

Let us give the prime time access rule a chance, at least a 5-year trial, before we try to kill it.

The FCC is currently considering a number of proposed changes in PTAR. If it wants, the FCC could decide the struggle is not worth it and simply erase the rule.

I am confident the Commission will take a long view over the grumblings of some inconvenienced broadcasters and opt for retaining the rule, albeit with improvements. In the long run, all those most immediately concerned—station officers and employees, program producers, the viewing public and even the great networks—will be the beneficiaries of such a farsighted policy.

WAR POWERS ACT

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Indochina war clearly emphasized the danger and the futility of conducting an undeclared war. This approach may be viable in a nation without a democratic form of government or tradition of liberty but it has no place in the United States of America.

In order to prevent future Vietnams or similar military operations carried on without the express consent of Congress, I have cosponsored the War Powers Act.

Clearly any national effort of a military nature must have the support of the people to achieve success. The fundamental premise of the Constitution is that warmaking decisions should be shared in by the people's representatives in Congress. In recent years this constitutional balance has been upset with a disturbing shift of authority to the President.

The War Powers Act would redress this situation while assuring that the President still retains full authority to protect this Nation, its citizens, and its troops in the case of an emergency.

I request that the full text of the War Powers Act be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. In order to facilitate study of the bill, however, I will highlight some of the important sections.

Sections 3 and 5 of the bill define the conditions under which, in the absence of a congressional declaration of war, the Armed Forces of the United States "may be introduced in hostilities or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances."

The first three categories are codifications of the emergency powers of the President, as intended by the Founding Fathers and as confirmed by subsequent historical practice and judicial precedent. Thus, subsections (1), (2), and (3) of section 3 delineate by statute the implied power of the President in his concurrent role as Commander in Chief.

Subsection (4) of section 3 is perhaps the most significant; while subsections (1), (2), and (3) codify emergency powers which are inherent in the independent constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief, subsection (4) deals with the delegation by the Congress of additional authorities which would accrue to the President as a result of statutory action by the Congress, and which he does not, or would not, possess in the absence of such statutory action. Thus, subsection (4) regulates and defines the undertaking of a "national commitment."

Section 5 provides that actions taken under the provisions of section 3 "shall not be sustained beyond 30 days from the date of the introduction of such armed forces in hostilities or in any such situation unless *** the continued use of such armed forces in hostilities or in such situation has been authorized in specific legislation enacted for that purpose by the Congress and pursuant to the provisions thereof."

Mr. Speaker, Congress is currently attempting to reestablish its congressional role in several different areas. It is my belief, however, that in foreign and military affairs the legislative branch has lost the most ground. It is here we must reverse the trend toward a dominant Executive. It is here we must restore the system of checks and balances and the separation of powers.

The full text of the War Powers Act follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "War Powers Act".

PURPOSE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces, in hostilities or in such situations. Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, it is specifically provided that the Congress shall have the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution, not only its own powers but also all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. At the same time, this Act is not intended to encroach upon the recognized powers of the President, as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, to conduct hostilities authorized by the Congress, to respond to attacks or the imminent threat of attacks upon the United States, including its territories and possessions, to repel attacks or forestall the imminent threat of attacks against the Armed Forces of the United States, and, under proper circumstances, to rescue endangered citizens and nationals of the United States located in foreign countries.

EMERGENCY USE OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 3. In the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress, the Armed Forces of the United States may be introduced in hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, only—

(1) to repel an armed attack upon the United States, its territories and possessions;

to take necessary and appropriate retaliatory actions in the event of such an attack; and to forestall the direct and imminent threat of such an attack;

(2) to repel an armed attack against the Armed Forces of the United States located outside of the United States, its territories and possessions, and to forestall the direct and imminent threat of such an attack;

(3) to protect while evacuating citizens and nationals of the United States, as rapidly as possible, from (A) any situation on the high seas involving a direct and imminent threat to the lives of such citizens and nationals, or (B) any country in which such citizens and nationals are present with the express or tacit consent of the government of such country and are being subjected to a direct and imminent threat to their lives, either sponsored by such government or beyond the power of such government to control; but the President shall make every effort to terminate such a threat without using the Armed Forces of the United States, and shall, where possible, obtain the consent of the government of such country before using the Armed Forces of the United States to protect citizens and nationals of the United States being evacuated from such country; or

(4) pursuant to specific statutory authorization, but authority to introduce the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities or in any such situation shall not be inferred (A) from any provision of law hereafter enacted, including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of such Armed Forces in hostilities or in such situation and specifically exempts the introduction of such Armed Forces from compliance with the provisions of this Act, or (B) from any treaty hereafter ratified unless such treaty is implemented by legislation specifically authorizing the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities or in such situation and specifically exempting the introduction of such Armed Forces from compliance with the provisions of this Act. Specific statutory authorization is required for the assignment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such Armed Forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities. No treaty in force at the time of the enactment of this Act shall be construed as specific statutory authorization for, or a specific exemption permitting, the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities or in any such situation, within the meaning of this clause (4); and no provision of law in force at the time of the enactment of this Act shall be so construed unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of such Armed Forces in hostilities or in any such situation.

REPORTS

SEC. 4. The introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act shall be reported promptly in writing by the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, together with a full account of the circumstances under which such Armed Forces were introduced in such hostilities or in such situation, the estimated scope of such hostilities or situation, and the consistency of the introduction of such forces in such hostilities or situation with the provisions of section 3 of this Act. Whenever Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in hostilities or in any such situation outside of the United States, its territories and possessions,

the President shall, so long as such Armed Forces continue to be engaged in such hostilities or in such situation, report to the Congress periodically on the status of such hostilities or situation as well as the scope and expected duration of such hostilities or situation, but in no event shall he report to the Congress less often than every six months.

THIRTY-DAY AUTHORIZATION PERIOD

SEC. 5. The use of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act shall not be sustained beyond thirty days from the date of the introduction of such Armed Forces in hostilities or in any such situation unless (1) the President determines and certifies to the Congress in writing that unavoidable military necessity respecting the safety of Armed Forces of the United States engaged pursuant to section 3(1) or 3(2) of this Act requires the continued use of such Armed Forces in the course of bringing about a prompt disengagement from such hostilities; or (2) Congress is physically unable to meet as a result of an armed attack upon the United States; or (3) the continued use of such Armed Forces in such hostilities or in such situation has been authorized in specific legislation enacted for that purpose by the Congress and pursuant to the provisions thereof.

TERMINATION WITHIN 30-DAY PERIOD

SEC. 6. The use of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act may be terminated prior to the thirty-day period specified in section 5 of this Act by an Act or joint resolution of Congress, except in a case where the President has determined and certified to the Congress in writing that unavoidable military necessity respecting the safety of Armed Forces of the United States engaged pursuant to section 3(1) or 3(2) of this Act requires the continued use of such Armed Forces in the course of bringing about a prompt disengagement from such hostilities.

CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Any bill or joint resolution authorizing a continuation of the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act, or any bill or joint resolution terminating the use of Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall, if sponsored or cosponsored by one-third of the Members of the House of Congress in which it is introduced, be considered reported to the floor of such House no later than one day following its introduction unless the Members of such House otherwise determine by yeas and nays. Any such bill or joint resolution, after having been passed by the House of Congress in which it originated, shall be considered reported to the floor of the other House of Congress within one day after it has been passed by the House in which it originated and sent to the other House, unless the Members of the other House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

(b) Any bill or joint resolution reported to the floor pursuant to subsection (a) or when placed directly on the calendar shall immediately become the pending business of the House in which such bill or joint resolution is reported or placed directly on the calendar, and shall be voted upon within three days after it has been reported or placed directly on the calendar, as the case may be, unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 8. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment but shall not apply to hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States are involved on the effective date of this Act. Nothing in section 3(4) of this Act shall be construed to require any further specific statutory authorization to permit members of the Armed Forces of the United States to participate jointly with members of the armed forces of one or more foreign countries in the headquarters operations of high-level military commands which were established prior to the date of enactment of this Act and pursuant to the United Nations Charter or any treaty ratified by the United States prior to such date.

RENT CONTROLS

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, approximately 18 months ago, the President stood before the people of this Nation and promised a program to curb inflation; a program that would break the inflationary cycle which was overwhelming the country. However, as phase I evolved into phase II, I became concerned by the apparent fact that the benefits and burdens of the economic stabilization program were not being shared equally. Of particular concern were the phase II rent guidelines. These guidelines did not afford adequate protection to tenants. Indeed, the rent regulations institutionalized rather than curbed inflation.

With the lifting of even these controls, we are witnessing what can only be characterized as a money grab by certain landlords. An informal survey I had taken in the eighth district has revealed rent increases ranging up to 40 percent, the average hovering around 12 percent. During the past few days, I have received over 425 complaints from area residents about rent increases that are clearly above the level that can be tolerated by the average tenant.

When landlords were allowed to pass along the vast bulk, if not all, of their fixed expenses under phase II, it is questionable whether these same landlords can now justify increases of the current magnitude. Many tenants now facing these large levies received one or more increases under phase II. And I will not belabor the obvious and frequently tragic dilemma of Americans living on fixed incomes. What is happening to these individuals often amounts to nothing less than a confiscation of the recently approved rise in social security payments. Nor will I dwell on the situation of the worker who received a rent increase of 10 percent to 40 percent on the same day that his employer was explaining to him the 5.5 percent wage guideline. Under the phase III program, our goal must be the equality of sacrifice, not the sacrifice of equality.

Too many landlords are insisting on

pursuing an inflationary policy. The situation in many cities in the Northeast corridor encourages this as these cities have extremely concentrated populations and low apartment vacancy rates. In the Washington Metropolitan Area where the vacancy rate is approximately 1 percent as compared to 5.6 percent nationwide, we truly have a sellers market. This leaves the tenant in a precarious position because it is extremely difficult for him to move even if an exorbitant rent is charged.

In light of our current plight, I have instituted a number of measures in an effort to restore sanity to the panic and confusion that is running rampant in the rental housing industry. As an immediate remedy, I am this afternoon meeting with Dr. John T. Dunlop, Director of the Cost of Living Council. My purpose in seeking this meeting is to impress upon the Council the need for the prompt reinstatement of rent controls. This effort is in addition to a letter which 28 of my colleagues joined me in sending to the President urging the reimposition of rent controls.

Recognizing that neither Dr. Dunlop nor the President may be prepared at this time to take what I consider to be essential action, I have this afternoon introduced legislation which will reinstitute rent controls.

This measure will create a Rent Control Board, separate and autonomous from the Cost of Living Council. The Board will be charged with the responsibility of establishing rent controls on the basis of a cost-justified formula. Thus landlords will not be permitted to raise rents unless expenses have increased. The controls will be retroactive to January 11 when phase II was lifted. Any rent increase occurring since that date will be rolled back to the January 11 level. Before the landlord can raise fees above the level prevailing on January 11, he must seek approval of the Rent Control Board. If any increase becoming effective after January 11 is found to be excessive when compared with the cost justification formula, the landlord will be required to reduce rents to an appropriate level. The controls will remain effective until April 30, 1974. At that time controls would terminate. However, the Rent Control Board will remain in existence for an additional 6 months to monitor the rental housing market. If the Board finds that landlords are indeed using the lifting of controls as an excuse for raising rents to excessive levels, as appears to be the instant case, the Board can recommend the reinstatement of controls.

There can be no doubt about the need for swift action. If we are to break the vicious inflationary cycle that has ravaged this Nation, we must act quickly and decisively.

BANKERS IN BED WITH HOSPITAL

(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, in this Congress I am sponsoring three bills

dealing with the accreditation of hospitals. These bills are H.R. 1898, H.R. 1899, and H.R. 1909. They are identical to measures which I introduced late in the second session of the 92d Congress.

The most recent article in the Washington Post by Ronald Kessler, on the operation of Sibley Memorial Hospital gives emphasis to the need for legislation such as I have proposed. Sibley Hospital is fully accredited under the existing structure and I doubt, though I do not know, if the inspectors for the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals, ever inquired into the situation described by Mr. Kessler's story. I do not know, and no other Member of Congress knows, because the Joint Commission's policy is that all of its reports should be kept secret from the public. I understand their point, and so will most people who have read the story in the Washington Post.

Members should keep in mind that—

Sibley, started in 1894 by Methodists, is incorporated under District of Columbia law as a charitable institution. It receives more than a quarter of its \$11.3 million annual budget from the Federal Government through the medicare and medicaid health insurance programs.

Its \$8.8 million, 355-bed building that was opened in 1961 near American University was half funded by a congressional appropriation for construction of D.C. hospitals. Sibley has since received additional federal money for remodeling.

There are millions of people in this country who believe as I do that the purpose of operating a hospital is to care for those individuals who are ill and need to be in such a place. There are other reasons for the operating of a hospital, as the article which I include as part of my remarks, makes quite clear.

The article follows:

TRUSTEES' BANKS USE HOSPITAL MONEY

(By Ronald Kessler)

Bankers who are trustees of Sibley Memorial Hospital have been keeping more than \$1 million of the hospital's money in interest-free amounts at their own banks without paying off a mortgage the hospital owes to the same banks, costing the hospital and its patients more than \$100,000 a year in interest payments.

The balances in the interest-free accounts—which have been criticized by the hospital's independent accountants—have risen and fallen as the influence of Sibley's most dominant trustee, who is connected with the bank where the most money has been kept, has gone up and down.

These and other transactions uncovered during an investigation of Sibley appear to be conflicts of interest that are in direct violation of D.C. law.

Sibley's interest-free accounts are one of several such abuses to come to light in recent years. In each, bankers at the institutions where the funds have been kept have also been directors or trustees of the organizations keeping the accounts.

Such tie-ins are no coincidence, according to True Davis, president and chairman of National Bank of Washington, which once had an interest-free account of the United Mine Workers' pension fund.

Davis said one of the reasons bankers go on boards of nonprofit organizations is to try to get their primary accounts.

The reason the balances in the accounts soon grow is equally simple: "The reason generally for the large balances is that bankers' first responsibility is to their banks," Davis said.

Harry Huge, an Arnold & Porter lawyer who successfully sued Davis' bank over the interest-free mine workers account, said, "The public is only beginning to realize that whether bankers steal money directly from the treasury of a hospital, or take it by keeping large sums in interest-free accounts, the loss to the hospital is the same."

Sibley's audited financial statements indicate that at the end of 1971, the hospital had enough cash in checking and savings accounts and certificates of deposit—nearly all kept at banking institutions with tie-ins to the Sibley board—to pay off the mortgage and have \$2.8 million left over.

The failure of Sibley trustees to pay off the mortgage costs each patient who enters Sibley \$1.11 a day in interest payments on the mortgage for each day he is hospitalized. The average daily patient charge is \$111, which is lower than that of most Washington area hospitals.

D.C. law prohibits trustees of charitable organizations that receive any federal money from doing business with those organizations. The law requires trustees in such situation to resign.

Sibley, started in 1894 by Methodists, is incorporated under D.C. law as a charitable institution. It receives more than a quarter of its \$11.3 million annual budget from the federal government through the Medicare and Medicaid health insurance programs.

Its \$8.8 million, 355-bed building that was opened in 1961 near American University was half funded by a congressional appropriation for construction of D.C. hospitals. Sibley has since received additional federal money for remodeling.

Sibley's most dominant trustee, Stacy M. Reed, a lawyer who is chairman of Sibley's board of trustees, said the hospitals' attorneys do not believe the trustees are violating the law, since, in his view, they do not gain any personal benefit from the transactions with the hospital.

Reed, who is himself involved in the apparent conflicts of interest, acknowledged that many of the bankers who are of Sibley's, board own stock in the banks where the interest-free accounts are kept and where the mortgage is owed. But he called such a benefit "remote."

If there is any benefit to trustees, Reed said, it is "overshadowed" by the benefit to the hospital of having the bankers' expert advice on financial matters. Such advice, Reed said, "cannot be reckoned in terms of money."

Reed said he did not believe that a hospital trustee whose bank does business with the hospital is in a conflict of interest, as long as the rates charged by the bank are not higher than other banks'.

Nathan Hershey, co-author of Hospital Law Manual, a standard legal reference work, and president of the American Society of Hospital Attorneys, an association of hospital lawyers, said a hospital trustee whose company does business with a hospital is in a conflict of interest, because he has responsibilities and interests on both sides of the transaction.

Reed said the balances in Sibley's checking accounts have not been improper. He said the hospital has been keeping large cash reserves in checking and savings accounts to pay for any future remodeling or expansion of the hospital.

Reed acknowledged that remodeling in the past has been paid for by the federal government, but he said such grants could not be counted on.

Reed also acknowledged that at least some of the cash reserves date back to 1961 when the hospital was opened. He said the hospital has been building up the cash because the need for eventual remodeling was recognized from the beginning.

Asked why Sibley could not pay off the mortgage and get a new one if money is re-

quired for remodeling, Reed said obtaining a new mortgage is costly and difficult.

"There is always room for a difference of opinion in the management of the complexities involved in operating a modern hospital such as Sibley," he said.

"It is our position that the members of the Sibley's interest in any and all transactions. Further, the policies adopted and adhered to by the board are sound."

Many of the practices found at Sibley parallel those reported in a recent Washington Post series that cited the financial dealings of Washington Hospital Center trustees and administrators as examples of the lack of public accountability of hospitals.

During preparation of that series, Sibley refused to disclose the identities of its trustees, saying the board had specifically ordered that their names were to be kept secret. Although the trustees' action was unusual, there is no law requiring hospitals to disclose their trustees' names on request.

After several months of prodding, Sibley relented, giving out a list of trustees but omitting their business affiliations and addresses.

One of a number of conflict-of-interest transactions uncovered at Washington Hospital Center was an interest-free account—stopped about two years ago—that was set up by the hospital's treasurer at a bank where he also was a vice president.

Sibley's bank records show that the hospital has continued to keep interest-free balances of just under \$1 million as recently as last June. Reed said no material change has been made in checking account policy since then.

While the hospital center, the Washington area's largest private, nonprofit hospital, kept enough money in its checking accounts to cover its cash needs for two weeks, Sibley a medium-size hospital, has been keeping enough money in its accounts to cover its operations for more than six weeks.

Sibley's balances averaged \$1.4 million in 1971 and ranged as high as \$1.8 million. Its mortgage debt was \$1.7 million at the end of 1971.

The hospital's primary interest-free checking account has been switched several times over the years between Security National Bank and Riggs National Bank. According to Dr. Garth L. Jarvis, who was administrator of Sibley for four years until last spring, these changes were made by Reed, Sibley's chairman, and Donald R. Ernst, who was Sibley's treasurer until he died last October.

Reed is a director and member of the executive committee of Security. Ernst appeared to be connected with Riggs, according to Charles C. Elderkin, a Sibley trustee who is an assistant vice president of Perpetual Building Association, although Elderkin said he did not know what the tie was, if any.

Ernst was chairman of Steuart Investment Co., whose majority owner is Curtis S. Steuart, a Riggs director, executive committee member and stockholder.

Dr. Jarvis and Elderkin said Ernst and Reed periodically fought for control of Sibley ever since Reed joined the board in 1956, when Hannemann Hospital, which he had headed, merged into Sibley.

As Reed got the better of these struggles, Dr. Jarvis said, the balances in the account at his bank, Security, would rise. Likewise, he said, as Ernst achieved more control, balances at Riggs would go up.

In 1968, Reed became president of Sibley as well as chairman, signifying an increase in his power. A year later, the hospital's primary checking account was switched from Riggs to Reed's bank, Security.

The balances in the Security account soon soared to more than \$1 million. But Riggs was not forgotten by the hospital. A sum ranging from \$100,000 to \$170,000 was left in the dormant Riggs account, without drawing interest.

Around September, 1971, Elderkin said, Ernst began objecting that the balances in the Security account were too high.

"Ernst felt it was a little ridiculous," he said.

In that month, records of the hospital show, the primary account was switched back to Riggs, where the balances quickly rose to between \$400,000 and \$750,000. As had been done with the previously dormant Riggs account, a balance of \$260,000 was left in the now-dormant Security account, also without drawing interest.

Dr. Jarvis said it was Ernst who made the decision to give the account back to Riggs.

Still another change occurred last May. In that month, Reed stepped down as president, while retaining the title of chairman. He was replaced as president by Renah F. Camalier, a former District commissioner whose cousin, Charles A. Camalier Jr., is a director and stockholder of Riggs. Renah Camalier said he is also a small stockholder in Riggs.

In the same month, the balance in the dormant Security account was reduced still further, from \$260,000 to \$96,000. The balance at Riggs immediately rose.

Was this all coincidence? Reed said, "We go to the banks that we know." He added that all changes were approved by Sibley's executive committee.

Four of the 11 members of the executive committee, which makes most of the major decisions at the hospital, have been tied to Security or Riggs.

Besides Reed and Camalier, these members are:

Edward K. Jones, a Sibley trustee, executive committee member, and finance committee chairman, who is a Riggs director and member of its executive committee, as well as a Riggs stockholder.

Guy T. Steuart II, a Sibley trustee and member of its executive committee, whose father, Curtis S. Steuart, is a Riggs director, executive committee member, and stockholder. The younger Steuart is president of Steuart Motor Co., a Ford dealership.

In addition, Raymond C. Briggs, who is a Sibley trustee but not a member of its executive committee, is a director of Security. Briggs is president of Briggs Ice Cream Co.

Dr. John M. Orem, Sibley's administrator and president until he died in 1968, was an advisory board member of Security. (Advisory board members give advice to a bank but have no decision-making authority.)

Camalier said he knew nothing about the hospital's finances. Jones said he had nothing to do with the decision to give the account to Riggs. Steuart said there was no relationship between his father's position at Riggs and the placement of Sibley accounts there. Briggs said he had no knowledge that Sibley's account was at Security.

Who does make the decisions? According to Reed, it is Sibley's executive committee, which includes Camalier, Jones, and Steuart.

Asked if any executive committee members had abstained from voting on bank matters, Reed said no.

In its 1971 audit report on Sibley, Millard T. Charlton & Co., the hospital's independent accountants, said, "It is suggested that management review, on a monthly basis, the cash requirements of the hospital to assure that noninterest-bearing checking accounts are not maintained at excessive levels."

Reed said that although some excess money has been transferred from the accounts into interest-bearing accounts since last June the hospital plans to remain "liquid" until final plans for remodeling and expansion are made.

"A rule of thumb has been that a balance should be equivalent to one month's average operating costs," Reed said. "This has not been strictly adhered to but the balances have been below this figure more often than above it."

Charlton's analysis indicates the balances were above that figure in all but one month during 1971 and averaged more than six

weeks of Sibley's cash needs. Reed said that "over the years" the one-month standard had been followed.

Government and private financial experts say the standard and prudent business practice is to leave only enough money in an account to cover checks written on it each day. This would mean a balance of close to zero.

O. W. Chapman, vice president for operations of American Security & Trust Co., which has a minor Sibley checking account and is a substantial holder of its mortgage, has said the common practice is for businesses to overdraw their accounts, leaving a negative balance on their checkbook stubs, to take advantage of the float in the accounts.

"Float" is the excess money that accumulates in an account because of the delay between the time a check is written and the time it is presented for payment at the bank it was written on.

James R. Alubowicz, a General Accounting Office manager who supervised an investigation into interest-free accounts of Group Hospitalization, Inc., the local Blue Cross agency, said GHI previously kept two weeks' cash needs in its accounts; now it keeps a negative balance and transfers excess money from the accounts into investments twice a day, he said.

Reed said, "The suggestion that no balance need be kept, and that the float is sufficient, is unrealistic and improper. It is contrary both to approve existing bank practice and to Federal Reserve requirements."

A Federal Reserve spokesman said the board has "absolutely" no requirement governing balances in accounts.

Informed of this, Reed said bankers have told him the board would "not approve" of accounts that depend on the float.

Alubowicz called the balances in the Sibley account "unbelievable." Another accountant, Leonard M. Reamer with Elmer Fox & Co., a national accounting firm, said he had never heard of a business with that much money in its checking account.

When told of the balances in the accounts, Elderkin, the Perpetual official, said he could see no reason why the money should not go to pay off Sibley's mortgage, and he said he would propose such a move at the next trustees' meeting this spring.

The mortgage—for \$3.5 million—was given in 1961. The current rate of interest is 7 1/2 per cent per year. The loan was given by a combination of nine banking institutions, each of which has had ties or has ties to the Sibley board, as shown in the accompanying chart. (Chart not reproduced in the Record).

Reed said the banking institutions gave the mortgage as a civic duty. He said there was "unusual risk" involved because the new building probably could only be used as a hospital, making foreclosure impractical.

Citing the hospital's partial dependence on contributions, Reed said, "Even with the government participation, there was no guarantee that the operation would be successful."

Sibley's lawyer, Thomas M. Raynor, said he understood the mortgage had been obtained only after some "arm twisting" by the late Fred A. Smith, a former Sibley trustee and realtor, whose son, Fred W. Smith is a Sibley trustee and president and chief executive officer of Jefferson Federal Savings and Loan Association.

He said he personally had unsuccessfully tried to get a mortgage for Sibley from a Massachusetts insurance company.

Joseph W. Barr, president of American Security, which services the Sibley mortgage by collecting the monthly payments, said that although hospitals can only be used for one purpose, they are considered safe investments.

"Very few have defaulted, let's put it that way," he said.

In addition to the cash in checking accounts, Sibley keeps large sums in savings accounts and certificates of deposit bearing interest rates from under 5 per cent to 6 per cent a year.

In contrast, the value of the average stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange rose during 1971 by 12.3 per cent.

A certificate of deposit for \$900,000 bearing interest of 4.875 per cent a year is kept at Riggs. The rate is lower than that of savings and loan association savings accounts that can be withdrawn at any time.

The certificate has been renewed each year at varying rates since 1961.

L. A. Jennings, chairman of Riggs, said no dealings between his bank and Sibley have been influenced by any ties between the two.

Security has a \$200,000 certificate of deposit at 5 per cent, in addition to \$343,000 in savings accounts. Reed, the Security director, said Sibley accounts are given to banks known to the board.

Interstate Building Association, whose chairman, Edward K. Jones, is a Sibley trustee, executive committee member and finance committee chairman, has two certificates of deposit for a total of \$250,000 bearing interest of 6 per cent.

Jones said it was "natural" to go to banks where Sibley has had other business dealings.

McLachlen National Bank, whose chairman, Lanier P. McLachlen, is a Sibley trustee, has \$279,000 of Sibley money in certificates of deposit at 5 per cent. McLachlen declined to comment, referring questions to Reed.

In addition to these apparent conflict transactions by bankers, George M. Ferris, Sr., a stock broker who is a Sibley trustee, was a member of its investment committee when the committee decided to give the stock brokerage business of the hospital to Ferris & Co., of which Ferris is chairman. Ferris is no longer a member of the committee but continues as a trustee.

Teunis F. Collier, a Sibley trustee and member of its executive committee, who is also a building contractor, has been given construction contracts by the hospital at various times, and he acknowledged this is generally without competitive bidding.

Reed said Ferris was requested by the hospital to act as broker and financial consultant at "prevailing established rates." He said Collier's firm has not accepted "one cent of profit" for the work it has done, and he said Collier has devoted many hours without compensation to the hospital as head of its buildings and grounds committee.

Last Nov. 20, Sibley's director of medical supplies, Thomas E. Trunzo, wrote a letter to Sibley suppliers to inform them that they are expected to give "gifts" up to and including color television sets and appliances as Christmas presents for Sibley employees.

"I hope that you bear in mind the amount of business that Sibley has carried on with you during this past year and that donations will be given in the true spirit of Christmas," he wrote.

Trunzo referred questions to Reed, who said the gifts were given to employees at a Christmas party through a raffle system. The gifts did not go to supervisors, he said.

Reed said the letter was written without the knowledge of the trustees.

"This action was wrong. It will not be repeated," he said.

SIBLEY HOSPITAL ACCOUNTS LISTED

The following table lists the nine banks and savings and loan associations that hold Sibley Memorial Hospital's mortgage, how much of the loan each institution had at the end of 1971, the total cash kept at the banking institution by Sibley in checking and savings accounts and certificates of deposit, and the Sibley trustee connected with or previously connected with the banking institution:

Bank	Mortgage	Cash	Ties
American Security and Trust Co.	\$474,179	\$504,473	William E. Schooley, vice president; died 1962.
First National Bank of Washington	55,779	2,50,000	Clarence E. Kefauver, Jr., advisory board member.
Interstate Building Association	111,577	426,270	Edward K. Jones, chairman.
Jefferson Federal Savings and Loan Association	55,779	448,144	Fred W. Smith, president and chief executive officer.
McLachlen National Bank	41,839	279,211	Lanier P. McLachlen, chairman.
National Bank of Washington	153,415		Leonard P. Steuart, great uncle of Guy T. Steuart II, a Sibley trustee, was a director; died 1966.
Perpetual Building Association	278,934	42,111	Charles C. Elderkin, assistant vice president.
Security National Bank	27,900	836,098	Stacy M. Reed, director; Raymond C. Briggs, director.
Riggs National Bank	474,172	1,738,171	Edward K. Jones, director.

¹ Each director or officer of the bank listed is a current trustee of Sibley unless otherwise indicated.

² Sibley says this sum is kept in an interest-free account to compensate the bank for cashing payroll checks of Sibley employees at its branch near Sibley.

PHILADELPHIA'S MAYOR FRANK RIZZO LEADS EFFORT TO WIN BACK BUSINESS AND YOUNG EXECUTIVE TALENT TO THE CENTRAL CITY

(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, the February 10 issue of Business Week magazine, the Nation's most respected journal of business and commerce, contains an article on Mayor Frank Rizzo's efforts to win back business to the central city and to encourage young executive talent to remain in the central city. His major effort has been to keep business in Philadelphia in order to establish the confidence to attract new business. The article states that a younger group of executives are moving into leadership positions in the major corporations in Philadelphia, such as Sun Oil, Rohm & Haas, Smith Kline & French, Philadelphia Electric, John Wanamaker and the commercial banking industry. Mayor Rizzo has met with these younger executives and has provided them the encouragement and initiative they claim is needed if major business enterprises are to continue to prosper in the city of Philadelphia.

In his first year in office, the mayor has run the city in a businesslike operation, which has won the praise of most of Philadelphia's business executives.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the article from Business Week's February 10 issue on Philadelphia's new formula to win back business following my remarks.

PHILADELPHIA'S NEW FORMULA TO WIN BACK BUSINESS

"No one ever mentions this," says the Philadelphia Planning Commission's executive director, Damon Childs, "but Philadelphia has built 30 downtown buildings of 15 or more stories in the past 10 years. Atlanta, which gets all the publicity, has built 17."

Outsiders tend to think of Philadelphia, when they think of it at all, as a good, gray place somehow overshadowed by dynamic New York and upstaged by imperious Washington. But as Childs suggests, new buildings mean business vitality. If you look at Philadelphia today, you find a tough, business-minded mayor linked in an unlikely alliance with the city's businessmen to stimulate even more vitality in its economic life.

Mayor Frank L. Rizzo, burly cop-turned-politician, now starting his second year in office, has set himself the task of arresting the city's formidable decay and pushing its economic growth. He is courting business support. "We've got to keep business here and attract new business," he says. For their part, businessmen are responding to

Rizzo's appeal. "Business leaders were not early supporters of Rizzo," says Chairman John T. Gurash of INA Corp., "but his conduct of office so far has won a lot of people over. He comes across well and has demonstrated that he wants progress."

LIVING DOWN A PAST

For years, Philadelphians have fought against the image of dull respectability that dogs their city. In the past decade, though, they have had far more than an image problem. Decaying housing, high crime rates, bitter social conflict, the flight of companies to outlying areas, lack of effective political and business leadership—all have combined to make Philadelphia a prime example of what has been happening to the older cities of the Eastern Seaboard.

Currently, for instance, the city's teachers are striking for the second time in this school year. The entire school system faces bankruptcy and will probably have to close several weeks early this spring for lack of operating funds.

NEW CLIMATE

Businessmen mainly have been impressed by Rizzo's pro-business approach to the city's problems. The city has dropped a corporate net profits tax, for example, and Rizzo is trying to eliminate a tax on the earnings of Philadelphia-based companies' outside subsidiaries. "The mayor is trying to get along without any new taxes," says John R. Bunting, chairman of First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., "and that's something businessmen like to see."

Bunting is typical of another hopeful augury for the city. He is a member of a younger group of executives who are moving into leadership positions, less tied to old ways of doing things. In the past five years, new presidents have taken over executive suites of such companies as Sun Oil, Rohm & Haas, Smith Kline & French, Philadelphia Electric, and John Wanamaker. These new professional managers come on the heels of a pride of young bank presidents who took command of five of the city's six largest banks before they reached the age of 50. "The old aristocracy is going. The trick is to fully embrace the new professional managers now on the scene here," notes Richard S. Ravenscroft, vice-president of the Philadelphia National Bank.

Businessmen also approve of Rizzo's appointment of Lennox L. Moak to the vital position of City Finance Director. A crusty budget expert who served in the same position under Mayor Joseph Clark 20 years ago, Moak admits freely that he works for "a city with a lot of financial problems." He adds though, "It's feasible to run this city without a tax increase with good management and a little bit of luck. And I know where all the corpses are buried."

Rizzo has looked to the business community for advice. He meets regularly with a hand-picked committee of 12 Philadelphia executives, a group quickly dubbed "the dirty dozen" that is headed by D. Herbert Lipson, publisher of *Philadelphia* magazine. Robert Harrison, a member of that group and president of John Wanamaker, says:

"Rizzo and his administration know they have a sizable interest in the fundamental health and well-being of business here. The biggest single difference in this administration as against what came before is attitude."

GRIM LEGACY

Swept into office on a promise of law and order and no new taxes, Rizzo inherited a financially reeling city government and school system and a legacy of bad blood between City Hall and Philadelphia's business leaders that had built up under his predecessor, James H. J. Tate.

"We didn't expect to find what we found when we took office," says Rizzo. "There was a \$130-million city budget deficit. No one knew how much land the city owned or where it was. We were starting from scratch."

What the emerging link between the new corporate establishment and the Rizzo administration will ultimately net the city in bricks, mortar, and increased tax revenue remains to be seen. "But the change in climate has helped already, and it can go a long way in keeping business here," says Creed Black, editor of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. Recalling his days on the *Chicago Daily News*, Black adds: "Look at what Mayor Daley in Chicago has done on that score."

Rizzo admits an open admiration for Chicago's mayor, and, as in Chicago and other urban areas around the country, law and order is as much a priority in Philadelphia as is economic development.

CRACKING DOWN

One of Rizzo's first moves as mayor was to put mounted police back on the streets in Philadelphia's downtown area. Police spending in Rizzo's first year jumped more than \$10-million, and plans are under way to add 2,000 policemen.

"Removing the social ills that cause people to turn to crime has got to be done," says Rizzo in a rare reflective moment. "But these problems have been around for generations, and no government can do it alone. The people, especially in the black community, have got to become aroused."

The city's black leaders remain skeptical of the new mayor. W. Wilson Goode, executive director of the Philadelphia Commission for Community Advancement, says: "Any businessman, black or white, who wants to do something for Philadelphia has a sympathetic ear in City Hall. But so far, I'm disappointed in the lack of coordinated programs for blacks. Maybe I'm expecting too much too soon."

Charles W. Bowser, executive director of the Philadelphia Urban Coalition, states flatly: "The administration has not shown any inclination to deal directly with the problems of the black community."

ECONOMIC CURES

Rizzo, who on his election day proclaimed his intention to be "mayor of all the people," insists that new development will mean economic and social gains for both blacks and whites. And, slowly, new projects are developing.

Recently, ground was broken for the first office building in the city's combined public-private \$600-million Market Street East commercial, office, and transportation complex in the shadow of City Hall. A key element in the project is a tunnel, now in final design after years of delay, to link the city's commuter railroad lines.

"The tunnel will completely integrate the commuter rail system," notes James C. McConnon, chairman of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority. "And in so doing, it will greatly enhance the mobility of our labor force by allowing people to traverse the city and get into the suburbs by riding one train, with no transfers or changes to other means of transit."

Four city blocks now separate the Penn Central and Reading lines, which between them give the Philadelphia metropolitan area a transit web that many American cities might envy. Above and around the tunnel, a complex of eight high-rise office buildings, shops, malls, parking areas, and pedestrian walkways is scheduled to be completed by 1985.

NEW LAMPS FOR OLD

"To some extent, Market Street East will be new lamps for old, without the genie," says Louis I. Kahn, Philadelphia's world-renowned architect, "but it's a place that will generate excitement. People will want to be near it."

Already Gimbel's has announced that it will replace its tired downtown outlet with a new store in the Market Street East area, adding a new look to the city's main retail district. Later this year, groundbreaking is planned for the ambitious Franklin Town project, an impressive private commercial and residential complex planned for the central city. The project carries a \$400-million price tag and solid support from its corporate sponsors: Smith Kline & French, I-T-E Imperial, Korman Corp., Butcher & Shererd, and Philadelphia Electric.

Area universities, in cooperation with local government, are redeveloping 19 run-down acres at a cost of \$200-million to house the University City Science Center, an applied research facility that futurist Buckminster Fuller already calls home, along with IBM's Eastern regional computer research unit, wood from New York.

On the Delaware riverfront, a stone's throw from Independence Hall, and the city's widely-acclaimed Society Hill development area, a 33-acre site will house a \$110-million hotel, office, apartment, commercial, and recreational development by 1976. Recently, the Penn's Landing Corp., which oversees the city- and state-backed project, placed national ads for a developer to break ground by 1974.

THE CATALYST

Taken together, these projects will give Philadelphia a near-total urban facelift and, it is hoped, give the city the economic shot in the arm that Rizzo and other administration officials envision.

"What is indispensable for this city's economic development is the catalyst necessary to effectively pull all the necessary elements together and coordinate them," points out Jan Vagassky, the city's blond and burly European-educated Deputy Commerce Director.

Whether or not Mayor Frank Rizzo will prove to be that catalyst, the future will decide. "Potentially, I think this community has the will to actualize its plans," says *Inquirer* editor Black. "Rizzo and his leadership are an important key. There are still plenty of ifs, but Knight Newspapers has a \$75-million investment here and plans to stay. And if I thought Philadelphia was going to become two Newarks, I'd be going somewhere else."

SPACE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to praise our space program on the 11th anniversary of the first American being placed in orbit.

On February 20, 1962, John H. Glenn, in his Friendship 7 spacecraft, successfully completed three orbits of the earth.

Since that time, the accomplishments of our space program have grown. Spaceships have docked, men have "walked" in space, and the moon has been explored.

Our future program looks bright. Currently, Astronauts Charles Conrad, Paul Weitz, and Joseph Kerwin are preparing for the first flight in the Skylab series. The launch is scheduled for early May. This 28-day flight is the first of three missions that will dock with an orbiting laboratory where astronauts will live and work. The second two flights in the series are each scheduled to last 56 days.

I would like to express my congratulations to all the persons involved in our space program for the fine work they have done and to wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans of Lithuanian descent and their millions of friends across the Nation join in observing two important Lithuanian anniversaries—the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

It was in February 1251, that Mindau-gas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom. It was on February 16, 1918, that Lithuanians broke the bonds of Russian domination and German occupation and declared their nation free and independent. For 22 years, Lithuania took her rightful place in the family of free nations. In 1940, the Soviets, acting in the name of a new imperialism, moved in and annexed Lithuania, thereby destroying her precious freedom.

Although they have ruled the country, the Russians have been unable to suppress the aspiration of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights as recently demonstrated by a petition to the United Nations. This petition, signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics in the occupied country, charges the Soviets with religious persecution. There were riots in Kaunas on May 18, 1972, following the funeral of a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, who had immolated himself in a public square of Kaunas in a dramatic protest against the Russian enslavement of Lithuania.

We who enjoy the blessings of liberty must encourage the spirit of independence.

ence in Lithuania and other nations held captive by the Soviets. At a time when the Western Powers have granted freedom and independence to nations in Africa and Asia, we must insist that the Soviet Union likewise extend freedom and independence to those countries which it simply incorporated into its empire.

HOW CAN WE END INDUSTRIAL DISASTERS?

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor Philip J. Brennan has expressed President Nixon's concern over the tragic death of 40 workers in a liquefied-gas storage tank in Staten Island. The men were killed during a mysterious blast within the tank, causing the roof to collapse, crushing and asphyxiating those inside.

Hopefully President Nixon will demonstrate his concern by promoting within the Labor Department and elsewhere in the Federal Government a more thorough enforcement of the standards promulgated by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. It appears, however, that this is not Mr. Nixon's intent at all. The funds requested for enforcement under the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in the President's budget represent less than \$25 million. Taking into account that more than 60 million workers are covered by this act, the Government has only allotted at most \$0.41 for the enforcement of the safety of each worker.

OSHA, the 2-year-old safety law, has run up against many difficulties in its early stages, most of which are directly related to poor financing and a lack of strong administration. This law is nothing less than mammoth in its scope of importance to employees and businessmen yet it is playing a back-seat role. Let us hope that the wasteful and heart-breaking death of these men will serve to underscore the value of strict enforcement of our vital safety legislation. Every worker should be guaranteed a safe and healthful place of employment.

The following is an editorial printed in the New York Times, Tuesday, February 13, 1973:

INDUSTRIAL DISASTER

The explosion that killed forty workers in a huge liquefied-gas storage tank on Staten Island last weekend is a reminder of the frequency with which death, disease or crippling injury haunts the job sites where millions of Americans are employed.

The tank, largest in the world, had supposedly been empty of all gas for months while undergoing repairs, and it will require weeks of study by the army of posthumous investigators now at the scene to determine what caused the mysterious blast.

But even if there is never any evidence that carelessness or skimping on safety standards were involved, the heavy toll should underscore the need for strict enforcement of the Occupational Health and Safety Act adopted by Congress more than two years ago.

We hope that Secretary of Labor Brennan, who has made two visits to Staten Island

since the explosion to express President Nixon's concern, will back up that expression by insisting on much more effective Federal policing of the new safety standards than has prevailed up to now. Organized labor has had to go to court to stop the Labor Department from ducking responsibilities put upon it by law, and the Administration is still fighting to turn enforcement over to the quixotic control of the states.

Unions are understandably seeking to write into labor-management contracts more exacting requirements for ridding the work place of preventable hazards. A rare united front of environmentalists and unionists has just been formed in support of 4,000 strikers at Shell oil refineries in Texas and California. The central issue in the two-week-old walkout is a union demand for establishment of a joint labor-management committee to monitor health and safety conditions in the Shell plants.

Virtually all the other major oil companies have already agreed to the setting-up of cooperative safety and health committees. The ground rules, as proposed by the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, are designed to keep these units from degenerating into instruments for indiscriminate union harassment of companies in exercising their managerial duties. To the extent that such committees can lessen the risk of disasters like the one that made an inferno of the tank alongside the Arthur Kill, they are long overdue.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INTERVIEW WITH CONGRESSMAN HALEY, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: My dear friend and colleague in the Florida delegation, Congressman JIM HALEY, the recently elected chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was interviewed by Congressional Quarterly recently. I believe that the interview which appeared in the January 27 issue of Congressional Quarterly gives many important insights and new viewpoints in regard to what actions the House Interior Committee may be taking in the near future. The interview is as follows:

NEW CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE INTERIOR PLANS TO SHARE POWER

Major changes in the philosophy and operations of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are in the works as James A. Haley (D Fla.) takes over as chairman. The House Democratic Caucus approved his selection as chairman Jan. 23.

Haley's views on pending legislation and committee procedures, outlined in an interview with Congressional Quarterly, contrast—sometimes sharply—with those of his predecessor, Wayne N. Aspinall (D Colo.), 76. Staunchly opposed by environmentalists for his stands on conservation issues, Aspinall suffered an upset defeat in Colorado's September primary. (1972 Weekly Report p. 2337)

Haley, 73, indicated that use of public lands by industries such as mining, logging and grazing must "very definitely" be curtailed and proposed that the legislation to regulate surface or strip mining of coal considered by the committee in 1972 be broadened to include other minerals such as phosphate.

He promised to give subcommittee chairmen "more latitude" than they had enjoyed

under Aspinall, who closely supervised subcommittee work and played a major role in managing the committee's bills on the House floor.

Elected to the House in 1952, Haley was assigned to the Interior Committee. For 18 years, he has served as chairman of its Indian Affairs Subcommittee, although, according to Haley, there are only two Indians in his district.

Excerpts from the interview follow:

CQ. Congressman Haley, what do you see as the role of the Interior Committee?

HALEY. I think the chief role of the Interior Committee is to more or less protect the natural resources of our nation (and) to see that they are not destroyed. . . . We've been a very wasteful nation and we thought at one time that we had rather unlimited resources, but now we find that we've used them up rather carelessly. . . . I think that people realize that we must conserve some part of this nation as we found it.

KEY LEGISLATION

CQ. With that in mind, what do you see as the key environmental bills that will be before the committee this session?

HALEY. I think one of the things that we need to do is to pass bills that will protect our public lands from such things as strip mining and destruction of land unless that land can be put back in use—reclaimed, in other words—so that when you take the minerals out you don't abandon the land . . . and absolutely destroy it. After all, there're going to be other people on this earth as we go along.

CQ. A very tough strip mining bill was reported out of the committee last year. Would you foresee a bill similar to that coming out this session?

HALEY. That was just a strip coal mining bill and members of the committee feel that it should go farther than that. For instance, in my own congressional district I have the huge phosphate mines. A good many years ago as a member of the Florida legislature I tried to point out to the people who were in the mining of phosphate that they should reclaim this land and they have. . . .

CQ. Will a revision of the Mining Act of 1872 be on the agenda?

HALEY. We need to take a look at this. After all . . . we're a different people than we were in 1872. . . . People now are more conscious of the fact that they must protect the environment and not just use these resources (without) replacing them as far as you can. . . . I understand that several members of the committee have proposed to introduce a very broad (revision).

CQ. Another very broad bill which was discussed in the last session was the land use bill. Do you share (former chairman) Wayne Aspinall's philosophy that public lands should be managed on the basis of multiple use?

HALEY. I'm not sure that I do. On the other hand, let me say this: One of the bases of wealth in this country has been the ownership and use of land, and we've allowed the owners—who have paid for it with money—to go way beyond what I think that we should. We should do something to protect the land itself. While you may hold a section of land at this particular time . . . you must think about the other people in the nation and the generations to come.

Somewhere along the line we must work out something here that's fair to everybody and I'm inclined to think that more use of land is not quite the answer.

CQ. There are a number of industries, of course, that depend on the land—the miners, the loggers, grazing. How do you think that something like this can be worked out, at least as far as the federal lands go?

HALEY. Well, that's one of the problems that we have now. You just can't go out and say we're going to shut down everything, be-

cause then you'll have a chaotic condition, you'll have people out of work. . . .

CQ. But won't some of this have to be curtailed in order to do what you were suggesting?

HALEY. Very definitely. Let's see where we can curtail without too drastically disrupting the lives of the other people of the nation.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

CQ. The committee for a long time in the past has been dominated by members from western states. Do you think it's going to make any difference that, for example, of the House Democrats who were appointed recently, many of them are not from the west and are replacing members from the west and that you yourself are from the South?

HALEY. No, I don't think so. I think that all members of the Congress serving on a committee . . . look more towards what is good for the nation rather than what is good for just one particular part or community or state. . . . This committee was chaired by J. Hardin Peterson of Florida 22 years ago, so it's not always been a western committee so to speak. . . . I think, after all, as presiding officer you must be fair, you must recognize everybody's point of view and give him an opportunity to express it, whether (you) agree with it or not. . . .

CQ. You mentioned points of view. . . . As you know, Mr. Aspinall was very much opposed by a number of environmental groups. How do you think that you're going to get along with these environmental groups?

HALEY. I think that I'm going to get along with them all right. On the first day of this session, I introduced—along with the entire Florida delegation—the Big Cypress Swamp bill which we think is very vital for the protection of our Everglades National Park, which is a very unique park and one that we must do everything we can to save.

I introduced an eastern wilderness bill yesterday (Jan. 11). I think that the people of the eastern states have to some extent been neglected—not because they haven't been interested. The land . . . in the eastern part of the nation is very valuable, it's more valuable, for instance, than a lot of the acreage in western states. It was easy to acquire lands in the western states and, so much of it was in the public domain, it didn't cost a whole lot to turn it into the wilderness when there was a justification for it.

CQ. How would you characterize the differences between your thinking and that of Mr. Aspinall?

HALEY. I don't know just how to answer that. Mr. Aspinall was one of the most knowledgeable men and one of the most able chairmen of the Congress, in my opinion. He knew his subject and when he got a bill to the floor, he was able to explain it. He had the confidence and respect of people from all over the nation and both sides of the aisle. How I can perform on that, time will have to tell.

I think about the only difference between the operation of the committee between Congressman Aspinall's and my chairmanship is that I would give the subcommittees more latitude. . . . I want the chairmen of the subcommittees who hear the testimony and . . . have the responsibility of writing the bill to take it to the floor and explain it. I'll be glad to help them out when I can but I don't want to stand in the way of . . . the man who has done the work (so) I take all the bows. . . . If it's a good bill, fine, let him take the credit. If it's a bad bill, let him take that.

CQ. Will the same thing be true of subcommittee staff hiring and scheduling of hearings?

HALEY. I want to sit down with the chairmen of the subcommittees and put first

things first. . . . It's a matter of judgment what should come first. . . . Somebody might not agree that the bill that you have under consideration should be the first order of business . . . but that is a matter of judgment that the chairman must make.

CQ. Will you encourage other subcommittee chairmen to do what a few have done, that is, to hire their own staff members if they want to?

HALEY. If they need assistance, yes.

CQ. Have you decided whether you want to retain chairmanship of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee or are you looking perhaps to take over chairmanship of the Environmental Subcommittee?

HALEY. I haven't made up my mind. I think that I will first sit down with the ranking members of the committee. . . . Politically, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee is not a very popular committee for me to continue to chair . . .

CONCERN FOR INDIANS

CQ. With only two Indians in your district, what led you to be so concerned with them?

HALEY. When I first came to the Congress, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee was the last on the bottom of the totem pole, so I was chairman of a subcommittee my second term here. The only thing available was Indian Affairs. . . . I have always been interested in American history and I know of no place that you can find more of the history of the United States 150 or 100 years ago than dealing with Indians . . .

I think probably that our treatment of the American Indian is one of the blackest pages in the history of our nation. We pushed them around, we put them out on arid plains, we tried to make farmers out of hunters, and when it became valuable, regardless of the treaties we might have, we opened up their land for homesteading and so forth. In other words, we have mistreated the Indian.

And if anybody should be protesting—while I don't approve of the thing that they did down here in the Bureau of Indian Affairs building, because that's not the way to do it—I can understand why the Indians would be upset. But I can see in the last 18 years a tremendous improvement in the life of the Indians. (There are) many things that should be done and it will take many years to do it but I think that we are making progress and I think substantial progress.

CQ. Do you think that the existing federal Indian programs are adequate?

HALEY. No, I've never been satisfied with them.

CQ. Is the committee going to try to do something about that?

HALEY. Well, we've been trying, within the limitations that we have.

CQ. Do you have any specific legislation on the agenda that you're planning to consider?

HALEY. I have . . . an Indian loan program that I want to increase and another program where an Indian will be able to borrow money and the government will be able to back him up and he can go into business—in other words, (bills) to raise the economic life of the Indians . . .

However, you must consider that practically every Indian tribe, every reservation has different problems. . . . It's not something that you do in one full circle sweep. . . . You must take these tribes and try to study what really will be beneficial to them. . . . These things are not as simple as a lot of people think.

CQ. You held hearings in December and promised more this session on the takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs building. What do you hope to accomplish?

HALEY. I want to find out who encouraged these people to come there and take the attitude that the federal government had to make special arrangements for their housing, for their feeding and so forth and then to go down and take over a government building and cause \$2.5-million dollars worth of damage. Somebody misled them because I think I know the Indians about as well as any white man and Indians are just not that kind of people.

CQ. You're not satisfied with existing Indian programs but you've only mentioned two or three bills that you might be considering next session. What's going to happen to the Indians without any affirmative action from Congress? Won't the situation stay the same?

HALEY. Yes, in many instances it will. Each one of these Indian reservations has its own peculiar problems. The Seminoles in Florida don't need water, but the Navajos . . . need water. . . . It's going to be nearly a case-by-case proposition. . . . I see no other way. . . .

THE "ENERGY CRISIS"

CQ. An Interior Committee report last September dealt with what it called the "gravity" of the fuel and energy shortage and made a number of recommendations, including more federal leasing and increased research and development of energy sources. Are you planning any legislation implementing these recommendations?

HALEY. I think we must have it, because I think it's something that we must face up to. As you can see right now the severe weather we have had in the midwest and northwestern part of the country . . . (forced) schools to be closed down for lack of heat. We're just going to have to do something.

CQ. What specifically can Congress do?

HALEY. That's a good question. What can they do?

CQ. For example, are you considering any legislation to deregulate wellhead prices of natural gas or that kind of thing which is a matter of law?

HALEY. I haven't gone into that very much. We have plenty of natural resources, it's a matter of getting them to the proper people at the proper time and the proper way. When we wrote the Alaskan native claims bill, nobody wanted to put that pipeline in there. Maybe that's not the best way to do it but how otherwise are you going to get the material to the people who need it?

CQ. Do you think you'll be reporting anything out of your committee in 1973 dealing with the energy crisis?

HALEY. Well, I hope so. . . . This is a situation that requires a lot of study. We're depending, in my opinion, entirely too much on foreign importation of oil and other things. If suddenly it's cut off, we would be in a rather critical situation.

THE ADMINISTRATION

CQ. Has the administration approached you with any bill that they are interested in in 1973?

HALEY. No, they have not. I think that Congress should have its own program and the people down there don't worry me too much. I think Congress should be responsible for passing legislation and I think the executive branch of the government is responsible for . . . seeing that the laws are obeyed. . . .

CQ. President Nixon recently appointed Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz as special counselor for natural resources. . . . How do you feel about Mr. Butz being given this responsibility instead of Interior Secretary Morton?

HALEY. Maybe I better not comment on that. After all, Secretary Morton is the secretary of the Interior Department. He should be responsible for its operation. I just don't

like to see somebody else making decisions that probably he has no real responsibility for.

CQ. President Nixon is very concerned about holding down federal spending in fiscal 1973 and 1974. Do you think that's an important priority?

HALEY. Yes, I think it's a very important priority. We now owe about \$450-billion. That's more money than owed by all the rest of the governments of the world. We have in the last three years run deficit financing to over \$100-billion dollars. We cannot forever keep that up. One day, the roof's going to fall in. . . . That's what the federal government's going to do unless we get a little bit of fiscal responsibility, and not only in the executive (branch) but in the Congress.

CQ. With that in mind, would you favor or would you be opposed to cutbacks in spending for environmental protection? I'm thinking particularly of Mr. Nixon's recent impoundment of the funds in the water pollution bill that were to be for the construction sewage treatment plants.

HALEY. I think the President probably was misled. I think there are other places where he might have made some reductions rather than in this program which everybody realizes is a very serious one and one that must be done. . . . The President, I think, took the view that this is too much money, that you could not expend this money and get a dollar's worth of service for a dollar earned.

CQ. Do you agree with that view?

HALEY. I don't know. He had the facilities to research it. . . . However, if he just did this because he thought this was a place where he could make a few savings, then I think he was wrong.

CQ. How would you characterize the Nixon record on environmental protection?

HALEY. Frankly, I don't think it's been very good. There's been a lot of talk, but very little action.

SENIORITY SYSTEM

CQ. As you're about to ascend to the position of committee chairman, you are a beneficiary *par excellence* of the seniority system. Do you feel that this is the best way for selecting committee leadership?

HALEY. We have tried others in the past . . . the Cannon era . . . and we elected chairmen, and it just didn't work out.

Here's what I think is beneficial as far as the seniority system is concerned. When I came to the committee, I didn't know the difference between a volt and a kilowatt hour. Now I think I know something about it. . . . Providing a man or a person has command of all his faculties, I think it's the best system we've devised. . . .

The system is not without its faults. . . . I think many chairmen of committees have abused the power they have. After all, the chairman of the committee should be a presiding officer, that's all. He shouldn't take his own will and overpower his committee. Let the committee speak, that's the democratic process.

CQ. Do you feel that's how Mr. Aspinall handled the committee?

HALEY. Well, Mr. Aspinall was always nice to me. . . . But if you got two people who agreed all the time, then you've got only one mind working.

VFW WINNER'S SPEECH

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, all too frequently over the past few years the news media has focused the public's atten-

tion on the obscene shrieks and brickbats of the long-haired anarchists among the young people of this country, ignoring the vast majority of our youth who stand steadfast in their adherence to those values that made this Nation great.

Thus, too often have the misfits been made to seem in the majority. Because of this it is doubly gratifying to know that youngsters such as Bryon G. Tyson of Waterloo, Iowa, fully share the concerns of most of their elders for the future of their country.

Bryon is a 16-year-old student at Waterloo's East High School and he recently won the statewide Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

His winning speech deserves the attention of all of us and I am pleased to include it for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

THE SPRING OF HOPE

(By Bryon G. Tyson)

It was the best of times—the worst of times—it was the age of wisdom—the age of foolishness—it was the spring of hope—the winter of despair.

From the streets of Washington to the slums of Los Angeles the fires of change are raging. The babies born just after WW II came booming into the 60's and nearly caused a national nervous breakdown. Freedom rides and civil rights demonstrations, radical politics, peace marchers, draft card burning, campus takeovers, hippies and Hell's Angels, drugs, sex, violence. That decade ranks as one of the most convulsive periods in American history.

There are those who excuse the action of these malcontents who caused such havoc, by simply excusing their behavior because they are becoming involved—involved they say in changing a sick society—Well maybe they're right. I submit that I'm sick . . . I'm sick of having policemen ridiculed and called pigs while cop killers are hailed as some kind of folk hero.

I'm sick of Black Panthers handing out coloring books to little negro children which portray blacks shooting and knifing policemen with the caption: "The only good pig is a dead one."

I'm sick of men robbing, stealing, burning buildings, threatening others with guns, and teaching others to burn and kill. How long, I ask, will we permit the tacit acceptance of criminal acts just because some thug was raised in a poor environment, or because some murderer had an unhappy childhood? There are always those who are ready to explain the "motivation" behind criminal activity . . . but are unwilling to lift a hand to protect the innocent against such acts.

I intend to exert my responsibilities to freedom by becoming involved and thereby help my country and my society rid itself of this malignant cancerous growth that allows riots, bombings and other mob temper tantrums of people incapable of working within the system. And I challenge each of you to join me in those responsibilities to freedom.

Walt Whitman, the great American philosopher and poet, said—"Everything, everything comes out of the people, the people as you find them and leave them, people, people, just people"—I am one of Whitman's people—just one little part of this vast humanity, but I don't propose to be brow beaten, humiliated, or defeated before my life has scarcely begun. The responsibilities that await me and each of you is to force a turnaround of permissiveness in the home, school, and court. We must quit coddling criminals, we must insist the courts do their jobs, but most of all we must teach respect for discipline in our homes.

I am not saying that there are not things that should be changed in our society, but take note—you will not find me throwing a rock or a bomb, you will not find me under a placard; you will not see me take to the streets; you will not find me ranting to wild-eyed mobs to right wrongs.—But you will find me upholding my responsibilities to freedom by serving in the community where I live. You will also find me expressing my anger and indignation to elected officials. But most of all, you'll find me at the polling place. There if you listen—you can hear the thunder of the common man.

Robert Frost has stated my responsibilities to freedom quite well in his poem *Stopping by the Woods on a Snowy Evening* when he said, "I have promises to keep and miles to go before I sleep—and miles to go before I sleep." My promise as a young adult is to work, and through my actions and the actions of the vast majority of Americans to transmit to other generations a clean and lawful land so that they will not be able to say that these were the worst of times—but the best of times—not the age of foolishness but the age of wisdom—not the winter of despair—but the *spring of hope*.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 20 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DU PONT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STEELMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEHMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALDIE, for 30 minutes, February 21.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LOTT) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUDNUT, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. GRAY in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DU PONT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. GUDIE.

Mr. MILLER in six instances.

Mr. COHEN.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. FORSYTHE in two instances.

Mr. CONABLE in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. RINALDO in five instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. RAILSBACK in five instances.

Mr. LOTT in five instances.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. COLLINS in four instances.

Mr. HUNT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Miss HOLTZMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in 10 instances.

Mr. MOAKLEY in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. SARBANES in five instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in nine instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. BADILLO in five instances.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.

Mr. STOKES in five instances.

Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

Mr. CLARK in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in four instances.

Mr. BRASCO in three instances.

Mr. SISK in two instances.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. HANLEY.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS in two instances.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. KOCH in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in five instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LOTT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. WYDLER.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint Resolution to authorize the erection of a monument to the dead of the 1st Infantry Division, U.S. Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on House Administration

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 21, 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:

459. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the calendar year 1972 on special pay to officers holding positions of unusual responsibility and a critical nature, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 306; to the Committee on Armed Services.

460. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

461. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a request for approval of construction of various border station facilities under the purchase contract provisions of section 5(a) of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

462. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on difficulties of the Labor Department's Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school program and its management problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 182. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; (Rept. No. 93-16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 185. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries on any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 3, rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 93-17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution authorizing

the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations. (Rept. No. 93-18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 226. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1975, a bill to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 345. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: H.R. 4328. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4329. 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.

H.R. 4330. 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. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4331. 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. BADILLO:

H.R. 4332. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4333. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for the National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4334. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for the Federal prison system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4335. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for programs under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4336. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for grants to States for unemployment insurance and employment services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4337. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for airport and airway programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4338. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4339. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Peoples; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4340. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for the National Institutes of Health, for assistance to educa-

tion, or for related programs and activities under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4341. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated to the Veterans' Administration for grants to States for extended care facilities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4342. A bill to prohibit the impoundment of funds appropriated for Appalachian Regional Development programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4343. A bill to establish the Office of Economic Opportunity as an independent agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 4344. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to provide that rents shall not be exempted from any application of this act solely upon the ground that such rents are subject to local rent control laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4345. A bill to prohibit Federal assistance to rental housing projects where tenants are not allowed to have dogs, or to local governments which do not permit dogs in rental housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4346. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4347. 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. BROOMEFIELD:

H.R. 4348. 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. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. GUYER, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.R. 4349. 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.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. RAILSBACH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN, Mr. SCHNEEBELL, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. MALLARY):

H.R. 4350. 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.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the retirement income credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the personal exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent shall be available without regard to the dependent's income in the case of a dependent who is over 65 (the same as in the case of a dependent who is a child under 19); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4353. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the

Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 4355. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide visas for parents of permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4356. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 4357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4358. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964 by designating certain lands for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4359. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 4360. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any non-market economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition to emigration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4361. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus (Mikolaj Kopernik); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4362. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in Cook County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 4363. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into agreements with hospitals, medical schools, or medical installations for the central administration of a program of training for interns or residents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4365. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to authorize an agreement with the Republic of the Philippines providing for hospital care and medical services to be furnished Commonwealth Army veterans and new Philippine Scouts for service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4366. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to consider as active duty service, for certain purposes and under certain circumstances, the initial period of active duty for training served by a veteran pursuant to section 511(d) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 4367. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 4368. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California).

H.R. 4369. A bill to provide for the use of certain funds to promote scholarly, cultural, and artistic activities between Japan and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 4370. A bill to provide that appointments to the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4371. A bill to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 with respect to discrimination on the basis of sex in admissions to undergraduate institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 4372. A bill to amend the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 to provide programs for unemployed scientists and engineers to assist State and local governments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4373. A bill to establish the French Pete Creek National Woodlands Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4374. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4375. 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. GROSS:

H.R. 4376. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 4377. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to direct the President to establish a Rent Control Board which, through the establishment of a cost justification formula, will control the level of rent with respect to residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4378. A bill concerning the war powers of the Congress and the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 4379. A bill to provide for a study and investigation to assess the extent of the damage done to the environment of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia as the result of the operations of the Armed Forces of the United States in such countries, and to consider plans for effectively rectifying such damage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 4380. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4381. A bill to provide for the study of certain lands to determine their suitability for designation as wilderness in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4382. A bill to confer pensionable status on veterans involved in the Brownsville, Tex. incident of August 13, 1906, and to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make certain compensatory payments to such veterans and their heirs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUDNUT:

H.R. 4383. A bill to protect confidential sources of the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4384. 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. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4385. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 in order to establish a framework of national science policy and to focus the Nation's scientific talent and resources on its priority problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 4386. A bill making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the national industrial reserve under the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4387. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956, relating to the payment of annuities to widows of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4388. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4389. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 15 the number of quarters of coverage which an individual must generally have had within a specified 10-year period in order to qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 4390. 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. MILLS of Maryland:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1894, to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations requiring more frequent openings of the Penn Central Drawbridge across the Bush River near Aberdeen, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to deem service as a member of the Women's Airforce Service Pilots during World War II to be active service for purposes of computing retirement and longevity benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4393. A bill to provide that time spent by American civilians in enemy prisoner-of-war camps and similar places shall be creditable (as though it were military service) toward pensions, annuities, or similar benefits under various Federal retirement programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 4394. A bill to implement the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage and the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request):

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4396. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to clarify the proper use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 4397. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit the broadcasting of any advertising of alcoholic beverages between certain hours; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTIS (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 4398. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an insured individual otherwise qualified may retire and receive full old-age insurance benefits, at any time after attaining age 60, if he has been forced to retire at that age by a Federal law, regulation, or order; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DENHOLM, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROE, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 4399. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 4400. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAWKINS, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. ROY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 4401. A bill to implement the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4402. A bill to strengthen and expand the Headstart program, with priority to the economically disadvantaged, to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 4403. A bill; the Antihijsacking Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4404. A bill to amend section 1130 of the Social Security Act to repeal the provision presently limiting to 10 percent the portion of the total grants for social services paid to a State which may be paid with respect to individuals not actually recipients of or applicants for aid or assistance, and to amend the public assistance provisions of such act to specify the minimum periods within which an individual (not receiving aid or assistance) must have been or be likely to become an applicant for or recipient of aid or assistance in order for expenditures for services provided to him to qualify for Federal matching; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that taxpayers shall not be required to reduce the amount of casualty loss deductions by the amount of reimbursement anticipated from the cancellation of certain Federal loans made in the case of certain disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FREY, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 4406. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4407. A resolution to make it clear that code standards prescribed for purposes of the Federal laws relating to housing and urban development do not supersede the corresponding standards embodied in local building, plumbing, electrical, fire prevention, or related codes where the local standards are higher; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 4408. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 4409. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4410. A bill to provide that service performed by prevailing rate employees before conversion to wage schedules under the amendments made by the act of August 19, 1972, shall be counted for all step-increases under the time in step provisions of section 5343(e)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAGUE of Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. MAHON, Mr. WHITE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. FISHER, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 4411. A bill to name a Federal office building in Dallas, Tex., the "Earle Cabell Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 4412. A bill to abolish the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 4413. A bill to promote the exploration and development of geothermal resources through cooperation between the Federal Government and private enterprise; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself and Mr. CONLAN):

H.R. 4414. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase property located within the San Carlos mineral strip; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 4415. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to broadcast license renewals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4416. A bill to support the price of milk at 85 percent of the parity price for the period beginning April 1, 1972, and ending March 31, 1974; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 4417. 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. 4418. 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. VEYSEY (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURGENER, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MAILLARD, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 4419. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify California's right to enforce its own stringent motor vehicle emission standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SISK, Mr. STARK, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. LEAGUE of California, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 4420. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify California's right to enforce its own stringent motor vehicle emission standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 4421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to encourage the use of recycled oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 4422. A bill to extend migrant Health Act and increase appropriation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 4423. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 4424. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4425. A bill; the Eastern Wilderness Areas Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 4426. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, to provide for a mid-decade sample survey of population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4427. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to authorize the Bureau of the Census to establish a program for the canvassing of the election process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4428. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to the financing of the cost of mailing certain matter free of postage or at reduced rates of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business, or any business having twenty-five or less employees in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses, from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4430. A bill to suspend the importation of liquified natural gas and the construction of new storage facilities for such gas until such time as a thorough evaluation of the hazards associated with the marine transportation and the delivery and storage of such gas is made and other actions are taken to prevent or minimize such hazards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4431. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to gun control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 4432. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include in the definition of law enforcement the enforcement of laws, ordinances, and regulations in any State relative to environmental recreation, including parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 4433. 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; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. LOTT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution amending the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to insure the safety of U.S. commercial fishing vessels, crews, and equipment against illegal harassment and seizure; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.J. Res. 347. 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. PETTIS:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to appropriate funds for projects and activities under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the first Sunday of June of each year as "American Youth Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes, and to acquire a permit to locate a desalination plant within the territorial limits of the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to authorize the emergency importation of oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. Roy, Mr. CONLAN, and Mr. RUPPE):

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolution calling for an immediate moratorium on the killing of the eastern timber wolf; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself and Mr. BINGHAM):

H. Res. 223. Resolution of inquiry with respect to a pending grand jury investigation in the Northern District of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 224. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct studies and investigations with respect to matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. ERLENBORN, and Mr. QUIE):

H. Res. 225. Resolution to provide additional funds to the Committee on Education and Labor to study welfare and pension plan programs; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Zivka Jovanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Bernard Mark Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4436. A bill for the relief of CWO Gordon C. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Joseph Francis Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Boulos Stephan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4439. A bill for the relief of George W. Polk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Gerda D. Koziol Etzola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Mary Kay Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Maria Librizzii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Ronald K. Downie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 4444. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Brainard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Diana L. Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 4446. A bill for the relief of Armen Sahakian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 4447. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Maria Hiceta Porquez, and his wife, Erlinda Mosqueda Porquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4448. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. John P. Dunn, Army of the United States, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4449. A bill for the relief of Col. Charles V. Greffet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 4450. A bill to clear and settle title of certain claimants to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Milton Mayer, New York, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

50. Also, petition of AMVETS, Department of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, relative to cuts in veterans' pensions because of increases in social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

51. Also, petition of the Mahoning County Welfare Advisory Board, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to the food stamp benefit entitlement for welfare recipients transferred to the supplemental security income program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

52. Also, petition of Milton Mayer, New York, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.